**Unit 4, Module 12, Video 1: Incorporating Feedback and Refining the First Draft**

This is a brief presentation on a brief chapter that, frankly, represents a heck of a lot of work. That is because the process of going from a first draft to a final draft is often quite involved. Galvan offers only 6 guidelines, each as sensible as you’d expect from our work with him to date. Note, however, that while you’re expected to read this chapter and view this video, there is no assignment associated with it. But, just in the spirit of full disclosure, the system is set up in Blackboard such that we can tell if you viewed the video and for full credit on Unit 4, you need to have done so. So please invest about 15 minutes in the process of doing that, and reading this wise counsel. It’s a time of the semester when energy often flags, so plan for that as well. Okay, off we go!

**Before this process begins, a heads up**

As you’re reading the textbook and viewing this video, think about how you can continue to use Word’s neat features to make your work more organized. How? By generously inserting comments in your manuscript so that they essentially become your to-do list. If you have some over-riding issues or revisions that aren’t exactly associated with a single point of the document, then you can put them on the first page. In addition, your instructor or UTF will also probably be using comments to provide feedback. Remember that, with the way that the shared libraries are configured, there will be a detailed record of what happened when. Therefore, if you delete a comment by a reviewer without acting upon it, that is very easily detected. For that reason, please remember to use the comments feature as intended.

And finally, you will note that this is the last module, even though Galvan’s book has two additional chapters. While you’re welcome to read them, Chapter 13 is about all the stuff you have to worry about if you manage your references by hand – which you are not doing. And I think that Chapter 14, although admirably detailed, really mixes up questions that are pertinent at very different points of the process. We’ve covered many of them already, and the remaining ones are essentially embedded in prior assignments and in the Excel-based rubric. So, in other words, this is it! With that in mind, read the introduction and Guideline 1.

**Guideline 12.1: The reader is always right.**

Galvan owns up to the fact that he’s exaggerating for effect here. In addition to his own interpretation of this point, I would add the following: the reader is always the most trustworthy source of information about their own opinion. But, for example, that opinion may not stand entirely on its own. If they convey confusion at a certain point of the document, then that’s very helpful. But it’s probably the first step in a dialogue, where you will get more information. Read the next two guidelines and then come back.

**Guideline 12.2 & 12.3: What’s the topic of commentary?**
The thing I like about 12.2 is that Galvan is implicitly saying that you should expect the person evaluating your work to be focusing on the substance of your work more than the mechanics. Or, if you get commentary about the mechanics, chances are good that it will not be true copy-editing, where the same error is noted on every occasion. When I’ve been trained in being a reviewer, I actually learned a lot and changed my style rather profoundly. That’s because I did a lot of copyediting. Which, according to the experts, is not super helpful.

And in the spirit of “less is more,” I actually don’t have anything substantive to add to the rest of this chapter’s advice. Well, beyond what I started out saying: implement this guidance by inserting comments. Also, on the web-based resources page are some links to guidance on how to view and print your comments. As they become an ever-more important part of the process, that guidance may now be most helpful.

But since this is the end of the final module and video, let me thank you for your indulgence, your patience, and your very helpful feedback. While these so-called hybrid courses are new to UVM, I think that they represent the potential for significant learning, even though I am sure that I’ll look back in a few years with a mixture of horror and laughter at my fledgling efforts. I hope that, despite any inadequacies, you have been able to see through the glitches and have taken a rewarding journey.

I’ll close with an entirely optional few minutes: if you’re allergic to Broadway musicals, I’d stop right here. One of Rogers and Hammerstein’s most enduring works is *The King and I*, based loosely on the story of Anna Leonowens, a widowed late 19th-century British teacher who was hired by the King of Siam to help educate his many children, born of his several wives. As a sort of introduction to these children, Anna sings one of Richard Rogers’s deceptively simple lyrics. It sums up the central truth of my professional life:

> It’s a very ancient saying,  
> But a very honest thought.  
> That if you become a teacher,  
> By your pupils you’ll be taught.

So thank you for giving me the gift of learning—from you!