Cover Sheet

Attach this sheet to the front of your essay [2 points]

**Student number**: **Email**: **Class**: English 1/THURS/1200-1500h

For each assignment, you need to save your assignment as a single **pdf** file. Use the checklist to make sure you have submitted everything that is needed (type ‘X’ under ‘YES’ or ‘NO’). **Checklist** for all assignments:

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Item** | **YES** | **NO** |
| 1. This cover sheet |  |  |
| 1. The **affirmation** (below) is signed (by typing my student number in the blank) |  |  |
| 1. The **FINAL DRAFT** of my essay (copy & paste) |  |  |
| 1. The completed **reflection** (Both Reflection #1) |  |  |
| 1. The **rubric** for this assignment (already attached!) |  |  |
| 1. **Only my student number is used in the document** |  |  |
| 1. It is saved as a pdf file and as a Word file |  |  |
| 1. The file name is “mystudentnumber\_essaytype (e.g. *201712345\_PRO-D3.pdf*) |  |  |
| 1. I emailed a PDF version **and** an MS Word version to the professor before the deadline |  |  |

Note: If the following affirmation is not signed, I will not mark your paper until it is. (just type your name)

AFFIRMATION:

*I affirm that the following essay is entirely my work. Any portions that are not my own ideas or words have been cited in the text and the original source is in the reference list. I understand that the professor checks all work with an antiplagiarism program. I also understand that submitting work that is not entirely my own will result in a grade of 0 (“zero”) for the assignment and no make-ups will be permitted.*

**Student number**: .

# Title of your essay

**Copy and paste the text of your essay** **here** – Use Times New Roman, 12pt font, 2.0 spacing, left-aligned (as is this template). Make sure you indent one tab for later paragraphs (not the first). Use APA formatting for any citations and referencing. See the OWL (“OWL,” 2017) for guidance on APA if you forget. (No reference are necessary for the PRO-D3 essay).

## References

Purdue OWL: APA Formatting and Style Guide. (2017). Retrieved February 22, 2017, from <https://owl.english.purdue.edu/owl/resource/560/01/>

# PRC Reflection #1 (complete after PRO-D1 PRC)

Answer the following questions. For each, provide at least **one specific example** (80 – 100 words per answer). Type your answers on this sheet. [8 points]

**1 Think about your peer feedback process. What helped you the most (this time)?**

**2 Think about your peer feedback process. What was least helpful (this time)?**

**3 What will you do differently the next time you do peer review?**

**4 How else did you get feedback on this draft before you submitted it? How was it different from the peer review process? Explain.**

# PRC Reflection #2 (completed after PRO-D2 PRC 2)

Answer the following questions. For each, provide at least **one specific example** (80 – 100 words per answer). Type your answers on this sheet. [8 points]

**1 Think about your peer feedback circle. What different between your last group and this group?**

**2 Think about your new PRC group. What was the most helpful and the least helpful (this time)?**

**3 What will you do differently the next time you do peer review? How is this different from before?**

**4 How else did you get feedback on this draft prior to this PRC or submitting it? How was that feedback different from the PRC? Was it more or less helpful than the PRC? Explain.**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **PROCESS ESSAY** | **Weak to under-developed (none)** | **Developing to below average** | **Average to Good** | **Very good to excellent** | **Total** |
| **Organization**  **(30)** | **(0) 13-16**  May be missing key structural components. Does not communicate well; very difficult to follow argument line, disorganized. Thesis, TS’s and conclusion missing, unrelated, or repetitive | **17-21**  Some elements are not present or clearly unsuccessful. Ideas somewhat unclear or disconnected, lacks logical sequencing, incomplete development, poor transitioning. Thesis TS and/or CP not explicitly related or one or more missing or repetitive | **22-26**  All structural elements are present, some more successfully than others. Ideas clear, sequencing may be questionable, loose organization, transitions not always signaled clearly, choppy or stringy. Thesis, TS’s and CP related and introduce the process, but not engaging or do not cover the whole process | **27-30**  All necessary structural elements are present and well-formed. Ideas clearly stated and supported, logical sequencing, smooth transitions and signals; focused, cohesive. Thesis, TS’s and conclusion are explicitly related; introduce the process and state the author’s point about the process. |  |
| **Content**  **(20)** | **(0) 7-9**  Shows little knowledge of topic, non-pertinent, does not develop the thesis or answer the claim, lack of detail – contains generalization only, or details not related to the topic | **10-13**  Limited knowledge, little substance; treats the surface of the topic; inadequate development, overly general with limited detail; details are either not clear & specific, or there are not enough of them to clearly analyze the topic | **14-17**  Some knowledge of subject, adequate range of information, partial development of thesis, relevant to topic; lacks detail.  Details are concrete and specific, but not engaging or interesting. (min 2 details) | **18-20**  Each BP contains a clearly focused topic sentence that relates to the process being described. Details in the essay are clear and specific, and there are enough details to help the reader see and understand all the steps of process. Concrete sense language is used effectively |  |
| **Language**  **(20)** | **(0) 7-9**  Very limited range, essentially a translation; inappropriate use of words/forms leads to fatal issues of understanding | **10-13**  Limited range, overly repetitive of items, frequent errors of form/use/choice; understanding is difficult or impossible sources | **14-17**  Adequate range, generally appropriate register and style; few errors (none fatal to understanding) | **18-20**  Sophisticated range of language, appropriate register and style, few (or no) errors of language |  |
| **Citations and referencing**  **(if assigned)**  **(10)** | **(0) 3-5**  Formatting is used with the presence of many mistakes; incorrect citations or missing sources. Uses of sources of ill-repute (yahoo, wikipedia, blogs) | **5-6**  Formatting is used with the presence of mistakes, but the source of all information is clear. Uses mostly popular, relevant website sources (well-known .com & .org) | **7-8**  Formatting is used consistently but not correct format. OR there are minor flaws I the mechanics of the referencing. Sources are generally of good repute, integrated with popular sources | **9-10**  Formatting is used accurately (in-text and in the ref. list). No mistakes are present. No evidence of copying without citing. Only uses sources of highest repute (books, scholarly articles, academic websites) |  |
| **Format / Mechanics**  **(10)** | **(0) 3-5**  No mastery of conventions or COPS. Many errors in both formatting or paragraphing. Inconsistent use of capital letters. Several RO’s, FRAGs, CSs | **5-6**  Many errors in conventions and COPS. They obscure meaning; somewhat painful to read; meaning and intent can be discerned. One or two major errors (RO, FRAG, CS) | **7-8**  Almost complete mastery of conventions. Few errors, but there may be patterns of error indicating unlearned rules or systematic errors, but the overall meaning is clear. | **9-10**  Demonstrates mastery of conventions. NO errors in COPS (capitals, omitted words, punctuation, spelling), and paragraphing; may be one or two non-systematic errors but does not detract from overall message |  |
| **Cover sheet**  **(2)** | **0** Not present | - | **1** Incomplete | **2** Correctly filled in and signed |  |
| **Reflection**  **(8)** | **0-2**  Not done or only minimal answers given with no examples | **3-4**  Superficial; lacks clear examples; OR unrelated to actual PRC | **5-6**  Self-analysis is inconsistent. Some responses clearly better than others. Relevant to goals of PRC and of writing | **7-8**  Excellent in-depth self-analysis. Demonstrates knowledge of goals of peer review circle (PRC) and of writing. Clear, explicit answers that demonstrate your thoughts with clear example for each |  |
| **TOTAL** |  | | | | /100 |