Cover Sheet

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

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

Save each assignment as a single **pdf** file. Use the checklist to ensure all parts are submitted (type ‘X’ under ‘YES’ or ‘NO’):

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **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
 |  |  |
| 1. The completed **PRC reflection** (Reflection #1 AND Reflection #2)
 |  |  |
| 1. The **rubric** for this assignment
 |  |  |
| 1. **Only my student number is used in the document**
 |  |  |
| 1. It is saved as a pdf file
 |  |  |
| 1. The file name is “mystudentnumber\_essaytype (e.g. 2017123456\_CC-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.

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

Text of your essay – Use Times New Roman, 12pt font, 1.5 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.

# PRC Reflection #1 (completed after our CC-D1 for PRC 1)

Answer the following questions. For each, provide at least **one specific example** (80 – 100 words per answer). Type your answers on this sheet. [4 points]

**1 Think about your new PRC group. Was it good to be in a new group again? What was different?**

**2 Think about your new PRC group. What was the most helpful or 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 essay prior to the this week? Was it more or less helpful?**

# PRC Reflection #2 (completed after our CC-D2 for PRC 2)

Answer the following questions. For each, provide at least **one specific example** (100 – 120 words per answer). For dual-part questions, please write longer responses. Type your answers on this sheet. [4 points]

**1 Think about your final PRC group. How does it compare to the other groups you were in?**

**2 Has your ability to give feedback in the PRCs (in English) strengthened or not over the term? Are you better able to articulate questions and answers, clarify and critique? Explain and give examples.**

**3 Overall, what will you change about your own writing as a result of doing PRCs?**

**4 What will you change about how you give others feedback as a result of following the PRC process? How is this different from earlier feedback that you have given?** (Please answer both parts).

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | **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; introduction and thesis are well-developed but not so engaging  | **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. They cover both subjects and the author’s point for the comparison or contrast; essay map has three clear and relevant points  |  |
| **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**Knowledgeable, substantive, thorough development of thesis; relevant to topic. Details are concrete and specific, effectively represent either causes or effects related to the topic of analysis. There are enough details to clearly analyze the topic, and each cause or effect has sufficient details (min 3) for clear analysis. |  |
| **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 or 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 both conventions and COPS which obscure meaning; somewhat painful to read; meaning and intent can be discerned. Several major errors (RO, FRAG, or CS).  | **7-8**Almost complete mastery of conventions. Few minor 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 points**Not present | **1 point**Incomplete | **2** **points** Correctly filled in and signed | - |  |
| **Reflection****(8)**  | **0-2 points**Not done or only minimal answers given with no examples.  | **3-4 points**Superficial; lacks examples; OR unrelated to actual PRC | **5-6 points**Self-analysis is inconsistent. Some responses clearly better than others. Relevant to goals of PRC and of writing | **7-8 points**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 |