

Note: For all the assignment due dates, please refer to the course outline.

English 102

Summary (20% of the term grade)

Objectives:

- To develop the skill of summarizing accurately a piece of writing by another author.
- To continue to develop revising and editing skills.

Task:

Write a summary (about 250 words) of **one** of the following essays:

- Zinsser, W. "Simplicity". In P. Farvolden & P. Lumsden (Eds.), *Classic Short Prose Reader* (164-168). Toronto: Prentice Hall.
- Zinczenko, David. "Don't Blame the Eater". In G. Graff & C. Birkenstein (Eds.). *They Say I Say*. (195-197)

Expectations:

Follow the MLA format. Please note that no marks are awarded for this but that I still expect it. Completion of this task will help you later on with your research project.

ENGL 111 Summary Evaluation Guide

Name:-----

Mark: /100

	Excellent /Strong (80-100)	Very Good /Good (70-79)	Satisfactory (60-69)	Needs Work (0-50)
Bibliographical information is complete (5)				
The writer's thesis, purpose and method are stated (15)				
The summary covers the main ideas of the essay (20)				
The major ideas are intelligently unified, coherent, and well developed. The material is kept in the same order and proportion as in the original. The summary ends in the same way the essay ends (25)				
Reference to the author Strong signal verbs No distortion of the original idea Use of denotative (emotionally neutral) language (10)				
Writing on the technical level is sound (25)				

Grant MacEwan University

English 102 Critical Analysis of an Argument (25% of the term grade)

Draft copy due for peer review workshop (Refer to the date mentioned on the course outline)

For the peer editing / review workshop, please bring a **hard/printed** copy of complete essay draft to the class. The essay should be properly formatted with a “Works Cited” page. **In-class peer review exercises and in-class quizzes are not eligible to be turned in late or for make-ups. If you miss class, you miss the work.**

Formatting Requirements:

- MLA format
- Times New Roman, Font Size 12
- 1” margins on all sides, but NOT right-justified
- Double spacing
- 700-750 words

This assignment is based on the on a small selection of essays that we have discussed so far. Choose **one** of the topics for your critical analysis essay. Make sure that you write a well-organized and carefully written critique that makes a specific argument. Remember that mechanics count, so do please leave yourself time to take your paper through that all-important copy-editing and proof-reading process. **When you hand in your revised essay, make sure to clip the draft copy and the peer-edited worksheet to it. Provide a Works Cited entry for the essay you choose to use.**

Please feel free to consult with me at any point in the writing process.

1. To what extent does Orwell succeed in persuading the reader to accept his point of view in “Shooting an Elephant”?
2. To what extent does Forster succeed in persuading the reader to accept his point of view in “My Wood”?
3. In “Globalisation’s Time Is Up”, to what extent does Kunstler succeed in convincing the reader that “the sunset of the current phase of globalization seems dreadfully close to the horizon”?
4. In his essay “The Men We Carry in Our Minds”, to what extent does Sanders present a credible case about his attitudes towards gender issues?

As discussed in class, a critical analysis of an argument does the following things:

- Analyses the piece of writing for subject, main idea, argument, and evidence, and provides a context for your critical writing.
- Evaluates the strengths and weaknesses of the argument and evidence by providing some critical commentary on whether the evidence used is sufficient, whether the “moves” used to develop the argument are sufficient to prove the case, and whether there are any gaps or flaws in the logic.
- States a thesis that gives an opinion about the relationship between strengths and weaknesses in the work, provides support for that opinion, and indicates that you are using the logical standard of evaluation.
- Reflects a logical organizational structure, and includes middle paragraphs with strong arguments and effective evidence gained through observations of the text
- Summarizes the main points by presenting both the strengths and weaknesses of the argument, and includes comments on the larger implications of the argument.

Peer Editing/Review:

For the peer review workshop, please bring a **hard/printed** copy of complete essay draft to the class. The essay should be properly formatted with a "Works Cited" page.

In-class peer review exercises and in-class quizzes are not eligible to be turned in late or for make-ups. If you miss class, you miss the work. The following criteria illustrates how your peer review performance will be judged:

Brought a hard copy of paper to class: 3 pts

Provided peers with specific, constructive written feedback: 3 pts

Participated actively in discussion of each paper: 1 pts

Wrote specific response to peers' feedback: 3 pts

Total score for each peer review session: 0-10 pts

Guidelines for Peer Review

Few writers can rely on their own judgment to know whether something they've written is clear to someone else. Peer review sessions give writers an opportunity to find out what their writing looks like to someone else. Reviewers can help you discover whether what you've written is appropriate to your purpose and intended reader, is well-organized, concise, and easy to read. Peer reviewing/editing will also help you get used to having others review your work to let you know what works best. Peer editing helps the writer receive input and guidance, and it also helps the peer reviewers understand how to improve their own writing.

Here are some suggestions for approaching a piece of writing that you are reading as a peer editor:

- Always read through a piece twice. Use your first time through just to get familiar with the piece. Your second reading is your opportunity to really try to understand what is being said and how. If you still aren't sure after two readings, the writer needs to know.
- Take the role of the intended reader What writers need most is someone who will read in the same way as the intended reader will—that is, someone who is reading for content not for errors. The most valuable editing advice concerns content, organization and style. Peer editors whose only comments are about punctuation, mechanics or spelling may help the writer write a more correct piece of writing, but it still may not be clear or engaging. Leave the copy-editing to the writer.
- Avoid "fixing" the problem. Your role as peer editor is not to fix the problems you find but to bring them to the writer's attention. Do not take on the writer's work as your own. The biggest help you can offer is to point out what works and doesn't work for you as a reader.
- Be honest but constructive. It can be hard to say what you really think about a piece of writing. It's often tempting to say "Looks fine to me," but your writer will learn nothing from the exercise. A good approach is to start by telling the writer what you like and then

mention what doesn't work. Be tentative: rather than saying "This is really muddled" try something like "I wasn't completely clear about what this sentence meant."

- Be specific, and do not to make blanket judgments ("It's really hard to understand) or vague statements ("Your description here is ok) in favor of specific instances ("This list really makes the procedure clear"; "I think you need to make this point more clearly"). Wherever you can, say **why** you found that something worked or didn't work.

When you are the writer, here are some suggestions for how you can get the most out of having a peer editor review your work:

- Always explain the purpose and audience to your peer editor as well as any other information that will help your editor understand what the intended reader of the piece might need.
- Take advantage of the opportunity. Writers benefit from the feedback they get from peer editors, even if they don't much like it at the time. When you write, try to think of your work as open to revision. Take advantage of having someone read your work to make what you write clearer and more readable.
- Ask when you don't understand. Feel free to ask your editor for clarification if you find the person's comments too vague or otherwise unclear. Similarly, if your peer editor says what you've written "looks fine" ask about specific parts of your draft ("Did you think the purpose was clearly stated in my introduction?").
- Don't take it personally. If you feel rather upset by the comments of your peer editor, remind yourself that the comments are about your writing, not about you. If someone finds what you've written unclear, confusing, muddled, repetitive or just plain boring, that's one person's opinion. Accept it and see what you can do to correct it.

Feel free to decline. If you've considered your peer editor's advice and don't feel that it's helpful, you're always free to ignore it. But usually if a reader says there's a problem, it's worth taking a careful look.

You will learn how to write your essays, but also learn more from evaluating each other's writing, which supplies more ideas about how to modify your own writing. You benefit from playing the role of assessor for your peers and gain feedback about your strengths and weaknesses from the peers in such activities. A combination of both written and oral feedback has been shown to be most effective in peer assessment of writing.

Category	Yes	No (Give reasons)
Does the title reflect the argument of the paper?		
Does the intro include a summary (of the text/essay) with a spin that allows the summary to fit with your own overall agenda while being true to the text you are summarizing?		
Are the counter-arguments addressed in the introduction / the body paragraphs? Do the introductory lines make a smooth transition towards the thesis?		
Is the thesis clear and easily identifiable at the end of the introduction?		
Are the major points of the argument stated along with the thesis?		
Does the argument show an understanding and engagement with the topic?		
Does the author take risks or approach the topic from a new perspective?		
Do the topic sentences convey the major points of the argument?		
Do the major points connect with the thesis?		
Does the author engage with adequate and persuasive primary source support (secondary source support for a research paper)?		
Are quotations integrated properly?		
Is the paper well-organized with logical transitions between paragraphs?		
Is the language appropriate to an academic paper?		
Are there major lapses in terms of grammar and mechanics? Does the paper follow MLA standards?		
Does the conclusion reaffirm the argument and open it up for wider implications?		
Does the conclusion leave you with a clear understanding of the topic?		
Does the paper make you interested in the topic?		

Given the above criteria (the paper's purpose/evidence/organization/conclusion/mechanics), was this paper successful?

Go over the checklist with the writer, explaining your observations. (You may also refer to the grading rubric overleaf).

Your reflection on peer-editing (for more detailed response, you may comment on the back of the last page of your essay draft):

What major comments came up about your paper from your peer? Which were most useful to you and why?

What major changes did you make to your paper after your peer/peers discussed your rough draft?

ENGL 102 Critical Analysis Essay Evaluation Sheet

Writer's Name:

Peer-edited by:

Category	Excellent /Strong (80-100)	Very Good /Good (70-79)	Satisfactory (60-69)	Needs Work (0-50)
<u>Content: 35%</u> - Grasp of the main concepts of the work - Evidence and details: well supported with textual evidence				
<u>Overall organization: 35%</u> Introduction: - Analyses the piece of writing and provides a context for your critical writing - Evaluates the strengths and weaknesses of the argument/ evidence - Includes a clear thesis statement that outlines the major points in support for your opinion and indicates that you are using the logical standard of evaluation Body Paragraphs: - Include topic sentences that convey the major points of your argument mentioned in the thesis; body sentences support the main point and reflect a logical/clear sequence of ideas with adequate evidence; the concluding sentence reinforces the major point without repeating or summarizing Conclusion: - summarizes the main points (without being repetitive and without stating the obvious, "to summarize", "to conclude" etc.); includes comments on the larger implications of the argument				
<u>Language and Mechanics: 30%</u> Language: - word usage appropriate to rhetorical situation - accurate and concise language - effective use of transitions - voice: formal enough for an academic paper, strong and original voice Mechanics: - spelling, punctuation, and grammar - proofreading, documentation, format				

Peer editing:

Mark:

ENGL 102

Persuasive Research Essay (30% of term grade)

Draft copy due for peer editing workshop (Refer to the date mentioned on the course outline) For the peer editing workshop, please bring a **hard/printed** copy of complete essay draft to the class. The essay should be properly formatted with a “Works Cited” page.

In-class peer editing exercises and in-class quizzes are not eligible to be turned in late or for make-ups. When you hand in your revised essay, make sure to clip the draft copy and the peer-edited worksheet to it. Provide a Works Cited entry for the essay you choose to use.

Choose **one** of the topics for your research essay. Your essay should be about **1000-1200** words in length, and double-spaced. Do not justify right-side margins, and use at least 12 pt font. Your essay must integrate material from at least **four** secondary sources. You may use academic sources obtained through the library (electronic articles on databases / e-books, journals, books), popular print sources (books, articles, newspapers, magazines), government documents, trade books, and credible internet sources. Two of these four sources **MUST** come from academic material in the library. Only one of your sources can come from the free Internet, but it must be of high quality and relevance. Be sure to include both in-text citations and ‘Works Cited’ entries for all your sources.

Remember that this assignment is an essay, not a report. Use the information you obtain from secondary sources to support your own interpretation of the work you are analyzing. For this reason, it’s important to figure out your own ideas about the works before you do any research. Please make sure that your essay is well-organized and carefully written in MLA format, and that it makes a specific argument. Remember that mechanics count, so do please leave yourself time to take your paper through that all-important copy-editing and proof-reading process. When you hand in your revised essay, make sure to clip the draft copy and the peer-edited sheet to it.

Please feel free to consult with me at any point in the writing process.

1. In her essay “Girl Unprotected”, Robinson argues that justice system fails to protect women in the hockey system. To what extent do you agree with Robinson’s claim? In your persuasive research essay, respond to the author’s position and explain your viewpoint on her claim.
2. In “Embraced by the Needle”, Maté argues that that drug addictions always originate in emotional deprivation, and are not caused by physiological predispositions or individual moral failures. In a well-researched persuasive essay, evaluate Maté argument.
3. To what extent do you agree with Zinczenko’s claim that fast-food industry is fuelling obesity by failing to provide healthier food alternatives and adequate warning labels on its foods? In a well-researched persuasive essay, evaluate Zinczenko’s argument.

Persuasive Research Essay Evaluation Form

Name:

Peer-edited by:

Category	Excellent /Strong (80-100)	Very Good /Good (70-79)	Satisfactory (60-69)	Needs Work (0-50)
<u>Content: 35%</u> - grasp of the main concepts of the work, insights, depth, complexity - engagement with topic, risk taking - evidence and details: well-integrated, and well supported with textual evidence and secondary sources				
<u>Overall organization: 35%</u> - introduction: guides the reader, includes some counter-argument and a clear thesis statement outlining the major points - body paragraphs: topic sentences convey the major points; body sentences support the main point and reflect a logical/clear sequence of ideas with adequate evidence; the concluding sentence reinforces the major point without repeating or summarizing - conclusion: summarizes the main points (without being repetitive and without stating the obvious, “to summarize”, “to conclude” etc.); includes comments on the larger implications of the argument				
<u>Language and Mechanics: 30%</u> Language: - word usage appropriate to rhetorical situation - accurate and concise language - effective use of transitions - voice: formal enough for an academic paper, strong and original voice Mechanics: - spelling, punctuation, and grammar - proofreading, documentation, format				

Peer-editing:

Mark: