

FL 222 Checklist and reflective statement

I have neither given nor received unauthorized aid on this paper.

Signature:

Name:

Date:

Title of paper:

Answer these questions before submitting the final draft and include with your paper. Write on the back of the sheet if necessary.

	Checklist adapted from <i>A Short Guide to Writing about Literature</i>	YES	SOMEWHAT	NO
1.	Is the title of my paper informative and interesting?			
2.	Do I identify the subject of my essay (authors and titles) early?			
3.	What is my thesis? Do I state it soon enough (perhaps even in the title) and keep it in view?			
4.	Is the organization logical and effective? Does each point lead into the next and support the thesis?			
5.	Is each paragraph unified by a topic sentence or topic idea?			
6.	Are the quotations an appropriate length? Are they well integrated and presented correctly? Do they provide evidence and let the reader hear the author's voice?			
7.	Is the opening paragraph interesting and, by its end, focused on the topic? Is the final paragraph conclusive without being repetitive?			
8.	Is the tone appropriate? Is the language formal rather than informal?			
9.	Is the present tense used to describe the work and what happens?			
10.	Is the sentence structure varied?			
11.	Is the vocabulary varied and lively or thought-provoking?			
13.	Did you address the comments and corrections from peer and instructor reviews?			
14.	Did you spell check AND proofread? Did you check punctuation?			

Reflective Statement

* Were you able to achieve your personal and academic goals for this class this semester? Why or why not? Comments?

* Which was your favorite of the works we read this semester? Why?

* Which was your least favorite of the works we read this semester? Why?

* What do you like best about this paper?

* What would you like to improve next time you have to write a paper?

SCORING RUBRIC FOR WRITTEN ESSAYS IN FL 222

SCORE CRITERIA

CONTENT:

37-40	<i>Excellent to very good:</i> knowledgeable; substantive, thorough development of the thesis, including appropriate examples; quotations are well chosen to support the argument; quotations are well integrated and presented correctly, good analysis and synthesis of the material; literary devices noted and analyzed, good use of comparison and contrast, critical inquiry and interpretation. Interpretation is imaginative and nuanced.
32-36	<i>Good to average:</i> some knowledge of the subject; adequate range of analysis and synthesis; limited thematic development and use of examples; mostly relevant to the topic, but lacks detail in critical interpretation of the material; quotations support the argument somewhat; quotations are adequately integrated, but may be too long or short. Interpretation shows some originality.
27-31	<i>Fair to poor:</i> limited knowledge of the subject; minimal substance, analysis and synthesis; poor thematic development, use of examples and critical interpretation of the material; inadequate use of quotations. Interpretation is predictable and/or unfocused.
23-26	<i>Very poor:</i> shows little or no knowledge of the subject; lacking analysis or synthesis of the material and lacking good examples; inadequate quantity; not relevant, or not enough to rate. Interpretation is overly predictable.

ORGANIZATION AND FORMAT:

27-30	<i>Excellent to very good:</i> clear statement of ideas; title that orients the reader to the thesis; clear organization (beginning, middle, and end) and smooth transitions; introduction leads reader into topic; conclusion effectively summarizes main findings and follows logically from the analysis presented, logical and cohesive sequencing both between and within paragraphs; quotations/footnotes properly cited; length, spacing, fonts, margins, numbered pages all carefully adhered to.
22-26	<i>Good to average:</i> main ideas clear but loosely organized or connected; title pertinent to the thesis; sequencing logical but incomplete; bibliographical material and formatting adequate.
17-21	<i>Fair to poor:</i> ideas not well connected; title too general; poor organization and transitions; logical sequencing and development lacking; formatting inadequate.
13-16	<i>Very poor:</i> ideas not communicated; no title; organization, sequencing and transitions lacking, or not enough to rate, formatting lacking.

GRAMMAR, VOCABULARY, AND FLUENCY:

18-20	<i>Excellent to very good:</i> fluent expression; accurate use of relatively complex structures; very few grammatical errors. Complex range of vocabulary; accurate word/idiom choice; mastery of word forms and expressions; appropriate level of usage.
14-17	<i>Good to average:</i> adequate fluency; simple constructions used effectively; some problems in use of complex constructions; some grammar and spelling errors.
10-13	<i>Fair to poor:</i> low fluency; significant mistakes in the use of complex constructions; frequent grammar and spelling errors, lack of accuracy interferes with meaning.
7-9	<i>Very poor:</i> lacks fluency; no mastery of simple sentence construction; text dominated by errors; does not communicate meaning, or not enough to rate.

SUPPORTING DOCUMENTS

8-10	<i>Excellent to very good:</i> all supporting documents required are attached and appropriately labeled: 1) a typed first draft; 2) peer review and evidence that you have addressed these comments, 3) the checklist/reflective statement , and 4) final draft reflecting all previous work.
6-7	<i>Good to average:</i> checklist/reflective statement missing.
3-5	<i>Fair to poor:</i> Two of the supporting documents missing.
1-2	<i>Very poor:</i> Three of the supporting documents missing.

Late submissions will be penalized by at least **5 points/day**, if an extension is not suggested or approved ahead of time by professor.

REMINDER TO STUDENTS: ALL WORK SUBMITTED MUST BE ACCOMPANIED BY A SIGNED NC STATE ACADEMIC CODE OF STUDENT CONDUCT HONOR PLEDGE. ANY VIOLATION OF THE PLEDGE WILL RESULT IN A FAILING GRADE FOR THE PAPER.

Adapted from: Hedgcock and Lefkowitz, "Collaborative Oral/Aural Revision in Foreign Language Writing Instruction," *Journal of Second Language Writing* 1(3):255-76, 1992, cited in Scott, *Rethinking Foreign Language Writing*, 1995, p. 116.