

## FL 222 Checklist and reflective statement for Creative Rewriting Papers

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

Signature:

Name:

Date:

Title:

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

		YES	SOMEWHAT	NO
1.	Did you reflect on the topic carefully before writing?			
2.	Did you clearly formulate your idea for extending or rewriting the story?			
3.	Did you make an outline before writing?			
4.	Is the title of the paper informative and interesting?			
5.	Is the sequencing between and within paragraphs logical and cohesive?			
6.	Did you include enough concrete and detailed elements for your story to connect with the original?			
7.	Are any quotations from the original story well integrated and formatted correctly in italics with page references?			
8.	Do the vocabulary, style, and tone echo the author's and the correct time period?			
9.	Do any new characters fit well with the original story?			
10.	Is the sentence structure varied?			
11.	Does the reflection portion of the paper adequately reflect your re-writing experience? Did you add to it at each stage?			
12.	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 the next time you have to write a paper?

## SCORING RUBRIC FOR CREATIVE PAPERS IN FL 222

### SCORE CRITERIA

#### CONTENT:

37-40	<i>Excellent to very good:</i> knowledgeable; substantive, thorough development of the new story, including appropriate plot and tone; characters are well chosen; dialogue is appropriate for the period; point of view appropriate for the story, good imitation/appreciation of the original material; literary devices noted and repeated; reflection portion shows understanding of the original text as well as the writing process, relevant to the topic assigned. Adaptation is imaginative and nuanced.
32-36	<i>Good to average:</i> some knowledge of the original text; adequate range of imitation/appreciation of author's style and context; limited thematic development and use of examples; mostly relevant to the topic, but lacks resonance with original text; adaptation shows some originality; rewrite reflects original adequately; reflection section adequate, but may be too long or short.
27-31	<i>Fair to poor:</i> limited knowledge of the subject; minimal substance, analysis and synthesis; poor thematic development, interpretation of original material; adaptation shows little understanding of the original text; inadequate reflection.
23-26	<i>Very poor:</i> shows little or no knowledge of the original text; lacking analysis or synthesis of the material and lacking good examples; inadequate quantity; not relevant, or not enough to rate.

#### ORGANIZATION AND FORMAT:

27-30	<i>Excellent to very good:</i> clear statement of ideas; title that orients the reader to the original story; clear organization (beginning, middle, and end) and smooth transitions in both parts; opening leads reader into story; reflection appropriately separated from literary portion; 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 but not interesting; weak distinction between rewriting and reflection sections; 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) <a href="#">peer review</a> and evidence that you have addressed these comments, 3) <a href="#">the checklist/reflective statement</a> , 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 **10 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.