Name: Matthew\_Kwong

Assessment: [grade here]

Comments:

You have a good summary and response. However, your analysis has room for improvement in making a clear claim about the Expertise lens and providing an explanation of the examples. Your analysis was focused on Sonne’s expertise, not in the different expertise that the author mention in the article. If you have any questions, please contact us during office hours, TA sessions, or by email.

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Section** | **Criterion** | **Assessment** | **Comments** |
| Summary | Objectivity | 1 | The summary is completely objective. |
|  | Originality | 1 | The summary is in your own words (no quotations). |
|  | Length | 1 | The summary is 250-300 words. |
| Response | Focus | 1 | The response is your own reactions to or thoughts about the article. |
|  | Length | 1 | The response is 250-300 words. |
| Analysis | Claim | 0 | The analysis makes a claim about the article based on the specific lens. |
|  | Support | 0.5 | *The analysis sometimes supports the claim with examples or short quotations from the article.* |
|  | Explanation | 0.5 | *The analysis sometimes explains how the examples or quotations support the claim.* |
|  | Length | 1 | The analysis is 250-300 words. |
| SRA as a whole | Clarity | 1 | The writing throughout is clear and unambiguous |
| Attributions | 1 | It is clear at all points which ideas are yours and whom other ideas are from. |
| Professionalism | 1 | The SRA is written and formatted according to instructions (i.e., with a heading and word count for each section).  The SRA has been spell checked. |