

**Geoffrey B. Elliott**

**Fall 2015**

**ENGL 1113: Composition I—Reference Document**

Appearing on the following pages are best versions of the major documents distributed to students in my four sections of ENGL 1113: Composition I—Sections 025, 044, 084, and 102—during the Fall 2015 instructional term at Oklahoma State University in Stillwater, Oklahoma. They appear much as they were distributed to students; the only changes imposed on them are those made during the instructional term after errors were found in them and an adjustment to the Profile Assignment Sheet made to preserve student privacy.

In order, the documents are

- Syllabus and Course Calendar
- Diagnostic Exercise
- Literacy Narrative Assignment Sheet\*
- Profile Assignment Sheet\*
- Textual Analysis Assignment Sheet\*
- Evaluation Assignment Sheet\*
- Final Exam Assignment Sheet\*
- Final Exam Prompt\*
- Special Exercise Assignment Sheet
- Special Exercise Prompt
- Riddle Quiz 1
- Riddle Quiz 2
- Riddle Quiz 3
- Riddle Quiz 4
- Riddle Quiz 5
- Riddle Quiz 6

\* indicates materials for major assignments.

**Geoffrey B. Elliott**  
**ENGL 1113: Composition I Syllabus and Course Calendar**  
**Fall 2015**

<b>Office</b>	411 Morrill Hall Oklahoma State University Stillwater, OK 74078	<b>Office Phone</b>	405-744-2084
		<b>Office Email</b>	<a href="mailto:geoffrey.b.elliott@okstate.edu">geoffrey.b.elliott@okstate.edu</a>
		<b>Office Hours</b>	MWF 0930-1020 MWF 1130-1220

Note that information in this document is subject to change. Reasonable efforts will be made to inform students of any such changes that occur.

### **Course Description**

Per the University, ENGL 1113: Composition I treats “The fundamentals of expository writing with emphasis on structure, development and style. [*sic*]”

### **Course Objectives**

Per program policy, the primary goal for ENGL 1113 is that “Students will recognize composing as a process and demonstrate that recognition by adapting their compositions to a variety of rhetorical situations and audiences through inventing, drafting, revising, and editing writing in a variety of styles and genres.” This is reflected in a programmatic statement of desired outcomes, to wit:

By the end of English 1113, all students will:

- Recall and describe vivid details through a narrative that shapes and expresses those details for a general/public audience.
- Interpret and explain vivid details through inquiry and observation, and then characterize those details in the form of a profile constructed for a general/public audience.
- Break down and analyze the rhetorical moves made in a primary text, and then arrange and assemble those details in an essay explaining their overall purpose/effect for a specialized/academic audience.
- Evaluate and assess the positions taken in a collection of texts about a particular researched subject and take a stance on that issue through a thesis-driven essay for a specialized/academic audience.
- Read, summarize, analyze, synthesize, and evaluate texts in a variety of styles, genres, and mediums, demonstrating the ability to do so in forms that may include - but are not limited to - class discussions, quizzes, annotations, and writing about writing.
- Revise and edit multiple drafts to produce writing that is well organized, mechanically and grammatically sound, and mostly error free.

### **Textbook**

Per program policy, ENGL 1113 requires one textbook: Richard Bullock, Maureen Daly Goggin, and Francine Weinberg’s *The Norton Field Guide to Writing with Readings and Handbook*, 3rd edition (ISBN 978-0-393-91959-2). Be sure to get the correct edition, as the class will make use of materials and will reference pagination and chapters in that edition and not in others.

The textbook may be available in an electronic edition as well as in print. Students who opt to use electronic textbooks should note that they, and they alone, are responsible for securing access to the text during class time and for any hardware or software problems attendant upon their doing so.

### **Other Resources**

In addition to the required textbook, the following resources will be helpful or vital in carrying out the tasks of the course:

- OSU Writing Center, Student Union 440, <http://osuwritingcenter.okstate.edu>, 405-744-6671
- *ElliottRWI*, [www.elliotttrwi.com](http://www.elliotttrwi.com)
- *Purdue University Online Writing Lab*, <http://owl.english.purdue.edu>
- Major English-language dictionary, such as those from Oxford University (preferred) and Merriam-Webster
- Access to campus email and D2L
- Pen/pencil and paper every class meeting

## Evaluation

Student grades in the class will be determined according to the distribution in Table 1, below.

**Table 1: Grading Distribution**

Assignment or Category	Percent of Grade
Literacy Narrative (LitNarr)*	10
Profile*	15
Textual Analysis (TxtAn)*	20
Evaluation (Eval)*	20
Final Exam (FinEx)*	5
Special Exercise (SpEx)	5
Minor Assignments (i.e. quizzes, homework)	15
Student Professionalism (Prof; see below)	10
<b>Total</b>	<b>100</b>

\* Indicates a major assignment.

Major and some minor assignments will be assessed in terms of their demonstrated performance in several categories (these will be discussed in more detail on the individual assignment materials). Individual categories on such assignments will be assigned a number of “steps,” individual motions through the grading scale indicated on Table 2, below; the total number of steps, positive or negative, will indicate the final assignment score.

Some minor assignments will only be offered an overall score. Such scores also conform to Table 2, below.

**Table 2: Grading Scale**

Score	A+	A	A-	B+	B	B-	C+	C	C-	D	F	0
Steps	+7	+6	+5	+4	+3	+2	+1	+/-0	-1	-2	-3 or more	N/A*
Numerical Equivalent	98	95	92	88	85	82	78	75	72	65	55	0

\*Grades of zero (0) result from non-submission of assignments or from academic integrity violations.

Final grades for the term will be reported according to the standard grading scale in force at Oklahoma State University, which unfortunately eschews -plus and -minus grades (i.e., A+, A, and A- are all reported as A).

Each of the major written assignments with the exception of the FinEx is expected to be submitted as a work of polished prose. “Polished prose” refers to work that has been written and revised more than once; much time in class will be given over to reading and critique of the work we do in the class. We shall take the short works of polished prose through a cycle of invention,

drafting, and revision. As part of this, you will need to be ready to read and comment appropriately on the work of your classmates as well as to have them do the same to your work. **Peer review is a vital component of this class, and is to be conducted respectfully and only within the context of the classroom.**

Please note that you may be asked to read your work aloud for the class to critique; sometimes talking through a piece is just what is needed. As with peer review, **presentations will be conducted respectfully and only within the classroom context.**

Please note that most major and many minor assignments will be submitted through D2L and that the plagiarism-detection software included in D2L will be applied to the materials submitted through it.

I generally grade fairly holistically. This does not mean that I shall not mark or penalize your errors, but I shall do my best to give you better and more useful feedback on the work you do than simply “fixing” your punctuation and spelling and slapping a grade on the work. Mechanical “correctness” is important, but organization, depth, and originality of thought are more so.

In this class, the fact that you or somebody else paid for you to have a seat does not entitle you to any specific grade; by registering and meeting the requirements for this class, you have earned the right to have access to higher learning and the **opportunity to earn** credit, much as you have to pay to take a martial arts class but are not assured of earning any specific belt. I do not **give** you a grade, you **earn** a grade; I report to you on the quality of the work you turn in to me, as measured against standards expressed for each assignment.

### **Discussion of Grades and Progress**

I am always happy to discuss your progress and grades with you. I am not going to discuss your grades with your parents, your siblings, your roommates, your spouses, your children, or anyone else except as required by my superiors and the law. I am also not going to discuss your grades over the phone or through email; if you want to know your grades, come see me during office hours or set up an appointment, and we can go over how you are doing, what you have done well, and what you can improve upon.

### **Attendance**

Ideally, every student will attend every class meeting. Things happen that ought not to happen, however, and so some allowance for absence is made. Per program policy, students enrolled in Monday/Wednesday/Friday sections of ENGL 1113 may miss up to six classes without penalty to the final grade. Penalties apply afterward as follows:

- The seventh absence incurs a five percent reduction from the final grade (i.e., a grade of 92% is reduced to 87%).
- The eighth incurs a ten percent grade penalty (i.e., a grade of 92% is reduced to 82%).
- The ninth incurs a fifteen percent grade penalty (i.e., a grade of 92% is reduced to 78%).
- The tenth absence results in automatic failure of the class.

Program policy additionally makes the following statement, with the original emphasis retained:

You are expected to be present every day your class meets, but we do allow a specific number of absences without penalty for unavoidable circumstances that may occur. Absences beyond the limit are considered excessive and result in grade reductions. The only absences that do not count toward the total allowed are those taken for mandatory military service and activities required for classes or scholarships. **No other absences will be considered excused, including absences due to illnesses, doctor's appointments, and emergencies.** Reductions will be taken on a percentage basis from the total number of points possible in the course. Students are expected to arrive in class on time in order to be counted present. Requests for exemption from this policy must be made in writing to the Program Director. However, exemptions are extremely rare and have been granted only for the most extraordinary circumstances.

The composition program director is Prof. Lynn C. Lewis (309C Morrill Hall, 405-744-6267, [lynn.lewis@okstate.edu](mailto:lynn.lewis@okstate.edu)).

### **Tardiness and Early Departure**

Students are encouraged to note the above statement from program policy, repeated here for convenience: "Students are expected to arrive in class on time in order to be counted present." Students are additionally subject to being counted absent if they leave before a class meeting is dismissed, or if they are out of the room for protracted periods during class (usually more than five minutes), or multiple times in a given class period.

### **Late Work**

Program policy makes the following statements regarding missed and late work:

#### **Missed in-class work**

Students absent for university-sponsored activities (which do not include social or Greek-sponsored activities, clubs, or intramural athletics) or mandatory military service may make up work missed due to such absence. Other policies regarding missed in-class work are at the discretion of the instructor.

#### **Late work**

Grades of work defined as "late" (coming in after established due date and time) will be reduced by 5% of the total points possible for the assignment each day it is late. Instructors may determine if this policy includes drafts and how weekends will be counted toward the grade reduction. Instructors may reduce the grade on a paper by up to 5% if a conference or peer editing session is missed.

#### **Missing work**

You must complete all required drafts and all final copies of the four major papers in order to receive credit for the course.

### **Student Professionalism**

Please treat the classroom with the same degree of attention and consideration as any professional space. Please show up to class prepared and on time; **this means having necessary materials, having completed the assigned readings, and having prepared any assignments upon entry into the classroom.** Silence or deactivate electronics during class time, and refrain from private conversations outside of group/class discussion. If you are late, please be respectful of the instructor and others in the classroom by quietly and quickly finding a seat without gratuitous comment, questioning, or other obtrusive behavior (this includes interrupting lecture or discussion to explain your tardiness, ask what the class is doing, or make other comments). The same requests also apply to those who need to leave early. If you feel the need to discuss late arrival or early departure, please do so via email, during office hours, or before or after class.

Please note that excessive tardiness or early departure will negatively impact your professionalism in addition to other penalties noted above. Please note also that egregious violations of professional conduct will result in your being asked to leave; if you are thusly asked to leave, you will be counted absent for the class.

### **Special Needs Students**

This class follows the program's statement regarding students with special needs, presented below:

If you think you have a qualified disability and need special accommodations for this course, you should notify your instructor and request verification of eligibility for accommodations from the Office of Student Disability Services (315 Student Union) as soon as possible. Accommodations for disabilities cannot be made until the instructor receives a verification letter from the SDS office, and accommodations cannot be made retroactively for assignments already completed or absences already accrued. For more information, call 405-744-7116 or go to <http://sds.okstate.edu/>.

### **Academic Integrity**

This course follows the program statement regarding academic integrity, provided below:

According to University Policy, plagiarism is "presenting the written, published or creative work of another as the student's own work. Whenever the student uses wording, arguments, data, design, etc., belonging to someone else in a paper, report, oral presentation, or other assignment, the student must make this fact explicitly clear by correctly citing the appropriate references or sources. The student must fully indicate the extent to which any part or parts of the project are attributed to others. The student must also provide citations for paraphrased materials." Plagiarism can result in failure of the course or suspension from the University. For more information, see the policies listed at <http://academicintegrity.okstate.edu/>.

### **Contact Policy**

Email is my preferred mode of contact outside of class time; I check my email at least once (and usually more often) each day I am scheduled to teach, usually in the morning. As a note, I do not sit up all night waiting for my email inbox to chime, and I may not have time to read and answer all emails before class.

### **Agreements**

Students who remain enrolled in the class past the Nonrestrictive Drop/Add Deadline signal their understanding of, and agreement to, the policies and procedures outlined in this syllabus.

A form will be distributed allowing students to opt into or out of the use of their work in the course for study and professional development purposes. Opting in or out will make no difference to grading.

## Course Calendar

Readings and minor assignments not already on the course calendar (Table 3, below) may be announced in class. When they are, they are to be treated as appearing on the calendar at the correct time. Also, readings may not always be discussed in class. You are still responsible for knowing the material; the readings form the bases for discussions and are likely to undergird any necessary quizzes and/or homework.

“Readings Due” indicates that the readings listed are assigned **to be completed before the beginning of class** on the day listed, unless otherwise noted. “Norton” refers to readings in the standard course textbook. “Assignment Due” indicates that the activities listed are to be completed and submitted at the time and in the manner indicated. Due dates for major assignments, including the FinEx, and their significant components, are already noted.

In the event that a given class day has neither reading nor activity listed, class will still meet normally. The only times class does not meet as scheduled will be announced in advance (if possible) or posted on the door to the classroom.

**Table 3: Course Calendar**

Week	Date	Readings Due	Assignment Due
1	17 Aug.	Syllabus (in class) Course Calendar (in class)	
	19 Aug.		Diagnostic Exercise (in class)
	21 Aug.		
2	24 Aug.	LitNarr Assignment Sheet Norton, Chs. 7, 15, and 57	
	26 Aug.	Norton, Chs. 22-28, 30, 31, 40, and 41	
	28 Aug.		LitNarr PV (in print as class begins)
3	31 Aug.		
	2 Sept.		
	4 Sept.	Norton, Handbook	LitNarr RV (via D2L before the beginning of class)
4	9 Sept.		
	11 Sept.	Profile Assignment Sheet Norton, Chs. 16 and 63	LitNarr FV (via D2L before the beginning of class)
5	14 Sept.	Norton, Chs. 22-28, 36, 37, and 38	
	16 Sept.	Norton, Chs. 1-4, 30, 34, and 41	
	18 Sept.		Profile PV (in print as class begins)
6	21 Sept.		
	23 Sept.		
	25 Sept.	Norton, Handbook	Profile RV (via D2L before the beginning of class)
7	28 Sept.		
	30 Sept.		
	2 Oct.	TxtAn Assignment Sheet Norton, Chs. 6, 8, and 58	Profile FV (via D2L before the beginning of class)
8	5 Oct.	Norton, Chs. 22-28	
	7 Oct.	Norton, Chs. 43-50	
9	12 Oct.		TxtAn PV (in print as class begins)
	14 Oct.		
	16 Oct.		

**Table 3, continued**

Week	Date	Readings Due	Assignment Due
10	19 Oct.		
	21 Oct.	Norton, Handbook	TxtAn RV (via D2L before the beginning of class)
	23 Oct.		
11	26 Oct.		
	28 Oct.		
	30 Oct.	SpEx Assignment Sheet	TxtAn FV (via D2L before the beginning of class)
12	2 Nov.		SpEx (in class)
	4 Nov.	Eval Assignment Sheet Norton, Chs. 10, 13, and 61	
	6 Nov.	Norton, Chs. 22-28, 43-50	
13	9 Nov.		Eval PV (in print as class begins)
	11 Nov.	Norton, Chs. 31-33, 35, and 41	
	13 Nov.		
14	16 Nov.	Norton, Handbook	Eval RV (via D2L before the beginning of class)
	18 Nov.		
	20 Nov.		
15	23 Nov.	FinEx Assignment Sheet Norton, Ch. 42	Eval FV (via D2L before the beginning of class)
16	30 Nov.		
	2 Dec.		
	4 Dec.		
17	Varies	FinEx, by section: Section 025: Friday, 11 December, 1000-1150; meet in the regular classroom Section 044: Friday, 11 December, 1400-1550; meet in the regular classroom Section 084: Monday, 7 December, 0800-0950; meet in the regular classroom Section 102: Wednesday, 9 December, 1000-1150; meet in the regular classroom	

**Dates to Remember**

The following notes derive from program and University calendars, with the exception of the note regarding 2 November.

- Monday, 24 August: 100% Refund, Nonrestrictive Drop/Add Deadline
- Friday, 28 August: Partial Refund- Restrictive Add/Drop Deadline
- Monday, 7 September: Labor Day, classes do not meet
- Tuesday, 29 September: Six-week grades due
- Friday, 9 October: Fall Break, classes do not meet
- Monday, 2 November: Prof. Elliott will be away at a conference. Class will still meet. Attendance will be taken. Note the activity on the course calendar.
- Friday, 6 November: W Drop/Withdraw Deadline
- Friday, 20 November: W/F Withdraw Deadline
- Wednesday through Friday, 25-27 November: Thanksgiving Break, classes do not meet

Other dates may be announced.

**Geoffrey B. Elliott**  
**Fall 2015**  
**ENGL 1113: Composition I—Diagnostic Exercise**

<b>Student Name</b>	<b>Student ID</b>

On the following pages, please draft a well-developed essay that addresses the prompt given below. The essay will not be graded, per se, but it will be used 1) to take attendance in class on the day administered and 2) to assess where the class as a whole is in its writing skills so that instruction may be more appropriately focused. It may also factor into the Prof score awarded at the end of the term, so please approach it sincerely and honestly.

Please also be sure to retain this document once it is reviewed and returned. It may well be of use in such future assignments as the LitNarr and FinEx.

One last thing: Please confine your remarks to the space provided.

**The Prompt**

What has been your experience with literacy? Has it been good or bad, overall? Why has it been thus? Please explain in a way that makes clear to an educated reader who reads well but does not share your background, expertise, or experience.







**Geoffrey B. Elliott**

**Fall 2015**

**ENGL 1113: Composition I—Literacy Narrative Assignment Sheet**

Below appears a print version of the guidelines for the Literacy Narrative (LitNarr), posted online at <http://goo.gl/Xa5ZKm>. The online version is to be considered authoritative, superseding any previously published information regarding the LitNarr.

The program describes the LitNarr as seeking “To practice and develop writing strategies that include vivid description, a well-told story, and a sense of significance/meaning to the story. To be able to define literacy (see below) and apply this definition to selected contexts [*sic*].” It defines literacy as “the ability to use context-specific language enabling a communicative act. It is bound up with reading and writing traditionally but may also be considered to include other forms of communication.”

The program stipulates for the LitNarr that “Students will write a 4-5 page narrative essay that explores an experience with literacy and applies writing techniques that include description, a well-told story, and a sense of significance/meaning to the story. The essay will follow MLA conventions for font, margins, page numbering and title.”

Sections of the course taught by Prof. Elliott will need to complete a number of individual tasks to negotiate the assignment successfully:

- Select and read an article from the list provided;
- Compose a version of the LitNarr for peer review (LitNarr PV), bring that version to class in print as assigned, and review it in collaboration with classmates;
- Revise the peer review version of the LitNarr in light of comments made by peers and submit the resulting version (LitNarr RV) online for instructor review; and
- Revise the instructor-reviewed version of the LitNarr in light of comments made by the instructor and submit the resulting final version (LitNarr FV) online for assessment as a major assignment.

Information about each follows.

**Select and Read an Article**

Owing to the nature of literacy, experiences with it are many and varied among the students who will compose a LitNarr. In the interests of building common points of reference for class discussions, providing examples of the level of discourse appropriate to a general public audience, and in building a knowledge base useful for future assignments in the class, students will focus the LitNarr on one of the following three articles, written by Frank Bruni for the *New York Times*:

- “Today’s Exhausted Superkids” (29 July 2015)
- “A Prudent College Path” (8 August 2015)
- “Can We Interest You in Teaching?” (12 August 2015)

Each is available online. Choose one and read it. While doing so, be sure to take detailed notes of the experiences of selecting and reading (perhaps looking at the assignment guidelines provided below to guide note taking). It is from those notes that the text of the LitNarr will proceed most easily, as it is easier to make notes as matters are in progress and collate them later than to try to recall all of the details at that later time.

Begin on the reading and note-taking as soon as can be done. Early beginnings allow more time for completion, as well as more time for reflection and revision; each conduces to better performance on assigned tasks, which translates into better grades.

### **Compose the LitNarr PV**

After reading the selected article and taking notes on it, draft a narrative that relates your experience of reading to a potential reader who has completed high school in the United States but has not gone to college and who does not share your background, experience, or expertise. In doing so, you will need to provide some background information about yourself—possibly including a summary or distillation of your previous reading experiences—so that your reader can understand from what position and understanding you approach the exercise.

You will also need to offer context for the writing; that is, you will need to offer expressions of the circumstances in which the assignment is being conducted. Remember that you are writing to a reader who does not share your background, and your college coursework is part of that background.

The bulk of the draft should concern itself with the actual narrative. Moving chronologically, report the experience of reading the piece. In telling the story, address such questions as

- What did you think?
- What did you feel?
- What made sense?
- What confused you?

In essence, tell the story of your selecting and reading the piece you choose.

The draft should conclude with an indication of what implications the literacy experience detailed has for your future work as a reader and writer. That is, consider what the reader can take away from your reported experience of reading.

It is not strictly necessary that the draft be the full required length of the LitNarr FV (4 to 5 full pages, formatted appropriately, equivalent to some 1,300-1,625 words); it is assumed that the work is in progress. That said, a more complete draft is more desirable than a less complete one, largely in that it eases the later work that must be done and offers more opportunity for concrete improvement to the writing that is done. Please note also that the text composed in the draft may well need to change; keep in mind that it cannot get better without changing, and that all writing can be improved.

Please type the draft, either initially or as a later stage of composition, prior to class time on **28 August 2015. Please bring a typed and printed copy of that draft to class as the LitNarr PV on that day**; class that day will concern itself with peer review, with students reading and commenting on one another's papers. (Guidelines for how to do so will be provided.) This will allow students 1) access to other readers to help ensure comprehensibility of their narratives and 2) practice in reading and assessing written work, which they may then apply to their own writing moving forward.

A holistic minor assignment grade will be taken from the presence or absence of your LitNarr PV in class that day; the instructor will call for student drafts while peer review is in session during class that day. A reasonably complete or complete draft for the LitNarr PV will receive an A. One mostly in place but still lacking one or two major components will receive a B. One perhaps half-done will receive a C. One that lacks several major components will receive a D. One that is barely sketched-out will receive an F. Students who arrive in class without drafts will receive a zero for the minor assignment grade, as will those who fail to attend class that day (excepting those covered under class attendance policies expressed in the syllabus and detailed during class discussions).

Students are encouraged to consult with the instructor and with tutors in the Writing Center during the process of composing the LitNarr PV. No extra credit will be afforded to the project for doing so, but doing so is likely to improve the grade received and will likely be considered positively in the Prof score awarded at the end of the term.

### **Revise the LitNarr PV into the LitNarr RV**

Following peer review of the LitNarr PV, you are **strongly** encouraged to revise your draft in light of the comments made by your peer reviewer/s. Work from global issues—such as enhancing and clarifying your background and the context of the assignment, rethinking the ordering of the main narrative thrust, and reconsidering the implications of your narrative for other readers—to more local issues—such as how best to transition between each major part, how to transition from paragraph to paragraph and sentence to sentence, and how best to phrase for concision and emphasis. Only after all of that is done should there be any thought of checking and amending as appropriate the surface-level features of formatting, spelling, punctuation, and the like.

The draft that results from that process of revision, the LitNarr RV, should still have an introduction that offers a synopsis of your reading background so that readers can understand your approach to the work, comments offering context for the assignment so that they can understand what it is supposed to do, a narrative that depicts your experience of the process of reading the selected piece, and a conclusion that moves toward what readers can do once armed with the knowledge of your experience of reading the selected piece. It **does** need to be at the full length of the assignment (4 to 5 full pages, formatted appropriately, equivalent to some 1,300-1,625 words); even though it is still a work in progress, it should be nearing completion. It may still need to change, however, as all writing can be improved.

It is to the end of improving it yet further that **the LitNarr RV is to be submitted to the instructor via D2L before the beginning of class time on 4 September 2015**. It needs to be a .doc, .docx, or .rtf document, so that comments may be appended to it. A version of the form that will be returned to students along with the reviewed LitNarr RV appears below; assessment standards are outlined more thoroughly thereupon. A minor assignment grade will be taken therefrom. Ideally, the grade and comments will serve to motivate further improvement in advance of the final submission detailed below.

Students are encouraged to consult with the instructor and with tutors in the Writing Center during the process of developing the LitNarr RV. No extra credit will be afforded to the project

for doing so, but doing so is likely to improve the grade received and will likely be considered positively in the Prof score awarded at the end of the term.

### **Revise the LitNarr RV into the LitNarr FV**

Once the LitNarr RV is returned—which will be via email through the D2L classlist—you are **strongly** encouraged to revise it in light of the comments made on it by the instructor. As with revising the LitNarr PV into the LitNarr RV, work from global issues—such as enhancing and clarifying your background and the context of the assignment, rethinking the ordering of the main narrative thrust, and reconsidering the implications of your narrative for other readers—to more local issues—such as how best to transition between each major part, how to transition from paragraph to paragraph and sentence to sentence, and how best to phrase for concision and emphasis. Only after all of that is done should there be any thought of checking and amending as appropriate the surface-level features of formatting, spelling, punctuation, and the like.

The draft that results from that process of revision, the LitNarr FV, should still have an introduction that offers a synopsis of your reading background so that readers can understand your approach to the work, comments offering context for the assignment so that they can understand what it is supposed to do, a narrative that depicts your experience of the process of reading the selected piece, and a conclusion that moves toward what readers can do once armed with the knowledge of your experience of reading the selected piece. It **does** need to be at the full length of the assignment (4 to 5 full pages, formatted appropriately, equivalent to some 1,300-1,625 words), since it **is** the final submission of the LitNarr project. While all writing can be improved, there comes a point at which the task of developing a piece of writing must be set aside in favor of other concerns; the LitNarr FV is that point for the LitNarr project.

It is in the interests of providing feedback with which to develop other writing that **the LitNarr RV is to be submitted to the instructor via D2L before the beginning of class time on 11 September 2015**. It needs to be a .doc, .docx, or .rtf document, so that comments may be appended to it. A version of the form that will be returned to students along with the reviewed LitNarr FV appears below; assessment standards are outlined more thoroughly thereupon. **A major assignment grade worth 10% of the total course grade will be taken therefrom.**

Students are encouraged to consult with the instructor and with tutors in the Writing Center during the process of developing the LitNarr FV. No extra credit will be afforded to the project for doing so, but doing so is likely to improve the grade received and will likely be considered positively in the Prof score awarded at the end of the term.

### **Grading Rubric**

Please note that, in the interest of offering students practice in proofreading and editing their own work, comments offered through reproductions of the form below are general in nature. That is, they identify systematic problems and make broad suggestions rather than making line-by-line corrections.

The same rubric will be used for both the LitNarr RV and the LitNarr FV. Grading of the LitNarr PV is detailed above.

With the rubric below, all papers start at a grade of C, as baseline competence is presumed unless there is reason to believe otherwise.

Category	Comments	Steps Yes/No
Assigned Guidelines Met	•	+0/-3
Ample and Appropriate Background Provided	•	+2/-1
Ample and Appropriate Context Provided	•	+2/0
Ample and Appropriate Narration Provided	•	+2/-2
Ample and Appropriate Conclusion Provided	•	+2/-1
Correct Formatting Provided	•	0/-1
Mechanical Correctness Displayed	•	0/-1
Engagement Developed	•	+1/0
<b>Total Change in Steps and Grade Equivalent</b>		
<b>Overall Comments</b>		

- Assigned Guidelines Met—Is the paper at the required length? Is it of the assigned genre?
- Ample and Appropriate Background Provided—Does the paper offer sufficient information about the narrator that a general public reader would understand the narrator’s stance towards and past experience with literacy?
- Ample and Appropriate Context Provided—Does the paper offer sufficient information about the project being undertaken that a general public reader would understand its nature and be able to interpret it appropriately?
- Ample and Appropriate Narration Provided—Does the paper offer a sufficiently intricate account of the process and experience of reading that a general public reader would be able to follow the series of events as a story?
- Ample and Appropriate Conclusion Provided—Does the paper indicate what a general public reader can take from the narrative? Does it motion towards some lesson for the reader or general statement about literacy?
- Correct Formatting Provided—Is the paper submitted as a .doc, .docx, or .rtf file? Is it typed on a letter-size sheet in 12-point, double-spaced Times New Roman or Garamond font? Does it have a heading, title, and page numbers in accordance with MLA standards?
- Mechanical Correctness Displayed—Do the paper’s usage, spelling, punctuation, and similar surface-level concerns conform to the standards promulgated by the MLA and discussed during class time?
- Engagement Developed—As a sort of extra-credit component, does the paper offer some particularly engaging or poignant elements unusual or exceptional in a work of first-year composition? Does it stake out an unusual position or make a solid and reasonable attempt to push the boundaries of the assignment in productive ways?

## Notes

Aside from the piece read, no outside information should be deployed in completing the LitNarr. Since there will be no need to reference outside information other than the piece read, informal citation will suffice for it—although that informal citation must still be sufficient for a readership that does not share the authorial/narrative background, experience, and expertise to clearly understand the piece being referenced. **Failure to provide appropriate informal citation may be treated as an academic integrity violation.**

Aside from the examples of such pieces and similar pieces provided in the Norton, many examples of the kind of work to be done for the LitNarr project can be found at the *Digital Archive of Literacy Narratives*, <http://daln.osu.edu/>. Examples can also be found through the instructor's website, specifically <http://goo.gl/Xa5ZKm>. Review of them is encouraged, as having models to follow tends to make work easier to do.

Below appears a print version of the guidelines for the Profile, posted online at <http://goo.gl/z6yvWh>. The online version is to be considered authoritative, superseding any previously published information regarding the Profile.

The program describes the Profile as seeking “To continue to develop the ability to select and organize details in order to reveal an interesting topic, present a particular angle, and define a topic’s significance through the profile genre. To practice and develop interview and observation skills as appropriate research methodology. [*sic*].”

The program stipulates for the Profile that “students will select an individual, group, place, or event to observe and/or interview as appropriate to the assignment in order to write a 4-6 page profile. They will research appropriate background or context and develop the skills of selecting appropriate and interesting details. The essay will follow MLA conventions for font, page numbering, margins and title.”

Sections of the course taught by Prof. Elliott will need to complete a number of individual tasks to negotiate the assignment successfully:

- Coordinate with the assigned subject of the profile, determine what angle or approach to take toward the subject, draft interview questions for that subject, and conduct at least one interview of the subject;
- Compose a version of the Profile for peer review (Profile PV), bring that version to class in print as assigned, and review it in collaboration with classmates;
- Revise the peer review version of the Profile in light of comments made by peers and submit the resulting version (Profile RV) online for instructor review; and
- Revise the instructor-reviewed version of the Profile in light of comments made by the instructor and submit the resulting final version (Profile FV) online for assessment as a major assignment.

Information about each follows.

### **Coordinate with and Interview the Subject**

To help streamline the process of composing the Profile, the subject of the paper is being assigned. Tables 1 through 4, below, lay out, by section, who will be the subject of whose paper.

It will be necessary to meet with the assigned subject, as effective writing requires knowledge of the materials treated. Coordinate with the subject to establish appropriate meeting times; it is not likely that class time will be devoted to completion of the assignment, as other concerns will necessarily occupy assigned instructional time.

After an initial meeting, a potential angle—an overall impression to create about the subject—should begin to emerge. Draft a series of interview questions to elicit information from the subject that can be used to demonstrate that angle. A combination of closed-ended and open-ended questions will be of benefit, the former because of ease of interpretation, and the latter for the provision of additional—and sometimes unexpected—information. More specific questions will be of greater benefit than less specific, as their answers will tend to require less interpretive

work than will broader questions. Asking after demographic data is a good beginning; other questions should point towards the angle being pursued in the paper.

**Table 1: ENGL 1113.025 Subject Assignments**

<b>Writer</b>	<b>Subject</b>	<b>Writer</b>	<b>Subject</b>
Redacted	Redacted	Redacted	Redacted
Redacted	Redacted	Redacted	Redacted
Redacted	Redacted	Redacted	Redacted
Redacted	Redacted	Redacted	Redacted
Redacted	Redacted	Redacted	Redacted
Redacted	Redacted	Redacted	Redacted
Redacted	Redacted	Redacted	Redacted
Redacted	Redacted	Redacted	Redacted
Redacted	Redacted	Redacted	Redacted
Redacted	Redacted	Redacted	Redacted

**Table 2: ENGL 1113.044 Subject Assignments**

<b>Writer</b>	<b>Subject</b>	<b>Writer</b>	<b>Subject</b>
Redacted	Redacted	Redacted	Redacted
Redacted	Redacted	Redacted	Redacted
Redacted	Redacted	Redacted	Redacted
Redacted	Redacted	Redacted	Redacted
Redacted	Redacted	Redacted	Redacted
Redacted	Redacted	Redacted	Redacted
Redacted	Redacted	Redacted	Redacted
Redacted	Redacted	Redacted	Redacted
Redacted	Redacted	Redacted	Redacted
Redacted	Redacted	Redacted	Redacted
Redacted	Redacted	Redacted	Redacted

**Table 3: ENGL 1113.084 Subject Assignments**

<b>Writer</b>	<b>Subject</b>	<b>Writer</b>	<b>Subject</b>
Redacted	Redacted	Redacted	Redacted
Redacted	Redacted	Redacted	Redacted
Redacted	Redacted	Redacted	Redacted
Redacted	Redacted	Redacted	Redacted
Redacted	Redacted	Redacted	Redacted
Redacted	Redacted	Redacted	Redacted
Redacted	Redacted	Redacted	Redacted
Redacted	Redacted	Redacted	Redacted
Redacted	Redacted	Redacted	Redacted
Redacted	Redacted	Redacted	Redacted
Redacted	Redacted	Redacted	Redacted

**Table 4: ENGL 1113.102 Subject Assignments**

<b>Writer</b>	<b>Subject</b>	<b>Writer</b>	<b>Subject</b>
Redacted	Redacted	Redacted	Redacted
Redacted	Redacted	Redacted	Redacted
Redacted	Redacted	Redacted	Redacted
Redacted	Redacted	Redacted	Redacted
Redacted	Redacted	Redacted	Redacted
Redacted	Redacted	Redacted	Redacted
Redacted	Redacted	Redacted	Redacted
Redacted	Redacted	Redacted	Redacted
Redacted	Redacted	Redacted	Redacted
Redacted	Redacted	Redacted	Redacted

It may also be of benefit to interview others who have knowledge of the subject, although this is entirely optional. Observing the subject, however, is highly recommended; opportunities to do so outside of class time should be coordinated with the subject.

Begin on the interviewing as soon as can be done. Early beginnings allow more time for completion, as well as more time for reflection and revision; each conduces to better performance on assigned tasks, which translates into better grades.

**Compose the Profile PV**

After conducting the preliminary work to identify and gather information about the subject, draft an initial version of the Profile. Thinking of it as an essay with the angle as its thesis may be of help in the composition.

While the paper may follow any number of structures, it will benefit from opening with a name and description of the subject. Discussing the context in which the subject was encountered will likely be of benefit, as doing so will help the reader to understand the approach being taken towards the work. It may also lend itself towards an easy statement of the angle; again, thinking of the angle as a thesis to be proven in the rest of the essay may be of benefit.

The Profile that follows can be primarily narrative or primarily descriptive. A narrative approach will benefit from adhering to chronological order, recounting the process by which the writer learns enough about the subject to inform the angle and providing evidence along the way that supports that angle, explaining along the way. A descriptive approach will benefit from breaking the angle into component parts, offering evidence that conduces to each of those component parts, and explaining how it does so.

The Profile will also do well to conclude with some indication of what can be done now that the reader has the information provided. While moralization is not likely to be effective, some indication of what has been gained through carrying out the work of the Profile is likely to be of help.

It is possible to write a humorous or satirical Profile. **This should not be done without the approval of the subject;** s/he should know s/he will be a figure of fun in the project. The same overall guidelines otherwise apply.

It is not strictly necessary that the draft be the full required length of the Profile FV (4 to 6 full pages, formatted appropriately, equivalent to some 1,400 to 2,100 words); it is assumed that the work is in progress. That said, a more complete draft is more desirable than a less complete one, largely in that it eases the later work that must be done and offers more opportunity for concrete improvement to the writing that is done. Please note also that the text composed in the draft may well need to change; keep in mind that it cannot get better without changing, and that all writing can be improved.

Please type the draft, either initially or as a later stage of composition, prior to class time on **18 September 2015. Please bring a typed and printed copy of that draft to class as the Profile PV on that day;** class that day will concern itself with peer review, with students reading and commenting on one another's papers. (Guidelines for how to do so will be provided.) This will allow students 1) access to other readers to help ensure comprehensibility of their narratives and 2) practice in reading and assessing written work, which they may then apply to their own writing moving forward.

A holistic minor assignment grade will be taken from the presence or absence of your Profile PV in class that day; the instructor will call for student drafts while peer review is in session during class that day. A reasonably complete or complete draft for the Profile PV will receive an A. One mostly in place but still lacking one or two major components will receive a B. One perhaps half-done will receive a C. One that lacks several major components will receive a D. One that is barely sketched-out will receive an F. Students who arrive in class without drafts will receive a zero for the minor assignment grade, as will those who fail to attend class that day (excepting those covered under class attendance policies expressed in the syllabus and detailed during class discussions).

Students are encouraged to consult with the instructor and with tutors in the Writing Center during the process of composing the Profile PV. No extra credit will be afforded to the project for doing so, but doing so is likely to improve the grade received and will likely be considered positively in the Prof score awarded at the end of the term.

### **Revise the Profile PV into the Profile RV**

Following peer review of the Profile PV, you are **strongly** encouraged to revise your draft in light of the comments made by your peer reviewer/s. Work from global issues—including clarity of the angle and effective support for it—to more local issues—such as how best to transition between each major part, how to transition from paragraph to paragraph and sentence to sentence, and how best to phrase for concision and emphasis. Only after all of that is done should there be any thought of checking and amending as appropriate the surface-level features of formatting, spelling, punctuation, and the like.

The draft that results from that process of revision, the Profile RV, should still have clear indications of the subject and the angle of approach, as well as well-explained evidence

supporting the latter and a conclusion motioning toward implications of the supported angle. It **does** need to be at the full length of the assignment (4 to 6 full pages, formatted appropriately, equivalent to some 1,400 to 2,100 words); even though it is still a work in progress, it should be nearing completion. It may still need to change, however, as all writing can be improved.

It is to the end of improving it yet further that **the Profile RV is to be submitted to the instructor via D2L before the beginning of class time on 25 September 2015**. It needs to be a .doc, .docx, or .rtf document, so that comments may be appended to it. A version of the form that will be returned to students along with the reviewed Profile RV appears below; assessment standards are outlined more thoroughly thereupon. A minor assignment grade will be taken therefrom. Ideally, the grade and comments will serve to motivate further improvement in advance of the final submission detailed below.

Students are encouraged to consult with the instructor and with tutors in the Writing Center during the process of developing the Profile RV. No extra credit will be afforded to the project for doing so, but doing so is likely to improve the grade received and will likely be considered positively in the Prof score awarded at the end of the term.

#### **Revise the Profile RV into the Profile FV**

Once the Profile RV is returned—which will be via email through the D2L classlist—you are **strongly** encouraged to revise it in light of the comments made on it by the instructor. As with revising the Profile PV into the Profile RV, work from global issues—including clarity of the angle and effective support for it—to more local issues—such as how best to transition between each major part, how to transition from paragraph to paragraph and sentence to sentence, and how best to phrase for concision and emphasis. Only after all of that is done should there be any thought of checking and amending as appropriate the surface-level features of formatting, spelling, punctuation, and the like.

The draft that results from that process of revision, the Profile FV, should still have clear indications of the subject and the angle of approach, as well as well-explained evidence supporting the latter and a conclusion motioning toward implications of the supported angle. It **does** need to be at the full length of the assignment (4 to 6 full pages, formatted appropriately, equivalent to some 1,400 to 2,100 words), since it **is** the final submission of the Profile project. While all writing can be improved, there comes a point at which the task of developing a piece of writing must be set aside in favor of other concerns; the Profile FV is that point for the Profile project.

It is in the interests of providing feedback with which to develop other writing that **the Profile FV is to be submitted to the instructor via D2L before the beginning of class time on 2 October 2015**. It needs to be a .doc, .docx, or .rtf document, so that comments may be appended to it. A version of the form that will be returned to students along with the reviewed Profile FV appears below; assessment standards are outlined more thoroughly thereupon. **A major assignment grade worth 15% of the total course grade will be taken therefrom.**

Students are encouraged to consult with the instructor and with tutors in the Writing Center during the process of developing the Profile FV. No extra credit will be afforded to the project

for doing so, but doing so is likely to improve the grade received and will likely be considered positively in the Prof score awarded at the end of the term.

### Grading Rubric

Please note that, in the interest of offering students practice in proofreading and editing their own work, comments offered through reproductions of the form below are general in nature. That is, they identify systematic problems and make broad suggestions rather than making line-by-line corrections.

The same rubric will be used for both the Profile RV and the Profile FV. Grading of the Profile PV is detailed above.

With the rubric below, all papers start at a grade of C, as baseline competence is presumed unless there is reason to believe otherwise.

Category	Comments	Steps Yes/No
Assigned Guidelines Met	•	+0/-3
Subject Clearly Identified	•	+1/-1
Angle Clear and Appropriate	•	+1/-1
Evidence Sufficient and Appropriate	•	+2/+0
Explanations Sufficient and Appropriate	•	+2/-1
Correct Formatting Provided	•	0/-1
Mechanical Correctness Displayed	•	0/-1
Engagement Developed	•	+1/0
<b>Total Change in Steps and Grade Equivalent</b>		
<b>Overall Comments</b>		

- Assigned Guidelines Met—Is the paper at the required length? Is it of the assigned genre?
- Subject Clearly Identified—Is the subject of the paper clearly named and described?
- Angle Clear and Appropriate—Is there an evident dominant impression created of the paper’s subject? Is it one appropriate to a college classroom and the level of discourse expected therein?
- Evidence Sufficient and Appropriate—Does the paper offer sufficient interview and observational data to accurately depict its subject? Is that evidence provided in an accessible fashion? Is it incorporated smoothly into the text?
- Explanations Sufficient and Appropriate—Is sufficient explanation provided of how the evidence presented supports the angle taken by the paper? Does it adequately and systematically lead the reader from the evidence to the assertions made about it? Does it avoid logical fallacy (unless the angle supports the inclusion thereof, as in a humorous or satirical treatment)?

- **Correct Formatting Provided**—Is the paper submitted as a .doc, .docx, or .rtf file? Is it typed on a letter-size sheet in 12-point, double-spaced Times New Roman or Garamond font? Does it have a heading, title, and page numbers in accordance with MLA standards?
- **Mechanical Correctness Displayed**—Do the paper’s usage, spelling, punctuation, and similar surface-level concerns conform to the standards promulgated by the MLA and discussed during class time? Do they correspond to the level of discourse to be expected of students in lower-division college coursework?
- **Engagement Developed**—As a sort of extra-credit component, does the paper offer some particularly engaging or poignant elements unusual or exceptional in a work of first-year composition? Does it stake out an unusual position or make a solid and reasonable attempt to push the boundaries of the assignment in productive ways?

### Notes

Since the Profile will focus on another member of the class, it is possible that student withdrawals will prevent the original subject of the assignment from being treated. If your subject drops the class or is otherwise uncooperative, please inform the instructor so that appropriate other measures may be taken.

Aside from the examples of such pieces and similar pieces provided in the Norton, many examples of the kind of work to be done for the Profile project can be found among obituaries published by newspapers, as well as in the kinds of speeches given to introduce recipients of high awards. Examples can also be found through the instructor’s website, specifically <http://goo.gl/z6yvWh>. Review of them is encouraged, as having models to follow tends to make work easier to do.

**Geoffrey B. Elliott**

**Fall 2015**

**ENGL 1113: Composition I—Textual Analysis Assignment Sheet**

Below appears a print version of the guidelines for the Textual Analysis (TxtAn), posted online at <http://goo.gl/rqgpTE>. The online version is to be considered authoritative, superseding any previously published information regarding the TxtAn.

The First-Year Composition Program at Oklahoma State University describes the TxtAn as enabling students “To be able to describe and define the rhetorical moves a writer/composer selects in a given text; to identify the contexts and patterns informing a given text; to offer an interpretation of a text’s rhetorical moves in order to analyze its significance.”

The program stipulates for the TxtAn that “The student will write a 4-5 page rhetorical analysis of a text. The analysis will be thesis-driven and include a close ‘reading’ of the object of analysis in order to meet program outcomes. The essay will follow MLA conventions for font, page numbering, margins and title.”

Sections of the course taught by Prof. Elliott will need to complete a number of individual tasks to negotiate the assignment successfully:

- Select a suitable subject for analysis and read it, noting key features of the text, its context, and its paratext;
- Compose a version of the TxtAn for peer review (TxtAn PV), bring that version to class in print as assigned, and review it in collaboration with classmates;
- Revise the peer review version of the TxtAn in light of comments made by peers and submit the resulting version (TxtAn RV) online for instructor review; and
- Revise the instructor-reviewed version of the TxtAn in light of comments made by the instructor and submit the resulting final version (TxtAn FV) online for assessment as a major assignment.

Information about each follows.

**Select and Read a Suitable Subject for Analysis**

The TxtAn should focus on a single piece of writing; for this exercise, select an article from the Opinion section of the *New York Times* (either in print or online), **including** pieces by regular columnists, editorials, op-ed and Opinionator pieces, pieces from the Sunday review, pieces from Taking Note, and Topics pieces, but **excluding** videos, editorial cartoons, and letters to the editor.

Students desiring to treat other texts may petition the instructor in that regard; decisions regarding alternative texts will be made on a case-by-case basis, but analyses of texts not from the Opinion section of the *New York Times* and not approved by the instructor are subject to summary failure.

The article must be recent; **its publication date may not be earlier than 28 September 2015**. You are **strongly** encouraged to discuss your selection with the instructor to ensure that you are treating a text of sufficient heft and content to bear sustained analysis.

Note that the Eval will work with the same subject as the TxtAn. Be sure to select a subject with several weeks of use in mind.

After selecting an appropriate article, read it at least twice. The first reading should be a simple read-through, getting a sense of the article and its contents. The second and many subsequent readings (as needed) should explicitly look for rhetorical features and devices of the text, its context, and its paratext. Making notes about those features and devices is **strongly** encouraged.

### Compose the TxtAn PV

After conducting the preliminary work to read, understand, and assess the article, draft an initial version of the TxtAn. Thinking of it as an investigation of what the text is doing and how it is doing so may be of help in the composition.

In composing the initial version of the TxtAn, a fair bit of prewriting will be helpful. Having answers to the following questions will not ensure a good paper in itself, but it will be markedly difficult to write a good TxtAn *without* having such answers:

- What is the context of the article? That is, among what is it situated? To what overall purpose (to entertain, to inform, to persuade) is the context directed? What information in the context indicates the direction?
- To what overall purpose (to entertain, to inform, to persuade) is the article directed? What in the text and its paratext indicates the overall purpose?
- To what specific purpose is the article directed? What in the text, context, and paratext indicates the direction?
- To what overall audience are the context and text directed? What information in each indicates the direction? What information in the paratext indicates the direction?
- How much and what kinds of pathos are present in the text, context, and paratext? What effect are they likely to have?
- How much and what kinds of ethos are present in the text, context, and paratext? What effect are they likely to have?
- How much and what kinds of logos are present in the text, context, and paratext? What effect are they likely to have?
- Ultimately, does the article succeed at fulfilling its purpose for its presumed audience?

The list above is not and cannot be comprehensive. That is, other questions may also need to be asked and answered to help develop a version of the TxtAn. The last one, however, should lead to the thesis of the TxtAn, one assessing the effectiveness of the article at fulfilling its purpose for its audience. The TxtAn as a whole will support that thesis.

The TxtAn will benefit from an introduction that identifies and summarizes in a few sentences the article being analyzed before stating a thesis and providing an essay map. The paragraphs that follow—which should support the thesis, based on the answers to the above and similar questions—will benefit from being placed in either emphatic or topical order and having graceful, appropriate transitions between them. (A paragraph detailing counterargument to the thesis may also do well to be included early among them.) As with earlier papers, a conclusion suggesting what readers can do with the thesis—since the TxtAn should justify that thesis sufficiently to allow it to be used—is a good way to end.

It is not strictly necessary that the draft be the full required length of the TxtAn FV (4 to 5 full pages, formatted appropriately, equivalent to some 1,400 to 1,750 words); it is assumed that the

work is in progress. That said, a more complete draft is more desirable than a less complete one, largely in that it eases the later work that must be done and offers more opportunity for concrete improvement to the writing that is done. Please note also that the text composed in the draft may well need to change; keep in mind that it cannot get better without changing, and that all writing can be improved.

Please type the draft, either initially or as a later stage of composition, prior to class time on **12 October 2015. Please bring a typed and printed copy of that draft to class as the TxtAn PV on that day**; class that day will concern itself with peer review, with students reading and commenting on one another's papers. (Guidelines for how to do so will be provided.) This will allow students 1) access to other readers to help ensure comprehensibility of their narratives and 2) practice in reading and assessing written work, which they may then apply to their own writing moving forward.

A holistic minor assignment grade will be taken from the presence or absence of your TxtAn PV in class that day; the instructor will call for student drafts while peer review is in session during class that day. A reasonably complete or complete draft for the TxtAn PV will receive an A. One mostly in place but still lacking one or two major components will receive a B. One perhaps half-done will receive a C. One that lacks several major components will receive a D. One that is barely sketched-out will receive an F. Papers that are directed away from the thrust of the assignment will receive a lowered grade, as well. Students who arrive in class without drafts will receive a zero for the minor assignment grade, as will those who fail to attend class that day (excepting those covered under class attendance policies expressed in the syllabus and detailed during class discussions).

Students are encouraged to consult with the instructor and with tutors in the Writing Center during the process of composing the TxtAn PV. No extra credit will be afforded to the project for doing so, but doing so is likely to improve the grade received and will likely be considered positively in the Prof score awarded at the end of the term.

### **Revise the TxtAn PV into the TxtAn RV**

Following peer review of the TxtAn PV, you are **strongly** encouraged to revise your draft in light of the comments made by your peer reviewer/s. Work from global issues—such as strengthening the thesis and support for it—to more local issues—such as how best to transition between each major part, how to transition from paragraph to paragraph and sentence to sentence, and how best to phrase for concision and emphasis. Only after all of that is done should there be any thought of checking and amending as appropriate the surface-level features of formatting, spelling, punctuation, and the like.

The draft that results from that process of revision, the TxtAn RV, should still have an introduction that identifies and summarizes in a few sentences the article being analyzed before stating a thesis and providing an essay map; paragraphs supporting the thesis (possibly including a counterpoint) in either emphatic or topical order and having graceful, appropriate transitions between them; and a conclusion suggesting what readers can do with the thesis, since the TxtAn should justify that thesis sufficiently to allow it to be used. It **does** need to be at the full length of the assignment (4 to 5 full pages, formatted appropriately, equivalent to some 1,400 to 1,750

words); even though it is still a work in progress, it should be nearing completion. It may still need to change, however, as all writing can be improved.

It is to the end of improving it yet further that **the TxtAn RV is to be submitted to the instructor via D2L before the beginning of class time on 21 October 2015**. It needs to be a .doc, .docx, or .rtf document, so that comments may be appended to it. A version of the form that will be returned to students along with the reviewed TxtAn RV appears below; assessment standards are outlined more thoroughly thereupon. A minor assignment grade will be taken therefrom. Ideally, the grade and comments will serve to motivate further improvement in advance of the final submission detailed below.

Students are encouraged to consult with the instructor and with tutors in the Writing Center during the process of developing the TxtAn RV. No extra credit will be afforded to the project for doing so, but doing so is likely to improve the grade received and will likely be considered positively in the Prof score awarded at the end of the term.

### **Revise the TxtAn RV into the TxtAn FV**

Once the TxtAn RV is returned—which will be via email through the D2L classlist—you are **strongly** encouraged to revise it in light of the comments made on it by the instructor. As with revising the TxtAn PV into the TxtAn RV, work from global issues—such as strengthening the thesis and support for it—to more local issues—such as how best to transition between each major part, how to transition from paragraph to paragraph and sentence to sentence, and how best to phrase for concision and emphasis. Only after all of that is done should there be any thought of checking and amending as appropriate the surface-level features of formatting, spelling, punctuation, and the like.

The draft that results from that process of revision, the TxtAn FV, should still have an introduction that identifies and summarizes in a few sentences the article being analyzed before stating a thesis and providing an essay map; paragraphs supporting the thesis (possibly including a counterpoint) in either emphatic or topical order and having graceful, appropriate transitions between them; and a conclusion suggesting what readers can do with the thesis, since the TxtAn should justify that thesis sufficiently to allow it to be used.. It **does** need to be at the full length of the assignment (4 to 5 full pages, formatted appropriately, equivalent to some 1,400 to 1,750 words), since it **is** the final submission of the TxtAn project. While all writing can be improved, there comes a point at which the task of developing a piece of writing must be set aside in favor of other concerns; the TxtAn FV is that point for the TxtAn project.

It is in the interests of providing feedback with which to develop other writing that **the TxtAn FV is to be submitted to the instructor via D2L before the beginning of class time on 30 October 2015**. It needs to be a .doc, .docx, or .rtf document, so that comments may be appended to it. A version of the form that will be returned to students along with the reviewed TxtAn FV appears below; assessment standards are outlined more thoroughly thereupon. **A major assignment grade worth 20% of the total course grade will be taken therefrom.**

Students are encouraged to consult with the instructor and with tutors in the Writing Center during the process of developing the TxtAn FV. No extra credit will be afforded to the project

for doing so, but doing so is likely to improve the grade received and will likely be considered positively in the Prof score awarded at the end of the term.

### Grading Rubric

Please note that, in the interest of offering students practice in proofreading and editing their own work, comments offered through reproductions of the form below are general in nature. That is, they identify systematic problems and make broad suggestions rather than making line-by-line corrections.

The same rubric will be used for both the TxtAn RV and the TxtAn FV. Grading of the TxtAn PV is detailed above.

With the rubric below, all papers start at a grade of C, as baseline competence is presumed unless there is reason to believe otherwise.

Category	Comments	Steps Yes/No
Assigned Guidelines Met	•	+0/-3
Clear and Appropriate Thesis Provided	•	+1/-1
Clear, Ample, and Appropriate Evidence Provided	•	+1/-2
Clear, Ample, and Appropriate Explanations Provided	•	+2/-2
Organization Effective	•	+2/-1
Correct Formatting Provided	•	0/-1
Mechanical Correctness Displayed	•	0/-1
Engagement Developed	•	+1/0
<b>Total Change in Steps and Grade Equivalent</b>		
<b>Overall Comments</b>		

- Assigned Guidelines Met—Is the paper at the required length? Is it of the assigned genre?
- Clear and Appropriate Thesis Provided—Does the paper state a decisively argumentative thesis that articulates an overall assessment of the rhetorical effectiveness of the chosen article?
- Clear, Ample, and Appropriate Evidence Provided—Does the paper make appropriate reference to the chosen article, such that a general reader who has not read the piece can understand what is being discussed? Does it follow formal citation guidelines adequately? Does it introduce information from the article appropriately?
- Clear, Ample, and Appropriate Explanations Provided—Does the paper explain how the evidence provided to support the thesis serves to support the thesis? If it includes counterargument, does it explain the movement of the counterargument appropriately?

Are the explanations sufficient to convince a general reader who is not familiar with the piece?

- **Organization Effective**—Does the paper adhere to either emphatic or topical order consistently? Does it transition smoothly and appropriately between paragraphs and larger textual divisions? Does it forecast its organization and adhere to the forecast?
- **Correct Formatting Provided**—Is the paper submitted as a .doc, .docx, or .rtf file? Is it typed on a letter-size sheet in 12-point, double-spaced Times New Roman or Garamond font? Does it have a heading, title, and page numbers in accordance with MLA standards?
- **Mechanical Correctness Displayed**—Do the paper's usage, spelling, punctuation, and similar surface-level concerns conform to the standards promulgated by the MLA and discussed during class time? Do they correspond to the level of discourse to be expected of students in lower-division college coursework?
- **Engagement Developed**—As a sort of extra-credit component, does the paper offer some particularly engaging or poignant elements unusual or exceptional in a work of first-year composition? Does it stake out an unusual position or make a solid and reasonable attempt to push the boundaries of the assignment in productive ways?

### Notes

As the assignment is in a more formal genre than earlier papers in the course, more formal usage is expected; strive for a semiformal register, rather than the informal or casual usage allowed in the LitNarr and Profile. This means, among others, that formal citation, including in-text and end-of-text components, is expected even if only one source is deployed in the TxtAn. (The TxtAn requires no recourse to outside sources in itself; it can be written entirely from the chosen article and the thoroughly-explained interpretations of it by the student.) Failure to provide it may be investigated as an academic integrity violation.

Aside from the examples of such pieces and similar pieces provided in the Norton, many examples of the kind of work to be done for the TxtAn project can be found in any number of rhetorical studies. Examples can also be found through the instructor's website, specifically <http://goo.gl/rqgpTE>. Review of them is encouraged, as having models to follow tends to make work easier to do.

**Geoffrey B. Elliott**

**Fall 2015**

**ENGL 1113: Composition I—Evaluation Assignment Sheet**

Below appears a print version of the guidelines for the Evaluation (Eval), posted online at <http://goo.gl/ksxgGh>. The online version is to be considered authoritative, superseding any previously published information regarding the Eval.

The First-Year Composition Program at Oklahoma State University describes the Eval as enabling students “To practice and develop the ability to construct, define, and support evaluative criteria; To generate a thesis based on evaluative criteria, revise the thesis in order to increase its effectiveness, and arrange, draft, and write a persuasive essay [*sic*].”

The program stipulates for the Eval that “Students will [each] write a 5-7 page essay [*sic*]. [...] The essay will include carefully developed criteria, support for the criteria and for the evaluation as well as a thesis.”

Sections of the course taught by Prof. Elliott will need to complete a number of individual tasks to negotiate the assignment successfully:

- Determine what (sub-) genre most appropriately and immediately includes the piece to be evaluated (ideally the piece treated by the TxtAn);
- Retrieve other works in the (sub-) genre and distill common features from them, thereby developing criteria for the assessment of the piece to be evaluated;
- Compose a version of the Eval for peer review (Eval PV), bring that version to class in print as assigned, and review it in collaboration with classmates;
- Revise the peer review version of the Eval in light of comments made by peers and submit the resulting version (Eval RV) online for instructor review; and
- Revise the instructor-reviewed version of the Eval in light of comments made by the instructor and submit the resulting final version (Eval FV) online for assessment as a major assignment.

Information about each follows.

**Determine a (Sub-) Genre against Which to Assess the Piece**

Evaluating a thing requires determining what group that thing belongs to and against which it can be evaluated. For the Eval, which treats a piece of writing (see Note 1 below), the group of writing—that is, the genre or sub-genre—to which the piece belongs must be identified. In selecting such a group, a tension between inclusivity and manageability emerges; the group must be large enough to admit of reasonable assessment but not so large that the assessment ceases to have meaning. Groups that suggest themselves for the pieces likely to be treated by the Eval are

- Pieces written by the same author as that of the piece to be treated in the Eval,
- Pieces appearing in the same sub-section and on the same day as the piece to be treated in the Eval,
- Pieces appearing in the same series as the piece to be treated in the Eval, and
- Pieces addressing the same topic as the piece to be treated in the Eval.

Other appropriate groups may be used to incorporate the piece to be treated in the Eval. Each of those listed above, however, offers an easy avenue through which to begin the assessment that informs the essay, pointing to a group that negotiates the tension between breadth and inclusion

well, making enough information available to carry out the next task in composing the Eval while not overwhelming the writer with materials to negotiate.

### **Develop Criteria for Inclusion in the (Sub-) Genre**

After determining what the most appropriate (sub-) genre against which to assess the piece treated by the Eval is, defining qualities for that (sub-) genre must be identified. That is, the features most typical of members of the group must be determined. The determination is accomplished through taking a sample of members of the group and examining them, identifying individual features thereof, and noting which features occur most commonly among the samples. For the Eval, the group members will be pieces of writing, and so their common features will derive from consideration of features and attributes of writing—text, context, and paratext.

No comprehensive list of common features can be provided, given the flexibility of writing, but ideas from which to begin include

- Diction—How complicated / elevated is the usage in the texts?
- Figuration—Do the texts make use of common or similar metaphors, similes, analogies, puns, references, cadences, and/or other figurative language constructions?
- Images—Do the texts deploy visuals? Do they deploy the same kinds of visuals?
- Phrasing—Are there particular words or phrases that occur frequently in the texts?
- Referentiality—Do the texts pull information from the same or similar sources? Which sources tend to be used?
- Register—At what level of formality / politeness (formal, semiformal, informal, casual) do the texts operate?
- Section Divisions—Do the texts offer explicit sectional divisions? Are they indicated in a consistent manner?
- Word Counts—How many words are in the texts? How many words are in each paragraph?

No single Eval needs to treat all of the features listed—or, indeed, any of them; the paper can be written examining other qualities entirely. Those listed above are offered as a guide rather than a stricture; they are to be used to help write the paper, not overdetermine its content.

Keep in mind that (sub-) generic boundaries are not absolute and cannot be. Not all qualities will be present in each example of the (sub-) genre, and not all criteria will be of equal importance. It is not necessary to have a comprehensive view to have a convincing one.

### **Compose the Eval PV**

After conducting the preliminary work to read, understand, and assess the article, draft an initial version of the Eval. Thinking of it as simply laying out criteria and applying them to a given piece of writing may be helpful in the endeavor.

In composing the initial version of the Eval, some prewriting will be helpful. The most significant criteria for inclusion in the (sub-) genre against which the piece treated in the Eval is to be assessed should be determined and explanations of them provided. Those criteria should then be applied to the piece to be treated in the Eval; that is, the piece should be assessed in terms of whether or not it fits those criteria, and to what extent it fits or fails to fit. From that

assessment, a thesis indicating whether or not the piece being treated is or is not a representative example of the (sub-) genre should emerge. Again, not all criteria will be of equal importance, and fit within (sub-) generic boundaries may not be exact; the overall tendency should be what informs the thesis.

The Eval will benefit from an introduction that identifies and summarizes in a few sentences the article being analyzed before stating a thesis and providing an essay map. The paragraphs that follow—which should explicate the criteria against which the piece is assessed before demonstrating the degree of adherence to them—will benefit from being placed in either emphatic or topical order and having graceful, appropriate transitions between them. (A paragraph detailing counterargument to the thesis may also do well to be included early among the paragraphs explicating the criteria and indicating the degree of adherence thereto.) As with earlier papers, a conclusion suggesting what readers can do with the thesis—since the Eval should justify that thesis sufficiently to allow it to be used—is a good way to end.

It is not strictly necessary that the draft be the full required length of the Eval FV (five to seven full pages, formatted appropriately, equivalent to some 1,750 to 2,450 words—exclusive of Works Cited); it is assumed that the work is in progress. That said, a more complete draft is more desirable than a less complete one, largely in that it eases the later work that must be done and offers more opportunity for concrete improvement to the writing that is done. Please note also that the text composed in the draft may well need to change; keep in mind that it cannot get better without changing, and that all writing can be improved.

Please type the draft, either initially or as a later stage of composition, prior to class time on **9 November 2015. Please bring a typed and printed copy of that draft to class as the Eval PV on that day**; class that day will concern itself with peer review, with students reading and commenting on one another's papers. (Guidelines for how to do so will be provided.) This will allow students 1) access to other readers to help ensure comprehensibility of their narratives and 2) practice in reading and assessing written work, which they may then apply to their own writing moving forward.

A holistic minor assignment grade will be taken from the presence or absence of your Eval PV in class that day; the instructor will call for student drafts while peer review is in session during class that day. A reasonably complete or complete draft for the Eval PV will receive an A. One mostly in place but still lacking one or two major components will receive a B. One perhaps half-done will receive a C. One that lacks several major components will receive a D. One that is barely sketched-out will receive an F. Papers that are directed away from the thrust of the assignment will receive a lowered grade, as well. Students who arrive in class without drafts will receive a zero for the minor assignment grade, as will those who fail to attend class that day (excepting those covered under class attendance policies expressed in the syllabus and detailed during class discussions).

Students are encouraged to consult with the instructor and with tutors in the Writing Center during the process of composing the Eval PV. No extra credit will be afforded to the project for doing so, but doing so is likely to improve the grade received and will likely be considered positively in the Prof score awarded at the end of the term.

### **Revise the Eval PV into the Eval RV**

Following peer review of the Eval PV, you are **strongly** encouraged to revise your draft in light of the comments made by your peer reviewer/s. Work from global issues—such as strengthening the thesis and support for it—to more local issues—such as how best to transition between each major part, how to transition from paragraph to paragraph and sentence to sentence, and how best to phrase for concision and emphasis. Only after all of that is done should there be any thought of checking and amending as appropriate the surface-level features of formatting, spelling, punctuation, and the like.

The draft that results from that process of revision, the Eval RV, should still have an introduction that identifies and summarizes in a few sentences the article being assessed (see Note 2, below) before stating a thesis and providing an essay map; paragraphs supporting the thesis (possibly including a counterpoint) in either emphatic or topical order and having graceful, appropriate transitions between them; and a conclusion suggesting what readers can do with the thesis, since the Eval should justify that thesis sufficiently to allow it to be used. It **does** need to be at the full length of the assignment (five to seven full pages, formatted appropriately, equivalent to some 1,750 to 2,450 words—exclusive of Works Cited); even though it is still a work in progress, it should be nearing completion. It may still need to change, however, as all writing can be improved.

It is to the end of improving it yet further that **the Eval RV is to be submitted to the instructor via D2L before the beginning of class time on 16 November 2015**. It needs to be a .doc, .docx, or .rtf document, so that comments may be appended to it. A version of the form that will be returned to students along with the reviewed Eval RV appears below; assessment standards are outlined more thoroughly thereupon. A minor assignment grade will be taken therefrom. Ideally, the grade and comments will serve to motivate further improvement in advance of the final submission detailed below.

Students are encouraged to consult with the instructor and with tutors in the Writing Center during the process of developing the Eval RV. No extra credit will be afforded to the project for doing so, but doing so is likely to improve the grade received and will likely be considered positively in the Prof score awarded at the end of the term.

### **Revise the Eval RV into the Eval FV**

Once the Eval RV is returned—which will be via email through the D2L classlist—you are **strongly** encouraged to revise it in light of the comments made on it by the instructor. As with revising the Eval PV into the Eval RV, work from global issues—such as strengthening the thesis and support for it—to more local issues—such as how best to transition between each major part, how to transition from paragraph to paragraph and sentence to sentence, and how best to phrase for concision and emphasis. Only after all of that is done should there be any thought of checking and amending as appropriate the surface-level features of formatting, spelling, punctuation, and the like.

The draft that results from that process of revision, the Eval FV, should still have an introduction that identifies and summarizes in a few sentences the article being analyzed before stating a

thesis and providing an essay map; paragraphs supporting the thesis (possibly including a counterpoint) in either emphatic or topical order and having graceful, appropriate transitions between them; and a conclusion suggesting what readers can do with the thesis, since the Eval should justify that thesis sufficiently to allow it to be used.. It **does** need to be at the full length of the assignment (five to seven full pages, formatted appropriately, equivalent to some 1,750 to 2,450 words—exclusive of Works Cited), since it **is** the final submission of the Eval project. While all writing can be improved, there comes a point at which the task of developing a piece of writing must be set aside in favor of other concerns; the Eval FV is that point for the Eval project.

It is in the interests of providing feedback with which to develop other writing that **the Eval FV is to be submitted to the instructor via D2L before the beginning of class time on 23 November 2015**. It needs to be a .doc, .docx, or .rtf document, so that comments may be appended to it. A version of the form that will be returned to students along with the reviewed Eval FV appears below; assessment standards are outlined more thoroughly thereupon. **A major assignment grade worth 20% of the total course grade will be taken therefrom.**

Students are encouraged to consult with the instructor and with tutors in the Writing Center during the process of developing the Eval FV. No extra credit will be afforded to the project for doing so, but doing so is likely to improve the grade received and will likely be considered positively in the Prof score awarded at the end of the term.

### **Grading Rubric**

Please note that, in the interest of offering students practice in proofreading and editing their own work, comments offered through reproductions of the form below are general in nature. That is, they identify systematic problems and make broad suggestions rather than making line-by-line corrections.

The same rubric will be used for both the Eval RV and the Eval FV. Grading of the Eval PV is detailed above.

With the rubric below, all papers start at a grade of C, as baseline competence is presumed unless there is reason to believe otherwise.

Category	Comments	Steps Yes/No
Assigned Guidelines Met	•	+0/-3
Clear and Appropriate Thesis Provided	•	+0/-2
Clear, Sufficient, and Appropriate Criteria Provided	•	+2/-1
Clear, Ample, and Appropriate Evidence Provided	•	+1/-2
Clear, Ample, and Appropriate Explanations Provided	•	+2/-2
Organization Effective	•	+1/-1
Correct Formatting Provided	•	+0/-1
Mechanical Correctness Displayed	•	+0/-1
Engagement Developed	•	+1/+0
<b>Total Change in Steps and Grade Equivalent</b>		
<b>Overall Comments</b>		

- Assigned Guidelines Met—Is the paper at the required length? Is it of the assigned genre?
- Clear and Appropriate Thesis Provided—Does the paper state a decisively argumentative thesis that articulates an overall assessment of whether or not the piece assessed is representative of the asserted (sub-) genre?
- Clear, Sufficient, and Appropriate Criteria Provided—Does the paper explicitly indicate what (sub-) genre will be used as an assessment rubric? Does the paper explicitly assert suitable criteria against which to evaluate its focal piece? Are the criteria reasonable for the (sub-) genre as part of which the focal piece is evaluated?
- Clear, Ample, and Appropriate Evidence Provided—Does the paper make appropriate reference to the chosen piece and to the materials used to develop criteria, such that a general reader who has not read the pieces in question can understand what is being discussed? Does it follow formal citation guidelines adequately? Does it introduce information from the pieces appropriately?
- Clear, Ample, and Appropriate Explanations Provided—Does the paper explain how the evidence provided to support the thesis serves to support the thesis? If it includes counterargument, does it explain the movement of the counterargument appropriately? Are the explanations sufficient to convince a general reader who is not familiar with the piece?
- Organization Effective—Does the paper adhere to either emphatic or topical order consistently? Does it transition smoothly and appropriately between paragraphs and larger textual divisions? Does it forecast its organization and adhere to the forecast?

- **Correct Formatting Provided**—Is the paper submitted as a .doc, .docx, or .rtf file? Is it typed on a letter-size sheet in 12-point, double-spaced Times New Roman or Garamond font? Does it have a heading, title, and page numbers in accordance with MLA standards?
- **Mechanical Correctness Displayed**—Do the paper’s usage, spelling, punctuation, and similar surface-level concerns conform to the standards promulgated by the MLA and discussed during class time? Do they correspond to the level of discourse to be expected of students in lower-division college coursework?
- **Engagement Developed**—As a sort of extra-credit component, does the paper offer some particularly engaging or poignant elements unusual or exceptional in a work of first-year composition? Does it stake out an unusual position or make a solid and reasonable attempt to push the boundaries of the assignment in productive ways?

## Notes

1. Ideally, the Eval will assess the same piece treated by the TxtAn. That is, the article analyzed in the TxtAn will be evaluated for the Eval. A shift in topics is permissible, but only after consultation with and receiving the approval of the instructor; changing topics without approval may result in summary failure of the assignment. Shifting topics will result in much more work to do, and there is not much time in the term to attend to the Eval.
2. The summary of the piece to be assessed may derive from the summary expected in the TxtAn, provided the piece treated by the Eval is the same.
3. Because the Eval is a paper in a relatively formal genre, and it will be making use of primary and secondary sources to make its argument, semiformal register and MLA-style formal citation (in-text citations and an appropriate Works Cited page) will be required. Failure to provide the first will result in lowered grades as the expectations of audiences are not met. Failure to provide the second may be investigated as an academic integrity violation.
4. Aside from the examples of such pieces and similar pieces provided in the Norton, many examples of the kind of work to be done for the Eval project can be found in any number of rhetorical studies. Examples can also be found through the instructor’s website, specifically <http://goo.gl/ksxgGh>. Review of them is encouraged, as having models to follow tends to make work easier to do.

**Geoffrey B. Elliott**

**Fall 2015**

**ENGL 1113: Composition I—Final Exam Assignment Sheet**

Below appears a print version of the guidelines for the Final Exam (FinEx), posted online at <http://goo.gl/uiNH8y>. The online version is to be considered authoritative, superseding any previously published information regarding the FinEx

The First-Year Composition Program at Oklahoma State University notes that an in-class exam must be administered during the University-assigned exam period. In an effort to make instruction and assessment more student-centered and to afford the students some agency in the class, a survey of student preferences for the FinEx was administered online, polling the sections of the course taught by Prof. Elliott. The results of that survey indicate that a majority of respondents (33 of 65 or 50.8%) preferred an extended version of the riddle quizzes that have been given throughout the semester. Accordingly, the FinEx will take said form for the sections of the class taught by Prof. Elliott.

Students in those sections will need to complete a number of individual tasks to negotiate the assignment successfully:

- Read the provided text,
- Proofread the provided text,
- Answer the provided text, and
- Explain the answer based on the information in the provided text.

Information about each follows, along with a brief discussion of assessment and some notes.

**Read the Provided Text**

As with the riddle quizzes earlier in the semester, the FinEx will present students with a text—a riddle, likely drawn from a historical English-language source and adapted to reframe some cultural norms for ease of intelligibility. The first step in treating the FinEx will be to read the riddle, working first to make sense of the words-as-sounds in the order they are presented. **The sounds of the words will be correct in the order presented.**

**Proofread the Provided Text**

The text provided for the FinEx, as with the texts provided for the riddle quizzes, will contain errors of usage (as judged against dictates in the course handbook and expressed during class discussions throughout the term). **The errors in the FinEx may be of more than one type**, but any such errors will be reflective of errors observed among student writing throughout the term. (See Note 1, below.) The errors should be noted and appropriate corrections suggested, using the proofreading marks indicated in the back of the course textbook insofar as can be done.

**Proofreading factors into the grade assigned to the FinEx. Inappropriate corrections will be marked as errors, lowering the proofreading score.**

**Answer the Provided Text**

The text provided for the FinEx is a riddle. It will explicitly call for a solution—“Say what I am.” An assertion should be made about what the thing described in the riddle is. **This is not the same thing as addressing the proofreading corrections made to the text.** The answer provided will serve as a sort of thesis for the explanation that follows, but **the “correctness” of the answer given will not be considered as part of the FinEx grade.**

### **Explain the Answer Given**

After the text of the riddle is corrected and an answer to the riddle that constitutes the text is given, an explanation of that answer is needed. That is, how the text supports the answer needs to be expressed. Doing so will require specific reference to individual portions of the text and explication of how the information contained therein leads to the answer given. **Both the provision of specific evidence and the effective explication thereof will factor into the grade assigned to the FinEx. Usage errors therein will lower the relevant scores.**

### **Grading**

Assessment of the FinEx will follow an amended version of that for the riddle quizzes. The correctness of the proofreading, quality and specificity of evidence, and thoroughness and mechanical correctness of the explication will each be holistically assessed, with scores coming from Table 2 in the course syllabus. The average of the proofreading, evidence, and explication scores will be reported as the FinEx grade.

### **Notes**

1. While there are limits to how effective study in advance of the FinEx can be, since the specific text to be treated will not be announced until the FinEx is distributed, students will be well served to look back at the coursework they have submitted during the term, noting the errors that have received comment on their reviewed assignments.
2. The FinEx will be open book and open-note, but it will not be collaborative. Students found to be colluding risk summary failure of the class.
3. Physical copies of the FinEx will be retained by the instructor. Students who wish to have copies of their exams and comments may make individual arrangements to retrieve them during the next regular term of instruction.











**Geoffrey B. Elliott**

**Fall 2015**

**ENGL 1113: Composition I—Special Exercise Assignment Sheet**

This looks funny...

Below appears a print version of the guidelines for the Special Exercise (SpEx), posted online at <http://goo.gl/5NXaQf>. The online version is to be considered authoritative, superseding any previously published information regarding the SpEx.

The First-Year Composition Program at Oklahoma State University makes no mention of the SpEx; it is something that arises from the demands of conference work and the obligation to offer as much instructional and practice time to students as may be done.

Sections of the course taught by Prof. Elliott will need to complete a number of individual tasks to negotiate the assignment successfully:

- Locate a copy of the assigned piece and read it;
- Discuss various features of context, paratext, content, and form of the piece;
- Draft notes about the piece and discussion thereof that will ease essay-writing conducted about the assigned piece; and
- Write, in class on the assigned date, a short essay that addresses a prompt to be provided at the time, submitting it for a combination of attendance and five percent of the total course grade.

Information about each follows.

### **Find and Read the Piece**

The piece to treat for the SpEx is David Courtney's October 2015 iteration of the *Texas Monthly* feature, "The Texanist." (*Oklahoma Magazine*, which was suggested by students as an appropriate alternative, does not appear to feature a regular humorous column—or even an irregular one.) It can be reproduced from a printed copy of the magazine, or it can be retrieved online for free. Students should have, and have read in its entirety multiple times, a copy of the feature no later than 26 October 2015. As they read, they should take notes about the piece's content, context, and paratext, noting points that suggest the genre, audience, and means of addressing the audience, among others.

### **Discuss the Piece and Its Features**

The class meetings leading up to the SpEx (beginning on 26 October 2015) will devote time and attention to discussing the piece assigned for it. Students should generally lead the discussion, as much of the SpEx inheres in student determination of standards and practices to follow; good places to begin discussion are the context, paratext, content, and form or genre of the piece assigned. Each influences and determines meaning and impact, indicating what the piece does, for whom it does it, and how it does so.

The point of the discussions is not to reach consensus, necessarily (although doing so is acceptable as a secondary consideration). It is, instead, to allow students to refine their understanding of what the assigned piece is doing and how in the interests of facilitating their ability to articulate a vision of those quantities and to argue convincingly in support of that vision. Ideally, the discussion will lead students to be able to generate new knowledge about the

piece, and to present that new knowledge in a way that validates it for readers who are not present for the discussion.

### **Compile Notes**

As discussion goes on, students should compile notes about the discussion, detailing major relevant points and counterpoints made during discussion. Students should subsequently reflect on their discussion notes, writing out how they can be used to make and support an argument about the character of the piece and its effects upon readers.

### **Write the SpEx**

On the assigned date, 2 November 2015, students should report to class as usual. They will be given a small packet which offers a specific prompt to be addressed—one deriving from the assigned piece and class discussions of it—and paper on which to respond thereto. Responses should take the form of a short essay. The assigned piece, notes, textbooks, and silent online materials may be used, but the exercise will **not** be collaborative.

The essay written in response to the SpEx is due in hard copy at or before the end of class time (except as indicated in Note 2, below). Submission of the SpEx will be the only record of attendance for the day. **It will be assessed as an assignment worth five percent of the total course grade.**

Owing to the nature of the SpEx, formal citation will not be expected in the resulting essay; Works Cited pages are not necessary. Appropriate informal citation of all materials deployed in the essay is mandatory, however, as accounting for the provenance of information clearly and accurately remains important even in less formal circumstances.

### **Grading Rubric**

Please note that, in the interest of offering students practice in proofreading and editing their own work, comments offered through reproductions of the form below are general in nature. That is, they identify systematic problems and make broad suggestions rather than making line-by-line corrections. This is particularly true given the limited writing-time available; while comments will be made as the writing is assessed, the fact that the writing is expected to take place within a limited time will be taken into consideration as comments and assessment are conducted. Timed writing by its nature does not admit of as polished an argument or prose as longer-term assignments permit and demand.

With the rubric below, all papers start at a grade of C, as baseline competence is presumed unless there is reason to believe otherwise.

Category	Comments	Steps Yes/No
Clear and Appropriate Thesis Provided	•	+2/-1
Clear, Ample, and Appropriate Evidence Provided	•	+1/-2
Clear, Ample, and Appropriate Explanations Provided	•	+2/-2
Organization Effective	•	+1/-1
Mechanical Correctness Displayed	•	+0/-1
Engagement Developed	•	+1/0
<b>Total Change in Steps and Grade Equivalent</b>		
<b>Overall Comments</b>		

- Clear and Appropriate Thesis Provided— Does the essay state a decisively argumentative thesis that articulates how the humor of the piece functions?
- Clear, Ample, and Appropriate Evidence Provided—Does the essay make appropriate reference to the chosen article, such that a general reader who has not read the piece can understand what is being discussed? Does it follow informal citation guidelines adequately? Does it introduce information from the article appropriately?
- Clear, Ample, and Appropriate Explanations Provided—Does the essay explain how the evidence provided to support the thesis serves to support the thesis? Are the explanations sufficient to convince a general reader who is not familiar with the piece of the validity of the thesis?
- Organization Effective—Does the essay display a clear and consistent pattern of organization (emphatic, topical, or chronological)? Does the order serve to reinforce the argument made in the essay?
- Mechanical Correctness Displayed—Do the essay’s usage, spelling, punctuation, and similar surface-level concerns conform to the standards promulgated by the MLA and discussed during class time? Do they correspond to the level of discourse to be expected of students in lower-division college coursework as they write a timed exercise?
- Engagement Developed—As a sort of extra-credit component, does the essay offer some particularly engaging or poignant elements unusual or exceptional in a work of first-year composition? Does it stake out an unusual position or make a solid and reasonable attempt to push the boundaries of the assignment in productive ways?

### Notes

1. The SpEx does not count as a major assignment for the purposes of make-up and late submission. It is a one-time affair in the term.
2. Students allowed accommodation for such an activity as the SpEx must coordinate with the instructor, indicating in writing whether or not they will avail themselves of the available accommodations and determining when and in what circumstances they are to take place.

Student Name	Student ID

On the following pages, please draft a well-developed essay that addresses the prompt given below. The essay will be assessed for **five percent of the total course grade, using the rubric presented on the SpEx Assignment Sheet**, and it will be used to take attendance in class on the day administered. It may also factor into the Prof score awarded at the end of the term, so please approach it sincerely and honestly.

Please also be sure to retain this document once it is reviewed and returned. It may well be of use in such future assignments as the Eval and FinEx.

One last thing: Please confine your remarks to the space provided.

### The Prompt

What is the text assigned? To what audience is directed? Assuming that it is supposed to be funny, what makes it funny to its presumed audience? What in the text, its context, and its paratext indicates these? How does it do so? Please explain in a way that makes clear to an educated reader who reads well but does not share your background, expertise, or experience—including reading the assigned text.









Student Name	Student ID

Below appears the text of a riddle into which a number of proofreading errors have been embedded. Your task is three-fold:

- Proofread the text, using the standard proofreading marks in the back of the Norton
- Offer an answer to the proofread riddle
- Explain why the answer is the correct one

You may use your books and notes to help you solve the riddle, but you may not use your classmates; the exercise **is not collaborative**. Please confine your explanatory remarks to the space provided, and keep in mind that usage is an important feature of the exercise.

The “correctness” of the proofreading and thoroughness of the explanation will be holistically assessed, with scores coming from Table 2 in the course syllabus. The average of the proofreading and explanation scores will be reported as a minor assignment grade.

### The Text to Proofread

I, who am very small am nonetheless a problem. Sometimes I am left out when I should not be. Sometimes I, am shoved, in where I ought, not to go, sometimes I am asked to work too hard, and as I am only a little thing, I do not do well in such cases. Do you see me yet? I am after all, right in front of you. Say what I am.

### The Answer

---

### The Explanation of the Answer

---

---

---

---

---

---

---

---

---

---

**Scoring (Instructor Use Only)**

<b>Category</b>	<b>Score</b>
<b>Proofreading</b>	
<b>Explanation</b>	
<b>Total Score (average of Proofreading and Explanation)</b>	
<b>Comments</b>	

**Geoffrey B. Elliott**  
**Fall 2015**  
**ENGL 1113: Composition I—Riddle Quiz 2**

<b>Student Name</b>	<b>Student ID</b>

On the next page appears the text of a riddle into which a number of proofreading errors have been embedded. Your task is three-fold:

- Proofread the text, using the standard proofreading marks in the back of the Norton
- Offer an answer to the proofread riddle
- Explain why the answer is the correct one

You may use your books and notes to help you solve the riddle, but you may not use your classmates; the exercise **is not collaborative**. Please confine your explanatory remarks to the space provided on the next page, and keep in mind that usage is an important feature of the exercise.

The “correctness” of the proofreading and thoroughness of the explanation will be holistically assessed, with scores coming from Table 2 in the course syllabus. The average of the proofreading and explanation scores will be reported as a minor assignment grade.

<b>Scoring (instructor use only)</b>	
<b>Category</b>	<b>Score</b>
<b>Proofreading</b>	
<b>Explanation</b>	
<b>Total Score (average of Proofreading and Explanation)</b>	
<b>Comments</b>	



**Geoffrey B. Elliott**  
**Fall 2015**  
**ENGL 1113: Composition I—Riddle Quiz 3**

Student Name	Student ID

On the next page appears the text of a riddle into which a number of proofreading errors have been embedded. Your task is three-fold:

- Proofread the text, using the standard proofreading marks in the back of the Norton
- Offer an answer to the proofread riddle
- Explain why the answer is the correct one

You may use your books and notes to help you solve the riddle, but you may not use your classmates; the exercise **is not collaborative**. Please confine your explanatory remarks to the space provided on the next page, and keep in mind that usage is an important feature of the exercise.

The “correctness” of the proofreading and thoroughness of the explanation will be holistically assessed, with scores coming from Table 2 in the course syllabus. The average of the proofreading and explanation scores will be reported as a minor assignment grade.

<b>Scoring (instructor use only)</b>	
<b>Category</b>	<b>Score</b>
<b>Proofreading</b>	
<b>Explanation</b>	
<b>Total Score (average of Proofreading and Explanation)</b>	
<b>Comments</b>	

**The Text to Proofread (adapted from a source to be noted in the class report)**

By two dumb things is a warrior brightly extracted brought into the world in wonder for the use of lords. For the hurt of the other foe bears it against foe. Strong though it is it is easily bound and obeys well serving quietly if people tend it duly and feed it fairly. It offers them comfort and happiness in life but it rewards with destruction those who let it grow proud. Say what it is.

**The Answer (say what it is)**

---

**The Explanation of the Answer**

---

---

---

---

---

---

---

---

---

---

---

---

---

---

---

---

---

---

---

---

---

**Geoffrey B. Elliott**  
**Fall 2015**  
**ENGL 1113: Composition I—Riddle Quiz 4**

Student Name	Student ID

On the next page appears the text of a riddle into which a number of proofreading errors have been embedded. Your task is three-fold:

- Proofread the text, using the standard proofreading marks in the back of the Norton
- Offer an answer to the proofread riddle
- Explain why the answer is the correct one

You may use your books and notes to help you solve the riddle, but you may not use your classmates; the exercise **is not collaborative**. Please confine your explanatory remarks to the space provided on the next page, and keep in mind that usage is an important feature of the exercise.

The “correctness” of the proofreading and thoroughness of the explanation will be holistically assessed, with scores coming from Table 2 in the course syllabus. The average of the proofreading and explanation scores will be reported as a minor assignment grade.

<b>Scoring (instructor use only)</b>	
Category	Score
<b>Proofreading</b>	
<b>Explanation</b>	
<b>Total Score (average of Proofreading and Explanation)</b>	
<b>Comments</b>	



**Geoffrey B. Elliott**  
**Fall 2015**  
**ENGL 1113: Composition I—Riddle Quiz 5**

Student Name	Student ID

On the next page appears the text of a riddle into which a number of proofreading errors have been embedded. Your task is three-fold:

- Proofread the text, using the standard proofreading marks in the back of the Norton
- Offer an answer to the proofread riddle
- Explain why the answer is the correct one

You may use your books and notes to help you solve the riddle, but you may not use your classmates; the exercise **is not collaborative**. Please confine your explanatory remarks to the space provided on the next page, and keep in mind that usage is an important feature of the exercise.

The “correctness” of the proofreading and thoroughness of the explanation will be holistically assessed, with scores coming from Table 2 in the course syllabus. The average of the proofreading and explanation scores will be reported as a minor assignment grade.

<b>Scoring (instructor use only)</b>	
<b>Category</b>	<b>Score</b>
<b>Proofreading</b>	
<b>Explanation</b>	
<b>Total Score (average of Proofreading and Explanation)</b>	
<b>Comments</b>	

**The Text to Proofread (from a source to be announced in the course blog)**

I dwell alone, wounded by iron, injured by blade's—I have had my fill of battle-work's—w weary of weapons. I have often seen warfare, perilous fighting. I hope not for comfort, nor yet that respite from battle-struggle's will come before I am eaten up wholly. But the hammers leaving's will beat upon me, hard-edged, severe and sharp, smiths handiwork; they bite upon me on the battlement's. I must endure the loathsome meeting's, never able to find a tribe of healers in folks dwelling's who might heal my wound's with medicine's. Instead, the gashes become greater through fatal blow's by day and by night. Say what I am.

**The Answer (say what it is)**

---

**The Explanation of the Answer**

---

---

---

---

---

---

---

---

---

---

---

---

---

---

---

---



**The Text to Proofread (from a source to be announced in the course blog)**

I have been spotted near the homes of the people, I feed the cattle and have many teeth, my nose is useful, going along downward, ravening loyally and tugging towards home, roaming beyond walls, seeking plants, I always find them, at least those not rooted, I make them stand still, those rooted fast, in the place they are established, shining brightly, blowing and growing. Say what I am.

**The Answer (say what it is)**

---

**The Explanation of the Answer**

---

---

---

---

---

---

---

---

---

---

---

---

---

---

---

---

---

---