

## Peer Evaluation, Project 3, Final Version (Evaluative Feedback)

### \*\*\*\*Reading and Responding to Other Writers Makes You a Better Writer\*\*\*\*

Evaluative feedback enables writers to reflect on not only the writing project, but also themselves as writers. Providing effective evaluative feedback will enable your colleagues to move forward to Project 4 and advance as writers. Providing evaluative feedback will enable you to grow as a writer as you reflect on what another writer's project can teach you about writing.

### A Quick Review of Project 3 Goals

#### Purpose:

Learn how to research an in-depth example of expertise.

#### Assignment:

Build on your work in Project 1 and Project 2, and extend our conversations about expertise through a 1000-1250 word case study in which you articulate a position about expertise or an expert in the area of inquiry you have chosen. Your case study can be about a particular person or aspect of expertise in your chosen area. Use this case study to generate an argument about expertise.

#### Learning Objectives for Project 3:

- conduct research;
- write an extended argument;
- examine disciplinary expectations;
- develop an intertextual conversation;
- understand popular sources and scholarly sources;
- create effective introductions; and
- write strong conclusions.

Visit the overall [learning objectives](#) for our course to see how these fit in with our larger trajectory.

#### Grading Criteria

An excellent project will meet the following criteria, showing that you can:

- present the case study thoroughly
- conduct research and evaluate sources
- effectively use the case study to support and develop your own argument
- effectively integrate evidence in the form of details about the case study, as well as quotes and paraphrases from sources
- employ scholarly conventions for citing sources, including in-text citations and works cited page
- organize the essay clearly
- develop paragraphs that achieve paragraph unity

- create effective introductions and conclusions
- revise deeply as well as edit carefully
- include an effective title

### **Providing Evaluative Feedback For Project 3, Final Version**

Using the grading criteria above, the writer's "Note to Readers," and our overall learning objectives/criteria for this unit, you will be scoring your colleague's projects on a 6-point scale in order to help them improve as writers for subsequent writing occasions.

Think of the 6-point scale as two halves:

- a top half of 4, 5, or 6 representing different levels of successful projects and
- a lower half of 1, 2, and 3 representing different levels of unsuccessful projects.

You can think of a paper scoring 5 as the center of success and one scoring 2 as the center score for lack of success, with the other scores as a minus or plus. Thus a score of 4 is successful, but marginally so, a kind of 5-. A score of 6 is exceptionally successful, a kind of 5+.

Only one whole number, without pluses or minuses, can be entered on the SCORE line. Your score will be combined with three other peer scores to obtain a grade for the writer's project.

**Score of 6:** This project will meet all criteria and goals for unit 3 and be very clear and well written. It need not be perfect but it will be well reasoned, show a deep understanding of the case study, evaluates and discusses relevant research, and shows a compelling discussion of how the case study reflects, contrasts, or modifies our thinking about expertise. The project uses the case study to raise new questions about expertise. The introduction and conclusion are strong. Evidence is integrated effectively, and the title is strong. Citations are mostly correct.  
Short description: Exceptionally successful

**Score of 5:** This project not only presents the case study, but also uses it to make an argument about expertise. It is clear and well written. The project includes relevant research. Paragraphs are unified and the paper is organized clearly. The introduction and conclusion are strong. Evidence is integrated effectively, and the title is strong. Citations are mostly correct.  
Short description: Successful

**Score of 4:** This project describes the case study in an organized way, but it does not offer a thorough understanding of it, and has little or nothing to say about its relation to the issue of expertise. It may have a few unconventional features of written English, such as vocabulary, sentence construction, etc., but these do not for the most part interfere with the communication of the writer's ideas. It is for the most part clearly written. Paragraphs are mostly organized clearly and unified. Research may be a bit limited, and evidence is integrated effectively some of the time. Distinctions are rarely made among the sources and quotations are sometimes inserted without being discussed. The introduction and/or conclusion are somewhat effective. Citations are present and mostly correct. The title is somewhat effective.  
Short description: Successful, but marginally so

**Score of 3:** This project shows only a superficial understanding of the case study and limited description of it. It may have some unconventional features of written English, such as vocabulary, sentence construction, etc., that interfere with the communication of the writer's ideas. It offers little by way of argument. The project uses little research and does not evaluate or discuss the sources. Evidence is only occasionally integrated effectively, and/or not much evidence is used. Citations are often incorrect. The introduction and /or conclusion are present, but not effective. The title is largely ineffective.

Short description: Unsuccessful, but marginally so

**Score of 2:** This project pays little attention to the case study or shows little understanding of it. It offers very little by way of argument, and hardly any research. It may also contain some unconventional features of written English, such as vocabulary, sentence construction, or other features that interfere with the communication of the writer's ideas. The essay is not organized clearly, and the paragraphs often are not unified. Evidence is for the most part not integrated effectively, and/or very little evidence is used. Citations are mostly incorrect or absent. The introduction and /or conclusion are not effective. The title is ineffective.

Short description: Unsuccessful

**Score of 1:** This project has misunderstood the nature of the assignment or the meaning of the case study and presents many unconventional features of written English, such as vocabulary, sentence construction, or other features that interfere with the communication of the writer's ideas. Evidence is not integrated effectively, and/or no evidence is used. The paper is disorganized and paragraphs are not unified. Citations are incorrect or absent. The title is absent or ineffective.

Short description: Extremely Unsuccessful

Fill in the following boxes:

What overall comments do you have for the writer as he or she moves on to Project 4?

What did you learn about your own writing based on reading and evaluating this writer's project?