

Workshop 2 Fall 2011

Grading 10/24/11

- I. Opening Remarks: Laura mentions “norming” and hands out copies for those who need them. (Maybe contextualize next time, which LJ did some, that this was one of the workshops people wanted to see).
 - a. Reviews instructions
 - b. Passes sign-up sheet, etc.
 - c. 10 to read and 5 to discuss, one at a time.
- II. Essay 1: “The Devastation of the Oil Spill”
 - a. Everyone reads
 - b. 1-A, 10-B, 5-C, 0-D, 0-F
 - c. Strengths:
 - i. Generally strong sentences
 - ii. Focused paragraphs
 - iii. Documentation
 - iv. Lots of info
 - v. Some good para transitions
 - d. Weaknesses
 - i. Lacks specific, predictive thesis
 - ii. Minimal analysis, more summary, no so what
 - iii. Some generalizations
 - iv. Concl: gets into argument/takes stance
 - v. Mechanics gradually worsen
 - vi. Lacks page #s
 - vii. Heavy paraphrase and light quote
- III. Essay 2: “Trouble in the Gulf”
 - a. Everyone reads
 - b. 0-A, 0-B, 8-C, 7-D, 1-F
 - c. Strengths:
 - i. Various issues covered; facets intro’ed
 - ii. A bit of a stronger thesis
 - iii. Paragraphs focused to some extent
 - iv. Student who takes risks (CP)
 - d. Weaknesses:
 - i. Body doesn’t address the thesis/unfocused
 - ii. Mode of judgment and not analysis
 - iii. Confusion w idioms, wrong words, “get the easy way out,” awkward phrasing
 - iv. Thesis not complete . . .

- v. Paragraph on Obama not relevant
 - vi. Contradictions
 - vii. Broad generalizations w/o support
 - viii. Futility of analysis as thesis?
 - ix. No transitions
 - x. Doesn't utilize transitions effectively
- IV. Essay 3: "Coastal Analysis"
- a. Everyone reads
 - b. 3-A, 7-B, 5-C, 1-D, -F
 - c. Strengths
 - i. Precise thesis
 - ii. Framing device
 - iii. Coherent throughout
 - iv. Identified various perspectives
 - v. Details were not just piled up but clustered around perspectives
 - vi. Well documented research
 - vii. Killer transitions
 - viii. Insights at moments
 - ix. Ending w quote effective
 - x. Evidence of analysis
 - d. Weakness
 - i. Lack of proofreading?
 - ii. Sentences/ paragraphs tend to be long
 - iii. Point 1 top-heavy
 - iv. Org doesn't follow follow plan from thesis
 - v. Multiple sources in one paragraph (good, actually)
 - vi. Several unsupported conclusions
 - vii. Points w/o stakeholder.
 - viii. Narrow research: sources are so . . . ? These were for our assessment, Christy said.