Evaluation for Unit 3: "TCU-pedia" Article

Name: TEAM NAME   **Article: HALL OF FAME**

COLLABORATIVE ARTICLE	Missing/ Incomplete	Not Satisfactory	Satisfactory	Good	Excellent
Collaborative Author's Note: Your group provides a thoughtful and detailed reflection on what you've learned in this unit and the process of writing and revising collaboratively. Also, you outline who did what work for the project and what specific revisions your group made after peer review.				X – I wanted a bit more about your revision process (i.e. who did what) but overall, nice work!	
Conventions/Organization: You consider the rhetorical situation and the conventions of a Wikipedia page. You have a clear controlling idea with a clear purpose for a clear audience. You make specific rhetorical moves that develop your ethos, and your information is laid out logically. You include a "**general information**" section. You use appropriate headings; your title is clear; and at least two rhetorically-purposeful **visuals** are included.					X - so much better! I love the info about the layout of the place itself, though it does get a little confusing about where things are – consider segmenting or bolding. Overall, though, excellent!
Research/Citation: At least **three sources** are used; one is a text-based document. Sources are integrated well into your text and support your overall purpose for the page. All information (including visuals) is appropriately cited according to some consistent citation style. A **reference list** is included.				X – you rely a bit on Wikipedia, which is fine for the people, but consider going to the source about the awards.	X – really good, on the whole!
Editing and Style: Details explain your subject thoroughly and well, according to your particular purpose; sentences are clear, concise, and varied; there is a sense of singular, formal "voice;" errors have been eliminated. Article is between 1,600 and 2,100 words long					X – only minor errors now!
Design: The text (or a hyperlink to the article) is posted on its own webpage; title is visible in the menu navigation of each team member's blogs. The text is formatted for the web with attention to layout and readability. All links work, including at least one **hyperlink** to another TCU-pedia article.					X – organization works much better!
Drafting and Revision: Complete drafts with author's notes are submitted on time to the portfolio and/or D2L. Revision demonstrates attention to peer and teacher feedback.				X – some good changes, but some editing between the drafts wasn't done as carefully as would have helped you!	X – really great changes!

ARTICLE Grade: B+ (88)
Team Comments: Wow, guys! You did some great work! This is one of the most substantial revisions I've seen, and I really like what you've done here! Nice job! If you had another draft, I would say try not to simply use Wikipedia as your sources, but I think the hyperlinking works really well. Nice job!

OVERALL Grade: (see gradebook)
Individual Comments: So, I took the difference between your first article grade and your overall grade for the unit and added the revision grade accordingly (for example, if you got a 80 on your article and a 82 for your overall grade the first time around, I added 2 to your revision article grade). Let me know if this confuses you!