**Evaluation for Unit 3: “TCU-pedia” Article**

**Name: Article:**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **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. |  |  |  |  |  |
| **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. |  |  |  |  |  |
| **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. |  |  |  |  |  |
| **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 |  |  |  |  |  |
| **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. |  |  |  |  |  |
| **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. |  |  |  |  |  |
| **PROCESS** |  |  |  |  |  |
| **Individual Reflection:** You explain how you and your partner(s) worked together. You reflect on what you personally learned in writing with in a team. *This is only submitted to D2L.* |  |  |  |  |  |
| **Workshop Participation:** Draft is posted to discussion forum. Online peer response shows attention to assignment criteria and each writer’s intention. You engage in discussion about your and others’ drafts in class. |  |  |  |  |  |
| **In-Class Work:** Preliminary activities have been completed thoughtfully and on time. |  |  |  |  |  |

**ARTICLE Grade: OVERALL Grade:  
Team Comments:  
Individual Comments:**