

Fall 2026 ENGL 1302 Syllabus

ENGL 1302 | Asynchronous Online | Blackboard

See below for attribution information¹

Professor Dr. Hamid Reza Moeini (call me Hamid) | hmoeiniasl@tamusa.edu

Course format: Asynchronous online in Blackboard | Office hours: By appointment via Zoom (email 2-3 days in advance; Zoom link posted in Blackboard)

Course Catalog Description

ENGL 1302 examines students' language practices in the context of the communities they belong to, especially their academic disciplines. Students research and critically examine their communities, and they learn to contribute to their communities as effective and persuasive writers. Students compose texts in multiple genres and media, and they complete the digital portfolio they first developed in ENGL 1301/1301L.

Student Learning Outcomes

Student Learning Outcomes
Critically examine the conventions of academic discourse
Conduct effective research, with an emphasis on secondary research
Demonstrate rhetorical agency when communicating with academic audiences
Compose texts in a variety of genres and media
Reflect on individual and collaborative writing processes
Collaborate with peers
Compose a digital writing portfolio

Texas Core Curriculum Objectives

All First-Year Composition (FYC) courses are part of the Texas Core Curriculum. They are specifically designated as "Core 10" courses focused on communication.

Core Objective	Description
Critical Thinking Skills	To include creative thinking, innovation, inquiry, and analysis, evaluation, and synthesis of information.

¹ Information for Attribution: Fish, S.R., Khimen Cooper, and C. Anneke Snyder. "ENGL 1302 Syllabus." *Writing and Rhetoric: Second Semester Composition*, May 2026. This item is licensed under a Creative Commons Attribution 4.0 International License, except where otherwise noted. For more information, see <https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/>.

Core Objective	Description
Communication Skills	To include effective development, interpretation, and expression of ideas through written, oral, and visual communication.
Teamwork	To include the ability to consider different points of view and to work effectively with others to support a shared purpose or goal.
Personal Responsibility	To include the ability to connect choices, actions, and consequences to ethical decision-making.

Grades and Assignments

This asynchronous online course is writing-intensive and includes discussion of assigned texts, individual composing, research, and peer workshops. Each week, complete the Blackboard module in order: review the overview and learning goals, complete the readings and instructional materials, contribute to required discussions or workshops, and submit assignments by the posted deadlines. To succeed, log in several times each week, read closely, take useful notes, develop original ideas, engage respectfully with peers, write with integrity, and ask for help early. I grade assignments each week with written feedback, and you can check your total grade at any time in Blackboard. Email me to request an extension in advance or to discuss a revision. Late assignments lose 1 point per day without an approved extension.

ENGL 1302 Method of Evaluation

This asynchronous online course is writing-intensive and includes discussion of assigned texts, individual composing, research, and peer workshops. Each week, complete the Blackboard module in order: review the overview and learning goals, complete the readings and instructional materials, contribute to required discussions or workshops, and submit assignments by the posted deadlines. To succeed, log in several times each week, read closely, take useful notes, develop original ideas, engage respectfully with peers, write with integrity, and ask for help early. I grade assignments each week with written feedback, and you can check your total grade at any time in Blackboard. Email me to request an extension in advance or to discuss a revision. Late assignments lose 1 point per day without an approved extension.

Grade Distribution

Grades will be determined by the following:	Details		Percentage (100% total)
Participation	Your success and development as a writer depend on your presence and active participation in formative assessments as assigned		10%
Digital Writing Portfolio	Publication of summative assessments and writing goals journal entries in a final digital portfolio		5%
Writing Goals Journal	An individual journal kept in correspondence with instructor over the course of the semester; focused on writing goals and improvement		5%
Précis Assignments	Short, formative writing assignments designed to improve rhetorical analysis and citation skills (5 total)		10%
Explorative Proposal	Short proposal essay about a selected topic of interest and how it can reflect academic argument conventions; will be used to inform all future assignments		15%
Investigative Annotated Bibliography	Completed after the topic proposal, six to seven sources with annotations with working title, topic description, and preliminary thesis		15%
Argumentative Research Paper	Researched academic argument essay incorporating secondary sources; 2,000–2,500 words excluding references page		25%

Grades will be determined by the following:	Details		Percentage (100% total)
PSA Project	Collaborative Public Service Announcement produced in stages throughout the semester		15%

Numerical Grade Equivalents

Course grades are calculated on the standard scale:

A = 100-90; B = 89-80; C = 79-70; D = 69-60; F = 59 or less

Assignment Descriptions

1. **Digital Writing Portfolio:** Students compile all their completed summative assessments and writing goals journal entries into a final digital portfolio to reflect on their individual writing processes and critically examine their language practices.
2. **Writing Goals Journal:** The Writing Goals Journal assignments are intended to be an informal, low-stakes way for students to communicate and reflect upon their writing targets, needs, strengths, and weaknesses. There are four Writing Goals Journal assignments throughout the semester.
3. **Précis Assignments:** Précis assignments are intended to be relatively low-stakes opportunities for students to begin practicing analytical writing, with a focus on developing their skills in summary and analysis. There are five précis assignments throughout the semester.
4. **Participation:** Students complete weekly Blackboard learning activities and collaborate asynchronously. Participation includes discussion posts and replies, research and writing-process activities, peer review, collaborative PSA work, and other formative work that demonstrates engagement and accountability.
5. **Unit 1 Summative Assessment (Explorative Proposal):** Students complete a proposal about their selected topic of interest and how it can reflect academic argument conventions, which will inform future assignments.
6. **Unit 2 Summative Assessment (Investigative Annotated Bibliography):** Students complete an annotated bibliography about their selected topic (established in Unit 1) to explore the conversations related to their topic. The students gather six to seven sources, mixing popular and scholarly sources, so they explore the varied

perspectives and presentations of information while also understanding the role these sources have in forming academic arguments.

7. **Unit 3 Summative Assessment (Argumentative Research Paper):** Students complete a paper providing a researched academic argument related to their semester-long work with prior unit summative assessments. The project should demonstrate key features of academic argument models. The assignment should demonstrate the student's mastery of synthesizing sources to communicate persuasive perspectives.
8. **Public Service Announcement (PSA) Project:** Students complete a semester-long group multimodal project. The project is divided into smaller tasks throughout the semester, which gradually leads to the final multimodal presentation. Students will submit the final project at the end of the semester to demonstrate how they incorporate concepts learned in class into the project's final product. A video component and a written reflection component are required in the final submission.

Course Policies

All faculty in the FYC program follow a specific set of policies you should be aware of, including attendance, plagiarism and AI use policies, as well as policies related to the classroom environment and course materials.

Attendance

Because this course is asynchronous, attendance is demonstrated through academically meaningful participation rather than presence at a scheduled meeting. You are considered present for a week when you access the weekly Blackboard module and complete the required participation activity or assignment by the posted deadline. Logging in by itself does not count as attendance. If circumstances prevent you from participating, contact me as soon as possible. Consistent weekly engagement and timely collaboration are crucial to your success.

Required Materials

- All course readings and weekly learning materials provided for free in Blackboard
- Notebook and pen, or a digital note-taking tool, for journaling and drafting
- Reliable internet access and regular access to a laptop or desktop computer capable of using Blackboard and course media

Digital Tools

Blackboard is our classroom and the official location for weekly modules, announcements, instructional materials, discussions, feedback, grades, and submissions. Plan to log in several times each week and enable course notifications. If you experience technical difficulties, document the problem with a screenshot when possible, try a different browser, contact me

promptly, and contact the ITS Help Desk at (210) 784-4357 or helpdesk@tamusa.edu. Submit files in the format specified by each assignment; links with restricted sharing permissions may not be accepted.

Plagiarism

We recognize that what constitutes plagiarism depends upon context. As such, we work with you to learn how different genres, professions, and academic disciplines define plagiarism. In the context of your FYC classes, plagiarism is defined as the intentional use of another's "language, ideas, or original (not common-knowledge) material" without acknowledgement (["Defining and Avoiding Plagiarism"](#)). If you are found to have committed plagiarism as defined here, your instructor may report you for academic dishonesty, and you may be subject to failing the assignment or even failing the class.

Online Course Environment

We are committed to fostering welcoming online course environments where all students are not only respected and understood but are also recognized as powerful resources for building communities of writers in Blackboard and across the university. While working with classmates and instructors, we ask that you:

- respectfully share your unique experiences and perspectives
- demonstrate respect for and openness to the perspectives and experiences of others
- value the opportunity to learn from difference

Demonstrating respect for those different from you not only prepares you for success in this course, but it also prepares you for success as citizens and professionals in a global community. Because we value the respectful expression and exchange of ideas, students who use violent, harassing, and/or discriminatory language will be reported to the university and may be subject to Student Code of Conduct policies.

GAI Technology

The FYC program expects you to generate your own content this semester. However, there are situations and contexts within our courses where you may use generative artificial intelligence (GAI) tools to support your work as a writer. For example, GAI technologies such as ChatGPT can work well as a starting point for written assignments, assisting you with brainstorming, outlining, generating ideas, and collecting basic information about a topic/idea. Note that the emphasis here is on "support." GAI programs have been shown to provide biased information, to circulate misinformation, and to generate writing that is, at best, mediocre. For these reasons, FYC discourages you from using GAI technology to generate content **for you**. If you have reason to use GAI to generate content **with you**, then we ask that you consult with your professor before doing so. If your professor approves your use, you should acknowledge the GAI program you have used, and you should identify which portions of the text you submit

were produced by GAI. Using GAI content without your professor's permission and/or without proper attribution qualifies as plagiarism.

Disability Support Services and Accessibility

Texas A&M University-San Antonio is committed to providing all students with reasonable access to learning opportunities and accommodations in accordance with the Americans with Disabilities Act, as amended, and Section 504 of the Rehabilitation Act. If you experience barriers to your education due to a disability or think you may have a disability, contact Disability Support Services in the Central Academic Building, Suite 210, at (210) 784-1335, or at dss@tamusa.edu. Contact the instructor promptly if Blackboard content, course technology, or instructional material presents an accessibility barrier so an accessible alternative can be provided. Approved accommodations apply to all course activities and deadlines as documented.

ENGL 1302 Calendar

Unless a Blackboard assignment states otherwise, each week's work is due Sunday by 11:59 p.m. Central Time. Peer-review activities may include an earlier draft deadline and a later response deadline; follow the dates shown in the weekly module. Week 16 has no classes, course activities, assignments, or final examination.

Important Dates:

August 24th First class day
September 7th Labor Day Holiday – No Classes
November 13th Last day to drop with a “W”
November 25th Study day – No Classes
November 26th-28th Thanksgiving Holiday – No Classes
December 5th-11th University final-examination period - no ENGL 1302 classes, assignments, or final exam

The complete [academic calendar](#) is available online.

Unit 1: Introduction to Academic Argument Writing

Week Topics	Recommended Readings (Instructors choose between 1 and 3 readings per week.)
Week 1: August 24–28 Introducing Major Academic Argument Concepts	Lloyd, Amanda. “8.2 Basic Structure and Content of an Argument.” <i>1st Edition: A Guide to Rhetoric, Genre, and Success in First-Year Writing (No Longer Updated)</i>, eds. Melanie

Week Topics	Recommended Readings (Instructors choose between 1 and 3 readings per week.)
• Introduction to ENGL 1302 • Introduction to Major Academic Argument Concepts *Instructors may choose to focus this course on any argumentative style (e.g., Toulmin, Rogerian, Classical)	Gagich and Emilie Zickel. MSL Academic Endeavors, Pressbooks, 2017. • Savini, Catherine. "Looking For Trouble: Finding Your Way into a Writing Assignment." <i>Writing Spaces: Readings on Writing</i>, Vol. 2, eds. Charles Lowe and Pavel Zemliansky. Parlor Press, WAC Clearinghouse, 2011. • Carillo, Ellen C. "Chapter 4. Writing and Revising Academic Projects." <i>A Writer's Guide to Mindful Reading</i>, The WAC Clearinghouse and University Press of Colorado, 2017, pp. 35–47. • Jones, Rebecca, and Sarah LeMire. "4.5 Toulmin: Dissecting the Everyday Argument." <i>Informed Arguments: A Guide to Writing & Research</i>, 4th Edition, eds. Terri Pantuso, Sarah LeMire, Kathy Anders, and Kalani Pattinson. Texas A&M University, Pressbooks, 2023. • Pantuso, Terri. "4.6 Rogerian Argument." <i>Informed Arguments: A Guide to Writing & Research</i>, 4th Edition, eds. Terri Pantuso, Sarah LeMire, Kathy Anders, and Kalani Pattinson. Texas A&M University, Pressbooks, 2023. • Cohen, Daniel. "For argument's sake." <i>TED</i>, February 2013. Assignments • Consider assignments from the Formative Assessment Repository
Week 2: August 31–September 4 Arguments Informed by the Rhetorical Situation	• Carroll, Laura Bolin. "Backpacks vs. Briefcases: Steps toward Rhetorical Analysis." <i>Writing Spaces: Readings on Writing</i>, Vol. 1, eds. Charles Lowe and Pavel Zemliansky. Parlor Press, WAC Clearinghouse, 2010.

Week Topics	Recommended Readings (Instructors choose between 1 and 3 readings per week.)
- Consider the Rhetorical Situation via Textual Analysis - Introduction to Academic Style Guides - Introduction to the Précis Assignment - Introduction to the Writing Goals Journal	- DasBender, Gita. "Critical Thinking in College Writing: From the Personal to the Academic." <i>Writing Spaces: Readings on Writing</i>, Vol. 2, eds. Charles Lowe and Pavel Zemliansky. Parlor Press, WAC Clearinghouse, 2011. - Jeffrey, Robin, Emilie Zickel, Terri Pantuso, et al. "3.4 What is the Rhetorical Situation?" <i>Informed Arguments: A Guide to Writing & Research</i>, 4th Edition, eds. Terri Pantuso, Sarah LeMire, Kathy Anders, and Kalani Pattinson. Texas A&M University, Pressbooks, 2023. - Long, Liza, Amy Minervini, and Joel Gladd. "4.7. Introduction to Analysis Writing." <i>Write What Matters: Your Guide to College Writing</i>, eds. Liza Long, Joel Gladd, and Amy Minervini. MSL Academic Endeavors, Pressbooks, 2020 Assignments Explorative Proposal Brainstorm Worksheet Précis #1: Textual Analysis Writing Goals Journal #1
Week 3: September 7–September 11, *No Class on September 7 for Labor Day Considering Arguments Through Visual Analysis - Consider the Rhetorical Situation via Visual Analysis - Introduction to (Basic) Proposal Writing	Readings - Cohn, Jenae. "Understanding Visual Rhetoric." <i>Writing Spaces: Readings on Writing</i>, Vol. 3, eds. Dana Driscoll, Mary Stewart, and Matthew Vetter. Parlor Press, WAC Clearinghouse, 2020. - Francis Jr., James. "3.13 Visual Analysis in Composition & Rhetoric and Literature." <i>Informed Arguments: A Guide to Writing & Research</i>, 4th Edition, eds. Terri Pantuso, Sarah LeMire, Kathy Anders, and Kalani Pattinson. Texas A&M University, Pressbooks, 2023. - Witte, Alison C. "Research Starts with Answers." <i>The Ask: A More Beautiful Question</i>, eds. Kate L. Pantelides, Erica M. Stone,

Week Topics	Recommended Readings (Instructors choose between 1 and 3 readings per week.)
• Introduction to Research Processes via Starting with Questions	Elizabeth M. Williams, Harlow Crandall, Lisa Williams, and Shane A. McCoy. Middle Tennessee State University, Pressbooks, 2021. • Hoermann-Elliott, Jackie, and Kathryn Quesenbury. “4. Application: Question Trees.” <i>First-Year Composition: Writing as Inquiry and Argumentation</i>, Pressbooks, 2021. • Binder, Leandra, Andrew Fields, Asa Holcombe, et al. “Proposal.” <i>UNM Core Writing Program: English Reader</i>, eds. Lisa Myers and Lukus Malaney. University of New Mexico Core Writing OER Collection, Pressbooks, 2023. Assignments • Precis # 2: Visual Analysis
Week 4: September 14–September 18 Finalizing the Explorative Proposal • Review Unit 1 Concepts • Introduction to the Writing Process via Drafting Practices	Readings • Bruce, Yvonne, and Emilie Zickel. “3.4 Creating the Thesis.” 1st Edition: A Guide to Rhetoric, Genre, and Success in First-Year Writing (No Longer Updated), eds. Melanie Gagich and Emilie Zickel. MSL Academic Endeavors, Pressbooks, 2017. • Kashyap, Athena, and Erika Dyquisto. “5.4 Writing Introductory and Concluding Paragraphs.” <i>Writing, Reading, and College Success: A First-Year Composition Course for all Learners</i>. Libretexs, 2020. • Crowther, Kathy, Lauren Curtright, Nancy Gilbert, et al. “5.3 Writing Paragraphs.” <i>Informed Arguments: A Guide to Writing & Research</i>, 4th Edition, eds. Terri Pantuso, Sarah LeMire, Kathy Anders, and Kalani Pattinson. Texas A&M University, Pressbooks, 2023. • Crowther, Kathryn, Lauren Curtright, Nancy Gilbert, et al. “5.4 Drafting.” <i>Informed Arguments: A Guide to Writing & Research</i>, 4th

Week Topics	Recommended Readings (Instructors choose between 1 and 3 readings per week.)
	Edition, eds. Terri Pantuso, Sarah LeMire, Kathy Anders, and Kalani Pattinson. Texas A&M University, Pressbooks, 2023. Assignments • Explorative Proposal Summative Assessment • Introduction to the Public Service Announcement (PSA) Project

Unit 2: Investigating and Engaging Sources

Week Topics	Recommended Readings
Week 5: September 21–September 25 Introducing Annotated Bibliographies and Academic Research • Introduction to the Investigative Annotated Bibliography Assignment • Introduction to Annotated Bibliographies • Introduction to Locating Credible Sources	Readings • Bernnard Deborah, Greg Bobish, Jenna Hecker, et al. “6.2 Evaluating Important Voices.” <i>Informed Arguments: A Guide to Writing & Research</i>, 4th Edition, eds. Terri Pantuso, Sarah LeMire, and Kathy Anders, and Kalani Pattison. Texas A&M University, Pressbooks, 2023, • Zickel, Emilie, Melanie Gagich, and Terri Pantuso. “7.7 Writing an Annotated Bibliography.” <i>Informed Arguments: A Guide to Writing & Research</i>, 4th Edition, eds. Terri Pantuso, Sarah LeMire, Kathy Anders, and Kalani Pattinson. Texas A&M University, Pressbooks, 2023. • Bernnard, Deborah, Greg Bobish, Jenna Hecker, et al. “7.4 Developing a Research Strategy.” <i>Informed Arguments: A Guide to Writing & Research</i>, 4th Edition, eds. Terri Pantuso, Sarah LeMire, Kathy Anders, and Kalani Pattinson. Texas A&M University, Pressbooks, 2023. • Jeffrey, Robin, and Yvonne Bruce. “8.3. Types of Evidence in Academic Arguments.” 1st Edition: <i>A Guide to Rhetoric, Genre, and</i>

Week Topics	Recommended Readings
	<i>Success in First-Year Writing (No Longer Updated)</i>, eds. Melanie Gagich and Emilie Zickel. MSL Academic Endeavors, Pressbooks, 2017. Assignments • Precis # 3: Text of Choice • PSA Task #1: Finalize PSA Groups
Week 6: September 28–October 2 Introducing Ethical Source Integration • Introduction to Ethical Source Integration • Introduction to Scholarly Article Reading Strategies	Readings • Buck, Rachel, and Silvia Vaccino-Salvadore. “Doing Research is Fun; Citing Sources is Not: Understanding the Fuzzy Definition of Plagiarism.” <i>Writing Spaces: Readings on Writing</i>, Vol. 5, eds. Trace Daniels-Lerberg, Dana L. Driscoll, Mary Stewart, and Matthew A. Vetter. Parlor Press, WAC Clearinghouse, 2023. • Stedman, Kyle D. “Annoying Ways People Use Sources.” <i>Writing Spaces: Readings on Writing</i>, Vol. 2, eds. Charles Lowe and Pavel Zemliansky. Parlor Press, WAC Clearinghouse, 2011. • Rosenberg, Karen. “Reading Games: Strategies for Reading Scholarly Sources.” <i>Writing Spaces: Readings on Writing</i>, Vol. 2, eds. Charles Lowe and Pavel Zemliansky. Parlor Press, WAC Clearinghouse, 2011. • Gagich, Melanie, and Emilie Zickel. “2.3 How to Read Rhetorically.” 1st Edition: A Guide to Rhetoric, Genre, and Success in First-Year Writing (No Longer Updated), eds. Melanie Gagich and Emilie Zickel. MSL Academic Endeavors, Pressbooks, 2017 Assignments • PSA Task #2: Effective Collaboration
Week 7: October 5–October 9	Readings • Delf, Liz, Rob Drummond, and Kristy Kelly. “Chapter 17: The Burkean Parlor Metaphor.” A

Week Topics	Recommended Readings
Developing Annotated Bibliographies and Research Skills • Introduction to The Burkean Parlor • Introduction to Reflective Research Strategies • Introduction to Works Cited/Reference Pages • Review of Writing Process- Revising and Editing Practices	<i>Dam Good Argument</i>, eds. Liz Delf, Rob Drummond, and Kristy Kelly. Oregon State University, Pressbooks, 2022. • Zhuravlova, Svetlana. "5.3 Make Connections When Synthesizing in Your Writing." 1st Edition: <i>A Guide to Rhetoric, Genre, and Success in First-Year Writing (No Longer Updated)</i>, eds. Melanie Gagich and Emilie Zickel. MSL Academic Endeavors, Pressbooks, 2017 • Lloyd, Amanda. "4.5 Explaining Evidence." 1st Edition: <i>A Guide to Rhetoric, Genre, and Success in First-Year Writing (No Longer Updated)</i>, eds. Melanie Gagich and Emilie Zickel. MSL Academic Endeavors, Pressbooks, 2017. • "The Burkean Parlour Method Explained." <i>YouTube</i>, uploaded by CriticalSkills MU, 9 March 2020. • Zhuravlova, Svetlana. "5.3 Make Connections When Synthesizing in Your Writing." 1st Edition: <i>A Guide to Rhetoric, Genre, and Success in First-Year Writing (No Longer Updated)</i>, eds. Melanie Gagich and Emilie Zickel. MSL Academic Endeavors, Pressbooks, 2017 Assignments • Writing Goals Journal # 2 • PSA Task #3: Productive Team Meetings
Week 8: October 12–October 16 Finalizing the Investigative Annotated Bibliography • Continued Review of Writing Process- Revising and Editing Practices	Readings • Hulst, Craig. "Grammar, Rhetoric, and Style." <i>Writing Spaces: Readings on Writing</i>, Vol. 3, eds. Dana Driscoll, Mary Stewart, and Matthew Vetter. Parlor Press, WAC Clearinghouse, 2020. • Lacy, Sarah M, and Emilie Zickel. "3.7 Proof-Reading and Editing Your Final Draft." 1st Edition: <i>A Guide to Rhetoric, Genre, and</i>

Week Topics	Recommended Readings
	Success in First-Year Writing (No Longer Updated), eds. Melanie Gagich and Emilie Zickel. MSL Academic Endeavors, Pressbooks, 2017. - Grauman, Jillian. “What’s That Supposed to Mean? Using Feedback on Your Writing.” <i>Writing Spaces: Readings on Writing</i>, Vol. 4, eds. Dana Lynn Driscoll, Megan Heise, Mary K. Stewart, and Matthew Vetter. Parlor Press, WAC Clearinghouse, 2022. - Irvin, L. Lennie. “Changing Your Mindset About Revision.” <i>Writing Spaces: Readings on Writing</i>, vol. 5, edited by Trace Daniels-Lerberg, Dana Driscoll, Mary K. Stewart, and Matthew Vetter. Parlor Press and The WAC Clearinghouse, 2023. Assignments Investigative Annotated Bibliography Summative Assessment

Unit 3: Composing Researched Academic Arguments

Week Topics	Recommended Readings
Week 9: October 19–October 23 Composing Academic Arguments - Introduction to the Argumentative Research Paper - Introduction to Outlining and Planning - Introduction to Establishing Exigence - Review of Academic Arguments and the Rhetorical Situation	Readings - Hoermann-Elliott, Jackie, and Kathy Quesenbury. “24. Academic Research Essay.” <i>First-Year Composition: Writing as Inquiry and Argumentation</i>. Pressbooks, 2021. - Jeffrey, Robin, Emilie Zickel, Terri Pantuso, et al. “3.4 What is the Rhetorical Situation?” <i>Informed Arguments: A Guide to Writing & Research</i>, 4th Edition, eds. Terri Pantuso, Sarah LeMire, Kathy Anders, and Kalani Pattinson. Texas A&M University, Pressbooks, 2023. - Vieregge, Quentin. “Exigency: What Makes My Message Indispensable to My Reader.” <i>Writing Spaces: Readings on Writing</i>, Vol. 3, eds. Dana

Week Topics	Recommended Readings
	Driscoll, Mary Stewart, and Matthew Vetter. Parlor Press, WAC Clearinghouse, 2020, • Crowther, Kathryn, Lauren Curtright, Nancy Gilbert, et al. “5.2 Methods of Organizing Your Writing.” <i>Informed Arguments: A Guide to Writing & Research</i>, 4th Edition, eds. Terri Pantuso, Sarah LeMire, Kathy Anders, and Kalani Pattinson. Texas A&M University, Pressbooks, 2023. Assignments • PSA Task #4: Formatting an Argument
Week 10: October 26–October 30 Transforming Research into Argument • Developing Academic Argument Thesis Statements • Writing Introductions and Conclusions	Readings • Townsend, Julie A. “4.11 Moving Beyond the Five-Paraphrase Format.” <i>1st Edition: A Guide to Rhetoric, Genre, and Success in First-Year Writing (No Longer Updated)</i>, eds. Melanie Gagich and Emilie Zickel. MSL Academic Endeavors, Pressbooks, 2017. • Kashyap, Athena, and Erika Dyquist. “5.4 Writing Introductory and Concluding Paragraphs.” <i>Writing, Reading, and College Success: A First-Year Composition Course for all Learners</i>. Libretexts, 2020. • DeMint Bailey, Kristen, An Ha, and Anthony J. Outlar. “What Color is My Voice? Academic Writing and the Myth of Standard English.” <i>Writing Spaces: Readings on Writing</i>, Vol. 5, eds. Trace Daniels-Lerberg, Dana L. Driscoll, Mary Stewart, and Matthew A. Vetter. Parlor Press, WAC Clearinghouse, 2023. • Pantuso, Terri. “7.8 From Annotated Bibliography to Rough Draft: How to Develop Your Position.” <i>Informed Arguments: A Guide to Writing & Research</i>, 4th Edition, eds. Terri Pantuso, Sarah LeMire, Kathy Anders, and Kalani Pattinson. Texas A&M University, Pressbooks, 2023 Assignments

Week Topics	Recommended Readings
	• Precis # 4: Argument • Writing Goals Journal # 3 • PSA Task #5: Considering Audience
Week 11: November 2–November 6 Composing Claims with Meaningful Source Integration • Introduction to Composing Claims and Support with Meaningful Source Integration • Writing Cohesive Body Paragraphs	Readings • Gladd, Joel. “91. Pack Snacks: Use the ‘Quotation Sandwich.’” <i>Write What Matters: Your Guide to College Writing</i>, eds. Liza Long, Joel Gladd, and Amy Minervini. MSL Academic Endeavors, Pressbooks, 2020. • Lanning, John, Amanda Lloyd, Robin Jeffrey, et al. “6.3 Using Sources in Your Paper.” <i>Informed Arguments: A Guide to Writing & Research</i>, 4th Edition. eds. Terri Pantuso, Sarah LeMire, Kathy Anders, and Kalani Pattinson. Texas A&M University, Pressbooks, 2023. • Crowther, Kathryn, Lauren Curtright, Nancy Gilbert, et al. “5.3 Writing Paragraphs.” <i>Informed Arguments: A Guide to Writing & Research</i>, 4th Edition, eds. Terri Pantuso, Sarah LeMire, Kathy Anders, and Kalani Pattinson. Texas A&M University, Pressbooks, 2023. • Jeffrey, Robin. “8.4 Counterargument and Response.” <i>1st Edition: A Guide to Rhetoric, Genre, and Success in First-Year Writing (No Longer Updated)</i>, eds. Melanie Gagich and Emilie Zickel. MSL Academic Endeavors, Pressbooks, 2017. Assignments • Argumentative Research Paper Summative Assessment Rough Draft • PSA Task #6: Storyboard & Script

Week Topics	Recommended Readings
Week 12: November 9–November 13 Asynchronous Week with Individual Zoom Conferences • Plan Individual Student Conferences • Set Conference Parameters and Expectations • Conference Schedule	Readings • Ortega, A.J. “9. Building Self-Confidence in Writing.” <i>Write What Matters: Your Guide to College Writing</i>, eds. Liza Long, Joel Gladd, and Amy Minervini. MSL Academic Endeavors, Pressbooks, 2020. Assignments • Precis # 5: Research Gap
Week 13: November 16–November 20 *FYC Write-In on November 19 Incorporating Feedback • Coverage of Revising and Editing Strategies • Review of Ethical Attribution and Crafting the Final Bibliography Page • Reflecting on the Writing Process	Readings • Buck, Rachel, and Silvia Vaccino-Salvadore. ““Doing Research is Fun; Citing Sources is Not’: Understanding the Fuzzy Definition of Plagiarism.” <i>Writing Spaces: Readings on Writing</i>, Vol. 5, eds. Trace Daniels-Lerberg, Dana L. Driscoll, Mary Stewart, and Matthew A. Vetter. Parlor Press, WAC Clearinghouse, 2023. • Hoermann-Elliott, Jackie, and Kathy Quesenbury. “85. Reverse Outlining.” <i>First-Year Composition: Writing as Inquiry and Argumentation</i>. Pressbooks, 2021. • Giles, Sandra, “Reflective Writing and the Revision Process: What Were You Thinking?” <i>Writing Spaces: Readings on Writing</i>, Vol. 1, Ed Charles Lowe and Pavel Zemliansky. Parlor Press, WAC Clearinghouse, 2010 • Long, Liza, and Joel Gladd. “8. Peer Feedback, Revising, and Editing.” <i>Write What Matters: Your Guide to College Writing</i>, eds. Liza Long, Joel Gladd, and Amy Minervini. MSL Academic Endeavors, Pressbooks, 2020. Assignments

Week Topics	Recommended Readings
	• Argumentative Research Paper Final Summative Assessment • Writing Goals Journal # 4
Week 14: November 23–November 27 *No Classes for Thanksgiving Break	Readings • None Assignments • None
Week 15: November 30–December 4 Reflection • Reflecting on Public-Facing Arguments • Final Digital Writing Portfolio and Reflection	Readings • Kate Kiefer. (1994-2026). “Editing and Proofreading Strategies.” <i>The WAC Clearinghouse</i>. Colorado State University. A WAC Clearinghouse writing guide. Assignments • Completed PSA Project • Individual Final Conference • Final Digital Writing Portfolio
Week 16: December 7–December 11 No Classes or Course Activities	Readings None Assignments None No final examination

Summative Assignment Sheets

Unit 1 Summative Assessment: Explorative Proposal

See below for attribution information¹

Purpose

ENGL 1302 emphasizes research and academic arguments—but where to start? Many students jump right into research with a preconceived answer and then look for research to fit what they already think, which is called confirmation bias. This class shows you ways to avoid bias. It is important to remember 1) that research starts with questions and 2) that academic arguments have specific organizational structures.

Instead of using writing habits that might have worked before, you want to start working with writing and research habits needed for the rest of your educational and career journeys. That journey starts with questions, some initial thoughts, and the areas or topics you are interested in exploring. This Unit 1 Explorative Proposal assignment invites you to take the first step by reflecting upon and articulating those interests.

For this assignment, write an explorative proposal explaining the topic you are interested in learning more about, questions you have about that topic, and how those questions can lead to an academic argument using the ideas discussed in class. This assignment helps apply what you have learned about academic arguments to the questions and topics you are beginning to explore by asking: How might your current interests lead to a future academic argument?

Learning Outcomes: Upon successful completion of this assessment, you will have demonstrated evidence of the following learning outcomes:

1. Reflect on individual and collaborative writing processes
2. Collaborate with peers
3. Critically examine the conventions of academic discourse
4. Demonstrate rhetorical agency when communicating with academic audiences
5. Compose texts in a variety of genres and media

Skills: Upon successful completion of this assessment, you will have demonstrated the following core curriculum objectives:

1. **Critical Thinking:** Analyze personal interests for connections to academic argument; craft self-reflective inquiry to develop a writing project topic with appropriate support.
2. **Effective Communication:** Use the Explorative Proposal as a vehicle for communicating learning and analysis appropriate to audience while using polished, edited American English.
3. **Teamwork:** Communicate with peers and the instructor at various stages of the writing process to develop ideas and analyze example texts.
4. **Personal Responsibility:** Demonstrate ethical decision-making with explorative proposal subject matter, avoiding scholastic dishonesty concerns.
5. **Marketable Skills:** Manage time when completing a long-term writing project, develop individual and collaborative research and editorial skills while producing polished writing, develop writing to clearly communicate

perspectives to a non-expert reader, and analyze data to reach sound conclusions.

Knowledge: This assessment will also help you become familiar with important content knowledge in the discipline:

1. **Writing Process:** Demonstrate the stages of writing, including brainstorming, drafting, revising, and editing, to produce a polished and effective piece of writing.
2. **Research Process:** Demonstrate the ability to effectively and strategically develop and revise questions to establish a process for creating an academic argument.
3. **Reading Process:** Demonstrate the ability to effectively and strategically read course material to understand major academic argument concepts.
4. **Genre Conventions:** Communicate understanding of unique components for the proposal genre.
5. **Style Conventions:** Apply the conventions of style manuals for specific academic disciplines (e.g., MLA, APA, CSM, etc.).

Tasks

Using the topic you selected during the brainstorming exercises, develop an explorative proposal that examines your emerging ideas for the long-term argumentative research paper. This will be the topic you use for the later summative assessments (Unit 2 Investigative Annotated Bibliography and Unit 3 Argumentative Research Paper). This proposal is the first step toward building a working research question.

Your Explorative Proposal needs to communicate the following:

- An overview of your driving questions for the long-term project explaining your overall topic and the questions you can ask that invite academic argument conversations (i.e. how do those questions engage critical thinking and analysis?).
- An overview of how your questions connect with specific academic argument principles covered in class lecture.
- A brief discussion of why your topic or questions matter—academically, socially, or personally. What larger conversations or communities might your inquiry contribute to?
- A reflection on what sparked your interest in this subject—why you are curious about it, how it connects to your experiences or prior knowledge, and how your interest motivates your academic exploration.

The writing needs to align with academic writing conventions, so the Explorative Proposal needs to include 1) a meaningful statement of your interest in the topic and how it connects to your goals or course ideas, 2) insightful analysis about your driving questions and their connections to rhetorical analysis/argumentation, and 3) relevant evidence from course lectures and/or readings.

The following sequential steps will guide you through this Explorative Proposal:

1. Select the driving question(s) for your research focus that aligns with the focus of the course.
 - Complete the topic brainstorming activities that are assigned.
2. Plan and outline the proposal.
 - Complete the prewriting activity, which helps organize ideas. Break down your proposal to include all required elements.
 - Develop a timeline for completing the proposal.
3. Draft the proposal.
 - Draft the main points of the proposal focusing on developing your ideas in ways that show their potential and clarify your perspective for the audience.
4. Revise and edit the proposal.
 - Incorporate peer and professor feedback and make necessary revisions to the content and the structure.
 - Edit for grammar, spelling, punctuation, overall clarity and conciseness.
 - Edit document formatting elements to align the proposal with the required style guide.
5. Finalize the proposal.
 - Prepare the final version of the Explorative Proposal ensuring it is polished and professional.
 - Confirm the Explorative Proposal meets project requirements and core objectives.

Criteria for Success

1. **Length and Format Requirements:** The Explorative Proposal should be between 500–750 words (Note: One double-spaced page of 12-point Times New Roman font is about 300 words). The proposal needs to use formatting guidelines covered in class, but since you are not required to have an outside source for this assessment, no bibliography page is needed at this time. Make sure you follow correct formatting for headers, titles, margins, and other general set-up.

2. **Style and Tone:** This is an initial exploratory proposal, so you have flexibility in how you organize it for full development. Your assumed audience is a random group of your academic peers with varied beliefs.
3. **Reflection:** After submitting your Explorative Proposal, reflect on your completed work in Writing Goals Journal #2. Consider: What strategies worked well, and what changes might you make in future writing tasks to improve your performance? What changes need to be made to your writing style? What writing strategies should be changed, developed, and/or eliminated?
4. **Grading Criteria:** The Explorative Proposal will be graded based on the following criteria:
 - a. **Introduction (5%):** The introduction addresses audience needs by adequately setting up the Explorative Proposal. The introduction clearly states the topic and effectively orients the audience to what follows.
 - b. **Organization (20%):** The Explorative Proposal is organized in a way that flows, moves the content forward, and is easy to follow. Unimportant details that do not move the proposal forward have been removed.
 - c. **Development (50%):** The content is logically organized to effectively showcase your understanding of how to craft a strong explorative proposal. It demonstrates a clear articulation of motivation, academic goals, and the direction of the proposed project. There is a clear focus—either explicitly or implicitly—that conveys your central area of interest and inquiry. It reflects the conventions of an explorative proposal document with clearly defined questions, topics, and goals supported by specific and concrete details rather than generalizations. It demonstrates thoughtful engagement with the topic and shows promise for the direction and potential of the emerging project.
 - d. **Conclusion (5%):** The conclusion addresses audience needs by reminding the reader about the writing's purpose (what someone should take away from reading the explorative proposal).
 - e. **Style (15%):** The writing showcases clear, fluid prose with minimal grammatical and mechanical concerns that distract from the text's readability, demonstrating a commitment to the editing process. Word choice and tone are appropriate for an explorative proposal.
 - f. **Format (5%):** Formatting guidelines are followed with minimal errors in document layout.

Rubric

The rubric provided is based on the criteria for success outlined above.

Criteria	Meets Expectations	Approaching Expectations	Does Not Meet Expectations	Points (100)
Introduction	5-4 pts. Adequately sets up the topic and clearly orients the reader for the following explorative proposal.	3-2 pts. Partially sets up the topic; may be missing some context or clarity.	1-0 pts. Missing key elements needed to orient the reader or no apparent introduction.	/5
Organization	20-15 pts. Logical structure that moves the reader through the content.	14-7 pts. Some structure is present, but the flow is inconsistent or confusing.	6-0 pts. No discernible structure; reads as stream-of-consciousness.	/20
Development	50-40 pts. Includes a clear explorative proposal or throughline that shows how the interest could be developed into a well-defined research project. Clearly states motivation, academic goals, and project direction.	39-25 pts. Explorative proposal or throughline is somewhat unclear or underdeveloped. The connection to a potential research project is weak or lacks specificity.	24-0 pts. Lacks a clear explorative proposal or throughline. Motivation, goals, or direction are vague or disconnected with no clear path toward a research project.	/50
Conclusion	5-4 pts. Restates purpose and wraps up proposal as expected.	3-2 pts. Some attempt to reinforce the	1-0 pts. Lacks key components in reinforcing	/5

Criteria	Meets Expectations	Approaching Expectations	Does Not Meet Expectations	Points (100)
		proposal's purpose but lacks clarity.	purpose or no apparent conclusion.	
Style	15-12 pts. Prose is clear and fluid with minimal distracting errors.	11-6 pts. Some errors are present and mildly distracting but writing is mostly clear.	5-0 pts. Errors significantly affect clarity or readability.	/15
Format	5-4 pts. Formatting guidelines are followed with minimal errors in document layout.	3-2 pts. Formatting elements are inconsistent but not disruptive.	1-0 pts. Formatting guidelines are not followed.	/5

Unit 2 Summative Assessment: Investigative Annotated Bibliography

See below for attribution information¹

Purpose

Students' research often reflects confirmation bias, as they seek sources to support predetermined conclusions rather than explore open-ended questions. For this Investigative Annotated Bibliography, we are shifting into stronger research habits that start with questions: What information is available? What can we learn from what others have done? And how might authors' ideas overlap or disagree?

This summative assessment is the next phase of your research journey towards the Unit 3 Argumentative Research Paper. Based on the topic you explored in your Unit 1 Explorative Proposal, gather at least six sources related to your topic where three are a mix of popular sources and at least three or more are from scholarly sources. As you read, focus on the varied perspectives and presentations of information so you can start to think about how these might develop an academic argument: What do these authors tell us and how do they deliver the information?

Think of academic research as an exploration and an annotated bibliography as a journal about that exploration. The end goal is to gather and learn now so that we can decide what to work with later in the Argumentative Research Paper.

Learning Outcomes: Upon successful completion of this assessment, you will have demonstrated evidence of the following learning outcomes:

1. Reflect on individual and collaborative writing processes
2. Collaborate with peers
3. Demonstrate rhetorical agency when communicating with academic audiences
4. Critically examine the conventions of academic discourse

5. Conduct effective research, with an emphasis on secondary research
6. Compose texts in a variety of genres and media

Skills: Upon successful completion of this assessment, you will have demonstrated the following core curriculum objectives:

1. **Critical Thinking:** Analyze texts for important information and authors' unique perspectives; analyze how texts are in conversation with each other; and craft self-reflective inquiry to develop a statement of interest into an academic argument with appropriate support.
2. **Effective Communication:** Use the annotated bibliography genre as a vehicle for communicating learning and analysis appropriate to audience while using polished, edited American English.
3. **Teamwork:** Communicate with peers and the instructor at various stages of the writing process to develop ideas, analyze source information, and make decisions about assessment content.
4. **Personal Responsibility:** Demonstrate ethical decision-making with paper subject matter, avoiding scholastic dishonesty concerns.
5. **Marketable Skills:** Manage time when completing a long-term writing project, develop individual and collaborative research and editorial skills while producing polished writing, develop writing to clearly communicate perspectives to a non-expert reader, and analyze data to reach sound conclusions.

Knowledge: This assessment will also help you become familiar with important content knowledge in the discipline:

1. **Writing Process:** Demonstrate the stages of writing, including brainstorming, drafting, revising, and editing, to produce a polished and effective paper.
2. **Research Process:** Demonstrate the ability to accurately locate sources appropriate to academic research contexts and effectively and strategically

develop and revise questions to establish a throughline for creating an academic argument.

3. **Reading Process:** Demonstrate the ability to effectively and strategically read course material to understand major academic argument concepts and to read research material to understand emerging conversation about the initial topic of interest.
4. **Genre Conventions:** Communicate understanding of unique components for the annotated bibliography genre.
5. **Style Conventions:** Apply the conventions of style manuals for specific academic disciplines (e.g., MLA, APA, CSM, etc.).

Tasks

Using the topic you selected in the Unit 1 Explorative Proposal, develop an annotated bibliography that will provide support for the argument you craft in your Argumentative Research Paper. Your annotated bibliography needs to communicate your research explorations in two ways: 1) an introductory reflection about the conversation happening about your topic and 2) an annotated bibliography for your gathered sources.

The introductory reflection needs to demonstrate your progressing knowledge of the research question you crafted in your Explorative Proposal and how the sources you have compiled work together, or against, each other. For your introduction, consider questions such as: What are the agreements and disagreements in the conversation? What are the additions, extensions, and/or critiques in the conversation? Who writes/speaks from a position of authority on the topic and how convincing is the evidence they use to craft their argument? If so, are they distracting or helpful?

For the annotations, each entry needs to demonstrate ethical research processes by providing a reference entry for each source alongside an explanation of the text's perspective about the topic. In 150-200 words per annotation, address the following for each source:

- Identify the central argument of the source. If the source is primarily informational, its argument might be implied rather than explicitly stated.
- Identify the main type of evidence the author(s) use to support the argument.
- Evaluate the quality of the argument by referencing types of reasoning (inductive, deductive, analogical), the use of concessions or qualifiers, and/or logical fallacies
- Identify and explain one important counterargument, concession, and/or qualifier within the source (if present).
- Discuss how the source will be used in your Argumentative Research Paper (e.g., to advance your position, as an example of a counterargument/concession, etc.).

Additionally, the annotated bibliography should demonstrate ethical research practices by including, for each source, a reference entry, and for the annotation portion, a summary of the source's main perspective on the topic as well as two or three key takeaways that could help inform a potential argument. Consider: What is something you learned from this that you were surprised to learn? Or what did you learn from this article that will enhance (or challenge) your statement of interest from the last unit?

The following sequential steps will guide you through this Investigative Annotated Bibliography:

1. Locate and read the six sources needed for the Investigative Annotated Bibliography.
 - Follow the course lecture guidelines for locating sources appropriate for the course.
 - Read sources following the reading strategies recommended and practiced through assigned Blackboard activities.
 - Draft the reference entries for the sources.
2. Plan and outline the Investigative Annotated Bibliography.
 - Develop a timeline for completing the annotated bibliography.
 - Develop an outline for the annotated bibliography, noting the specific formatting used with annotated bibliographies.

3. Draft the Investigative Annotated Bibliography.
 - Draft the explanation of the required source information, applying specific writing guidelines addressed during class lecture.
 - Draft the introductory reflection, applying specific guidelines addressed during class lecture.
4. Revise and edit the Investigative Annotated Bibliography.
 - Incorporate peer and professor feedback and make necessary revisions to the content and the structure.
 - Edit for grammar, spelling, punctuation, and overall clarity and conciseness.
 - Edit the reference entries to align with the required style guide.
 - Edit for document formatting elements to align the assessment with annotated bibliography formatting to the required style guide.
5. Finalize the Investigative Annotated Bibliography.
 - Prepare the final version of the Investigative Annotated Bibliography ensuring it is polished and professional.
 - Confirm the Investigative Annotated Bibliography meets project requirements and core objectives.

Criteria for Success

1. **Length and Format Requirements:** The introductory reflection should be 200–300 words in length and 150–200 words for each source annotation excluding the reference/citation entry. (Note: One double-spaced page of 12-point Times New Roman font is about 300 words). The paper needs to use formatting guidelines covered in class. Make sure you follow correct formatting for headers, titles, margins, and other general document set-up concerns.
2. **Style and Tone:** This is a structured writing assessment, so while you can choose the type of organization you want to use for the introductory reflection, the annotated bibliography needs to follow the accepted conventions. Your assumed audience is a random group of your academic peers with varied beliefs.

3. **Reflection:** After submitting your annotated bibliography, reflect on your completed work in Writing Goals Journal #3. Consider: What strategies worked well, and what changes might you make in future writing tasks to improve your performance? What changes need to be made to your writing style? What writing strategies should be changed, developed, and/or eliminated?
4. **Grading Criteria:** The Investigative Annotated Bibliography will be graded based on the following criteria:
 - a. **Citations (15%):** Citations follow the instructor's chosen citation style with minimal errors. All required reference elements are included and ordered correctly. Minor inconsistencies may be present but do not detract from overall formatting quality.
 - b. **Central Argument (15%):** The central argument of all sources is identified. The purpose of each source (informational or argumentative) is clearly discussed as well as how an argument might be implied rather than explicitly stated.
 - c. **Evidence (15%):** The evidence used by all sources is identified and analyzed. There is a clear explanation of how the evidence supports each source's argument.
 - d. **Counterargument, Concession, and/or Qualifier (10%):** Discussions of counterarguments, concessions, and/or qualifiers are found in all sources or acknowledges a lack thereof, demonstrating a clear understanding of each source's rhetorical structure.
 - e. **Source Integration (10%):** Each source showcases thoughtful analysis. These arguments contribute to developing or supporting the overall argument. All sources are credible and appropriate for academic research. All guidelines are followed for source types (e.g., scholarly, popular, multimedia, etc.) as specified in the assignment.
 - f. **Grammar/Syntax/Punctuation (5%):** Writing showcases clear, fluid prose with minimal grammar, syntax, and punctuation errors. Word choice and

tone are appropriate to academic writing, and the text demonstrates a strong commitment to the revision and editing process.

- g. **Introductory Reflection (15%):** The introductory reflection frames the research question or topic clearly and previews areas for further development. The introduction shows an awareness of the evolving research conversation and connects the writer's goals to the project's broader context.
- h. **Development and Reflection (15%):** The writing is thoroughly developed to showcase your understanding of reflective research practices. Content logically presents the researched conversation, using specific examples, concrete details, and clear evaluations of sources. The writing clearly shows that the project is progressing well and is ready to develop further.

Rubric

The rubric provided is based on the criteria for success outlined above.

Criteria	Meets Expectations	Approaching Expectations	Does Not Meet Expectations	Points (100)
Citations	15-12 pts. All reference elements are present. All citations follow the instructor's chosen citation style correctly.	11-6 pts. Most (~75%) citations follow the instructor's chosen citation style correctly, though one or two errors may be present.	5-0 pts. Fewer than 50% of the citations are correct, or major errors are present.	/15
Central Argument	15-12 pts. Identifies the central argument of all sources and clearly discusses the purpose of each	11-6 pts. Identifies the central argument of all sources and attempts to discuss the purpose of each	5-0 pts. Does not identify the central argument of all sources OR Does not discuss the	/15

Criteria	Meets Expectations	Approaching Expectations	Does Not Meet Expectations	Points (100)
	source (informational or argumentative) as well as how an argument might be implied rather than explicitly stated.	source (informational or argumentative).	purpose of each source OR Annotations are shorter than 150 words each.	
Evidence	15-12 pts. Identifies and analyzes the evidence used by all sources. Demonstrates mastery in explaining how the evidence supports each source's argument.	11-6 pts. Identifies the evidence used by all sources but offers limited or surface-level analysis.	5-0 pts. Does not discuss the use of evidence, or lack thereof, in all sources. Shows minimal or no analysis.	/15
Counterargument or Concession and/or Qualifier	10-8 pts. Discusses the counterargument or concession and/or qualifier found in all sources OR Acknowledges a lack thereof. Demonstrates clear understanding of each source's rhetorical structure.	7-4 pts. Discusses the counterargument or concession and/or qualifier found in most sources OR Acknowledges a lack thereof. Some discussion may be limited or underdeveloped.	3-0 pts. Does not discuss the counterargument or concession and/or qualifier in any of the sources. Shows minimal or no engagement with this rhetorical element.	/10
Source Integration	10-8 pts.	7-4 pts.	3-0 pts.	/10

Criteria	Meets Expectations	Approaching Expectations	Does Not Meet Expectations	Points (100)
	Provides thoughtful analysis of each source and how these arguments contribute to developing or supporting the overall argument. All sources are credible and appropriate for academic research. All guidelines are followed for source types (e.g., scholarly, popular, multimedia, etc.) as specified in the assignment.	Analyzes most sources with some insight though some evaluations may lack depth, clarity, or direct relevance to the overall argument. Most sources are credible and mostly meet the required types. One or two sources may be questionable in reliability or may not meet guidelines.	Provides minimal or superficial analysis. Does not adequately address the source's role in developing or supporting the overall argument. Most sources are non-credible and mostly do not meet the required types. Most sources are questionable in reliability and do not meet guidelines.	
Grammar/ Syntax/ Punctuation	5-4 pts. The writing is clear and professional with virtually no grammar, syntax, or punctuation errors. Sentence structure is effective and enhances readability.	3-2 pts. Minor errors (no more than 10) are present but do not hinder understanding. Sentence structure is mostly clear with occasional lapses.	1-0 pts. Frequent errors (more than 10) disrupt clarity and readability. Sentence structure is often unclear or repetitive, showing limited proofreading.	/5

Criteria	Meets Expectations	Approaching Expectations	Does Not Meet Expectations	Points (100)
Introductory Reflection	15-12 pts. Introduction includes a clear reflection on the research topic and anticipates areas for future development and inquiry.	11-6 pts. Introduction reflects generally on the research topic and connects to the project goals though development may be uneven.	5-0 pts. Introduction lacks reflective engagement with the research topic or misses key components for framing future work.	/15
Development and Reflection	15-12 pts. Content is thoroughly developed, showcases reflection on the researched conversation, and demonstrates readiness for a larger project.	11-6 pts. Content is generally developed but may lack full critical reflection or detailed engagement with sources.	5-0 pts. Content is underdeveloped, missing reflection, or shows superficial engagement with the research conversation.	/15

Unit 3 Summative Assessment: Argumentative Research Paper

See below for attribution information¹

Purpose

The work you have done thus far has been focused on developing an Argumentative Research Paper. In Unit 1, you explored some initial ideas to choose a research topic. In Unit 2, you investigated researched information from experts around your chosen topic; now it is time to advance your unique academic argument. This kind of writing engages with complex questions, issues, and research going beyond reporting on a topic to making informed claims about the topic and how those claims impact individuals, specific communities, or society at large.

Drawing upon the skills and knowledge you have developed in prior units, compose a researched academic argument that is centered around the argument in your thesis. This essay should include: 1) a clear argumentative stance appropriate to your perspective, 2) an established significance of your research topic, and 3) ethically and appropriately synthesized information from a variety of sources in support of your thesis. Remember that while we use the term *argument*, it has varied meanings in academic settings, so the style and tone of the paper do not need to be combative or defensive.

This assessment is the culmination of your previous writing experiences in this course and prepares you for future research-writing tasks you may encounter in both academic and professional settings.

Learning Outcomes: Upon successful completion of this assessment, you will have demonstrated evidence of the following learning outcomes:

1. Critically examine the conventions of academic discourse
2. Conduct effective research, with an emphasis on secondary research

3. Demonstrate rhetorical agency when communicating with academic audiences
4. Compose texts in a variety of genres and media
5. Reflect on individual and collaborative writing processes
6. Collaborate with peers

Skills: Upon successful completion of this assessment, you will have demonstrated the following core curriculum objectives:

1. **Critical Thinking:** Analyze, evaluate, and integrate sources into your own original academic argument, demonstrating the ability to present an informed argument about a topic.
2. **Effective Communication:** Use the academic paper as a vehicle for communicating learning, analysis, and synthesis of sources in a manner appropriate to audience, while using polished, edited American English.
3. **Teamwork:** Communicate with peers and the instructor at various stages of the writing process to develop ideas and analyze example texts.
4. **Personal Responsibility:** Demonstrate ethical decision-making with source integration in writing, avoid scholastic dishonesty concerns, and demonstrate ethical decision-making with your academic argument.
5. **Marketable Skills:** Manage time when completing a long-term writing project, develop individual and collaborative editorial skills while producing polished writing, develop writing to clearly communicate perspectives to a non-expert reader, analyze data to reach sound conclusions, and ethically integrate source material in projects.

Knowledge: This assessment will also help you become familiar with important content knowledge in the discipline:

1. **Writing Process:** Demonstrate the stages of writing, including brainstorming, drafting, revising, and editing, to produce a polished and effective researched academic argument paper.

2. **Research Process:** Demonstrate the ability to integrate relevant and appropriate researched information in support of claims presented in the academic argument.
3. **Reading Process:** Demonstrate the ability to review prior material to locate relevant and appropriate information needed to develop an academic argument paper.
4. **Genre Conventions:** Communicate understanding of unique components of critical research-based papers.
5. **Style Conventions:** Apply the conventions of style manuals for specific academic disciplines (e.g., MLA, APA, CSM, etc.).

Tasks

The Argumentative Research Paper builds on your semester-long work. Using your topic and prepared sources, present the unique perspective you have developed through sustained thinking, research, and writing up to this point.

Use the following guidelines to structure your Argumentative Research Paper:

1. **Introduction:** Your introduction should identify your argument focus by describing it in detail, gaining the readers' interest, creating common ground, establishing the importance of the issue, establishing credibility for you to speak on this topic, and setting up the thesis statement. The thesis statement should give your readers a clear sense of your focused argument and provide structure for the rest of the essay.
2. **Body Content:** Your body paragraphs should effectively communicate the necessary structural elements for your approach to the argument (i.e. Classical, Toulmin, or Rogerian). It may help to think about this part as the sections needed to create the academic argument. Your body paragraphs should establish the exigency (significance) of your approach to the topic and integrate source materials seamlessly to explain the existing conversations about the topic. Additionally, you

should develop claims and support for your perspective about the argument while also acknowledging opposing viewpoints and objections.

3. **Conclusion:** Your conclusion should provide a thoughtful summary of your argument connected to the larger academic conversation with which you are working. Reflect on the implications of that argument for your intended audience. Make sure it is clear what you want the audience to think or do after reading your paper.

The following sequential steps will guide you through this Argumentative Research Paper:

1. Evaluate your prior research and plan for additional research needs.
 - Evaluate the sources you have and decide how each one provides differing support for your claims.
 - Add additional sources if needed or required.
 - Create works cited/references page and in-text citations as you annotate.
2. Plan and outline the Argumentative Research Paper using your selected argument structure (i.e. Classical, Toulmin, Rogerian, or something else).
 - Create an outline that includes the introduction, main points, supporting details, and conclusion.
 - Develop a timeline for completing the paper.
3. Draft the Argumentative Research Paper .
 - Draft the main points of the paper integrating relevant material from the selected sources.
 - Review attribution guidelines as you integrate source material into the writing.
 - Draft the introduction after the body paragraphs to establish an overview for the paper's main points.
 - Draft the conclusion to remind the reader of the purpose of the paper and clearly restate your perspective.
4. Complete peer/instructor review.

- Bring required materials to drafting and revising workshops.
 - Collaborate with instructor and peers during workshops to locate strengths and areas for improvement.
5. Revise and edit the Argumentative Research Paper.
- Incorporate peer and instructor feedback and make necessary revisions to the content and the structure.
 - Revise and edit any attribution missteps (i.e. missing in-text citation, incomplete paraphrasing).
 - Edit for grammar, spelling, punctuation, and overall clarity and conciseness.
 - Edit for document formatting elements to align the paper with the required style guide.
 - Utilize your institutional writing center tutors.
6. Finalize the Argumentative Research Paper.
- Prepare the final version of the Argumentative Research Paper ensuring it is polished and professional.
 - Confirm the Argumentative Research Paper meets project requirements and core objectives.

Criteria for Success

- **Length and Format:** The paper should be between 2,000–2,500 words. The document must be formatted according to the style guidelines discussed in class, including a properly formatted bibliographic page at the end.
- **Research Requirements:** The paper needs to integrate the sources used to support your unique claims. All research citations need to use the formatting guidelines covered in class, including a bibliographic page listing all your sources that are cited within the paper. These sources should be used in significant ways to develop the paper's argument. All sources should be credible, and some must be scholarly. Do not include sources on the bibliographic page that you do not directly cite or paraphrase within the essay.

- **Style and Tone:** This paper requires you to work closely with multiple sources which means that you will need to use signal phrases and in-text citation consistently and properly to effectively manage your source material without allowing it to overpower your own voice. In describing and responding critically to your source material, you must be sure to avoid unintentional plagiarism. Remember that you are addressing an audience of intelligent, sophisticated readers who come from a variety of backgrounds and hold a variety of positions on cultural issues. Your tone, therefore, should remain objective and respectful.
- **Reflection:** After submitting your paper, reflect on your completed work in Writing Goals Journal #4. Consider: What strategies worked well, and what changes might you make in future writing tasks to improve your performance? What have you learned about academic research writing that you can use again later and in what situations? How can you apply the skills you developed for this paper in other contexts?
- **Grading Criteria:** Your paper will be graded based on the following criteria:
 - a. **Context and Purpose for Writing (10%):** The paper responds to the prompt and engages with its broader purpose. The writing demonstrates a thorough understanding of context, takes into account the expectations of an academic audience, positions itself within a larger conversation or issue, and maintains focus appropriate to the purpose throughout the paper.
 - b. **Content Development (15%):** Ideas are explored and expanded using detailed explanation, relevant examples, and supporting evidence. The content illustrates mastery of the subject, conveying your understanding and shaping for the whole work. The integration of research and critical thinking builds complexity and depth in the paper.
 - c. **Organization (10%):** Ideas are clearly and logically arranged and connected throughout the paper. The use of transitions, paragraph structure, and an overall sense of flow helps readers move through the argument or narrative. Introductory and concluding paragraphs skillfully frame the discussion. Body

paragraphs are well developed, internally coherent, and build off of each other to advance the argument in meaningful ways.

- d. **Control of Syntax and Mechanics (10%):** Sentence structures, punctuation, grammar, spelling, and word choice demonstrate clarity and fluency of language. Attention to readability and the conventions of academic prose are shown.
- e. **Thesis (10%):** The thesis or central claim demonstrates thoughtful placement, clarity, and appropriate scope as well as how it frames the discussion that follows. The thesis statement is easily identifiable and makes an arguable claim that is specific, original, and compelling for the paper's intended audience.
- f. **Position and Counterargument (15%):** The paper presents a position on an issue and addresses alternative or opposing views. The paper builds a strong case in favor of the position stated in the thesis, and different perspectives are acknowledged, described, and situated in relation to the writer's own stance.
- g. **Word Count (5%):** The word count is within the expected word range and meets the required length, indicating appropriate development and effort.
- h. **References Page (10%):** Sources are properly documented, complete, and listed at the end of the paper using the formatting style discussed in class. Alphabetical order, punctuation, and consistency with in-text citations are demonstrated.
- i. **In-Text Citation Format (2.5%):** Formatting and placement of in-text citations are according to the assigned style guidelines. Parenthetical or narrative citations are accurately used when quoting, summarizing, or paraphrasing.
- j. **Quotation and Paraphrase Attribution (2.5%):** Quoted and paraphrased material are appropriately introduced, framed, and attributed to its original

source. Signal phrases are appropriately used, and there is a balance between the writer's voice and source material.

- k. **Source Usage (10%):** Sources are effectively woven into the paper to support claims, provide context, or offer different viewpoints. Sources are relevant and contribute to the development of the paper's ideas. All of the sources on the references page clearly appear in the paper.

Rubric

The rubric provided is based on the criteria for success outlined above.

Criteria	Meets Expectations	Approaching Expectations	Does Not Meet Expectations	Points (100)
Context and Purpose for Writing	10-8 pts. Demonstrates a thorough understanding of context, audience, and purpose that is responsive to the assigned task(s) and focuses all elements of the work.	7-4 pts. Demonstrates basic awareness of context, audience, and purpose with a generally clear focus on the assigned task(s). Shows some understanding of audience perceptions and assumptions but may lack full development or consistency.	3-0 pts. Demonstrates minimal attention to context, audience, purpose, and to the assigned tasks(s) (e.g., expectation of instructor or self as audience).	/10

Criteria	Meets Expectations	Approaching Expectations	Does Not Meet Expectations	Points (100)
Content Development	15-12 pts. Uses appropriate, relevant, and compelling content to illustrate mastery of the subject, conveying the writer's understanding and shaping the whole work.	11-6 pts. Uses appropriate and relevant content to explore and develop ideas within the context of the discipline though depth and consistency may vary throughout the paper.	5-0 pts. Uses appropriate and relevant content to develop simple ideas in some parts of the work.	/15
Organization	10-8 pts. Argument proceeds along clear and logical path of development with lucid transitions and without unnecessary digressions. Introductory and concluding paragraphs skillfully frame the discussion. Body paragraphs are well developed, internally coherent, and build off of each other to advance the	7-4 pts. The argument's development shows some clarity but may be inconsistently planned or unclear in parts. Transitions might be awkward or missing. Introductory and concluding paragraphs may insufficiently frame the discussion. Body paragraphs are related but may lack full development, coherence, or meaningful	3-0 pts. Argument lacks unity or any discernible path of development. Little or no attempt is made to frame the discussion, and paragraphs lack development and internal coherence.	/10

Criteria	Meets Expectations	Approaching Expectations	Does Not Meet Expectations	Points (100)
	argument in meaningful ways.	connection to each other.		
Control of Syntax and Mechanics	10-8 pts. Uses effective, fitting language that skillfully communicates meaning to readers with clarity and fluency and is virtually error-free.	7-4 pts. Uses straightforward language that generally conveys meaning to readers with clarity, though the writing may include some errors. These errors are noticeable.	3-0 pts. Uses language that sometimes impedes meaning because of errors in usage.	/10
Thesis	10-8 pts. Thesis statement is easily identifiable and makes an arguable claim that is specific, original, and compelling for the paper's intended audience.	7-4 pts. Thesis statement is identifiable but may be vague, factual rather than arguable, or unclear. It may also show some confusion about formulating a focused argument within the paper's parameters.	3-0 pts. Thesis statement is missing (or unidentifiable) or demonstrates little or no effort to formulate an argument within the parameters set by the paper's prompt.	/10
Position and Counterargument	15-12pts. Builds a strong case in favor of position stated in thesis; acknowledges a counterargument OR	11-6 pts. Establishes a case in favor of the position stated in the thesis though development may be uneven. May	5-0 pts. Does not establish support for position stated in thesis OR gets off topic to the	/15

Criteria	Meets Expectations	Approaching Expectations	Does Not Meet Expectations	Points (100)
	makes a concession that does not detract from the position.	acknowledge a counterargument or concession but is not fully explored or integrated.	point of distraction from original objective.	
Word Count	5 pts. Meets the minimum word count required for the paper.	4-3 pts. Meets between 60% and 90% of the minimum word count required for the paper. May fall short of expectations but still demonstrates an attempt to engage with the paper's scope.	2-0 pts. Meets less than 60% of the minimum word count required for the paper.	/5
References Page	10-8 pts. All reference elements are present. All citations contain all required elements in the correct order.	7-4 pts. Most citations (~ 50–75%) contain the required elements and follow the correct order, though several may have formatting or orthographic errors. Some entries may include extraneous information or missing components.	3-0 pts. Many (~75%) citations may not contain all required elements or too many.	/10

Criteria	Meets Expectations	Approaching Expectations	Does Not Meet Expectations	Points (100)
In-Text Citation Format	2.5 pts. All in-text citations follow the instructor's chosen citation style.	2-1 pts. Most citations follow the correct style; some may have formatting issues.	0.5-0 pts. Citations are largely incorrect or missing altogether.	/2.5
Quotation and Paraphrase Attribution	2.5 pts. All quotes and paraphrases are attributed.	2-1 pts. The majority (~60–75%) of quotations and paraphrases are clearly attributed, though some may lack precision or consistency.	1-0 pts. Quotations and paraphrases are rarely attributed OR missing.	/2.5
Source Usage	10-8 pts. All of the sources on the references page clearly appear in the paper. There are no sources in the paper that are missing from the references page.	7-4 pts. No more than one or two sources from the references page are missing from the paper, OR no more than one or two in-text citations are missing from the reference page. Some formatting issues may make it difficult to confirm that all sources are cited.	3-0 pts. Three or more sources from the references page are missing from the paper, OR three or more in-text citations are missing from the reference list. Clearly, some sources are missing from the references list or from the in-text citations OR there	/10

Criteria	Meets Expectations	Approaching Expectations	Does Not Meet Expectations	Points (100)
			is no references page.	

Public Service Announcement (PSA) Project

See below for attribution information^[1]

Purpose

As a genre, the Public Service Announcement (PSA) is a concise message, usually distilled into a catchy slogan meant to resonate with an audience long after viewing. A powerfully crafted phrase (“Just say no!”) combined with a poignant visual presentation (e.g., eggs frying in a pan meant to simulate brains fried on drugs) are two primary genre components.

As a powerful tool for education, persuasion, and mobilization, PSAs have historically served several crucial functions: public health promotion, safety and emergency preparedness, social and environmental awareness, civic engagement/responsibility, and behavioral change. They significantly contribute to public awareness and societal change around a collective issue.

Consider the following classic examples of PSAs that incorporate these elements:

- [“Don’t Mess with Texas”](#)^[2]
- [“This is Your Brain on Drugs”](#)^[3]
- [“Give a Hoot! Don’t Pollute”](#)^[4]
- [“Above the Influence”](#)^[5]

From these examples, note the brevity, careful phrasing, and engaging images that target a specific audience regarding a clearly stated community/social issue. Keep in mind that some PSAs use no spoken words; they communicate exclusively through visuals. Engage with the genre by researching other creative options. Your objective is to balance concise, effective communication skills with creativity to reach your audience.

Learning Outcomes: Upon successful completion of this project, you will have demonstrated evidence of the following learning outcomes:

1. Demonstrate knowledge of individual and collaborative research processes.

2. Develop ideas and synthesize primary and secondary sources within focused academic arguments, including one or more research-based essays.
3. Analyze, interpret, and evaluate a variety of texts for the ethical and logical uses of evidence.
4. Write in a style that clearly communicates meaning, builds credibility, and inspires belief or action.
5. Apply the conventions of style manuals for specific academic disciplines (e.g., MLA, APA, CSM, etc.).

Skills: Upon successful completion of this project, you will have demonstrated the following core curriculum objectives:

1. **Critical Thinking:** Demonstrate innovation, inquiry, analysis, evaluation, and synthesis by analyzing complex community issues using research-based evidence; synthesize information from multiple sources to develop a coherent argument; and evaluate visual storytelling techniques for message effectiveness.
2. **Communication:** Effectively communicate ideas through written, oral, and visual modes by translating research into concise visual narratives, creating storyboards with metaphors and analogies, developing integrated PSAs, and explaining rhetorical choices in design.
3. **Teamwork:** Support shared goals by collaborating to refine PSA concepts, integrating diverse perspectives, resolving creative differences, and exchanging constructive feedback during storyboarding.
4. **Personal Responsibility:** Consider different points of view and collaborate effectively to select community issues for PSAs based on ethics and impact, justify the approach, reflect on message consequences, and ensure integrity in research and representation.
5. **Marketable Skills:** Translate research into concise narratives, integrate diverse perspectives into visual storytelling, and make informed decisions that balance creativity and impact, while negotiating differences, providing feedback, and

ensuring integrity to enhance the quality and effectiveness of public service announcements.

Knowledge: This project will also help you become familiar with important content knowledge in the discipline:

1. **Visual Rhetoric:** Apply visual rhetoric principles to create persuasive PSAs and construct narrative structures for effective visual storytelling.
2. **Research Process:** Synthesize complex research into accessible visual messages and analyze community issues to inform targeted PSA content.
3. **Argumentation:** Formulate logical arguments and translate them into visual formats to enhance message clarity and impact.

Tasks

To create a polished and impactful PSA, follow a structured process designed to enhance your collaboration, communication, and critical thinking skills. This comprehensive approach ensures that you engage in all stages of the writing process—from brainstorming and research to revision and presentation—while fostering teamwork and social responsibility by building a solid group foundation.

The following sequential steps will guide you through this PSA project:

1. Establish group roles and communication methods.
 - Assign a project manager to oversee the group's progress, ensure deadlines are met, and to alert the professor to any difficulties encountered.
 - Define additional roles within the group such as director, actor(s), and materials coordinator.
 - Set up a clear mode of group communication such as group text, email chain, and/or regular Zoom meetings or asynchronous collaboration.
 - Document group roles and at least three group meetings by date and time to track progress and ensure accountability.
2. Identify a point of concern.

- Brainstorm as a group to identify various issues within the shared community.
 - Research and discuss to ensure a thorough understanding of potential topics.
 - Reach a consensus on a specific issue to address based on its relevance and impact.
3. Narrow the topic focus through research.
 - Conduct research to gather detailed information about the chosen issue.
 - Define a clear and specific focus for the PSA, identifying the main message or call to action.
 - Ensure the topic is manageable and can be effectively communicated within the constraints of a PSA format.
 4. Identify strategies for addressing the audience.
 - Analyze the target audience for the PSA considering demographics, interests, and concerns.
 - Decide on the most effective rhetorical strategies to engage and persuade the audience.
 - Plan the tone and style of the PSA to maximize its impact on the target audience.
 5. Plan and outline the PSA.
 - Create an outline that includes the introduction, main points, supporting details, and conclusion.
 - Assign specific tasks to group members based on their roles.
 - Develop a timeline for completing each stage of the project.
 - Consider the many free software applications that facilitate storyboarding for visual productions.
 6. Draft the PSA.
 - Begin drafting the PSA ensuring clarity, coherence, and persuasiveness within the genre constraints.
 - Use engaging language, visuals, and audio elements (if applicable) to enhance the message.
 7. Peer review and constructive feedback.

- Workshop among the group members to locate strengths and areas of improvement within the draft by sharing and considering all group members' perspectives. NOTE: All group members should provide and receive constructive feedback discussion to consider all viewpoints.
 - Discuss the feedback collaboratively and decide on revisions to improve the PSA.
8. Revise and edit the PSA.
- Incorporate feedback and make necessary revisions to the content and structure.
 - Edit for grammar, spelling, punctuation, overall clarity and conciseness.
 - Ensure all elements of the PSA work together cohesively and effectively convey the message.
9. Finalize the PSA draft.
- Prepare the final version of the PSA ensuring it is polished and professional.
 - Check all technical aspects (e.g., audio quality, visual clarity) if the PSA includes multimedia elements.
 - Confirm that the PSA meets the project requirements and core objectives.
10. Record and produce the PSA.
- Plan and rehearse the PSA prior to recording.
 - Each group member must prepare an individual written rationale behind the chosen issue, strategies, and rhetorical and creative decisions, so be able to articulate them among the group.
 - Reflect individually on the collaborative process and lessons learned. Confirm your role and understand other members' roles to ensure efficient recording as multiple recordings may not be feasible due to time constraints.

Criteria for Success

1. **Length & Format:** The PSA should include a 60- to 90-second video (maximum 2 minutes) and a reflection between 300-500 words. The reflection must be formatted

according to the style guidelines discussed in class including a properly formatted bibliographic page at the end if needed. Both project components should be submitted together.

2. **Grading Criteria:** The project will be graded based on the following criteria:
- a. **Message, Audience, and Purpose (50%):** The message is clear, engaging, and aims to persuade the viewer. It is crafted to influence the intended audience effectively.
 - b. **Evidentiary Support and Details (30%):** The PSA incorporates research, statistics, and relevant details that effectively support the message. This support is comprehensive and clearly connected to the overall purpose. Each component of the PSA reflects a deliberate and well-reasoned choice.
 - c. **Creativity and Execution (10%):** The PSA uses images, special effects, and superscripts to communicate creative ideas with originality. Its presentation reflects innovative and thoughtfully executed choices.
 - d. **Process Reflection and Listed Sources (10%):** A thorough individual reflection of what was learned through the collaboration and creation of the PSA is provided as a post-writing process piece. All listed sources are complete, clearly listed, and relevant.

Rubric

The rubric provided is based on the criteria for success outlined above.

Criteria	Meets Expectations	Approaching Expectations	Does Not Meet Expectations	Points (100)
Message, Audience, and Purpose	50-40 pts. Message is clear, engaging, and skillfully crafted to influence the intended audience. Purpose	39-20 pts. Message is somewhat clear and engaging but may lack consistent focus or full	19-0 pts. Message is unclear, unengaging, or poorly tailored to the audience and purpose. Purpose	/50

Criteria	Meets Expectations	Approaching Expectations	Does Not Meet Expectations	Points (100)
	is well-defined and consistently maintained throughout the PSA.	effectiveness in addressing the audience or purpose.	is not effectively communicated.	
Evidentiary Support and Details	30-22 pts. Uses comprehensive, relevant evidence and details that clearly support the message and purpose. Each component reflects thoughtful and deliberate choices.	21-10 pts. Includes some relevant evidence and details, but support may be uneven, insufficient, or loosely connected to the message.	9-0 pts. Lacks relevant evidence or details, or the connection to the message is weak or unclear. Choices appear arbitrary.	/30
Creativity and Execution	10-8 pts. Demonstrates strong creativity and originality with well-executed visual and multimedia elements that enhance the message.	7-4 pts. Shows some creativity and original elements but may lack full execution or innovation in presentation.	3-0 pts. Minimal or no creativity; presentation is basic or poorly executed.	/10
Process Reflection and Listed Sources	10-8 pts. Provides a thorough,	7-4 pts. Reflection is present but lacks	3-0 pts. Reflection is superficial or	

Criteria	Meets Expectations	Approaching Expectations	Does Not Meet Expectations	Points (100)
	insightful reflection demonstrating learning from collaboration and creation. All sources are clearly listed and relevant.	depth or clarity. Sources are listed but may be incomplete or unclear.	missing. Sources are missing or poorly documented.	

^[1] Information for Attribution: Inocencio, Gwendolyn, and Terri Pantuso. "Public Service Announcement (PSA) Project." *Writing and Rhetoric: Second Semester Composition*, May 2026. This item is licensed under a Creative Commons Attribution 4.0 International License, except where otherwise noted. For more information, see [Creative Commons Attribution 4.0 license](#).

^[2] State Department of Highways. "Don't Mess With Texas commercial (1987)." *YouTube*, uploaded by John Smith, 10 Jan. 2014, [PSA example video 1](#). This material may or may not be accessible.

^[3] The Partnership for a Drug-Free America. "This Is Your Brain...This Is Your Brain On Drugs - 80s Partnership For A Drug Free America." *YouTube*, uploaded by Anthony Kalamut (Southside AdGuy), 21 Mar. 2010, [PSA example video 2](#). This material may or may not be accessible.

^[4] USDA Forest Service. "Give A Hoot! Don't Pollute "Dirty Word" - 1986 Commercial." *YouTube*, uploaded by Rad Universe, 9 Nov. 2012, [PSA example video 3](#). This material may or may not be accessible.

^[5] abovetheinfluence.com. "Above The Influence (Mirror) (2000s) - PSA." *YouTube*, uploaded by Richard Canipe, 7 Dec. 2015, [PSA example video 4](#). This material may or may not be accessible.

Final Portfolio

Notes for Digital Portfolio assignment

Purpose

For this final assessment, you will curate your three substantive assignments and your four Writing Journals and frame them with a new collective introduction to showcase your journey throughout ENGL1302.

Task

1. **Review** all your Summative Assessments and Writing Goals Journal entries.
 - Revise and edit any of these artifacts as needed.
2. **Draft** the introduction to your Digital Writing Portfolio.
 - Your introduction should be at least 350 words.
 - Introduce yourself and briefly explain how your perception of yourself as a writer, or of your writing process, has changed, or been affirmed, during ENGL1302.
 - Subsequent paragraphs should discuss specifically what you feel is important about the pieces included in this collection. For example, what did you find most satisfying, and why? What did you find most challenging; how did you address the challenges?
3. **Compile** your introduction and artifacts into a single Word or PDF file.
 - Your introduction, Exploratory Proposal, your Investigative Annotated Bibliography, your Argument Essay, and your Writing Journals will each be worth 10 points for this portfolio (100 points total).
4. **Complete** peer review.
 - Bring required draft materials to peer review workshops.
 - Collaborate with peers to locate strengths and areas for improvement.
5. **Revise** and edit the Digital Writing Portfolio.
 - Use peer feedback to make necessary revisions.
 - Edit for grammar, spelling, punctuation, and overall clarity.
 - Edit for document formatting elements to align with MLA style.
6. **Finalize** the Digital Writing Portfolio.
 - Submit your portfolio file to Blackboard before your Week 15 Final Conference.