Kadynce Sanders: SA #2 Feedback

Here are some benchmarks or goals that you should keep in mind as you create your Source Analyses. I will use these as I provide feedback and evaluation. I'm looking not only at how you perform on any one individual Source Analysis, but also how you demonstrate growth in this area across the semester.

Criterion	Novice Level	Competent Level	Proficient Level
Source ID	Does not fully cite or identify the source. Makes no connections between the source and community partner.	Fully identifies the source, but does not use an established bibliographic citation style, for example, MLA or APA. Makes connections between the source and community partner.	Fully identifies the source and uses (without error) established citation style. Makes connections between the source and community partner.
Context	Analysis is missing information about the creator, the time of creation, its intended audience, or its format.	Analysis contains some or all of a discussion about the creator, time of creation, intended audience and format, but some areas are incomplete or inaccurate.	All of the context pieces are present, and they are discussed in full.
Summary	Analysis is missing some or most of the important facts about the source's content. As a rule of thumb: A good summary is about 25% of the length of the original source.	Analysis contains most of the important facts about the source's content, but some areas are incomplete or inaccurate. A good summary is about 25% of the length of the original source.	All of the important facts about the source content are covered. A good summary is about 25% of the length of the original source.
Analysis	Analysis is missing the argument contained in the source. Analysis contains only some of the main takeaways of the source. A good analysis may be longer than a summary.	Analysis contains most or all of the argument or main takeaways, but some of this is still missing or inaccurate. A good analysis may be longer than a summary.	Analysis contains all of the main takeaways, and these are fully developed. A good analysis may be longer than a summary.
Grammar/Style	Several grammatical errors, over-use of "passive voice", lack of clarity or specificity in presentation.	Few grammatical errors or over-use of "passive voice", a better sense of clarity and specificity in presentation.	No (or virtually no) grammatical errors. Presentation is clear, precise, and specific to the assignment.
Formatting & Presentation	Does not make use of a bibliographic formatting style in source ID and overall presentation has serious or repeated issues.	Makes use of a bibliographic formatting style in source ID and the overall presentation is neat and organized, with only a couple of issues.	Makes full and accurate use of a bibliographic formatting style in source ID and the overall presentation is neat and organized.

Comments on Source Analysis #2: Kadynce, I see this second attempt as still firmly in the "novice" category of the SA rubric, but with some nice improvements, too. I'm still looking for you to expand these more than what you have done.

First of all, thank you for the formitted bibliography at the end! Good job.
As for the context, you have good background on the author. I'd also recommend linking the context of Ch. 3 back to Ch. 2 in some way. How do these two chapters fit together or speak to each other?

I think what I'm really looking for from you is a more complete summary. Remember that a good summary is about 25% of the length of the original text. What you have is a brief, one-sentence, abstract of the chapter. I'd recommend building that out more to speak more to the nuances of these internal and external drivers, and also include an example or two.

The analysis is a bit better—but maybe think about how your understanding of these drivers might be useful or might apply in the CODES environment.

I will once again give you the option of revising this after we discuss the reading together as a group on Thursday.