# ENGL 103
## Rhetoric & Composition I

**Northern Illinois University**

## WP2: Value Analysis

## Description

For WP2, you will find a space that's new to you. The space should be currently active, small enough to get to know in the time frame, and user controlled. You'll observe that space, specifically looking for the language and genre conventions used. Then, you'll analyze that discourse to make an argument for what the space *values* in good discourse. You'll use evidence from your observations to make a point about what counts as a "good" post, image, response, comment, or other interaction within your space.

## Learning Outcomes

By the end of this writing project, students will be able to:
- Recognize patterns of language use in a new space.
- Recognize genre patterns in a new space.
- Reflect on the ways that language is shaped by discourse community practices.
- Evaluate systems of language use.
- Further build strategies for planning and revising writing.

## Requirements

### Choosing an Appropriate Space

The space must be completely new to you. Your space should be digital but can be in person upon request. It needs to be currently active, meaning users are engaging in real time when you observe. It also must be appropriately sized, meaning you can keep up with all activity during the duration of the assignment. And finally, the space must be user controlled, meaning there is active interaction between members of the group. No one person or small group should control all (or even most) content. **Your space must be approved by your instructor in advance and cannot be changed without approval.**

| | |
|---|---|
| **Discourse Explanation** | Explanation of your discourse community can take the form of a traditional paper or a multimodal project. However, even traditional projects will likely require some images or links to appropriate materials. Screen captures, photos, videos, and sound clips are encouraged. At least one multimodal element must be included. Your project should be approximately **1000 words** or the multimodal equivalent. |
| **Reflection** | Like with WP1, WP2's reflection will account for 50% of your grade for the completion and revision drafts. The reflection on WP2 should focus on how you chose what the community values, how your narrowed your content to that focus, and how you selected evidence to support that claim. Your reflection should be **800 words** or the multimodal equivalent. |
| **Submission** | Please submit your project through OneDrive. Please approve any alternative methods to submit your writing project with me in advance. |
| **Naming Documents** | Please name your files using the following convention:<br><br>course.section_your name_assignment.draft.<br><br>For example, a student in ENGL 103 section 08 named Malcolm Reynolds working on WP2 draft 1 would name their file:<br><br>103.08_MalcolmReynolds_wp2.1 |
| **Due Dates** | • Completion drafts are due on **Friday, October 20th**<br>• Revision drafts are due on **Friday, October 27th** |

| | |
|---|---|
| **Completion Drafts** | Completion drafts are graded on demonstrating a basic understanding of the requirements. Grades for completion drafts aren't an indication of how well you'll do on the revision draft. To get full credit for the completion draft, you must do the following: |
| **Choose an appropriate space** | Choose a space that is new to you, currently active, appropriately sized, and user controlled. Your space must have been approved by your instructor. You should have observed your space for a minimum of five hours by the time you write your draft. |
| **Make a claim about values** | Clearly choose at least one way in which the community values "good" content. What is a "good" post, comment, response, image, meme, etc. in the space, and how do you know? |
| **Select and curate evidence** | Select evidence from your observations that helps to support what your community values in good discourse. Be mindful to select appropriate observations that support your points well. Not all observations will be used in your drafts. |

| Reflect on your choices | Write a reflection that explains how you chose the main value to focus on and how your chose your evidence to support that claim. Explain your selection of any multimodal content, such as images, sounds, videos, links, and so on. Please remember that reflections are worth 50% of your completion draft. |
| --- | --- |

# Revision Drafts

Revision drafts are graded on the criteria below. Each criterion is evaluated as "exceptional," "met," or "not met." If all of the criteria are "exceptional," you will earn an A. If they are all "met," you will earn a C. One or more criteria in the "not met" column may result in an F.

| Grading Criteria: Reflection | Exceptional | Met | Not Met |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| 1. Reflecting on Your Claim | You have clearly explained why you have chosen your central claim and given reasons for why this was your best option. | You explain why you have chosen the central claim you make. | How the claim was chosen is not included or unclear. |
| 2. Reflecting on Your Evidence | You have clearly explained why you have chosen the evidence to support your claim and given reasons for why this evidence is better than other parts of your observations. | You explain why you have chosen the evidence to support your claim. | How the evidence was chosen is not included or unclear. |
| 3. Reflecting on Your Media | You have clearly explained why you have chosen the media to go with your evidence and explain how you chose that media. | You explain why you have chosen the media to go with your evidence. | How the media was chosen is not included or unclear. |

| | Exceptional | Met | Not Met |
|---|---|---|---|
| 4. Reflecting on Your Rhetorical Purpose | You have clearly explained the goal of WP2 and how you have met that goal. | You explain the goal of WP2. | The project goal is not mentioned or unclear. |
| 5. Responding to Feedback | You have revised your reflection substantially and/or thoughtfully based on both your peers' and your instructor's feedback. | You have revised your reflection based on both your peers' and your instructor's feedback. | No revisions to the reflection have been made or only minor changes have been made that do not adequately respond to feedback. |
| 6. Meeting Requirements | You have met or exceeded all of the requirements for the reflection. | You have met all of the requirements for the reflection. | One or more of the requirements for the reflection has not been met. |

| Grading Criteria: Analysis | Exceptional | Met | Not Met |
|---|---|---|---|
| 1. Choice of Space | Your space is new to you, currently very active, sized to keep up with all content, and no one user (or small group) controls content. | Your space is new to you, active, reasonably sized, and user focused. | The space is not new to the writer, is not active, is much too big or too small, or does not allow for participation. |
| 2. Claim | You have a focused claim about what your community values in content, and your analysis focuses solely on that claim. | You have made a single claim or related group of claims about what your community values in content. | No single claim is made or several unrelated claims are made. |
| 3. Evidence | You have selected several examples of your claim in action and clearly explained how those examples demonstrate your claim. | You have selected a minimum of three examples of your claim in action from your observations. | No examples of the claim are given, or examples do not match the claim. |

| | | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| 4. **Supporting Content** | You have used quotes, images, links, or other tangible evidence to demonstrate your examples. Each piece of evidence has one or more supporting pieces of media. | You have used quotes, images, links, or other tangible evidence to demonstrate your examples. | Supporting content is not included or does not support points. |
| 5. **Responding to Feedback** | You have revised your analysis substantially and/or thoughtfully based on both your peers' and your instructor's feedback. | You have revised your analysis based on both your peers' and your instructor's feedback. | No revisions to the analysis have been made or only minor changes have been made that do not adequately respond to feedback. |
| 6. **Meeting Requirements** | You have met or exceeded all of the requirements for the analysis. | You have met all of the requirements for the analysis. | One or more of the requirements for the analysis has not been met. |