

AENG100z Introduction to Analytical Writing Assignment Sheet: Portfolio of Revisions

This semester we've learned about the importance of revision. The final portfolio asks you to practice making global revisions to show that you can "re-see" and reshape your writing. Remember that revision should be a process of discovery; use the final project to refine your thinking.

The final portfolio is a cumulative assignment. It asks you to review and build upon what you've learned this semester. It is also an opportunity to synthesize and analyze the instruction your peers will provide in the final days of class regarding genres and discourse communities. As such, the portfolio should be a snapshot of the thinking you've done in AENG100z.

SUBMISSION GUIDELINES

- Bring the portfolio to our last class session on Tuesday, May 7.
- In a folder, collect all five documents and my comments on your analytical argument and checkpoint assignment.
- Your name should appear on all of the documents.
- Each document should be clearly labeled (as the "introductory statement," "discussion of presentations," "analytical argument," and "checkpoint assignment #1 and #2").

REQUIREMENTS

Your portfolio should include five documents:

Introductory Statement (1st document)

- The introductory statement should consist of at least two double-spaced pages of writing.
- Indicate what you discovered through the process of writing this semester.
- Summarize what "news" your analytical argument and checkpoint assignments provide an audience of scholars who are interested in writing.
- Identify several features of your revised analytical argument and checkpoint assignments that make these pieces of writing effective for their rhetorical situations. Be specific. Quote from your analytical argument and checkpoint assignments to provide evidence and examples of the features you describe.
- If you chose to ignore any of my suggestions for revision, explain your rationale in the introductory statement. Specify which suggestions you ignored, and explain how your choices serve your rhetorical aims.

Discussion of Presentations (2nd document)

- Write 3-5 double-spaced pages in response to your peers' presentations.
- Discuss at least four of your peers' presentations. Feel free to discuss your own presentation in addition to at least four of your peers'.
- Discuss at least one presentation from each of the following days of class: April 25, April 30, and May 2. If you are absent from class on one of these days, you'll lose points on this criterion. And you'll still need to write about at least four of your peers' presentations.
- Answer all of the following questions to compare and contrast the information your peers presented:

- What do different rhetorical situations require? How does one rhetorical situation differ from another? How do audiences' needs differ?
- How do the discourse communities' values, assumptions, beliefs, and shared knowledge shape the writing?
- How do the genres' conventions differ?
- Are there conventions, recommendations, or "rules" about writing that seem consistent across multiple genres?
- What strategies do writers have for improving their craft? How do people learn to write?

Draft and Revision of Your Analytical Argument (3rd document)

- All of the Analytical Arguments I read would benefit from more developed analyses. In your revision, add multiple sentences to your paper that deepen your analysis of the text that exemplifies the common conception. Offer additional insights about your object of analysis by using one or more of the "Tools for Analysis" listed in the handout and discussed in class.
- Additionally, all of the following requirements will be used to evaluate the Analytical Argument as well as the Checkpoint Assignments.

Drafts and Revisions of Two Checkpoint Assignments (4th and 5th documents)

- Include the draft (with my comments) and a revised version of your analytical argument and two checkpoint assignments. (You may choose any two checkpoint assignments that I've commented on.)
- Your rhetorical situation has remained the same: your analytical argument and your two checkpoint assignments are meant to address scholars who are interested in writing. Imagine that your checkpoint assignments and analytical argument are going to be collected in an anthology like *Writing About Writing*.
- Address all of my comments. (If you choose to reject one or more of the revisions I requested, that's perfectly fine. But please explain your rhetorical reasoning in the introductory statement.)
- Your revisions should go beyond my comments as well. Make changes that aren't prompted by my feedback.
- Employ multiple forms of revision. With the Kent Haruf article we saw that revision can mean *expansion*. With the Barbara Tomlinson article we saw that revision can mean *cutting, recasting*, etc. Perform more than one of the following revision actions: Expand, cut, rearrange, rewrite, recast, fix, add connecting phrases etc. **Note that the revised versions can be any page length.**
- Like Sommers's experienced writers, you should make *global* revisions, not just sentence-level revisions.
- Your draft should appear, at a glance, significantly different from your original.