

Improving Writing with a PAL: Harnessing the Power of Peer Assisted Learning with the Reader's Assessment Rubrics

Stephen G. McLeod, Gavin C. Brown, Preselfannie W. McDaniels, and Lawrence Sledge
Jackson State University

In response to widespread concern that many American students do not write well enough to meet the requirements of higher education and the workplace, the College Board's National Commission on Writing in America's Schools and Colleges has called for a writing revolution. A key component of this revolution is evaluation, with particular emphasis on the need to align writing standards, writing instruction, and writing assessment. Teachers of writing want to provide their students with the kind of quality feedback that coaches and personal trainers provide their clients, but large classes and heavy teaching loads often frustrate their intention. Peer assessment can alleviate this problem. In fact, research indicates that when students are given valid and reliable assessment instruments to guide the process, feedback from peers can be as effective as—or more effective than—feedback from professors. As a direct response to the Commission's call for curricular alignment, Jackson State University has launched the Reader's Assessment Project, a project that seeks to harness the power of Peer Assisted Learning by developing and applying a series of analytic Peer Assessment rubrics for specific rhetorical modes. While analytic rubrics are useful in identifying broad areas for improvement in student writing, such rubrics are sometimes difficult to use because they address general qualities of effective writing without reference to the way those qualities operate in specific rhetorical modes, such as comparison/contrast or process. Analytic scoring also tends to be time-consuming. The Reader's Assessment Project at Jackson State University seeks to overcome these drawbacks by developing mode-specific analytic instruments that are aligned with the reading process. In this article, members of the Reader's Assessment team review the relevant literature, outline the conceptual framework and methodology of the project, and explain how they have harnessed the power of Peer Assisted Learning with the Reader's Assessment rubrics through a strategy that they call CARE (creating a reassuring environment).

In response to widespread concern that “the level of writing in the United States is not what it should be,” the College Board has established the National Commission on Writing in America's Schools and Colleges (National Commission, 2003, p. 24). While the National Commission (2003) concedes that students do possess a modicum of basic writing skill, the problem is that students do not write well enough to meet the requirements of higher education and the workplace. So serious is this problem, the Commission argues, that nothing less than a “writing revolution” will suffice to solve it (2003, p. 24). In its sweeping agenda, the Commission calls for “making writing a centerpiece of the curriculum” (2003, p. 26), for at least doubling both the time and the financial resources allocated to student writing, for applying existing technology and developing new technology to facilitate writing instruction and writing assessment, and for providing the requisite professional development to faculty in all disciplines. In addition, the Commission places significant emphasis on the role of evaluation, stressing the need to align writing standards, writing instruction, and writing assessment. The assessment instruments presented in this article constitute a direct response to this call for curricular alignment and can contribute significantly to the Commission's writing revolution at both the local and the national levels.

The Frustrations

As any English professor will tell you, large classes and heavy teaching loads exacerbate the problem addressed by this writing revolution. That is precisely why the National Commission's (2003) call for increased financial, technological, and human resources is so significant—and so welcome. Nevertheless, English professors are not holding their breath. It has been 86 years since Edwin Hopkins (1923) published his groundbreaking study *The Labor and Cost of the Teaching of English*, and English language professionals have been calling for smaller classes and more humane teaching loads ever since. The National Council of Teachers of English (1980) has issued relevant policy statements for the elementary, secondary, and college levels. Some progress has been made, but not nearly enough and not in nearly enough places. As Popken (2004) observes, “To this day, for many hundreds of writing teachers..., composition is still very costly labor” (p. 63)

Peer Assessment to the Rescue

So, until the needed resources arrive, what can be done in the meantime? Part of the answer to this question can be found in the writing process itself.

Many writing teachers have found Peer Assisted Learning (PAL) to be helpful. Topping (2001) defines PAL as “the acquisition of knowledge and skill through active helping and supporting among status equals or matched companions. PAL involves people from similar social groupings...helping each other to learn and learning themselves by so doing” (p. 2). Simply put, then, PAL is learning with a pal. An important form of PAL is peer assessment, which involves “formatively and qualitatively evaluating the products or outcomes of others in the group” (Topping, 2001, p. 3). An important part of learning to be a writer is learning to assess one’s own writing and the writing of colleagues, learning to give and to receive effective feedback. In training students to engage in this mutual assessment process, professors are building additional quality into writing processes and products, preparing students for business and the professions (where peer review is an important part of the workplace), and transforming classes into learning communities (Heinrich, Neese, Rogers, & Facente, 2004). Research studies have demonstrated the effectiveness of peer assessment as a component of writing instruction across a broad spectrum of disciplines and educational levels: from agronomy to zoology (Liu, Pysarchik, & Taylor, 2002), from elementary school (Mullen, 2003), to graduate school (Heinrich et al., 2004; Topping, Smith, Swanson, & Elliot, 2000)—including students with special needs (Ammer, 1998). At the undergraduate level—the focus of this study—researchers and practitioners provide impressive testimony for the benefits of peer assessment (Topping, 1998). Among these benefits are the following:

- Peer assessment helps students develop important social skills as they learn to give and receive frank, tactful, and respectful feedback from others (Ammer, 1998; Heinrich et al., 2004).
- Peer assessment contributes to students’ professional preparation because peer assessment is a vital component of work in academe, business, and the professions (Liu, Pysarchik, & Taylor, 2002; Venables & Summit, 2003).
- Peer assessment fosters positive attitudes toward writing and builds the self-confidence of student writers (Light, 2003).
- Peer assessment promotes learning about the disciplines and learning about the writing process itself (Venables & Summit, 2003).
- Peer assessment is timely and efficient. As Walberg (1998) observes, “Working alone or during teacher presentations, learners can carry forward or even practice mistakes. In a small group, or in pairs, however, they need not

wait; they can quickly compare and correct their understandings” (p. x). Moreover, in contrast to an overloaded professor, who has many student essays to evaluate, a peer reviewer can concentrate on the one essay assigned to her and more easily provide a rich, detailed response (Topping et al., 2000; Venables & Summit, 2003).

Research indicates that peer assessment tends to be more accurate when its stated purpose is formative (improving a work in progress) rather than summative (assigning a grade to a finished product) (O’Donnell & Topping, 1998). Research also suggests that feedback can be enhanced by the use of assessment instruments, variously called guides, checklists, or rubrics (O’Donnell & Topping, 1998; Soles, 2001). When students are given valid and reliable assessment instruments to guide the process, feedback from peers can be as effective as—or more effective than—feedback from professors (O’Donnell & Topping, 1998; Topping, 1998).

Not only do valid and reliable rubrics serve as evaluation tools, but they also serve as teaching tools because they specify the expectations for assignments (Saddler & Andrade, 2004). As Soles (2001) asserts, “Shared rubrics empower students, they urge students to become active participants in the writing process, and they substantiate the connections among teaching, learning, and assessment” (p. 15). Soles’ insights are consonant with Huot’s (2002) call for a re-articulation of writing assessment in terms of its impact on teaching and learning. They are also consonant with Isaacson’s (1999) call for “instructionally relevant writing assessment” (p. 29). As Isaacson affirms, “Student self-assessment and peer review are the principal means of bringing assessment and instruction very close to one another” (p. 40).

The Jackson State University Reader’s Assessment Project

In keeping with the findings of research and the testimony of educational practitioners, the Jackson State University Center for University Scholars has funded a project to develop the Reader’s Assessment Series, a group of instruments to assess essays in various rhetorical modes. Students can use these instruments as a guide for planning an essay and as self-assessment or peer assessment tools for improving an essay in progress. Professors and graduate teaching assistants can use the instruments as summative assessment tools when essays reach final form. The Reader’s Assessment instruments are analytic assessment instruments, but they are not

analytic instruments of the kind that teachers of writing usually encounter.

The usual approach to constructing an analytic evaluation scale is to identify (i.e., list) the desired writing qualities and to include a rating scale for each quality. While analytic instruments of this type are useful in identifying the broad areas for improvement in student writing, such instruments are sometimes difficult to use because they address general qualities of effective writing without reference to the way those qualities operate in specific rhetorical modes, such as comparison/contrast or process instruction. Another drawback of analytic scoring is that it tends to be time-consuming (Mertler 2001). The Reader's Assessment Project seeks to overcome these drawbacks by developing mode-specific instruments that are aligned with the reading process. We have already developed instruments for assessing essays in the comparison/contrast and process instruction modes. We are currently developing an instrument for assessing research-based argumentative essays, and we plan to develop an instrument for classification essays.

Five assumptions undergird the development of the Reader's Assessment instruments:

Assumption 1: The act of reading an essay involves the reader in five experiential phases, which the reader experiences in the following order: the title, the introduction, the body, the conclusion, and the total impact.

Assumption 2: The qualities of effective writing are interactive in their effects on a reader.

Assumption 3: The qualities of effective writing interact differently at each experiential phase of the essay.

Assumption 4: The qualities of effective writing interact differently for different rhetorical modes (e.g., comparison/contrast, process instruction, classification, argumentation).

Assumption 5: The effectiveness of assessment instruments can be increased by developing them in a manner consistent with Assumptions 1-4 and by aligning their format with the reading process.

In accordance with these assumptions, the format of each Reader's Assessment instrument is aligned with the reading process. The basic procedure for constructing each instrument is to operationalize the qualities of effective writing (i.e., development, unity, coherence, and technique) in the form of criterion statements for each experiential phase of an essay in the particular rhetorical mode of interest. The basic procedure for constructing the scoring guide is to define each point on the rating scale for each criterion statement in terms of observable features of the writing. Because we have used a five-point scale, we have tried

to identify five features that would mark performance at the top of the rating scale for a particular criterion statement. Scoring is thus simplified, for if all five features are present, the essay receives the top score on that criterion. If only four of the features are present, the essay receives the next-to-highest score and so on. Thus, while our approach to assessment is decidedly qualitative, we have tried to facilitate the scoring process by defining the scoring levels in terms of observable and countable markers of quality. As an example of how this works, we have included the assessment instrument for process instruction essays (Appendix A) and its accompanying scoring guide (Appendix B).

Not only is the instrument distinctive in its format, but it is distinctive in its method of development as well. The Reader's Assessment instruments have been designed as tools of Peer Assisted Learning and, appropriately, the development process has involved a great deal of Peer Assisted Learning among our faculty and our students. Five phases are involved in the development of each instrument: a development phase, an evaluation for content validity, a scoring application, an evaluation for interrater reliability, and a refinement phase. Faculty from our department, students, and faculty from other departments have been involved in the process. The project is conducted under the guidance of a formative committee of Jackson State University writing faculty and an external mentor from the Mississippi Writing/Thinking Institute.

The instruments have been specifically developed for use in our freshman English courses, but we also look for ways in which we can validly apply or validly adapt them to other courses within our department. For example, we have found the instruments to be effective tools for training pre-service teachers to implement PAL, and we have begun to apply the instruments in our undergraduate and graduate teacher preparation courses. We have also successfully applied the Reader's Assessment for process instruction (Appendices A and B) to an undergraduate course in technical writing.

Our vision for the future of the Reader's Assessment Project is to expand beyond our own department by serving as consultants to other departments across the curriculum as they develop rubrics tailored to their own discipline-specific writing assignments. Our experience at Jackson State University indicates that peer assessment instruments such as those we have developed can provide clear criteria to students before they begin a writing assignment, guide them during the process of preparing the assignment, and assist them in the formative assessment of their own work and that of their peers. Such instruments can lighten the professor's burden of providing formative feedback, build additional quality

into the processes and products of writing, and make the task of reading and assessing the finished product much more pleasant.

Implementing PAL with CARE

As our experience—and a large body of research literature—indicate, PAL is an effective method of aligning writing standards, writing instruction, and writing assessment. PAL works. It works, however, only when the faculty and students make it work. We have found that the key to successful implementation is a strategy that we call CARE: Creating a Reassuring Environment. The challenge is to transform the class from a disconnected group of individuals—many of them freshman—into a learning community with the confidence to give and receive frank and respectful responses to each other's writing. From our own experience with the CARE strategy, we offer the following recommendations for implementing PAL with CARE.

Orient the students to Peer Assisted Learning. We explain the concept, method, and benefits of PAL early in the course so that we and our students are intentional in our application of PAL. On the first day of class, we also begin to form a learning community by having pairs of students interview each other and introduce each other to the class. This first assignment gives the students the opportunity to get to know each other, and it constitutes the first step in establishing an atmosphere of collegiality. If students are going to learn with a PAL, they must first become colleagues. Throughout the course, we provide numerous opportunities for students to build trust in each other and confidence in themselves as they practice giving frank and respectful feedback in groups of two or three.

Train the students to use the Reader's Assessment instruments. We train the students to use the assessment instruments by taking them through the scoring instructions step by step. We make sure to define any unfamiliar terms via the scoring guide and to distinguish between terms that might be viewed as synonymous, such as *tips*, *feedback*, and *precautions* (Appendix B). Once they understand the standards, we let them practice by scoring a sample essay; then they discuss the rationale for their ratings in class.

Make each peer review count. We stress the importance of giving quality responses by making each peer review count as an in-class writing assignment. When students know that they will get credit for giving meaningful, honest feedback, they tend to give better feedback. We also require our students to read their draft essays aloud to the class as well as the feedback they received from their peer reviewer. During this process, other classmates may also respond, and we also have the opportunity to question, comment, and

confirm. This process also offers the added benefit of building confidence by accustoming students to doing presentations and answering questions. Through this process, we also emphasize the importance of good speaking and its relationship to reading, writing, and listening as key skills in teaching and learning.

Use PAL only for formative review. This step alone takes a lot of pressure off the students and removes a major source of resistance to peer review. When students see themselves as “graders,” they may lack self-confidence in doing the peer review and in using the instruments and scoring guides; some students may also think that by scoring the essay as leniently as possible, they will get the same easy review in return. For these reasons, we explain, at the outset, that PAL peer assessment is not the same as grading an assignment. Instead, PAL peer assessment is providing guidance and feedback to improve an essay in progress as well as to highlight the strengths of the author's work. If students know that their essays will be revised after the peer review, they are more likely to give better feedback and desire the same in return. In fact, in a formative review situation, giving frank, respectful feedback is the best thing one student can do for another. We have found that frank, respectful feedback can result in better final products, better grades, and—most importantly—better writers.

Stress the student writer's AUTHORITY. Whether the student is receiving feedback from us, from a classmate, or from a tutor in the campus writing center, we stress the following theme: “Writing is a decision-making process. You are the author. You must decide what to do with the feedback that you receive.” Knowing that they are responsible for their own writing decisions gives the students a sense of AUTHORITY and builds their confidence. We also build confidence by recognizing and reinforcing the strengths of the essay while giving the student an honest, positive, improvement-oriented critique.

In conclusion, we realize that when many students first come to us, they lack confidence in themselves or in the writing they produce. That is why we build confidence and encourage achievement by applying PAL with CARE as we have described. In doing so, we strengthen the connections among writing standards, writing instruction, and writing assessment. As we engage our students in multiple opportunities to internalize the principles of effective writing, build their confidence, and enhance their educational experience, we find that PAL is indeed a very effective way to CARE for our students.

References

- Ammer, J. J. (1998). Peer evaluation model for enhancing writing performance of students with

- learning disabilities. *Reading and Writing Quarterly*, 14(3), 263-282.
- Heinrich, K. T., Neese, R., Rogers, D., & Facente, A. C. (2004). Turn accusations into AFFIRMATIONS: Transform nurses into published authors. *Nursing Education Perspectives*, 25(3), 139-145.
- Hopkins, E. (1923). *The labor and cost of the teaching of English in colleges and secondary schools with especial reference to English composition*. Chicago: National Council of Teachers of English.
- Huot, B. (2002). *(Re)Articulating writing assessment for teaching and learning*. Logan, UT: Utah SU.
- Isaacson, S. (1999). Instructionally relevant writing assessment. *Reading and Writing Quarterly*, 14, 29-48.
- Light, R. (2003). Writing and students' engagement. *Peer Review*, 6(1), 28-31.
- Liu, J., Pysarchik, D. T., & Taylor, W. W. (2002). Peer review in the classroom. *Bioscience*, 52(9), 824-829.
- Mertler, C. A. (2001). Designing scoring rubrics for your classroom. *Practical Assessment, Research & Evaluation*, 7(25). Retrieved January 31, 2008, from <http://PAREonline.net/getvn.asp?v=7&n=25>
- Mullen, M. P. (2003). *Excellence in elementary editing*. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED479069)
- National Commission on Writing in America's Schools and Colleges. (2003). The neglected 'R': The need for a writing revolution. *Peer Review*, 6(1), 24-27.
- National Council of Teachers of English. (1980, June). NCTE policy statements on teachers' workload. *SLATE: Support for the Learning and Teaching of English*, 5(6), 2.
- O'Donnell, A. M., & Topping, K. (1998). Peers assessing peers: Possibilities and problems. In K. Topping & S. Ehly (Eds.), *Peer assisted learning* (pp. 255-278). Mahwah, NJ: Erlbaum.
- Popken, R. (2004). Edwin Hopkins and the costly labor of composition teaching. *College Composition and Communication*, 55, 618-41.
- Saddler, B., & Andrade, H. (2004). The writing rubric. *Educational Leadership*, 62(2), 48-52.
- Soles, D. (2001, March). Sharing scoring guides. Paper presented at the annual meeting of the Conference on College Composition and Communication, Denver, CO. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED450379)
- Topping, K. J. (1998). Peer assessment between students in college and university. *Review of Educational Research*, 68(3), 249-276.
- Topping, K. J. (2001). *Peer assisted learning: A practical guide for teachers*. Newton, MA: Brookline.
- Topping, K. J., Smith, E. F., Swanson, I., & Elliot, A. (2000). Formative peer assessment of academic writing between postgraduate students. *Assessment & Evaluation in Higher Education*, 25(2), 149-169.
- Venables, A., & Summit, R. (2003). Enhancing scientific essay writing using peer assessment. *Innovations in Education and Teaching International*, 40(3), 281-290.
- Walberg, H. J. (1998). Foreword in K. J. Topping & S. Ehly (Eds.), *Peer assisted learning* (pp. ix-xii). Mahwah, NJ: Erlbaum.
-
- STEPHEN G. MCLEOD, EdD, is an assistant professor of English and graduate faculty member at Jackson State University. He directs the Reader's Assessment Project, the Strengthening the Core Curriculum and Academic Leadership Project, and the Richard Wright Center for the Written Word (the campus writing center). His research interests include the assessment of writing, Peer Assisted Learning (PAL), and the Scholarship of Teaching and Learning (SoTL).
- GAVIN C. BROWN holds the Bachelor of Science in Criminal Justice from Jackson State University, where he has served as a graduate assistant and a member of the Reader's Assessment Project. He is currently completing his thesis for the Master of Arts in English. His research interests include Twenty-First Century African-American literature, Asian poetry, and the application of psychological theories to the analysis of literature.
- PRESELFANNIE W. MCDANIELS holds the PhD in English from Louisiana State University, Baton Rouge. She is currently an assistant professor of English at Jackson State University, where she coordinates the Freshman English Program. Her current research interests include composition pedagogy and adolescent literature.
- LAWRENCE SLEDGE, MA, has more than twenty years of experience in teaching writing at the college level. He is an instructor of English at Jackson State University, where he teaches in the areas of composition, world literature, and professional and technical writing. His research interests include the role of technical communication in society, the cognitive aspects of meaning and form (including grammar) in language, and the multidisciplinary relevance of language concepts. He recently chaired the Name Society Session of the South Central Modern Language Association (SCMLA). He is

president-elect of the Mississippi Council of Teachers of English (MCTE).

Acknowledgements

This article was funded by a grant from the Jackson State University Center for University Scholars. Dr. Linda Irby of the Mississippi Writing/Thinking Institute (Mississippi State University), an affiliate of the National Writing Project, serves as the mentor for the Reader's Assessment Project.

APPENDIX A

READER'S ASSESSMENT: PROCESS INSTRUCTION* *Gamma* version

© 2007 by Stephen G. McLeod and Gavin C. Brown

Title of Essay: _____ Writer: _____

Reader: _____ Date: _____

Indicate the degree to which each statement applies to the essay by circling the appropriate number. Some statements carry a higher maximum point value than others because of differences in relative importance.

*Please note the following limitation: This instrument is designed for assessing only process instruction essays (i.e., "how to" essays), where the reader is expected to perform the process.

TITLE

1. The title is effective. (Note: The title may include a subtitle.)

1	2	3	4	5
hardly applicable		applicable	highly applicable	

Comments:

INTRODUCTION

2. The writer provides me with a motive for learning the process.

6	10
No	Yes

Comments:

3. The thesis is a sharply focused assertion about the process (e.g., its importance, its ease or difficulty, its benefits, its outcome).

11	12	13	14	15
hardly applicable		applicable	highly applicable	

Comments:

BODY

4. The writer explains the steps of the process in chronological order.

6 No 10 Yes

Comments:

5. The writer explains the steps in sufficient detail and with sufficient clarity so that I can perform the process.

11 hardly applicable 12 applicable 13 applicable 14 highly applicable 15 highly applicable

Comments:

6. The writer provides me with precautions, tips, feedback, and troubleshooting instructions at appropriate points.

6 hardly applicable 7 applicable 8 applicable 9 highly applicable 10 highly applicable

Comments:

7. The paragraph divisions are appropriate.

1 hardly applicable 2 applicable 3 applicable 4 highly applicable 5 highly applicable

Comments:

8. By using transitions of time or other transitions as appropriate, the writer guides me smoothly through the process.

1 hardly applicable 2 applicable 3 applicable 4 highly applicable 5 highly applicable

Comments:

CONCLUSION

9. The writer effectively culminates the essay.

6	7	8	9	10
hardly applicable		applicable		highly applicable

Comments:

TOTAL IMPACT

10. The writer has presented the process in a “reader friendly” way.

6	7	8	9	10
hardly applicable		applicable		highly applicable

Comments:

11. The technical aspects of the writing (i.e., sentence structure, grammar, punctuation, diction, usage, spelling, and mechanics) support the writer’s credibility.

6	7	8	9	10
hardly applicable		applicable		highly applicable

Comments:

APPENDIX B

READER'S ASSESSMENT: PROCESS INSTRUCTION ESSAY SCORING GUIDE*

Gamma version

© 2007 by Stephen G. McLeod and Gavin C. Brown

Title of Essay: _____ Writer: _____

Reader: _____ Date: _____

*Please note the following limitation: This instrument is designed for assessing only process instruction essays (i.e., “how to” essays), where the reader is expected to perform the process.

Indicate the degree to which each statement applies to the essay by circling the appropriate number. Some statements carry a higher maximum point value than others because of differences in relative importance.

TITLE

1. The title is effective. (Note: The title may include a subtitle.)

1	2	3	4	5
hardly applicable		applicable	highly applicable	

Comments:

Award a score of 5 if the title (a) captures your attention with an arresting phrase, a vivid figure of speech, or a question, (b) specifies the process to be explained, (c) aligns with a process instruction strategy, (d) is free of technical errors, and (e) follows the instructor’s format specifications.

Award a score of 4 if the title does four of the above.

Award a score of 3 if the title does three of the above.

Award a score of 2 if the title does two of the above.

Award a score of 1 if the title does only one of the above.

Award a score of 0 if the title is missing, and so note in the comments section.

INTRODUCTION

2. The writer provides me with a motive for learning the process.

6	10
No	Yes

Comments:

Award a score of 10 if the writer supplies one or more cogent reasons for learning the process.

Award a score of 6 if the writer provides no cogent reasons for learning the process.

3. The thesis is a sharply focused assertion about the process (e.g., its importance, its ease or difficulty, its benefits, its outcome).

6	7	8	9	10
hardly applicable		applicable		highly applicable

Comments:

Award a score of 10 if the thesis (a) is explicitly stated, (b) is readily identifiable, (c) is free of technical errors (d) identifies the process, (e) makes an assertion about the process (e.g., its importance, its ease or difficulty, its benefits, its outcome).

Award a score of 9 if the thesis meets only four of the above criteria.

Award a score of 8 if the thesis meets only three of the above criteria.

Award a score of 7 if the thesis meets only two of the above criteria.

Award a score of 6 if the thesis does only one of the above criteria.

Award a score of 0 if the thesis is missing or merely implied, and so note in the comments section.

BODY

4. The writer explains the steps of the process in chronological order.

6	10
No	Yes

Comments:

Award a score of 10 if the writer presents all the steps in chronological order.

Award a score of 6 if any step is not in chronological order or if the writer leaves you unsure of the order of any of the steps.

5. The writer explains the steps in sufficient detail and with sufficient clarity so that I can perform the process.

11	12	13	14	15
hardly applicable		applicable		highly applicable

Comments:

Award a score of 15 only if (a) you are confident that you can perform the process by following the writer’s instructions, AND (b) the writer has included all the necessary details about the materials required, (c) the writer has

included all the necessary details about the procedures involved, (d) the writer has defined any unfamiliar terms, and (e) the writer has not burdened or bored you with excessive detail.

Award a score of 14 only if you are confident that you can perform the process by following the writer’s instructions BUT the writer falls short only in burdening or boring you with excessive detail.

Award a score of 13 only if you are confident that you can perform the process by following the writer’s instructions BUT the writer falls short only in failing to define one of more unfamiliar terms.

Award a score of 12 if only two of the standards have been met (see *a* through *e* above)

Award a score of 11 if only one of the standards have been met (see *a* through *e* above).

6. The writer provides me with precautions, tips, feedback, and troubleshooting instructions at appropriate points. *

6	7	8	9	10
hardly applicable		applicable		highly applicable

Comments:

Award a score of 10 if the writer provides (a) precautions, (b) tips, (c) feedback, and (d) troubleshooting instructions and (e) places each type of guidance at the appropriate spot in the essay.

Award a score of 9 if the writer does four of the above.

Award a score 8 if the writer does three of the above.

Award a score of 7 if the writer does two of the above.

Award a score of 6 if the writer does one of the above.

Award a score of 0 if the writer does none of the above. and so note in the comments section.

*Note: Look for each type of guidance mentioned. The writer is expected to provide each type of guidance and to place each type of guidance at the appropriate spot in the essay. Definitions for the various types of guidance are given below, with guidelines for their placement.

A *precaution* is guidance designed to prevent either injury or the failure of an action and must be given before the action to which it refers.

A *tip* is guidance designed to facilitate performance and can be given before or during the action to which it applies.

Feedback is guidance designed to let the reader know whether s/he has performed an action correctly and can be given after an action is explained.

Troubleshooting instructions tell the reader what to do if s/he encounters a problem during the process and may be given at the end of the applicable step or phase or at the end of the entire process, as appropriate.

7. The paragraph divisions are appropriate.

1	2	3	4	5
hardly applicable		applicable		highly applicable

Comments:

Award a score of 5 if (a) paragraph divisions separate the introduction from the body and (b) the body from the conclusion, (c) if the body itself is divided into paragraphs, (d) if all the paragraph divisions in the body are appropriate, and (e) if each paragraph division is clearly marked by indentation.

Award a score of 4 if only four of the standards above have been met.

Award a score of 3 if only three of the standards above have been met.

Award a score of 2 if only two of the standards above have been met.

Award a score of 1 if only one of the standards above have been met.

8. By using transitions of time or other transitions as appropriate, the writer guides me smoothly through the process.

1	2	3	4	5
hardly applicable		applicable		highly applicable

Comments:

Award a score of 5 if a transition is present wherever it is needed and if all the transitions present are used appropriately.

Award a score of 4 if no more than one necessary transition is missing and/or no more than one transition is used inappropriately.

Award a score of 3 if no more than two necessary transitions are missing and/or if no more than two transitions are used inappropriately.

Award a score of 2 if no more than three necessary transitions are missing and/or if no more than three transitions are used inappropriately.

Award a score of 1 if four or more necessary transitions are missing and/or if four or more transitions are used inappropriately.

CONCLUSION

9. The writer effectively culminates the essay.

6	7	8	9	10
hardly applicable		applicable		highly applicable

Comments:

Award a score of 10 if the writer (a) completes the essay rather than merely stopping it, (b) reaffirms the thesis, (c) reaffirms the purpose or importance of the process, (d) builds effectively on what has gone before, and (e) encourages you—either explicitly or implicitly—to try the process.

Award a score of 9 if the writer does four of the above.

Award a score of 8 if the writer does three of the above.

Award a score of 7 if the writer does two of the above.

Award a score of 6 if the writer does one of the above.

Award a score of 0 if the conclusion is missing or if the writer does none of the above, and so note in the comments section.

TOTAL IMPACT

10. The writer has presented the process in a “reader friendly” way.

6	7	8	9	10
hardly applicable		applicable		highly applicable

Comments:

Award a score of 10 if the writer (a) addresses you directly by using the second person and the imperative mood, (b) uses the active voice, (c) avoids the cookbook style—even for a culinary essay *(d) makes the process clear on first reading, and (e) takes a helpful, encouraging approach.

Award a score of 9 if the writer does four of the above.

Award a score of 8 if the writer does three of the above.

Award a score of 7 if the writer does two of the above.

Award a score of 6 if the writer does 1 of the above.

Award a score of 0 if the writer does none of the above, and so note in the comments section.

* Note: The “cookbook style” refers to the abbreviated instructions often found in cookbook recipes whereby the writer omits words such as articles (*a, an, the*) and objects of verbs: for example, “Place in mixing bowl and stir until well blended.” Place *what* in a mixing bowl? Stir *what* until it is well blended? Avoid the cookbook style.

11. The technical aspects of the writing (i.e., sentence structure, grammar, punctuation, diction, usage, spelling, and mechanics) support the writer's credibility.

6	7	8	9	10
hardly applicable		applicable		highly applicable

Comments:

Award a score of 10 if there are no errors in technique.

Award a score of 9 if there is only one error in technique.

Award a score of 8 if there are only two errors in technique.

Award a score of 7 if there are only three errors in technique.

Award a score of 6 if there are four or more errors in technique.