

Imagining the Real (54071) Assessment 2: Non-Fiction Narrative of a Person or Place

Task: Develop an original narrative of 2,500 words, weaving together your own research combined with your own personal observations & reflections about either a person (living or dead) who has a public profile; or a place, (a suburb or town). Using documentary sources (e.g. newspaper archives) along with interviews (if the subject is living) with the person, or with people who know the subject, construct a compelling & interesting narrative. This assessment task is designed to develop research & writing skills & consider creative approaches in the area of non-fiction writing.

Weight: 70%

Due: 23:59 Sunday 29 October

| Criteria | Levels of Achievement | | | | |
|-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| | High Distinction | Distinction | Credit | Pass | Fail |
| | Work that ranges from the outstanding, to near faultless, requiring minimal to no corrections & gaining highly favourable feedback. | Superior quality work on all objectives of assessment task. Some corrections but mainly positive feedback, with suggestions for improvement. | Promising work that reflects a good grasp of all objectives of task; contains room for improvement in any or several areas. | Acceptably meets all requirements of assessment task without exceeding them; room to improve in all areas. Heavy to extensive corrections & feedback. | Few come into this range, which will generally only reflect a student's lack of effort on all counts of the assessment task and/or non-submission. |
| | 85-100 % | 75-84% | 65-74 % | 50-64% | 0-49 % |
| Language: originality & inventiveness of concept. Weight 20.00% | Demonstrates a unique perspective and/ or approach in sourcing a creative non-fiction narrative, & evidence of practice-led research, which includes the ethical integration of primary & secondary sources. | Strongly original, with some evidence of imaginative development of ideas. | Not necessarily highly original concept. Evidence of the need for development of ideas. | Lacking in originality & nil to little idea of development of ideas. Poor to acceptable story idea or subject topic. | No originality & no idea of development of ideas. No narrative development evident. |
| Language: originality & inventiveness of writing. Weight 40.00% | Demonstrates an excellent sense of originality & experimentation in writing; clear, effective & sophisticated use of structure & fictional techniques (including, but not limited to: perspective, tense/s, scene re-creation & dialogue) to construct a creative non-fiction narrative. | Strongly original, with some evidence of imaginative development of ideas. Very good use of creative nonfiction elements. | Well-crafted work but not necessarily highly original. Some use of creative nonfiction elements. Lacking certain depth. | Showing promise in one or more areas but requiring specific guidance as to where work may be developed or improved. Inconsistency or little use of creative nonfiction elements. Lacks depth. | Showing no promise in any area. No use of creative nonfiction elements. Evidence of undeveloped writing skills. |
| Language: consistency of writing. Weight 20.00% | Demonstrates a clear & controlled narrative arc, pace & tone. Excellent written clarity; no spelling or grammatical errors, correct use of tense/s & perspective. Adheres to word count. | Consistent style, fluency of expression, strong structure overall. Very good spelling & grammar, but with some errors. | Good use of punctuation, spelling & grammar; correct use & consistency of tenses. | Poor punctuation, spelling & grammar; improper use & inconsistency of tenses. | Incomprehensible expression, poor spelling, weak grammar etc. |
| Peer Review: self-assessment/critical feedback integration. Weight 5.00% | Demonstrates an excellent sense of critical analysis/ engagement. Demonstration of sophisticated critical editing/writing skills. | Demonstrates a very good sense of critical analysis/ engagement. Demonstration of good critical editing/writing skills. | Demonstrates a good sense of critical analysis/ engagement. Demonstration of good critical editing/writing skills. | Some sense of critical analysis/ engagement. Demonstration of few critical editing/writing skills | Failure to engage in any critical analysis/ engagement. |
| Peer Review: level of informative & creative exchange. Weight 5.00% | Demonstrates an excellent sense of critical analysis/ engagement with classmates online through discussion board. Demonstration of sophisticated critical reading/editing/proofing skills of their work. | Demonstrates a very good sense of critical analysis/ engagement with classmates online through discussion board. Demonstration of very good critical reading/ editing/ proofing skills of their work. | Demonstrates a good sense of critical analysis/ engagement. Demonstration of good critical editing/ writing skills. | Some sense of critical analysis/ engagement. Demonstration of few critical editing/writing skills. | Failure to engage in any critical analysis/ engagement. |
| Aesthetics: expression & presentation in line with professional standards. Weight 10.00% | The visual presentation of the piece is professional; clear, suitable to form, double-spaced, adheres to word count; & demonstrates evidence of intuitive paragraph structure, correct footnoting and/or referencing (if necessary). | Very good layout, presentation etc, allowing for some mistakes or lapses. Very good adherence to length & other presentation guidelines set for the assessment. | Acceptable to reasonably good grasp of assessment task, with some weakness in terms of word length or other set task guidelines. Layout, presentation reasonable; showing need for improvement. | Poor layout & presentation, including punctuation, needing specific & much guidance for improvement. | Work that is impossible to correct due to poor expression & overall presentation. Failure to meet all assessment task guidelines, including word length. |

Assessment task 2: Non-Fiction Narrative of a Person or Place

Subject: Imagining the Real

Subject code: 54071

Semester: Spring 2017

Weight: 70%

Task: Develop an original narrative of 2,500 words, weaving together your own research combined with your own personal observations & reflections about either a person (living or dead) who has a public profile; or a place, (a suburb or town). Using documentary sources (e.g. newspaper archives) along with interviews (if the subject is living) with the person, or with people who know the subject, construct a compelling & interesting narrative. This assessment task is designed to develop research & writing skills & consider creative approaches in the area of non-fiction writing.

Due: 23:59 Sunday 29 October

Instructional Rubric

This table provides a guide to producing an exceptional standard of work (H).

| | Criteria | Weight | Explain | Exemplars |
|-------------|---------------------------------------------------------------|--------|------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| Language | Inventiveness & originality of concept | 20% | Demonstrates a unique perspective &/or approach in sourcing a creative non-fiction narrative, & evidence of practice-led research, which includes the ethical integration of primary & secondary sources. | Inventive & original concept: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>Consider the Lobster</i>, David Foster-Wallace • <i>Manoly</i>, by Debora Adelaide Integration of sources: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>Lanfranchi</i>, John Dale |
| | Inventiveness & originality of writing | 40% | Demonstrates an excellent sense of originality & experimentation in writing; clear, effective & sophisticated use of structure & fictional techniques (including, but not limited to: perspective, tense/s, scene re-creation & dialogue) to construct a creative non-fiction narrative. | Structure & experimentation with form: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>Lanfranchi</i>, John Dale • <i>Kate Holden</i>, Sue Joseph Inventiveness & originality: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>Hiroshima</i>, John Hersey Scene setting: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>Schindler's List</i>, Thomas Kenneally • <i>The Hanging</i>, George Orwell |
| | Consistency of writing | 20% | Demonstrates a clear & controlled narrative arc, pace & tone. Excellent written clarity; no spelling or grammatical errors, correct use of tense/s & perspective. Adheres to word count. | Most of the readings in this course, but in particular: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>Alan Jones</i>, by David Leser |
| Peer-review | Self-assessment/critical feedback integration | 5% | Demonstrates an excellent sense of critical analysis/engagement. Demonstration of sophisticated critical editing/writing skills. | n/a |
| | Level of informative & creative exchange | 5% | Demonstrates an excellent sense of critical analysis/engagement with classmates online through discussion board. Demonstration of sophisticated critical reading/editing/proofing skills of their work. | n/a |
| Aesthetics | Expression & presentation in line with professional standards | 10% | The visual presentation of the piece is professional; clear, suitable to form, double-spaced, adheres to word count, intuitive paragraph structure & correct footnoting &/or referencing (if necessary). | Most of the readings in this course, but in particular: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>Consider the Lobster</i>, David Foster-Wallace • <i>Man or Myth</i>, Mark Mordue |