



The Fourth Annual
Myrna Loy Patton Corley
Critical Thinking & Writing Essay
The Provost Scholars Program



DUE DATE: Monday, March 9, 2020, 5:00pm
Provost Scholars in Grades 10 - 12

Overview:

The Myrna Loy Patton Corley Critical Thinking and Writing Essay was established by the East Cleveland City Schools and Case Western Reserve University to strengthen and enhance the critical thinking and writing of The Provost Scholars.

Requirements:

- 1) Electronically submit a **typed** 800-1,000 word essay (Times New Roman, 12 pt. type, 1" margins). A cover page with the Scholar's (1) full name, (2) date of essay submission, (3) grade level, (4) school name, (5) book title, and (6) question option must be included.
- 2) Answer **one** of the following essay questions based on the following book:
Vargas, Jose. 2018. *Dear America: Notes of an Undocumented Citizen*. HarperCollins Publishers.

Question Option 1: Throughout the book, what are some examples of the privileges Jose has that might give him an advantage over other undocumented immigrants? How would you characterize Jose's feelings about the help he receives? Discuss three examples of this from the book and offer your own arguments about the role privilege plays in (i.e. upward mobility, social status, or suffering consequences) from personal observation or experience.

Question Option 2: Near the end of the book, Jose talks about what he calls the "citizenship of participation" (195). For him, the phrase means, "Citizenship is showing up. Citizenship is using your voice while making sure you hear other people around you. Citizenship is how you live your life" (195-96). In what ways is Jose's definition changing what we typically associate with citizenship? Are these alternatives more positive or negative than the word's usual connotations?

Timeline:

Thursday, December 12th: Book distribution during Provost Scholars Winter Celebration at CWRU

Tuesday, January 21st: First day back! Essay outline due (review with mentor or tutor)

Tuesday, February 4th: Essay Rough Draft Due

Monday, March 9th: Final Essay Due by 5:00pm

***MUST be submitted electronically (email to kak121@case.edu or CampusGroups link)**

Evaluation:

The submitted essays will be evaluated by a faculty or staff person at East Cleveland City Schools or Case Western Reserve University. The rubric below illustrates the qualities being looked for in the essay.

IMPORTANT NOTE: Scholars not submitting a final draft by the due date could potentially jeopardize their future participation in the Provost Scholars Program.

Helpful websites and documents for organizing your essay

<https://en.oxforddictionaries.com/writing-help/how-to-organize-material-for-your-essay>

<http://thevisualcommunicationguy.com/writing/how-to-organize-a-paper/how-to-organize-a-paper-the-five-paragraph-essay/>

<https://depts.washington.edu/owrc/Handouts/How%20to%20Structure%20and%20Organize%20Your%20Paper.pdf>

<http://advice.writing.utoronto.ca/planning/organizing/>

Provost Scholars Critical Thinking and Writing Essay Rubric

	A Range - Displays following characteristic with exceptional grace and mastery	B Range - May resemble A paper, with any of the following qualities	C Range - May resemble B paper, with any of the following qualities	D Range - May resemble C paper, with any of the following qualities
Thesis / Argument	Interesting, arguable, incisive; sufficiently limited in scope; stated early on and present throughout	Arguable, but may be vague or uninteresting, or feature unintegrated parts; may only be implied, but not clearly stated; may not be argued throughout, disappears in places	Vague, descriptive, or confusing; parts unintegrated (i.e. three unrelated prongs); only implied or not stated early on; not argued throughout, disappears in places	Missing or purely descriptive (an observation or statement of fact, or may be total misreading)
Structure	Logical, progressive (not just a list), invites complications and consideration of counter-argument; strong and obvious links between points; coherent, well-organized paragraphs	Generally logical but either confusing in places (big jumps, missing links) or overly predictable; may be underdeveloped; some disorganized, bloated, or skimpy paragraphs	Confusing (big jumps, missing links or overly predictable ("five paragraph theme"); disorganized paragraphs (usually skimpy), often headed with descriptive (versus argumentative) topic sentences	Confusing; little focused development (usually short or rambling); disorganized paragraphs; missing, garbled, or purely descriptive topic sentences
Evidence	Sufficient, appropriate, well-chosen; presented in a readable and understandable way	Generally solid, but may be scanty or presented as undigested quotations	Either missing or presented as undigested quotations; may be taken out of context	Very few examples; undigested quotations; taken out of context
Analysis	Insightful and fresh; more than summary or paraphrase; shows how evidence supports thesis	At times insightful, but sometimes missing or mere summary; makes inconsistent connections between evidence and thesis	Some insightful moments, but generally either missing or mere summary; may present some misreadings	Missing or based on misinterpretations or mere summary
Sources	Well-chosen and deployed in a range of ways (to motivate argument, provide key-terms, etc); quoted and/or cited correctly	Quoted and/or cited correctly for the most part, but may be deployed in limited ways (often as a straw man or simply as affirmation of writer's viewpoint)	Plopped in if used at all; may be quoted and/or cited incorrectly, used as filler or affirmation of writer's viewpoint	Plopped in if used at all; incorrectly quoted and/or cited; used as filler
Style	Clear and conversational yet sophisticated; diction level appropriate to audience; smooth, stimulating, a pleasure to read	Generally clear but lacking in sophistication; may be weighted down by fancy diction meant to impress; may exhibit some errors in punctuation, grammar, spelling, and format	May be generally unclear and hard to read, or simplistic; may contain many technical errors; likely contains numerous careless mistakes; evidence of little to no editing and proofreading	Either simplistic or difficult to read; riddled with technical errors; lacks signs of any proofreading

Adapted from the Case Western Reserve University Department of English, 2017.