

Valuable College Critiques for the Twenty-First century

Public Lecture (or Scholarly Article, Book Chapter, or Entire Book)

Due: Seven days after the "Event" attended (lecture, performance, etc.)

The report should be **two full** pages (TYPED & numbered, of course). It should not be a mere summary but an informed evaluation (which includes minimal summary).

Edit your confusing and still disorganized notes of the original event or article as you shape your final copy. Prepare drafts. Thus, you can produce a mature and intelligent critique. The result should be coherent to a student peer (in our course) as well as to a professor. Keep all your notes until the semester ends.

You must follow standard rules of spelling, grammar, punctuation (quotations, running footnotes, if any), paragraphing, etc. found in current English Handbooks and my "Grading Guide." Be sure to **title** your critique. **Check your spelling and proofread.** Your name and the date of delivery to me should appear high on the right of p.1 of the text. **Staple** and **number** all pages (if more than one). Do not hesitate to be critical and witty as well as profound. Provide lucid answers to these questions in at least three (3) paragraphs. Following this sensible format (some requirements, some advice only, not a straightjacket) will simplify your task.

I. ESSENTIAL DATA.

a]] State the **name and rank** of the author/speaker, **home institution** or base (for lecturers) , **title** for the lecture or chapter, and the **date and place** of the event (or of the publication). This should appear at top in summary form, e.g.,

Brian Rose, Professor of Archaeology, University of Cincinnati.

"The Archaeological Survey of Troy"

17 February 2003, Ohio Wesleyan University

(Errors here, e.g., misspelling the presenter's name, are especially embarrassing and damaging to your grade, so double-check your facts.) Tell your reader upfront the Who what where when why? of the presentation.

b]] State the **topic** of the lecture/chapter/book. N.B. Title, topic, and thesis are often three distinctly different items. Do you know the difference?

c]] State the speaker's or writer's principal **thesis**. You may choose to underline OR *italicize* the thesis. Identify the main divisions of the oral or written presentation (sections, chapters).

II. ANALYSIS OF EVIDENCE.

a]] What kind and quantity of evidence did the presenter offer? Supply *specific* examples. Was the evidence literary, anecdotal, archaeological, statistical, historical, etc.? **Quoted sentences** or **summarized examples** will make your paper more credible and enjoyable.

b]] Did the evidence logically support the thesis? Did each division support the thesis? Was evidence sufficient? Was argument thorough and understandable?

c]] State the strongest AND weakest points of the author or speaker's case or presentation. In other words, where do **you** think the author/speaker was most convincing and what doubts or concerns remain in your mind?

III. RELATION OF Lecture/Article/Book TO OUR COURSE.

a]] Mention lecturer's or author's significant topics, evidence, theories, and conclusions that **supplement**, **parallel**, or **contrast** to our current course's material. *Apply* what you gained from this learning experience to our course. DL, lecrep07, ho