I. Opening Remarks: Laura mentions “norming” and hands out copies for those who need them. (Maybe contextualize next time, which LJ did some, that this was one of the workshops people wanted to see).
   a. Reviews instructions
   b. Passes sign-up sheet, etc.
   c. 10 to read and 5 to discuss, one at a time.

II. Essay 1: “The Devastation of the Oil Spill”
   a. Everyone reads
   b. 1-A, 10-B, 5-C, 0-D, 0-F
   c. Strengths:
      i. Generally strong sentences
      ii. Focused paragraphs
      iii. Documentation
      iv. Lots of info
      v. Some good para transitions
   d. Weaknesses
      i. Lacks specific, predictive thesis
      ii. Minimal analysis, more summary, no so what
      iii. Some generalizations
      iv. Concl: gets into argument/takes stance
      v. Mechanics gradually worsen
      vi. Lacks page #s
      vii. Heavy paraphrase and light quote

III. Essay 2: “Trouble in the Gulf”
   a. Everyone reads
   b. 0-A, 0-B, 8-C, 7-D, 1-F
   c. Strengths:
      i. Various issues covered; facets intro’ed
      ii. A bit of a stronger thesis
      iii. Paragraphs focused to some extendt
      iv. Student who takes risks (CP)
   d. Weaknesses:
      i. Body doesn’t address the thesis/unfocused
      ii. Mode of judgment and not analysis
      iii. Confusion w idioms, wrong words, “get the easy way out,” awkward phrasing
      iv. Thesis not complete . . .
v. Paragraph on Obama not relevant
vi. Contradictions
vii. Broad generalizations w/o support
viii. Futility of analysis as thesis?
ix. No transitions
x. Doesn’t utilize transitions effectively

IV. Essay 3: “Coastal Analysis”

a. Everyone reads
b. 3–A, 7-B, 5-C, 1-D, -F
c. Strengths
   i. Precise thesis
   ii. Framing device
   iii. Coherent throughout
   iv. Identified various perspectives
   v. Details were not just piled up but clustered around perspectives
   vi. Well documented research
   vii. Killer transitions
   viii. Insights at moments
   ix. Ending w quote effective
   x. Evidence of analysis
d. Weakness
   i. Lack of proofreading?
   ii. Sentences/ paragraphs tend to be long
   iii. Point 1 top-heavy
   iv. Org doesn’t follow plan from thesis
   v. Multiple sources in one paragraph (good, actually)
   vi. Several unsupported conclusions
   vii. Points w/o stakeholder.
viii. Narrow research: sources are so . . . ? These were for our assessment, Christy said.