**Psychology of Self in Social Media: Impact Project Proposal PEER AND SELF EVALUATION**

*For each person in your Working Group, including yourself, please complete this evaluation. For closed-ended responses, please choose the option that you think best represents that quality of the work. Please consider the instructions for all questions, including the Critical Comments, carefully.*

*To enter the values online, please follow the ipeer link on Connect. \*\*Please save your work regularly. Consider completing the ratings elsewhere and then copying them in ipeer to avoid lost work.\*\**

*It can be helpful to take notes on presentations to help you remember them for later evaluation. It can also be helpful to read all proposals first before evaluating them so that you can start to tease apart what is minimal versus exceptional work. Please be thoughtful in your evaluations. The* ***quality*** *of the feedback you give to yourself and to others on this stage of the project will comprise 4% of your final grade, and can be used to enhance your own and others’ final projects.*

How the quality of your feedback to self and peers be graded?

* Critical comments will each be evaluated by our TAs on dimensions including
	+ Specificity and helpfulness of suggestions
	+ Honesty of identifying strengths and areas for growth
	+ Sensitivity in delivering the feedback in a way that honours the receivers’ feelings
* Numeric evaluation: I will be developing an algorithm to account for the extent to which your ratings converge with your peers, as one potential indicator of accuracy. I will share this algorithm after developing it and invite feedback before final grades are decided.
* *Notes*
	+ *In the case of feedback to yourself, these comments should be addressed as if your paper is not your own. You should rate your own work after you have completed the evaluations of others.*
	+ *Why are we doing and evaluating peer- and self-evaluations? Recall that Learning Goal #6 emphasizes the ability to critically evaluate your own and others’ ideas and the manner in which they are presented. Every like, share, comment, update, photo, etc, that we enact online implies an evaluation. In this course, we’re formalizing that process.*

**Oral Presentation**

1. **Presentation Delivery**
* Full points - Exceeds expectations. This oral presentation was delivered expertly. All explanations were clear and articulate, and follow-up questions were addressed thoroughly. Nonverbal communications (e.g., voice volume, eye contact, visual aids if applicable) enhanced the presentation further.
* Meets expectations. Explanations were clear for the most part, and most follow-up questions were addressed well. Nonverbal communications (e.g., voice volume, eye contact, visual aids if applicable) did not detract from the presentation.
* Minimally meets expectations. Explanations and/or follow-up questions were addressed well, but one or both of those had some parts that were a bit unclear or confusing. Some nonverbal communications (e.g., voice volume, eye contact, visual aids if applicable) were distracting but not a major impediment to understanding.
* Does not meet expectations. Explanations and/or follow-up questions were not addressed clearly. Nonverbal communications (e.g., voice volume, eye contact, visual aids if applicable) began to detract from the quality of the presentation.
* 0 points - Missing/did not complete.

**Critical Comments**

This mini oral presentation acts as a small sample of oral communication. This person will be presenting their ideas in front of others in the future. Everyone has strengths as well as room for growth, but sometimes it’s hard to see for ourselves.

1. **Identify and explain one specific oral communication strength** that was demonstrated in this mini-presentation, something this person might consider doing more of in their oral communications. Why is this helpful for a listener/audience/working group member?
2. **Identify and explain one specific area for growth** in oral communication. What is something this person might consider addressing/fixing/doing less of in their oral communications. Why would this change be helpful for a listener/audience/working group member?

**Written Proposal**

1. **Title**
* Exceeds expectations. Captures attention, makes me want to know more about the topic, while accurately representing what the project is about.
* Meets expectations. Accurately represents what the project is about, but doesn’t really capture my attention.
* Minimally meets expectations. Captures my attention but does not seem to accurately represent what the project is about.
* Does not meet expectations. Does not seem to accurately represent the project topic or capture attention.
* Missing/did not complete.
1. **Project plan**
* Exceeds expectations. This project plan is very detailed, addresses all or most of the prompting questions in the template, and clearly indicates careful and well-considered thought about this project. It is easy to see how this project will take shape.
* Meets expectations. This project plan is detailed, addresses the essential prompting questions in the template, and shows evidence of thinking through the major components of the project.
* Minimally meets expectations. This project plan is complete, but lacks details for some of the major prompting questions in the template. Many decisions and issues need to be considered still.
* Does not meet expectations. This project plan does not seem to be complete. It does not seem to address the prompting questions. It is not clear whether the major decisions have been made or thought through.
* Missing/did not complete.
1. **Ethical considerations**
* Exceeds expectations. Major ethical issues related to this specific project have been identified and are already well-considered.
* Meets expectations. Major ethical issues related to this specific project have been identified, laying the groundwork for further consideration.
* Minimally meets expectations. Ethical issues raised are superficial or apply to the Impact Project Option in general, rather than being specific to this person’s particular project.
* Does not meet expectations. An ethical issue is identified, but does not seem relevant to this project.
* Missing/did not complete.
1. **Past research**
* Exceeds expectations. Three or more articles are listed, they seem to be relevant to this particular project, and are listed in APA style.
* Meets expectations. One or two articles are listed, they seem to be relevant to this particular project, and are listed in APA style.
* Minimally meets expectations. One or two articles are listed. However, it does not seem clear that they are relevant to this particular project, OR they are not listed in APA style.
* Does not meet expectations. One or two articles are listed that do not seem relevant AND they are not listed in APA style.
* Missing/did not complete.
1. **Next steps**
* Exceeds expectations. Four or more next steps are listed. They are specific and have deadlines attached to them. It is clear what this person will do next and when.
* Meets expectations. Three next steps are listed. They are specific and have deadlines attached to them. It is clear what this person will do next and when.
* Minimally meets expectations. Two or three next steps are listed. They are somewhat specific and/or do not have deadlines attached to them. It is not clear what exactly this person will do next OR when they will do it.
* Does not meet expectations. One to three next steps are listed. They are not specific and do not have deadlines attached to them. It is not clear what exactly this person will do next AND when they will do it.
* Missing/did not complete.
1. **Overall Quality of written communication**
* Exceeds expectations. Entire work is complete and clearly explained, writing flows easily between ideas.
* Meets expectations. High quality writing, with a couple of spelling/grammar issues or ideas that do not clearly flow.
* Minimally meets expectations. Mostly clear and flows reasonably well.
* Does not meet expectations. Unclear in some parts making writing difficult to read sometimes.
* Does not meet expectations. Very difficult to read and understand what is being said. Recommend seeking support at the Writing Centre.
* Missing/did not complete.

Critical Comments

About the project

1. **Identify one specific strength of this project so far.** What makes it particularly strong? What specific ideas do you have for helping this person improve it further?
2. **Identify one specific weakness, limitation, challenge, or shortcoming of this project so far.** Why do you think it is (or might become) problematic as this project progresses? What specific ideas do you have for helping this person improve or remedy this aspect of their project?

About the proposal: This proposal acts as a small writing sample. This person will be writing longer works throughout the rest of this course (and likely beyond). Everyone has strengths as well as room for growth, but sometimes it’s hard to see for ourselves.

1. **Identify and explain one specific writing strength** that is demonstrated in this proposal, something this person might consider doing more of in their writing. If applicable, copy a quote to illustrate what you mean. What makes this feature helpful for a reader?
2. **Identify and explain one specific writing challenge** that is demonstrated in this proposal, something this person might consider addressing/fixing/doing less of in their writing. If applicable, copy a quote to illustrate what you mean. Why would this change be helpful for a reader?
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