Mr. A. Bieronski—ENG2DU Name:\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

*Finding Neverland:* The Power of Stories

In a **formal** **paragraph of at least 8 sentences**, apply **two** of the points of Scott Russell Sanders’ theory of “why we’ll always need a good story” to the film *Finding Neverland,* about J.M. Barrie’s creation of the play *Peter Pan*. In other words, using the film as an example, demonstrate how it makes an argument for the importance of stories, while explaining how it fulfills two of Sanders’ criteria.

Follow the **writing** **process** that you have learned: use the outline on the back of this sheet.

Final copies should be word-processed, double-spaced, and formatted in proper MLA style, and you must submit a correctly formatted Works Cited page.

**Evaluation**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Category | **Level 4** | **Level 3** | **Level 2** | **Level 1** | **Below Level** |
| **Intro:**  **Thesis** | Thought-provoking  thesis; engages reader; sets up argument well | Solid thesis; engages the reader. Clearly sets up the argument | Thesis needs clearer expression, sharper definition | Weak/vague thesis; attempted but not clear. Argument not set up | Very weak or absent  Thesis; focus is unclear and/or lacking |
| **Point #1** | Insightful, forceful supporting point given  Proof is strong, innovative, and  specific; adds depth  Explanation develops insightful and sophisticated argument | Solid supporting point is given, well thought out  Proof is strong and  specific; adds some depth to argument  Explanation develops logical and clear progression of argument | Supporting point present but ordinary  Some proof offered but is not very strong or hard to discern  Explanation somewhat develops argument; limited progression | Supporting point is vague or superficial  Limited proof offered; or proof is used improperly  Limited explanation;  argument does not  progress logically | Supporting point is below level standard  Unclear or no proof offered  Very limited to no explanation; argument stalls |
| **Point #2** | Insightful, forceful supporting point given  Proof is strong, innovative, and  specific; adds depth  Explanation develops insightful and sophisticated argument | Solid supporting point is given, well thought out  Proof is strong and  specific; adds some depth to argument  Explanation develops logical and clear progression of argument | Supporting point present but ordinary  Some proof offered but is not very strong or hard to discern  Explanation somewhat develops argument; limited progression | Supporting point is vague or superficial  Limited proof offered; or proof is used improperly  Limited explanation;  argument does not  progress logically | Supporting point is below level standard  Unclear or no proof offered  Very limited to no explanation; argument stalls |
| **Conclusion** | Wraps up thesis/ argument very clearly; leaves reader with an insightful “big idea” | Wraps up thesis/ argument clearly; leaves reader with a clear “big idea” | Ordinary; may wrap up thesis/argument; attempts a “big idea” | Does not adequately wrap up thesis/ argument; does not attempt a “big idea” | Very weak; does not wrap up thesis/ argument; no attempt at big idea |
| **Style and Mechanics** | Writing is crisp; mature  vocabulary; excellent use of transitions  No spelling, grammar,  punctuation errors | Writing is quite good;  good vocabulary; clear transitions  Few spelling, grammar, punctuation errors | Writing is average;  vocabulary is ordinary; needs more transitions  Some spelling, grammar, punctuation errors | Writing is not strong;  lower-level vocabulary; limited coherence  Several errors: spelling, grammar, punctuation | Writing is below standard for level; totally disconnected  Many, many mechanical errors; below level |

**Checklist—things to check before you hand in this piece of writing for evaluation:**

* Have you double-checked your spelling and mechanics?
* Does your paragraph contain a clear introduction-body-conclusion (follow outline)?
* Does each sentence make sense?
* Have you used transition words to move your reader from point to point within the argument?
* Do you have specific references to the film to prove your points?
* Have you included explanations that develop your overall argument?

**Paragraph Planning/Outline:**

|  |
| --- |
| **Topic Sentence/Thesis: offer an overall opinion of why the film is a “good story”; mention both Russell Sanders, the name of the essay, as well as the film and its director** |
| **Point #1: state the first point that makes the film a “good story”** |
| **Proof for Point #1: give a specific example from the film to support point #1** |
| **Explanation #1: explain how the 1st point/proof make this film a “good story”: discuss its significance** |
| **Point #2: state the second point that makes the film a “good story”** |
| **Proof for Point #2: give a specific example from the film to support Point # 2** |
| **Explanation #2: explain how the 2nd point/proof make this film a “good story”: discuss its significance** |
| **Conclusion: restate topic sentence, and leave the reader thinking “wow!”** |