

Participation

Activity: Weekly Discussion

Course: PSYC 335 6382 Theories of Personality (2222)

Name: Paulette Palmer

Main post	Level 6 6 points	Level 5 5 points	Level 4 4 points	Level 3 3 points	Level 2 2 points	Level 1 1 point	No Response 0 points	Criterion Score
Main Post	Extraordinarily thorough and well-written, answers question(s) posed, and includes significant content-rich follow-through on presentation of the information, includes reference to the text material when appropriate (with page numbers).	5 = Covers major aspects, correct, and generally well-written, answers question(s) posed, some content-rich follow-through on the presentation of the information, includes reference to the text material when appropriate (with page numbers).	4 = Covers most major aspects, mostly correct, and generally well-written, answers question(s) posed, some content-rich follow-through on the presentation of the information, may or may not include reference to the text material when appropriate (with page numbers)	3 = Covers some aspects of the question(s) posed, thoughts are mostly clearly expressed or well thought-out, but not all. May contain some helpful follow-through. Missing attribution to the text or sources where appropriate.	2= Covers some aspects of the question(s) posed, thoughts are not clearly expressed or well thought-out. May contain some helpful follow-through. ✓	1 = Adequate or less than adequate response, answers little of the question(s) posed, either does not have sufficient detail or contains significant errors and/or unsupported generalizations, off topic or contains no relevant information	0 = No main response	2 / 6

Main post	Level 6 6 points	Level 5 5 points	Level 4 4 points	Level 3 3 points	Level 2 2 points	Level 1 1 point	No Response 0 points	Criterion Score
-----------	---------------------	---------------------	---------------------	---------------------	---------------------	--------------------	-------------------------	-----------------

Criterion Feedback

Paulette, Grammar here is a significant issue and I am unclear on your points around Erikson and Horney. Moreover, the foundation for this material is attributed to Paris- an outside source which is not permitted. You are required to use the textbook to respond to discussion prompts- outside source cannot earn credit for the response. Awarding credit for your opinion element.

Asides	Level 4 4 points	Level 3 3 points	Level 2 2 points	Level 1 1 point	Level 0 0 points	Criterion Score
Asides	4 = At least two extraordinarily thorough and clearly articulated responses that add to the discussion of the topic, are course relevant, and contain citations when appropriate	3 = one aside may be clearly articulated and thorough that adds to the discussion of the topic, are course relevant, and contain citations when appropriate; but one may not be as clear or thorough. Or both asides may be partially clear and/or thorough but not completely.	2 = Less than two responses, and/or are adequate responses that are generally correct but lack significant detail, and/or have minor errors, and/or lack appropriate citations, and/or are unsupported generalizations	1 = Minimal content, and/or are off-topic, and/or contain(s) no relevant information	No comments/A sides or aside(s) fail to go beyond meaningless and superfluous comments (e.g., nice job, I agree, good luck, etc.).	0 / 4



Total	2 / 10
-------	--------

Overall Score

