Canadian Poet Project

Your task is to research a famous Canadian poet and create a project around them. Your presentation may take any form you choose, but must include the following:

* **Part One**: A one page, double-spaced biography on your poet; be sure to include a brief explanation of their early years (birth, family, education, etc.), career, publications, and achievements.
* **Part Two**: A selection of two of their poems, with a critique of each one, a minimum of one paragraph (five sentences) per critique.
* **Part Three**: A reading of one poem in front of the class, with your own analysis
1. identification of literary devices with explanation
2. author’s message/what the poem is about
3. critique

Each part is worth 25 points, and will be marked separately. Part One will be marked based on the General Writing Rubric; Part Two will be marked based on your critique; for Part Three, you will be assessed on your presentation skills (speaking and listening), as well as your analysis.

You may find a list of famous Canadian poets by using the following link:

<http://famouspoetsandpoems.com/country/Canada/Canadian_poets.html>

You are not limited to this list, but your poet must be Canadian, published (an online blog does not count) and verified by your teacher.

# Part One Rubric

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Categories | 5 | 4 | 3 | 2 | 1 |
| Ideas and Content | Fresh, original treatment of ideas; well-developed theme from start to finish, with relevant, strong supporting detail. | Clear, focused, interesting ideas with appropriate details that enhance the main idea. | Evident main idea with some supporting details; may lack focus or contain bits of irrelevant material or gaps in needed information. | Some attempt to support, but main theme may be too general or confused by irrelevant details. | Writing lacks a central idea; development in minimal or non-existent. |
| Organization | Effectively organized in a logical and creative way; has a unique and engaging introduction and conclusion. | Structure moves the reader smoothly through the text; well organized with an inviting introduction and a satisfying closure. | Organization is appropriate, but conventional. There is an obvious attempt at an introduction and conclusion. | An effort has been made to organize the piece, but it may be a “list” of events. The introduction and conclusion are not well developed. | A lack of structure makes this piece hard to follow. Lead and conclusion may be weak or non-existent. |
| Word Choice | Carefully chose words convey strong, fresh, vivid images consistently throughout the piece. | Word choice is functional and appropriate. The writer has made some attempt at description, which sometimes may see overdone. | Words are likely to be correct, but lack flair. The writer may overuse generalised words and modifiers. | Word choice is monotonous; may be repetitious or immature. The writer uses patterns of conversation rather than book language. | Vocabulary ranges is limited and may be inappropriate. |
| Sentence Fluency | High degree of craftsmanship in sentence length and form; the writing sounds rhythmical to read aloud. | Easy flow and rhythm to most of the piece; good variety in sentence length and structure. | The writer is generally in control of sentence structure, but sentences often follow a similar structure without much variation for effect. | Generally in control, but lacking variety in length and structure. | No `sentence sense`; run-on or choppy sentences predominate. |
| Conventions | The paper contains few, if any errors in conventions. The writer shows control over a wide range of conventions beyond grade-level expectations. Some errors may result from experimentation with words and sentences. | The writer shows strong control of conventions. Writing is generally correct, but may be risk-free. | Occasional errors are noticeable, but minor. The writer uses conventions with enough skills to make the paper readable. | More frequent errors, inappropriate to the grade level, are evident but the reader can still follow the piece. | Errors in conventions make the writing difficult to follow. The writer seems to know some conventions, but confuses many more. |

# Part Two Rubric

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Categories | 5 | 4 | 3 | 2 | 1 |
| Ideas and Content | Fresh, original treatment of ideas; well-developed theme from start to finish, with relevant, strong supporting detail. | Clear, focused, interesting ideas with appropriate details that enhance the main idea. | Evident main idea with some supporting details; may lack focus or contain bits of irrelevant material or gaps in needed information. | Some attempt to support, but main theme may be too general or confused by irrelevant details. | Writing lacks a central idea; development in minimal or non-existent. |
| Critique | Each critique includes opinion, as well as clear evidence for that opinion. | Each critique includes opinion, as well as evidence for that opinion. | Each critique includes opinion, as well as some evidence for that opinion. | Each critique includes opinion, as well as evidence for that opinion, which may not go beyond simple statements of personal preferences. |
| Requirements | Three poems by a Canadian poet selected. Critique: One paragraph per poem, 5 or more sentences each are included. | Three poems by a Canadian poet selected. Critique: One paragraph per poem, 4-5 sentences each are included. | Three poems by a Canadian poet selected. Critique: One paragraph per poem, 3-4 sentences each are included. | Three or less poems by a Canadian poet selected. Critique: One paragraph per poem, 2-3 sentences each are included. | Three or less poems by a Canadian poet selected. Critiques may only consist of two or less sentences. |
| Organization | Effectively organized in a logical and creative way; has a unique and engaging introduction and conclusion. | Structure moves the reader smoothly through the text; well organized with an inviting introduction and a satisfying closure. | Organization is appropriate, but conventional. There is an obvious attempt at an introduction and conclusion. | An effort has been made to organize the piece, but it may be a “list” of events. The introduction and conclusion are not well developed. | A lack of structure makes this piece hard to follow. Lead and conclusion may be weak or non-existent. |
| Word Choice | Carefully chose words convey strong, fresh, vivid images consistently throughout the piece. | Word choice is functional and appropriate. The writer has made some attempt at description, which sometimes may see overdone. | Words are likely to be correct, but lack flair. The writer may overuse generalised words and modifiers. | Word choice is monotonous; may be repetitious or immature. The writer uses patterns of conversation rather than book language. | Vocabulary ranges is limited and may be inappropriate. |
| Sentence Fluency &Conventions | High degree of craftsmanship in sentence length and form; The paper contains few, if any errors in conventions.  | Easy flow and rhythm to most of the piece;The writer shows strong control of conventions. Writing is generally correct, but may be risk-free. | In general control of sentence structure, without much variation.Occasional errors are noticeable. The writer uses conventions with enough skills to make the paper readable. | Generally in control, but lacking variety in length and structure.More frequent errors, inappropriate to the grade level, are evident but the reader can still follow the piece. | No `sentence sense`; run-on or choppy sentences predominate.Errors in conventions make the writing difficult to follow.  |

# Part Three Rubric

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | **Level 4** | **Level 3** | **Level 2** | **Level 1** |
| Content & Understanding | Student demonstrates a clear and comprehensive understanding of the poem’s meaning; identification of literary devices with explanation, author’s message/what the poem is about. | Student shows good understanding of the poem’s meaning; identification of literary devices with explanation; author’s message/what the poem is about included. | Student shows some understanding of the poem’s meaning; few identification of literary devices with limited explanation; author’s message/what the poem is about is included, but has gaps. | Student shows limited to no understanding of the poem’s meaning; only 1-2 identification of literary devices with limited explanation; author’s message/what the poem is about is included, but misses the mark. |
| Critique | Student critiques the poem effectively: gives opinion, makes connections, uses evidence from the poem to back up opinion. | Student critiques the poem: gives opinion, makes some connections, uses evidence from the poem to back up opinion. | Student critiques the poem: gives opinion, makes a connection, uses little evidence from the poem to back up opinion. | Student attempts to critique the poem: gives opinion, but offers little to no evidence from the poem to back up opinion. |
| Presentation Skills | Student spoke for approximately 2 minutes, made regular eye contact with audience and spoke loudly and clearly. | Student spoke for a less than 2 minutes, made eye contact with audience and spoke loudly and/or clearly. | Student spoke for a less than 1 min 45 seconds minutes, made some eye contact with audience and spoke loudly and/or clearly. | Student spoke for a 1 min or less minutes, made some eye contact with audience and was difficult to understand at times. |
| Listening | During presentations, student attentively listened to others. Attentiveness reflected in attitude, behaviour and body language. | During presentations, student usually attentively listened to others. Attentiveness reflected in attitude, behaviour and body language. | During presentations, student somewhat listened to others. Attentiveness sometimes reflected in attitude, behaviour and body language. | During presentations, student lacked attentiveness ad respect for other presenters. |