

Adaptation rubrics: context

Author:

Dr. Joy McEntee
English Discipline & ERGA
University of Adelaide
joy.mcentee@adelaide.edu.au

These rubrics were developed as part of the Research Skills Development Framework project <http://www.adelaide.edu.au/clpd/rsd/>

They are used in an upper-level undergraduate course on literature-to-feature film adaptations.

Students face a particular challenge in this course: they must deal even-handedly with both the 'source' texts (novels in this case) and the films, while also framing text/film adaptations in terms of contemporary critical work and scholarly theory on adaptation, which is growing in volume and sophistication at an explosive rate.

To break this complex, three-way analysis into component parts, the assessment regime has the students producing two related works at staged intervals.

1. Literature review

At the mid-point of the course, students produce a **literature review** dealing *only* with theories of adaptation. This offers students an opportunity to prepare the theoretical groundwork for their essay. It offers the marker a timely opportunity to give feedback: students who are wandering off topic can be re-directed before they start preparing the final essay. This means the literature review has both formative and summative aspects. Accordingly, the rubric has a section for individualised notes at the end, to allow for the provision of feedback tailored to particular issues that arise from each student's work.

Students are expected to respond to this feedback actively, and they are marked on how effectively they use feedback to improve their performance on the subsequent essay. This mark is based not only on 'tacit' evidence of improvement, but also on a requirement that students explicitly address feedback in a brief '**rejoinder**' accompanying the essay. The rejoinder is designed to encourage students to read feedback, to consider it thoughtfully, and to take responsibility for improving their own work. The essay rubric contains a section for the assessment of this rejoinder.

2. Essay

At the end of the course, students produce a **final essay**, which normally relates the theoretical groundwork laid in the literature review to a given instance of adaptation (a text/film pair). This essay is due after classes end, and, as many students fail even to pick up this work, giving extensive individualised feedback is not a good use of the marker's time. This assessment is regarded as summative in character. Feedback is restricted to 'rubric' form only (the 'notes' section is deemed redundant). This still provides students who are interested with comprehensive feedback, without involving the marker in writing an essay on each student's essay.