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| **100-90:** Well organized, unified, and focused.  |
| * + The reader has a stake in the evaluation and cares about the quality of the item being evaluated.
	+ The voice of the reviewer is especially strong. The persona projected through voice is part of their appeal.
	+ The introduction is attention-getting, conclusion is strong, and the essay flows smoothly with effective use of transitions
 |
| * + The reviewer’s judgment is revealed through well-chosen reasons based on sophisticated criteria, which are relevant and convincing. The evaluation seems balanced and fair.
 |
| * + Description and back story are clear.
 |
| * + Verbs are vivid. Word choice is strong word choice to the essay.
 |
|  Sentence openings are varied, and sentences are sophisticated. No fragments or run-ons.  |
| * + Strong mechanics and English usage are employed.
 |
|  |
| **89-80:** Good organization; the question is answered; the review is original. |
| * Voice is evident but not throughout the entire paper, so that the appeal is weaker. Tone is established, but not thoroughly maintained.
 |
| * Beliefs, or quality judgments are revealed, but the argument is not as strong, and some details may be irrelevant.
* The evaluation seems less balanced and fair. The criteria for judging the value of the subject seem less sound, less clear, and may contain a few flaws.
 |
| * The introduction and conclusion are interesting, and the essay mostly flows smoothly with good use of transitions.
 |
| * Vivid verbs are predominant throughout the paper although there may be some usage of weak “be” verbs.
 |
| * Sentence opening variation is consistent, but sentence structure is less sophisticated.
 |
| * Few grammatical/mechanical errors
 |
|  |
| **79-70:** Paper is marked by generalization, and the writer strays from the focus.  |
| * Voice tends to be flat, merely informative, rather than taking a particular tone.
 |
| * Beliefs or quality judgements are presented through abstractions and generalities, and details are vague or do not appeal to the senses of the reader.
* The evaluation is somewhat unbalanced, flawed, or insufficient. The criteria for judging the value of the subject are insufficiently identified and developed.
 |
| * Organization is occasionally inconsistent, thus unclear.
 |
| * Grammatical/mechanical errors adversely affect readability.
 |
| * Introduction does not hook the reader, and/or conclusion may not bring the essay to closure.
 |
| * Usage of “be” verbs is more common that vivid action verbs.
 |
| * Sentence beginnings are repetitious or overly simplistic for the level of the class.
 |
| * Sentence structure shows little variation.
 |
|  |
| **69-60:** These essays lack a clear, dominant focus. |
| * Review consists mainly of summary. Argument is weak and not persuasive.
* The evaluation and criteria are flagrantly flawed or nonexistent.
 |
| * The essay lacks imagery, creativity, and originality, and introduction and conclusion are not engaging.
 |
| * Any paper with major mechanical/grammatical errors will automatically fall into this grade range or lower.
 |
|  |
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