	Excellent (A)	Good (A-)	Adequate (B to B+)	Poor (B- or lower)
	More Important			
Does the essay clearly express an opinion?	The essay: • Clearly states a central opinion or set of opinions • Has an opinion/argument that is consistent through the piece	• Clearly states a central opinion or set of opinions • Has an opinion/argument that is mostly consistent through the piece	• Has a central opinion or set of opinions that can be understood on one or two readings • Has an opinion/argument that is mostly consistent through the piece	• Does not have a central opinion or set of opinions OR • Has an opinion/argument that is inconsistent across essay
Does the essay address its target audience?	The essay: • Uses language easily understood by target audience • Limits jargon unless truly necessary • Is forthright about its own political assumptions or biases, if any • Explains the problem or conversation it addresses adequately for non-expert readers	• Gives a clear opinion of the book's worth and role, with some examples or evidence • Places the book's merit in context of the broader academic conversation • Partially explains place in conversation to expected audience	• Gives a mostly clear opinion of the book's worth and role • Opinions may not be fully backed up or may be implicit • Makes some mention of book's contribution to broader academic conversation • Partially explains place in conversation to expected audience	• Implicit or absent opinions • No evidence given for opinions • No connection to broader conversation OR • There is no clear introduction
Does the essay provide sufficient evidence to support its claim?	The essay: • Provides evidence for any contentious claim or claim that is not self-evident • Cites sources where appropriate	• Provides evidence for most contentious claims or claims that are not self-evident • Cites sources where appropriate	• Provides evidence for most but noticeably not all contentious claims • May be missing one or two needed citations	• Few claims are backed up by evidence • Uses outside evidence or ideas but does not cite them
Does the essay offer clear takeaways?	The essay: • Has clear takeaways for a broad audience • Some readers (i.e. not all readers but, say, politicians or consumers of one specific product) could clearly act on these takeaways	• Has takeaways for a broad audience that are mostly clear • Some readers could figure out how to act on these takeaways	• Has takeaways that are mostly clear; not all readers would necessarily see these • Some readers could figure out how to act on these takeaways	• Takeaways not clearly stated • Actionable points not clearly defined

	Excellent (A)	Good (A-)	Adequate (B to B+)	Poor (B- or lower)
Is the essay compellingly written?	The review: • Balances logical, emotional and ethical appeals in a compelling way • Uses rhetorical devices in a way that enhance the clarity and/or effectiveness of the argument	• Balances logical, emotional and ethical appeals • Uses rhetorical devices in a way that enhance the clarity and/or effectiveness of the argument	• Relies more on logic, emotion and or ethics than appropriate to central opinion or topic • Rhetorical devices may sometimes obscure instead of clarify	• Does not balance different kinds of appeals • Rhetorical devices obscure or "show off" more than clarify

<div align="center">

Less Important

</div>

	Excellent (A)	Good (A-)	Adequate (B to B+)	Poor (B- or lower)
Does the paper have an effective hook/lead?	The essay: • Has an opening sentence or paragraph that is particularly compelling and encourages the reader to continue on • Avoids cliché • Does not mislead or stretch the essay's other arguments or evidence	• Has an opening sentence or paragraph that encourages the reader to continue on • Avoids cliché • Does not mislead or stretch the essay's other arguments or evidence	• Has an opening sentence or paragraph that is not particularly interesting but is clear • Limits cliché • Mostly represents the essay's arguments and evidence accurately	• Has a confusing or completely uninteresting opening sentence or paragraph • Misrepresents the essay's arguments and evidence
Does the essay acknowledge potential counterarguments?	The essay: • Anticipates obvious counterarguments • Provides sufficient, brief evidence to obviate them.	• Anticipates some counterarguments • Provides sufficient, brief evidence to obviate them.	• Does not clearly anticipate obvious counterarguments • Counterevidence either lacking <u>or</u> too extensive for space provided	• Obvious counterarguments exist and are not addressed • Counterevidence either lacking <u>or</u> too extensive for space provided
Does the paper demonstrate evidence of proofreading and correct grammar and spelling?	Grammar, spelling, and sentence structure: • meets conventional writing standards for op-eds • There may be 2 or 3 small errors, but they do not interfere with the clarity of the paper • Fits necessary word count (500-850 words)	• meets conventional writing standards for op-eds • The writing may occasionally be either too informal or too academic/jargon-y • Writing may minimally interfere with clarity • There may be a few (3+) errors that catch the reader's attention, but do not significantly interfere with clarity • Fits necessary word count (500-850 words)	• Style does not seem to fully fit op-ed genre • grammar/sentence structure may significantly distract from the clarity of the paper • Noticeable spelling and technical errors.	• Grammar/sentence structure significantly distracts from the clarity of the paper • Reflects carelessness and lack of attention to detail