Satirical Essay

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **CRITERIA** | **Advanced:**thorough, effective | **Proficient**Sufficient, Satisfactory | **Acceptable**Adequate, Passable | **Not Acceptable**Incomplete, ineffective | **Comments** |
| **Completion/Meaning** | Uses a variety of rhetorical tools to criticize a social vice/flaw. Picked and mimicked appropriate medium/format. Critically analyzes flaw and addresses issues without resorting to base means. | Criticizes a social vice/flaw using some rhetorical tools. Is constructive (not overly negative) yet critical. | Mocks a social vice/flaw, using rhetorical tools. Touches on more than one aspect of the issue. | Mocks social vice but lacks use of rhetorical tools. Is not critical or strays too close to base, rude means of criticism.  |  |
| **Organization** | Excellent organization & transitions; material builds up and finished strongly.  | Good organization and transitions; material is all related and answers the questions “so what”.  | Organization works but may have small issues like transitions. Material is all related but may not build to strong conclusion.  | Little to no organization and/or transitions. Reader is confused. Ideas are hard to follow; Inappropriate format. |  |
| **Fluency** | Paragraphs and sentences “flow” well—with one idea leading to the next in logical manner. Word choice is engaging and interesting. No awkward sentences. Includes a variety of sentence lengths and types. | Paragraphs and sentences work well together, with ideas moving along well. Word choice is interesting; few sentences are awkward. Includes a variety of sentences lengths or types. | Paragraphs or sentences move the point along but might be too wordy or too choppy. Many awkward sentences or bland sentence structures. Some word choices are also awkward. | Sentences are difficult to read and do not move forward/transition well. Writing includes fragments or run-ons. Many awkward sentences and word choices. Difficult to read and comprehend in places. |  |
| **Use of Sources** | Quote/sources are well-integrated and flow naturally with the author’s individual style/voice | Most sources are well-integrated and do not disrupt the flow of the essay. | Most sources are integrated; some seem out of place or are not completely relevant or may disrupt the flow of the essay. | Sources are irrelevant and/or detract from the content. |  |
| **Style/Voice/word choice** | A consistent voice that is appropriate for the paper’s meaning and engages the reader. The essay has personality. | Paper reads will with developing style and voice. | Wordiness, clichés, and/or vagueness sometimes muffle the voice. Tone is inconsistent | No distinguishable voice or forced/unnatural voice. |  |
| **Documentation** | All sources are included in the Works Cited page and have correct in-text citations. | Evident effort in Works Cited and in-text citation; few errors | Includes a Works Cited page but lacks correct format. In-text citation may be missing or inadequate | Does not include a Works Cited page. In-text citations are sloppy or lacking. |  |
| **Grammar, Punctuation etc…** | Advanced traditional grammar and mechanics, except when irregularities (like fragments) are used for special effects. | Surface errors are minimal and do not detract from meaning and readability | Frequent grammar, spelling and/or punctuation errors clutter paper’s surface. Some sentences may be awkward. | Surface problems are so frequent they obscure meaning. Many sentences are poorly structured. |  |
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