**AP LANGUAGE AND COMPOSITION
BOOK REVIEW RUBRIC**

**Name: \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_ Hour: \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_ Grade: \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_/50**

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Category | **Excellent (5pts)** | **Good (4pts)** | **Poor (3-0 pt)** |
| **Organization: Compares and Contrasts Two Books** | Effectively and evenly compares and contrasts two books. | Compares and contrasts two books, however, there may be a significant focus on one book or on either comparison or contrast. Or, the comparison and contrast is not effective. | Does not compare and contrast two books. There may only be on book mentioned or a lack of either comparison or contrast. |
| **Organization: Book by Book or Topic by Topic** | Effectively utilizes the Book by Book or Topic by Topic organization as outlined in the handout. | Uses either the Book by Book or Topic by Topic organization, however, it is either not the same as the outline in the handout. Or, the organization method is not use effectively. | Does not use either the Book by Book organization or the Topic by Topic organization as outlined in the handouts. Or, a hybrid of the two organization methods was used. |
| **Thesis: Unifies Both Books** | Thesis pertains to both books and effectively unifies the two books together. | Thesis pertains to both books and somewhat connects or unifies them; however, it is not effective. | Thesis does not pertain to both books. Or, it does not connect or unify them. |
| **Thesis: succinct, accurate, unbiased, and clear** | Thesis is effective because it is succinct, accurate, unbiased, and clear. | Thesis may be succinct, accurate, unbiased, or clear. It may be lacking one or more of these traits. | Thesis is not succinct, accurate, unbiased, or clear. |
| **Content: Evidence supports claim** | Evidence is strong and effectively supports the thesis's claim. | Evidence may support thesis, but it is weak. | Evidence does not support claim. |
| **Content: Evidence is cited using (author p.#)** | Evidence is cited in-text accurately. There may be some minor inaccuracies on the Works Cited page, but it is still obvious for the reader to match the in-text citation with the entry on the Works Cited. | Evidence is cited; however, there may be some minor inaccuracies in the in-text citations or Works Cited page, but they do not detract from reading the review. | Evidence is not cited. Or, if evidence is cited, it is cited so inaccurately that it detracts from reading the review. The Works Cited page may be missing. |
| **Content: Critically analyzed both books** | The content reflects a critical analysis of both books. It is evident that both books were read and that the writer considered numerous angles before choosing this one because the analysis shows a sophisticated level of analysis. | It may be evident that both books were read; however, the review appears rushed and the books not critically analyzed to determine the best content for the review. | Neither book is critically analyzed. It is possible that one or more books were not read. Or, the content is unrelated to the thesis. |
| **Content: Style/Voice** | The writer effectually employs various rhetorical techniques to engage the reader. The overall combination of ideas, sentence fluency and word choice is individualistic. | It is apparent that the writer attempted to employ rhetorical techniques to engage the reader; however. These may be unsophisticated or ineffectual. The overall combination of ideas, sentence fluency, and word choice is typical rather than individualistic. | The writer makes no discernible attempt to employ rhetorical techniques to engage the reader. The overall combination of ideas, sentence fluency, and word choice is confusing or inappropriate for the task. |
| **Format: Basic MLA format, 500 words/2 double-spaced pages** | Basic MLA format was followed. The heading is correct, the review is in 12pt, Times New Roman font, and the student's last name and page number is in the upper right corner. Review is close to 500 words or 2 double-spaced pages. | For the most part, basic MLA format was used. There may have been just a few minor errors in format, such as font or font size. However, all major components of the heading are present. Review is either somewhat short or somewhat long; it is either closer to 370 words (1.5 double-spaced pages) or closer to 625 words (2.5 double spaced pages). | Basic MLA format was not followed. A significant number of the following were incorrect or missing: 12pt, Times New Roman font, 1 inch margins, and title. The heading was missing the student's name, the date, the teacher's name (Ms. Davis), the class, and the student last name & page number in upper right corner. Review is significantly short or significantly long; it is either around 250 words or less (1 double-spaced page) or around 750 words (3 double-spaced pages). |
| **Mechanics: Grammar, Punctuation, and Spelling** | Review is free from errors in grammar and spelling. There may or may not be some minor errors in advanced punctuation rules. Reading is not impaired due to punctuation errors, if any. | Review has some minor errors in grammar, punctuation, or spelling. Most are in advanced grammar, but there may be a couple errors in basic grammar. Reading is not impaired due to errors. | Review has significant errors in grammar, punctuation, and/or spelling. Errors are in basic rules. Reading is impaired due to errors. |
| **Total Points:** | 5 x \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_ | 4 x \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_ | (3-0) x \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_ |