REVIEW ESSAY ASSIGNMENT

PURPOSE
Whether we realize it or not, we are constantly evaluating different things we use, see, hear, experience, etc. Reviewing the things we evaluate is taking it a step, or two, further. At the heart of review – as a form or genre – is the act of evaluation based on criteria and evidence in order to make a judgment. While it begins with our initial feelings about something, it’s important to keep an open mind despite our opinions. As the author of the review, you must balance feelings (which come first) with support and evidence.

ESSAY ASSIGNMENT
For this project, you will be reviewing anything you so wish, writing an evaluation, and presenting your findings to the class.

APPROACHES (“Evaluation involves four things” page 156 and “Methods of Development” on 184)
“The key is that you evaluate something that interests you but also might matter to someone else” (Ballenger 160).

- Decide what you’d like to review (see Subject Matter on page 160)
  - A product
  - An advertisement or infomercial
  - A movie, book, album, or video game
  - An actor’s or athlete’s performance
  - A website or app

- Create the set of evaluation criteria (page 177)
  - What reasons do people have for making judgments about what you’re reviewing?
    - Ask classmates
    - Do some preliminary background research
  - Be as specific and thorough as possible
  - Remember that “a review is an evaluation for an audience” (Ballenger 156), so make sure your criteria are based on the sentiments of the masses, not just your own.

- Make your judgment
  - Based on your feelings AND evaluation criteria, do you think it’s “good or bad, useful or not useful, relevant or not relevant, convincing or not convincing, worth doing or not worth doing – or perhaps somewhere in between” (Ballenger 156)?

- Gather other necessary or relevant information and evidence to support your reasons and judgments to make your evaluation persuasive
  - Specific details
  - Observations
  - Facts

PRESENTATION REQUIREMENTS
- Your name
- Your topic
- Why your audience should care about it
- The evaluation criteria you used
- How you developed the evaluation criteria
- The results of your review
- One discovery you found most interesting (about the subject or your own feelings)
- Include images of the subject of your review

LOGISTICS
Paper: Due dates: Draft Final
Length: 3 pages, double-spaced
Format: Standard MLA format and heading, 1 inch margins, 12 pt. Times New Roman font, no cover page (See MLA format in AWR, pages 324-328)
Sources: Research, observations, interviews, etc.
Turn your paper in with the following work, stapled in the order the items appear:
1. Grading rubric
2. Assignment sheet
3. Typed final draft
4. Typed peer-workshop rough draft (actual draft used during the workshop)
5. Evidence of the writing process

Presentation: Date:
Length: 3-4 minutes
Format: PowerPoint or Prezi presentation or video (See me if you have another idea)
Sources: Your paper
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CRITERIA</th>
<th>Exemplary (14)</th>
<th>Average (13)</th>
<th>Adequate (12)</th>
<th>Inadequate (10)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>FOCUS/ PURPOSE (Thesis)</strong></td>
<td>The reason/point for writing paper is very strong as shown through the thesis</td>
<td>Reason/point for writing paper is clear as shown through the thesis</td>
<td>Reason/point for writing the paper is discernable</td>
<td>Reason/point for writing paper unclear</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>COHERENCE and ORGANIZATION</strong></td>
<td>Strong, clearly relevant and coherent development and progression of ideas within and between body paragraphs through use of topic sentences, support, and transitions</td>
<td>Relevant and logical development of supporting points within and between body paragraphs through use of topic sentences and transitions</td>
<td>Mostly relevant and logical development of supporting points within and between body paragraphs through use of topic sentences and transitions</td>
<td>Inadequate or irrelevant development and weak coherence, lacking topic sentences, support, and/or transitions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>ELEMENTS of REVIEW</strong></td>
<td>Strong, correct, and effective use of description, backstory, judgments, reasons/evidence, criteria, comparisons.</td>
<td>Clear, correct, and effective use of description, backstory, judgments, reasons/evidence, criteria, comparisons.</td>
<td>Reasonable, mostly correct, and relatively effective use of description, backstory, judgments, reasons/evidence, criteria, comparisons.</td>
<td>Weak, incorrect, and/or ineffective use of description, backstory, judgments, reasons/evidence, criteria, comparisons.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>GRAMMAR, USAGE, MECHANICS</strong></td>
<td>Few grammatical errors and well-developed style</td>
<td>Few grammatical errors and undeveloped style</td>
<td>Many grammatical errors, and undeveloped style</td>
<td>Serious grammatical errors, obscuring meaning, and weak sense of style</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>MLA DOCUMENTATION</strong></td>
<td>Minimal errors in MLA formatting, documentation, and analysis of source materials.</td>
<td>Few errors in MLA formatting, documentation, and analysis of source materials.</td>
<td>Some errors in MLA formatting, documentation, and incorporation of source materials.</td>
<td>Serious errors in MLA formatting, documentation, and incorporation of source materials.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>EVIDENCE of RECURSIVE WRITING</strong></td>
<td>Strong evidence of the writing process and effective revision</td>
<td>Good evidence of the writing process and revision</td>
<td>Some evidence of the evidence of the writing process and some revision</td>
<td>Little evidence of the writing process and/or revision</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>PRESENTATION</strong></td>
<td>All criteria met</td>
<td>Most criteria met</td>
<td>Some criteria met</td>
<td>Few criteria met</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>