

Book Review Rubric

	<b>4-Highly Competent</b>	<b>3-Competent</b>	<b>2-Minimally Competent</b>	<b>1-Not Competent</b>
<b>Thesis</b>	Clearly identifies and critically evaluates the author's central argument, purpose, and approach to the subject	Identifies but not does not critically evaluate the author's central argument, purpose, and approach to the subject	Identified a few main ideas but not the thesis	Is unaware of the author's thesis or the purpose of the book. The review is descriptive but not analytical
<b>Organization</b>	The review is exceptionally well organized with an introduction, body, and conclusion and follows the thesis throughout	The review is reasonably well organized	The view has a semblance of structure but its coherence is minimized by poor organization	The review is disorganized and incoherent
<b>Development</b>	A general analysis of the salient features of the book, as opposed to a general summary, and identifies the development of the author's thesis throughout the book	Demonstrates knowledge of the topic and provides supporting evidence and adequate detail	Minimal analysis, is repetitious, or and lacks development of salient features of the book being reviewed	No analysis, but merely a description of summary of the book's content
<b>Style</b>	Sophisticated sentence structure and paragraph development	Effective Use of Language	Simplistic sentence structure and imprecise use of language	Incorrect sentence structure and use of slang, jargon, or inappropriate language
<b>Mechanics</b>	The mechanics of the paper are correct. It is well written with no grammar or punctuation errors, and little or no use of the passive voice	Few errors	Errors are present that interfere with the presentation of ideas and arguments	Excessive errors in grammar and punctuation.

Total Points: \_\_\_\_\_