

MESSAGE CLAIM

- ♥ properly highlighted & well-integrated
- ♡ functional - but either poorly integrated or mishighlighted
- OK a bit janky but acceptable
- HL errors with highlighting
- RS not adequately restated
- NC not your central claim
- SM claim in intro is simple, not complex (no sub. con.)
- CD claim in intro is compound, not complex
- PR 1st/2nd person pronouns in claim
- AWK awkward phrasing weakens claim
- CS claim is in a comma splice
- RU claim is in a run-on
- FR claim is either not structured as a clause or is trapped in a sentence fragment
- PL plot mixed into claim
- ? no highlighted claim present in this paragraph
- X not a theme claim
- BS be specific (claim too vague)
- circles to indicate something specifically out-of-whack

AUTHORIAL CHOICES

- ★ full author + verb + feature fully highlighted
- LPT author verb is past tense
- △ missing author, verb, and/or feature
- HL → highlighting errors
- ...
- OK → phrasing isn't ideal, but it counts

COMMENTARY

- no marks = good!
- missed opportunity to comment on evidence
- SW "so what?" - how does this develop theme?
- ... more commentary needed here
- 😊 exceptionally convincing elaboration that pulls readers into your line of reasoning
- IA inaccurate to plot

QUOTATIONS

- # ✓ successfully woven & cited quotation (numbered 1-6)
- MQ misquoted
- NW not smoothly woven in
- PR 1st/2nd p. pronouns
- SB sentence break within quote
- QF quotation misformatted
- AWK awkward phrasing breaks weaving
- FR sentence fragment
- CS comma splice
- RU run-on sentence
- CP citation misplaced
- CF citation misformatted
- IR quotation irrelevant to choice/claim
- NC not cited
- BS be more specific by giving context
- Ⓢ exceptionally smooth, masterful weaving
- LPT not literary present tense

MECHANICS

- no marks = good!
- circles to draw attention
- FR sentence fragment
- CS comma splice
- RU run-on
- VT verb tense screwed up

- OK → wacky, but I counted it
- (V) →
- problem area

CONTEXT → no marks = good!

- missing element (plot summary, broader context, author first name, contextual information)
- title not italicized or underlined. (not both)
- ... more needed (inadequate specificity or depth of context)
- HL highlighting problems
- FR sentence fragment makes context unclear
- X → see me?

MLA FORMAT

- no marks = good!
- various circles & arrows to indicate missing/out-of-whack elements or misalignments
- ↖ inaccuracies with provided context of quotation