

		<b>High Distinction (80-100)</b>	<b>Distinction (70-79)</b>	<b>Credit (60-69)</b>	<b>Pass (50-59)</b>	<b>Not Pass + (45-49) Not pass (&lt;45)</b>
<b>Argument</b>	<b>Argument</b>	Thoughtful and nuanced argument is put forward and supported through essay.	Clear argument consistently supported.	Argument is stated, but not always clearly or consistently.	Some attempt to make an argument.	No overall argument.
	<b>Evidence</b>	Excellent use of ACS CoE and other references to reinforce individual points & overall argument. Additional references not in list provided with the essay description. Low quality references avoided were possible.	Good use of ACS CoE and other references to reinforce individual points & overall argument.	Adequate use of ACS CoE and other references to reinforce individual points & overall argument.	Inadequate use of ACS CoE and other references to reinforce individual points & overall argument.	Little or no use of ACS CoE and other references to reinforce individual points & overall argument.
<b>Structure</b>	<b>Introduction</b>	An engaging opening that draws reader into the essay. Defines/references domain-specific terms used in the essay. Articulates a thesis/domain of discussion.	Defines domain-specific terms used in the essay. Articulates a thesis/domain of discussion.	Some indication of the argument of essay; not all material is essential in setting up argument. Terms being used without definition	Indicates topic, but does not outline argument of essay.	No statement of argument or topic of the essay.
	<b>Body</b>	Each paragraph makes a point, clearly articulated in the first sentence(s) and supported; each paragraph's point is clearly delineated; one paragraph follows logically from the other. Clever, strategic use of headings.	Paragraphs are well delineated, topics clearly stated, internally coherent.	Recognisable paragraphs that are thematically organised.	Paragraphing hard to follow, with very long or short paragraphs; other problems with logical flow of information.	Little use of paragraphs to structure information; hard to tell why one sentence follows another.
<b>Expression and referencing</b>	<b>Clarity</b>	Eloquently written, logical flow of information, absence of unnecessary jargon.	Well-written and easy to read.	Reasonably clearly written.	Difficult to read, awkward sentences.	Incoherent.
	<b>Mechanics</b>	Free of grammar and spelling mistakes. Serif font, 1½ or double spaced.	Very few errors.	Several errors.	Many errors, requires better proof reading.	Unacceptable number of errors.
	<b>Referencing</b>	Correct Harvard or similar and consistently applied.	Very few errors or inconsistencies.	Several errors or inconsistencies.	Major flaws.	Missing or inadequate.

This rubric is for a review-style paper rather than a paper developing a particular thesis, i.e. the exploration of a topic. Main thing is that the review is well written and links into the ACS Code of Ethics/Code of Professional Conduct as its intellectual framework. The suggested weighting is: Quality of Discussion/Argument (40%), Quality of Expression/Grammar (40%), Formatting, Reference style, spelling, minor grammar, esp. punctuation (20%)