Your name: Zayla Crocker

Hyperlink to the draft under review:

https://docs.google.com/document/d/1ZQE06WruneppnCLxeyc -ECCjCmWmcgZd jte5v5NxPg/edit

Audience

argumen	ctively do yo t being mad seems to be	e, on a scal						ader the
12	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
Totally			Moderatel	y			Ext	remely
ineffective)	effective					ef	fective

If you give a score higher than 5 and you cannot cite at least THREE specific details from the draft to justify that score, I'm going to deduct one point from YOUR peer review grade for Deadline 12. If you give a score lower than 5 and can cite TWO specific things the writer needs to work on for this category, I'll award you an extra point towards YOUR peer review grade for Deadline 12. If your overall peer review grade for this assignment exceeds 20, I'll apply the additional points towards recent missing and/or low-rated blog posts. I reserve the right not to award points for under-explained or banal feedback.

Your rating for audience: 5

Please explain the reason for your score in at least 3 to 5 clear sentences. Cite specific details from the rough draft to explain your score:

Considering that your audience are city council officials I think you directed your tone in the appropriate professional fashion that would be suited for addressing this particular audience. However on the subject of persuading them to your side it doesn't seem you bring up new information . For example in your essay you recognized that Tucson is the one of the leading cities for water conservation practices , If Tucson is, wouldn't' they already be aware it? I think on the topic of persuasion you might want to leave that part out and focus on the strengthening the conservation part , not on what Tucson already does and what the officials already know.

Purpose
What kind of public argument do you think this is? Check one (and only one) of the argument types below: This argument establishes an original pro position on an issue of debate. This argument establishes an original con position on an issue of debate. This argument clarifies the causes for a problem that is being debated. This argument proposes a solution for a problem that is being debated. This argument positively evaluates a specific solution or policy under debate (and clearly identifies the idea I'm supporting). X This argument openly refutes a specific solution or policy under debate (and clearly identifies the idea I'm refuting). How effectively do you feel this draft achieves the purpose for the argument type you identified above, on a scale of 1 to 10? Refer back to the type descriptions in the instructions for Blog Post 10.7 if needed.
12345678910 Totally Moderately Extremely ineffective effective effective
If you give a score higher than 5 and you cannot cite at least THREE specific details from the draft to justify that score, I'm going to deduct one point from YOUR peer review grade for Deadline 12. If you give a score lower than 5 and can cite TWO specific things the writer needs to work on for this category, I'll award you an extra point towards YOUR peer review grade for Deadline 12. If your overall peer review grade for this assignment exceeds 20, I'll apply the additional points towards recent missing and/or low-rated blog posts. I reserve the right not to award points for under-explained or banal feedback.
Your rating for purpose:4_ Please explain the reason for your score in at least 3 to 5 clear sentences. Cite specific details from the rough draft to explain your score:

I can clearly see that you're refuting the original water conservation plans however because of the example of recognizing Tucson's achievement in water conservation practices as well "Tucon government is responsible for much of the great work that has already been done to promote conservation." I feel as if acknowledging these things undermines your argument of making the residents more responsible, and I think you should focus more on that particular idea.

Argumentation

Refresh your memory about the three different kinds of rhetorical strategies we read about for Project 2: Emotional appeals, Ethical or credibility-building appeals, and Logical or rational appeals.

How effectively do you feel this draft uses rhetoric to make its argument? This might mean balancing different kinds of appeals, doubling down on one category or something else. There's lots and lots of different ways authors can use these strategies... So, what do you think of how this draft made use of these three categories of appeals, on a scale of 1 to 10?

12	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
Totally		1	Moderatel	ly			Ext	remely
ineffective			effective				eff	ective

If you give a score higher than 5 and you cannot cite at least THREE specific details from the draft to justify that score, I'm going to deduct one point from YOUR peer review grade for Deadline 12. If you give a score lower than 5 and can cite TWO specific things the writer needs to work on for this category, I'll award you an extra point towards YOUR peer review grade for Deadline 12. If your overall peer review grade for this assignment exceeds 20, I'll apply the additional points towards recent missing and/or low-rated blog posts. I reserve the right not to award points for under-explained or banal feedback.

Your rating for argumentation: ____4_

Please explain the reason for your score in at least 3 to 5 clear sentences. Cite specific details from the rough draft to explain your score:

I feel as if you relied on mostly logical appeals in your argument but also used some emotional appeals as well. I thought your use of comparing Arizona to California's drought situation as well as listing logical reasons why the current methods wouldn't be effective for future use were effective logical appeals. ALthough you didn't use a lot of emotional appeal, I thought it was clever to state that we shouldn't wait for apocalyptic conditions, because that would make a reader think and feel scared for the future. I think using more emotional appeal to paint a picture of the future if we don't use your conservation methods would make for a better arguement.

Genre

You will need to read/look at the hyperlinked examples in the student author's Blog Post 11.3 in order to rate this category.

How effectively do you feel this draft follows the genre conventions established by the examples they linked us to in Blog Post 11.3, on a scale of 1 to 10? Try to keep in mind that this is about how well this draft would fit - visually and tonally - on the specific website the student author is designing their argument for.

12	3	45	6	7	8	9	-10
Totally		Moderat	ely			Extrem	nely
ineffective		effectiv	ve e			effect	tive

If you give a score higher than 5 and you cannot cite at least THREE specific details from the draft to justify that score, I'm going to deduct one point from YOUR peer review grade for Deadline 12. If you give a score lower than 5 and can cite TWO specific things the writer needs to work on for this category, I'll award you an extra point towards YOUR peer review grade for Deadline 12. If your overall peer review grade for this assignment exceeds 20, I'll apply the additional points towards recent missing and/or low-rated blog posts. I reserve the right not to award points for under-explained or banal feedback.

Vour	ratina	for	conro:	1
Your	rating	IOT	genre:	4

Please explain the reason for your score in at least 3 to 5 clear sentences. Cite specific details from the rough draft to explain your score:

Г