

<i>Grammar & writing</i>	<i>Connection to the UN</i>	<i>Preambulatory part reflects thorough research/understanding</i>	<i>Operative part thoroughly explained</i>	<i>Innovative thinking & problem solving</i>
<p>5: No mistakes; very well written.</p> <p>Excellent use of preambulatory and operative clauses and format is precise.</p>	<p>5: The UN could/would truly address this issue.</p>	<p>5: Evidence of great understanding and explanation of the problem/issue.</p> <p>Includes thorough definitions, facts, statistics, past UN efforts and how it might be solved based on statistics and facts.</p>	<p>5: Resolution explains who is involved (UN agency), what needs to be done and how.</p> <p>Time and money constraints detailed.</p> <p>Plan refers to problem/issue.</p>	<p>5: Creative and innovative thinking evident in plan of action.</p> <p>Solution is reasonably possible.</p>
<p>3: A few mistakes; needs more polishing.</p> <p>Some preambulatory and operative clauses misused and format is not precise.</p>	<p>3: The UN might address this issue it were more focused, less region specific or better tied to a UN purpose.</p>	<p>3: Uses a combination of facts, statistics and generalities to explain the problem and how it might be solved.</p>	<p>3: Resolution includes some but not all of these parts: UN agency involved, what to be done, money, time constraints.</p> <p>Plan echoes problem/issue.</p>	<p>3: Plan of action is effective but typical.</p> <p>Solution is somewhat possible.</p>
<p>1: So many mistakes that it's distracting. Preambulatory and operative clauses need to connect better to the sentences and the format needs correction.</p>	<p>1: Not an issue the UN would address.</p>	<p>1: Very little evidence of understanding and/or research on the issue.</p>	<p>1: Plan is vague and expresses more hope than concrete ideas.</p>	<p>1: Nothing creative or innovative in the plan.</p>

Scale: 5 = best 3= fair 1=poor