

I. Paper Mechanics

	0-1 Points	2 Points	3 Points	4 points	5 Points
Spelling and Grammar	The student needs to consult writing tutors for help with writing mechanics.	The paper contains at least two grammatical and/or spelling errors that prevent a reader from understanding the author's thesis.	The paper contains grammatical and/or spelling errors that make reading at least one paragraph difficult. One or two sentences may be ambiguous in ways that compromise clarity.	The paper contains more than two small spelling and/or grammatical mistakes. However, such mistakes do not detract from ability of the paper to be understood and/or read without difficulty.	The paper is largely free of spelling and/or grammatical errors. No more than two small mistakes are present.

	0 Points	1-2 Points	3 Points	4 points	5 Points
Citations and Quotations	No citations or quotations present.	-The paper contains three or more errors with respect to the criteria outlined in the "5 point" column.	-The paper contains at least two errors with respect to the criteria outlined in the "5 point" column.	-The paper contains at least one error with respect to the criteria outlined in the "5 point" column.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - All controversial interpretative claims are supported by quotations. -All quotations contain citations to appropriate page numbers within the text. -Paraphrased sections of the text are cited (you may cite the page numbers at the end of a paragraph). -A reference section is present that indicates all secondary literature that was consulted (if any). -Quotations are not used to bolster uncontroversial interpretative claims.

	0-3 Points	4-5 Points	6 Points	7-8 points	9-10 points
Opening Paragraph	The opening paragraph could be deleted without compromising the quality of the paper.	-The outline of the paper is missing. -There is no relevant background information that helps one understand the argument of the paper.	The outline of the paper is missing and the background is vague, but appropriate. The opening paragraph may also contain other unnecessary elements.	One of the following: -The outline is unclear, or -Background provided is either vague/overly- general, or insufficient to provide context for the thesis. -The opening paragraph contains information other than an outline of the paper and a brief explanation of the intellectual background.	-Clearly outlines of contents of the remainder of the paper. -Briefly explains necessary background to understand the paper. -Nothing other than an outline of the paper and a brief explanation of the intellectual background is present.

	0-1 Points	2 Points	3 Points	4 points	5 Points
Style	The paper is very difficult to read in virtue of excessively long sentences, inappropriate word choice, and unnecessary abstraction.	Exactly four sentences fail to satisfy the criteria in the “5 points” column.	Exactly three sentences fail to satisfy the criteria in the “5 points” column.	Exactly two sentences fail to satisfy the criteria in the “5 points” column.	- Sentences are concise. - Sentence structure is varied. - No unnecessary adverbs or adjectives are present. -Abstract concepts are explained using concrete examples.

	0-1 Points	2 Points	3 Points	4 Points	5 points
Defining terms and word choice	<p>Both of the following obtains:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> -Two or more central philosophical terms are undefined or unexplained. - Two or more errors concerning non-philosophical word choice. 	<p>At least one of the following obtains:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> -Two or more central philosophical terms are undefined or unexplained. -Two or more errors concerning non-philosophical word choice. 	<p>Both of the following obtain:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> -One central philosophical term is undefined. -Exactly two errors concerning non-philosophical word choice. 	<p>Exactly one of the following obtains:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> -One central philosophical term is undefined or is defined incorrectly. -Exactly two errors concerning non-philosophical word choice. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> -All technical philosophical terminology is correctly defined or explained in everyday English. -Examples are used to illustrate philosophical concepts. -Non-philosophical terms are used correctly and precisely throughout the paper. -The same word is used to denote the same concept throughout the paper (i.e., writer does not use a thesaurus needlessly).

II. Paper Substance

	0-11 Points	12-13 Points	14-15 Points	16-17 Points	18-20 Points
Summary	Several errors of the types enumerated in the column to the right.	<p>-The paper does not address all elements of the prompt.</p> <p>AND</p> <p>The paper does not explain how various parts of the two-sphere system and Aristotle's theory follow (logically or with high probability) from one another.</p>	<p>-The paper addresses all elements of the prompt.</p> <p>AND</p> <p>The paper does not explain how various parts of the two-sphere system and Aristotle's theory follow (logically or with high probability) from one another.</p> <p>AND</p> <p>Any of the following: -The paper fails to identify obvious implicit premises necessary to render the argument valid or strong.</p> <p>-The paper fails to explain how various claims in the argument follow from one another.</p> <p>-The paper contains at least one paragraph irrelevant to the prompt.</p>	<p>-The paper addresses all elements of the prompt.</p> <p>-The paper explains how various parts of the two-sphere system and Aristotle's theory follow (logically or with high probability) from one another.</p> <p>-Any of the following errors: The paper does not identify implicit hypotheses necessary to explain the motion of the stars, sun, etc.</p> <p>-The paper does not distinguish implicit from explicit hypotheses, or</p> <p>-The paper contains one or two sentences that are irrelevant.</p> <p>-The student does not distinguish his or her own ideas from those of Aristotle, Kuhn etc.</p>	<p>-The paper addresses all elements of the prompt.</p> <p>-The paper explains how various parts of the two-sphere system and Aristotle's theory follow (logically or with high probability) from one another.</p> <p>-The paper identifies implicit hypotheses (i.e., those not stated by Aristotle or Kuhn) necessary to explain the motion of the stars, sun, etc.</p> <p>-The paper distinguishes implicit from explicit hypotheses, and</p> <p>-The paper does not contain any paragraphs irrelevant to the prompt. In particular, the paper does not criticize Aristotle's theory or the two-sphere systems.</p> <p>-The student distinguishes his or her own ideas and theses from those of Aristotle, Kuhn etc.</p>

III. Additional Criteria:

A. Students also have the chance to earn points not specified in the above rubric. There are several ways a student may do so.

1. Novelty (up to 10pts) – The paper contains any of the following: (i) a novel example illustrating some thesis or term, or (iii) a novel analogy between two theories, arguments, or concepts.
2. Substantial additional research (up to 5pts) – The paper successfully uses theories, arguments, and/or concepts introduced in academic articles other than those discussed in class. Students should typically consult me before employing additional research, as additional research **ought not replace** a thorough discussion of the assigned readings.

B. Papers may be penalized even if they meet the above criteria. Again, there are at least two common sources of penalties:

1. Digressions - Papers that contain irrelevant material (i.e., digressions) or that fail to address aspects of the prompt can expect large deductions. Depending upon how far a student digresses from the assigned prompt, I may fail a paper regardless of whether its content is otherwise very good. For example, if the prompt asks you to discuss Hume's argument that *p* and the majority of your paper discusses the historical background to Hume's writing of the *Treatise on Human Nature*, you ought to expect large deductions. If your paper only tangentially discusses Hume, then your paper may receive a failing grade, regardless of how brilliant it is otherwise.
2. Overly-aggressive, arrogant, and/or otherwise unprofessional tone – Do not call authors “stupid”; do not call their arguments “incoherent” or “utterly incomprehensible.” Use terms that are precise and less aggressive. You may say an argument is “invalid”, “unsound”, or “fallacious”; you may say two premises “contradict” or “are in tension.” These phrases convey there is a problem with an argument without insulting an author.