

EDES101 Assessment Task 2 rubric

	High Distinction	Distinction	Credit	Pass	Not satisfactory
Thesis (10 points)	8.5-10 A clear statement of the main conclusion of the paper.	7.5-8 The thesis fails to capture a small part of the main point of the paper.	6.5-7 The thesis fails to capture a significant part of the main point of the paper.	5-6 The main point of the paper is obvious by the end, but there is no single clear statement of it	0-4.5 The main point of the paper is not obvious by the end, or there is no single main point
Accuracy (10 points)	8.5-10 Demonstrates a correct and illuminating description of the idea under discussion.	7.5-8 Demonstrates a correct but simplistic description of the idea under discussion	6.5-7 Contains a few mistakes about the idea under discussion that nonetheless allows for substantive engagement with the material	5-6 Contains serious mistakes about the idea under discussion that nonetheless allows for some engagement with the material	0-4.5 Contains serious mistakes about the idea under discussion that prevent serious engagement with the material
Argument (Part I) (40 points)	34-40 The paper identifies a philosophical mistake in the idea under discussion: counterexamples to an assumption, or a plausible principle that conflicts with it, or similar.	30-33.5 The paper identifies something that has the potential to be a philosophical mistake in the argument but does not fully describe the nature of the mistake	26-29.5 The paper identifies something that has the potential to be a philosophical mistake in the argument but does not describe the nature of the mistake in enough detail to let the reader fully tell whether a mistake has been made	20-25.5 The paper exhibits a misunderstanding of the argument in criticizing it that nonetheless allows for some engagement with the material	0-19.5 The paper exhibits a misunderstanding of the argument in criticizing it that prevents serious engagement with the material
Anticipating the original author's response (Part II) (15 points)	13-15 The paper considers responses that the original author would give to answer the criticism that you developed in Part I.	11.5-12.5 The paper considers responses that the original author would make to your Part I, without fully describing the nature of the problem that the response identifies	10-11 The paper considers responses that the original author would make to your Part I that have the potential to be a philosophical mistake, but does not describe the nature of the problem in enough detail to let the reader fully tell whether a mistake has been made	7.5-9.5 The paper only identifies philosophical problems with obvious answers	0-7 The paper considers responses that the original author would not make.
Discussion of the author's response (Part III) (15 points)	13-15 The paper gives a genuine philosophical answer that identifies a philosophical mistake in the response in Part II	11.5-12.5 The paper gives a philosophical answer to the author's response in Part II without fully describing the nature of the mistake made in the author's response in Part II.	10-11 The paper gives a genuine philosophical answer to the author's response in Part II, but without describing the mistake in enough detail to let the reader fully tell whether a mistake has been made	7.5-9.5 The paper only makes obvious points in answering the author's response.	0-7 Misunderstandings in previous sections of the paper prevent engagement with the author's argument.
Clarity/Style (10 points)	8.5-10 All sentences are complete and grammatical. All words are chosen for their precise meanings. All new or unusual terms are well-defined. Key concepts and theories are accurately and completely explained. Good, clear examples are used to illuminate concepts and issues. Information (names, facts, etc.) is accurate. Paper has been spell-checked and proofread, and has no errors, and no rhetorical questions.	7.5-8 All sentences are complete and grammatical. Most words are chosen for their precise meanings. Most new or unusual terms are well-defined. Key concepts and theories are explained. Examples are clear. Information (names, facts, etc.) is accurate. Paper has been spell-checked and proofread, and has very few errors, and no rhetorical questions.	6.5-7 A few sentences are incomplete and/or ungrammatical. Words are not chosen for their precise meanings. New or unusual terms are not well-defined. Key concepts and theories are not explained. Examples are not clear. Information (names, facts, etc.) is mostly accurate. Paper has several spelling errors and no rhetorical questions.	5-6 Many sentences are incomplete and/or ungrammatical. The author does not acknowledge that key words have precise meanings. Information (names, facts, etc.) is inaccurate. Paper has many spelling errors, or a rhetorical question.	0-4.5 Enough sentences are incomplete and/or ungrammatical that it is sometimes difficult to tell what the author is arguing.