

Sample Syllabus

PHL 358 Social and Political Philosophy

Course Information

Class meetings.	Wednesdays and Fridays, 12:30-1:45 pm
Instructor.	Dr. Kevin Graham, Timms Magis Core Curriculum Professor
Instructor's email address.	kgraham@creighton.edu
Instructor's office address.	Dowling Hall, Humanities Center, room 115
Instructor's office hours.	M W R F 2:00-2:50 pm, or by appointment
Instructor's office phone.	(402) 280-1219

Course Description

“Critical study of classical and contemporary theories concerning the nature and value of social and political institutions such as the state, the family, and civil society. Examination of the nature and application of political ideals such as justice, freedom, equality, and community.” ([Creighton University Catalog: Undergraduate Issue](#))

Course Learning Objectives

By the end of the semester, you will be able to:

1. Identify and define terms and concepts that are crucial to social and political philosophy.
2. Analyze and evaluate some contrasting approaches to a fundamental problem in social and political philosophy.
3. Formulate and defend a position of your own about the nature of social justice.
4. Express the virtues of humility, respectfulness, good judgment, courage and perseverance in your written work.
5. Use technology effectively for research, analysis, communication, and collaborative work.
6. Recognize that technology and the digitization of knowledge are powerful tools and will identify potential dangers concerning reliability, privacy, security, and equity.

Fit to Core and Mission.

This course satisfies the Designated Technology course requirement of the Magis Core Curriculum. The Jesuit tradition of liberal education is rooted in the goal of preparing graduates to engage the world as insightful, creative, and ethical citizens. To engage and lead in this information age, graduates must be well versed in technology. Such engagement and leadership require a basic understanding of the power and limitations of information technology, as well as the ability to apply appropriate tools technology of information technology to solving problems. The group research project requires students to

demonstrate the ability to utilize tools of information technology to search for and evaluate primary and secondary sources for research and to collaborate on the presentation of what they learn from these sources. The individual reflection essay about the group research project also requires students to reflect on the power of the tools of information technology and the potential hazards of these tools concerning reliability, privacy, security, and equity.

Required Course Texts

Goodin, Robert E., and Pettit, Philip, eds., *Contemporary Political Philosophy: An Anthology*, second ed. (Malden, Mass.: Blackwell, 2006). ISBN 1-4051-3065-2.

Abelson, Hal, Ken Ledeen, and Harry Lewis, *Blown to Bits: Your Life, Liberty, and Happiness after the Digital Explosion* (Upper Saddle River, N. J.: Addison-Wesley, 2008). ISBN 978-0-13-713559-2. Available for download as a PDF file through the BlueLine site for the course.

Martinich, A. P. *Philosophical Writing: An Introduction*, third ed. (Malden, Mass.: Blackwell, 2005). ISBN 978-1-4051-3167-4.

Grading Scheme

Requirement	Weight
One major essay of approximately 2000 words in length that articulates and defends a thesis about a problem in the field of social and political philosophy.	30%
One seminar essay of approximately 1250 words in length, which analyzes and evaluates the argument of one of the assigned readings about a problem in the field of social and political philosophy.	15%
One response essay of approximately 500 words in length, which analyzes and evaluates the position and argument expressed in a fellow student's seminar essay.	10%
One group research project on one assigned reading for the course, including: a. a group oral presentation about the assigned reading (worth 5%); b. a group slideshow to accompany the group oral presentation (worth 5%); c. a group annotated bibliography of primary and secondary sources to accompany the group oral presentation (worth 5%); and d. an individual reflection essay about the use of information technology in the group research project (worth 5%).	20%
One final examination	10%
Participation in class discussions	10%
Quizzes on the course readings	5%

Grading Scale

Grade	Percentage Range
A	90-100%
B+	85-89%
B	80-84%
C+	75-79%
C	70-74%
D	60-69%
F	0-59%

Course Requirements

Major Essay

You will compose one major essay of approximately 2000 words in length on a topic of your choice in the field of social and political philosophy. The major essay assignment is designed to measure the extent to which you have fulfilled [Course Learning Objectives 3 and 4](#). The major essay assignment will require you to identify a topic in social and political philosophy, to analyze and evaluate at least one philosopher's position and supporting argument about the topic, and to formulate and defend your own thesis about the topic. As part of the writing process, you will be required to submit a topic statement, an outline, and a draft in advance of the final version of your essay. For more details about the major essay assignment, please consult the major essay handout that is available on [the BlueLine site for the course](#).

Research Group Seminars

Seminar Essay

You will compose one seminar essay of approximately 1250 words in length on an [assigned reading for the course](#). The seminar essay assignment is designed to measure the extent to which you have fulfilled [Course Learning Objectives 2 and 4](#). The twofold goal of the seminar essay is (1) to summarize the overall argument of the assigned reading that is the topic of the essay and (2) to evaluate critically some part of the overall argument of the assigned reading. Your seminar essay will be the subject of a seminar discussion in the research group to which you will be assigned in class. You will submit each of your seminar essays to Dr. Graham and to the other members of your research group via email at least three days prior to the class meeting in which the seminar discussion of your seminar essay is scheduled to take place. One of your fellow students in your research group will prepare a response essay about your seminar essay, which he or she will read aloud at the beginning of your research group's seminar discussion of your seminar essay. After your fellow student has read her or his response essay, you will have the opportunity to respond orally to it. Then your research group will discuss your seminar essay and the response essay together. After the research group seminar, you will have the opportunity to revise your seminar essay in light of the response essay about it and the ensuing discussion in your research group before submitting your seminar essay. For more details about the seminar essay

Updated March 25, 2016

assignment and a schedule of the due dates and topics for your seminar essays, please consult the seminar essay handout that is available on [the BlueLine site for the course](#).

Response Essay

You will compose one response essay of approximately 500 words in length on a seminar essay composed by a fellow student in your research group. The response essay assignment is designed to help you to fulfill [Course Learning Objectives 2 and 4](#). The goal of the response essay is to evaluate critically either your fellow student's interpretation of the overall argument of the assigned reading or your fellow student's critical evaluation of some part of the overall argument of the assigned reading. You should receive your fellow student's essay via email at least three days prior to the beginning of the class meeting in which the seminar discussion of your fellow student's seminar essay is scheduled to take place. You will compose your response essay and present it orally at the beginning of your research group's seminar discussion of your fellow student's seminar essay. After you have read your response essay, your fellow student will have the opportunity to respond orally to it. Then your research group will discuss your fellow student's seminar essay and your response essay together. After the research group seminar, you will have the opportunity to revise your response essay in light of the discussion in your research group before submitting your response essay. For more details about the response essay assignment and a schedule of the due dates and topics for your response essays, please consult the response essay handout that will be made available on [the BlueLine site for the course](#) in the third week of the semester.

Group Research Project

Group Annotated Bibliography

Your research group will be assigned to prepare a group annotated bibliography of some critical philosophical literature concerning [the assigned reading](#) that is the topic of your group oral presentation. Your group annotated bibliography is designed to help you fulfill [Course Learning Objective 2](#) and to measure the extent to which you have fulfilled [Course Learning Objective 5](#). Your research group will use the [RefWorks software](#) that is available on [the course guide for PHL 358](#) on the [Reinert Alumni Memorial Library web page](#) to create and edit your group annotated bibliography collaboratively. A link to the course guide for PHL 358 is also available on [the BlueLine site for the course](#). For more information about the group annotated bibliography, please consult the group annotated bibliography assignment handout that will be made available in [the BlueLine site for the course](#) in the fourth week of the semester.

Group Oral Presentation

Your research group will be assigned to make an oral presentation about one of [the assigned readings for the course](#). The group oral presentation is part of the group research project that is designed to help you to fulfill [Course Learning Objectives 2, 5, and 6](#). Your group oral presentation should present a brief overview of the main argument of the assigned reading that is the topic of your presentation and raise some critical questions about the position or supporting argument of the assigned reading that arose from your investigation of the critical philosophical literature about the assigned reading. For more

Updated March 25, 2016

information about the group oral presentation, please consult the group oral presentation assignment handout that is available on [the BlueLine site for the course](#).

Group Slideshow

Your research group will be assigned to prepare a slideshow to accompany your group oral presentation about one [assigned reading for the course](#). The group slideshow is part of the group research project that is designed to help you to fulfill [Course Learning Objectives 2 and 5](#). For more information about the group slideshow, please consult the group slideshow assignment handout that is available on [the BlueLine site for the course](#).

Individual Reflection Essay

Each member of your research group will compose an individual reflection essay about the group oral presentation, the group slideshow, and the group annotated bibliography that are part of the group research project. The reflection essay will require you to reflect on the contributions of each member of your research group to the group research project and on the powers and potential dangers of the computer applications that your group used in preparing its group research project. The individual reflection essay is designed to measure the extent to which you have fulfilled [Course Learning Objective 6](#). For more information about the individual reflection essay, please consult the individual reflection essay assignment handout that will be made available on [the BlueLine site for the course](#) in the fourth week of the semester.

Final Examination

You will write a comprehensive final examination during final exam week. The final examination assignment is designed to measure the extent to which you have fulfilled [Course Learning Objectives 1 and 3](#). The final examination will consist of six short answer questions about some terms and concepts that are crucial to the study of social and political philosophy and one essay question that will ask you to articulate and defend your own view of the nature of social justice. For more information about the final examination, please consult the final examination review sheet that will be made available on [the BlueLine site for the course](#) in the final week of the semester.

Class Participation

You will be required to participate in large and small group discussions. While regular attendance at class meetings is necessary to do well on this component of the marking scheme, it is by no means sufficient. Both active listening to what others are saying and regular voicing of your own views, comments, and questions are expected. This is especially true of your research group seminar discussions, in which you and two or three of your fellow students will have the opportunity to discuss each other's written work in depth and detail. The overall goal of the small and large group discussions is the same, namely, to build a community of inquiry that collaborates to understand better the nature of social justice. You are expected to contribute to building such a community of inquiry by your participation in large group class discussions and research group seminar discussions. The research group seminar discussions are the most important class meetings of the semester for achieving this goal. You help research group seminar discussions to achieve this goal by taking them seriously and engaging in them actively. This is the best way to show that you take your fellow students seriously as scholars.

Updated March 25, 2016

For this reason, if you fail to take your fellow students seriously as scholars by being tardy to or absent from a research group seminar discussion without excuse, then I will penalize your class participation grade by 5% for tardiness or by 10% for absence.

Activities that disrupt class discussions will count against this portion of your mark. Disruptive activities include, but are not limited to, whispering to your neighbor while someone else is talking, interrupting others, arriving late to class or leaving early without permission, sleeping or eating in class, allowing your cell phone to ring during class, sending or reading text messages in class, and using your laptop or tablet computer for a purpose other than making class notes. *If you disrupt a class meeting in any of these ways, I will warn you on the first offense and deduct 10% from the class participation portion of your grade for each subsequent offense.*

Quizzes

Quizzes will be administered in each of NUMBER class meetings. The quizzes are designed to help you to fulfill [Course Learning Objective 1](#). Normally an in-class quiz will consist of four multiple-choice questions covering the key terms, concepts, and ideas presented in the assigned reading for that day's class meeting. The quizzes are intended to determine whether you are reading and understanding the daily reading assignments. In order to help you to read your assignments thoroughly enough to do well on the reading quizzes, I have published lists of reading questions concerning each assigned reading on [the BlueLine site for the course](#). The questions on the reading quizzes will address material covered in the list of reading questions. In order to encourage you to make thorough notes about each assigned reading, I will permit you to use any notes that you have made about the assigned reading, including notes taken on your laptop or tablet computer, as an aid for the quiz covering the assigned reading in question. Viewing anything other than notes that you have taken on your laptop or tablet computer during a quiz will constitute a form of academic dishonesty, and will be punished as such. Reading quizzes are also intended to serve as a deterrent to absenteeism and tardiness. For this reason, if you are absent from or tardy to a class meeting without excuse and you miss a reading quiz as a result, then you cannot make up the quiz and you will receive a grade of 0 for the quiz.

In addition to in-class quizzes, you will be required to complete 9 online quizzes on [the BlueLine site for the course](#). The online quizzes will normally consist of 5 questions covering the course syllabus or the assigned readings from Martinich, *Philosophical Writing*. Each online quiz must be completed within 5 minutes. The dates by which you must complete the online quizzes are listed in the [course schedule](#).

Academic Policies

Academic Integrity

If you receive unauthorized assistance from another student, provide unauthorized assistance to another student, or use an unauthorized aid during a quiz or examination, then you are guilty of cheating, which is a form of academic dishonesty. Depending on the nature and the seriousness of the offense, I will normally penalize acts of cheating either by assigning the offending student a grade of 0 for the quiz or exam or by assigning the offending student a grade of F for the course, consistent with

Updated March 25, 2016

the [university policy on academic honesty](#). Regardless of what penalty I apply, college policy requires that every act of academic dishonesty be documented by a letter placed in the student's permanent academic file in the College of Arts & Sciences that specifies the nature of the offense and the penalty applied.

If you present the words or thoughts of another person as if they were your own, then you are guilty of plagiarism. This is true whether or not you intended to pass off the words or thoughts in question as your own. You are also guilty of plagiarism if you present the same work for credit in two different university courses.

Plagiarism is an extremely serious academic offense. My normal penalty for an act of plagiarism is to assign the offending student a grade of F for the course, although I may assign a lesser penalty, such as a grade of 0 for the assignment, or petition the Dean of Arts & Sciences to assign a greater penalty, such as suspension or expulsion from the university, depending on the severity of the case. No matter what penalty is applied to punish an act of academic dishonesty, [College of Arts & Sciences policy](#) requires that a letter documenting the offense and the penalty applied be placed in the offender's permanent academic file in the college office.

Plagiarism is also relatively easy for the experienced instructor to spot, so it is difficult to get away with. This is especially true in this course, because all of your written work will be submitted through [the BlueLine site for the course](#), where it will be screened for plagiarism by Turnitin.com. Given the severe penalties that you may incur as a result of plagiarism and the high risk of getting caught, it is wise to do all in your power to avoid committing plagiarism knowingly or unknowingly. The best way to avoid plagiarism is to be as thorough as possible in documenting the sources you rely on for the claims you make in your papers. Detailed guidelines for documenting your sources will be supplied on the assignment handouts for each of the essays in this course.

You will submit all of your written work for the course through [the BlueLine site for the course](#), where its originality will be evaluated by Turnitin.com. Once you have submitted a written assignment through BlueLine, you can view a report on its originality. If you have inadvertently incorporated the words or thoughts of another author without attribution, then you can correct your mistake and resubmit your written assignment through BlueLine. I will grade the most recent version of your written assignment that is submitted prior to the assignment deadline.

The most common reasons for plagiarism are (1) carelessness or laziness in providing page references to sources, (2) confusion about just when documentation is and is not required, and (3) feeling overwhelmed or intimidated by the difficulty of an assignment. If you feel prone to any of these feelings, reflect for a minute on the fact that I am highly likely to see right through your attempt to get by without documentation, and consider what the consequences may be if you are caught. And remember, I am always happy to talk to you about any and all issues related to plagiarism, and especially about concerns (2) and (3) listed above.

Academic Integrity Pledge

The students and faculty of the Creighton College of Arts and Sciences comprise an academic community established within the framework of Jesuit ideals and firmly rooted in the concept of integrity. In an effort to instill integrity in those attending this College and to reaffirm its significance along each student's academic journey, the College has set in place an Integrity Pledge. I am asking you to include a signed copy of the Academic Integrity Pledge on the title page of each essay that you write for this course and to sign the copy of the Academic Integrity Pledge that will appear on each quiz and exam. Digital signatures are acceptable.

The Pledge promotes a shared culture of integrity amongst Creighton students, while acknowledging in its language that each of us holds him- or herself accountable for any attenuation or neglect of the conventions that define academic integrity. The intent of this Pledge is not to act heavy-handedly. The students and faculty of the College strongly believe that each student intends to present his or her own original work. But the Pledge serves as a regular reminder of Creighton University's commitment to the very highest standards of integrity—not only academic but also personal integrity.

The Pledge reads as follows:

Academic Integrity Pledge

In keeping with Creighton University's ideals and with the Academic Integrity Code adopted by the College of Arts and Sciences, I pledge that this work is my own and that I have neither given nor received inappropriate assistance in preparing it.

Signature: _____

Attendance Policy

In accordance with University policy, "conscientious attendance of classes" is a requirement for successful completion of this course ([Creighton University Catalog: Undergraduate Issue](#)). The main means of enforcing this requirement in this course is the quizzes that you will take regularly at the beginning of class. *Consequently, if you receive a failing grade on the quiz component of the grading scheme as the result of being absent or tardy without excuse an excessive number of times, then you will receive a grade of F for the course.*

Class Meeting Cancellation Policy

In the event that the university closes for the day and cancels all class meetings due to inclement weather, this action will be announced on the university's weather hotline (402-280-5800) and on the [university web site](#). You can arrange to receive direct notification of weather-related announcements by the university via email or text message by subscribing to the [CU Alert service](#). In the unlikely event that inclement weather or a family emergency prevents me from making it to campus to meet with your class on a day when the university has not cancelled classes, I will announce this by sending you an email

Updated March 25, 2016

message to your university email account and by posting an announcement on [the Blueline site for the course](#).

Disability Accommodations

“Section 504 of the Rehabilitation Act of 1973 and Americans with Disabilities Act of 1990 provide for reasonable accommodations and services to qualified individuals with disabilities. Creighton University requires that written documentation of a student's disability be provided to the Director of the Office of Disability Accommodations (ODA) before any assistance can be provided. This written document must be provided by a qualified evaluator as determined by the Director of ODA, and should provide current recommendations for a postsecondary setting.” ([Creighton University Disability Support Services](#))

“Disclosure of a disability to appropriate University personnel is the student's responsibility. The university cannot act on verbal or written statements by a parent, counselor, or teacher. If specific accommodations are needed, the student must notify the Director of ODA, provide documentation, and complete a written needs assessment. Once an acceptable documentation of disability is on file, accommodations will be provided in as reasonable a time as the particular circumstance of the request for accommodation warrants.” ([Creighton University Disability Support Services](#))

If you have established your eligibility for disability accommodations through the procedures described above, then I will be happy to work with you provided that you present me with the necessary written documentation as soon as possible, preferably by the date indicated in the [course schedule](#).

Petitions for essay deadline extensions and makeup examinations

All deadlines for submission of course work are firm. No late course work will be accepted for credit unless you have petitioned in advance for an extension of the submission deadline. If you submit an assignment late without previously having petitioned successfully for a deadline extension, then you will receive a grade of 0 for the assignment.

Seminar Essay Circulation and Submission Deadlines

When you compose a seminar essay, one of the other members of your research group will compose a response essay about your seminar essay between the time that you circulate your seminar essay via email and the class meeting in which the research group seminar discussion of your seminar essay will take place. For this reason, your fellow student is depending upon you to circulate your seminar essay on time so that he or she will have sufficient time to prepare a good response paper. Circulating your seminar essay on time is required in order to show respect for your fellow student as a scholar who needs time to do good scholarly work. *Consequently, if you fail to submit your seminar essay to Dr. Graham and to the other members of your research group via email by the deadline specified in the Seminar Essay assignment handout, then I will deduct 10% from your grade on the seminar essay. I will deduct an additional 10% from your grade on the seminar essay for each additional hour that you are late in submitting your essay. As a result, if you are 9 or more hours late in circulating a seminar essay to Dr. Graham and the members of your small seminar group, then you will receive a grade of 0 for the essay.* No exceptions will be made to this policy. The final version of each seminar essay is to be submitted through [BlueLine](#) within 2 days following the class meeting in which your small seminar group

discussed your essay. Late seminar essays will not be accepted unless you have successfully petitioned for an extension of the deadline *before the deadline arrives*. Petitions for extensions of major essay deadlines will be considered IF AND ONLY IF (1) you give a compelling reason why *circumstances beyond your control* prevent you from submitting the essay on time AND (2) you request an extension *in writing* at least 48 hours in advance of the submission deadline for the seminar essay. After that time, no requests for extensions will be considered. *If you submit your seminar essay late without previously having obtained an extension, your seminar essay will not be accepted and you will receive a grade of 0 for the assignment.*

Response Essay Presentation and Submission Deadlines

When you compose a response essay, presenting your response essay orally at the beginning of the research group seminar discussion of the seminar essay that is its subject is an essential part of the response essay assignment. Arriving in class in time to present your response essay to your research group seminar is a sign of respect for your fellow students as scholars who are engaged in a serious inquiry. *Consequently, if you are tardy to the class meeting in which you are scheduled to present your response essay to a research group seminar, then I will deduct 10% from your grade on the response essay. I will deduct an additional 10% from your grade on the response essay for each additional 5 minutes that you are tardy to the class meeting. As a result, if you are 50 or more minutes late to the class meeting in which you are scheduled to present your response essay to a research group seminar, then you will receive a grade of 0 for the essay.* The final version of each response essay is to be submitted through [BlueLine](#) within 2 days of the class meeting in which you presented the essay to your small seminar group. Late response essays will not be accepted unless you have successfully petitioned for an extension of the deadline *before the deadline arrives*. Petitions for extensions of response essay deadlines will be considered IF AND ONLY IF (1) you give a compelling reason why *circumstances beyond your control* prevent you from submitting the essay on time AND (2) you request an extension *in writing* at least 48 hours in advance of the submission deadline for the response essay. After that time, no requests for extensions will be considered. *If you submit your response essay after the deadline and you have not already obtained an extension for the essay, then you will receive a grade of 0 for the response essay.*

Group Annotated Bibliography Submission Deadline

Your research group is required to submit the Group Annotated Bibliography through [BlueLine](#) prior to the beginning of the regularly scheduled class meeting in which Group Research Project Workshop 2 will take place. For the date of this workshop, please consult the [course schedule](#). Late group annotated bibliographies will not be accepted unless you have successfully petitioned for an extension of the deadline *before the deadline arrives*. Petitions for extensions of group annotated bibliography deadlines will be considered IF AND ONLY IF (1) you give a compelling reason why *circumstances beyond your control* prevent you from submitting the group annotated bibliography on time AND (2) you request an extension *in writing* at least 48 hours in advance of the submission deadline for the group annotated bibliography. After that time, no requests for extensions will be considered. *If you submit your group annotated bibliography after the deadline and you have not already obtained an extension for the assignment, then all members of your research group will receive a grade of 0 for the assignment.*

Group Slideshow Submission Deadline

Your research group is required to submit the Group Slideshow through [BlueLine](#) prior to the beginning of the regularly scheduled class meeting in which your research group will make its Group Oral Presentation. For the date of your Group Oral Presentation, please consult the Group Oral Presentation handout that will be made available on [BlueLine](#) in the fourth week of the semester. Late slideshows will not be accepted unless you have successfully petitioned for an extension of the deadline *before the deadline arrives*. Petitions for extensions of group slideshow deadlines will be considered IF AND ONLY IF (1) you give a compelling reason why *circumstances beyond your control* prevent you from submitting the group slideshow on time AND (2) you request an extension *in writing* at least 48 hours in advance of the submission deadline for the group slideshow. After that time, no requests for extensions will be considered. *If you submit your group slideshow after the deadline and you have not already obtained an extension for the assignment, then all members of your research group will receive a grade of 0 for the assignment.*

Major Essay Submission Deadlines

Late major essays will not be accepted unless you have successfully petitioned for an extension of the deadline *before the deadline arrives*. Petitions for extensions of major essay deadlines will be considered IF AND ONLY IF (1) you give a compelling reason why *circumstances beyond your control* prevent you from submitting the essay on time AND (2) you request an extension *in writing* by the deadline specified in the major essay handout. After that date, no requests for extensions will be considered. *If you submit your major essay late without previously having obtained an extension, your major essay will not be accepted and you will receive a grade of 0 for the assignment.*

Absence from an Examination

If you miss an examination due to reasons beyond your control, then you can arrange to take a make-up examination by contacting me as soon as possible, and *no more than 24 hours* after the scheduled time of the examination. In order to obtain permission to take a makeup examination, you need to provide documentary proof of the circumstances that prevented you from writing the examination at the scheduled time within *5 business days* of the scheduled time. *If you fail to contact me within 24 hours or to provide evidence of what prevented you from taking the exam within 5 business days, then you will receive a grade of 0 for the examination.*

Absence from a Class Meeting in which a Quiz is Administered

If you miss a quiz due to reasons beyond your control, then you can arrange to be excused from taking the quiz by contacting me as soon as possible, and *no more than 24 hours* after the scheduled time of the quiz. In order to be excused from taking a quiz, you need to explain the circumstances that prevented you from taking the quiz at the scheduled time when you contact me. *If you fail to contact me or to explain how circumstances beyond your control prevented you from taking the quiz within 24 hours of the time when the quiz was administered, then you will receive a grade of 0 for the quiz.*

Grading Criteria

Major Essay Grading Rubric

Criteria	Excellent (5.0)	Good (4.0)	Satisfactory (3.5)	Marginal (3.00)	Unsatisfactory (1.5)
1. Introduction (Weight = 2)	The introduction to your essay clearly indicates what the topic of your essay is and what thesis you intend to establish about that topic. The introduction summarizes your argument in support of the thesis.	The introduction to your essay clearly indicates what the topic of your essay is, but your thesis statement about that topic is somewhat unclear. The introduction summarizes your argument in support of the thesis.	Your introduction states your topic and your thesis about the topic. The introduction does not clearly summarize your argument in support of the thesis, so the reader lacks a clear idea of where the essay is going.	Your essay contains a thesis statement, but the thesis is seriously ambiguous or unclear. The reader is uncertain exactly what conclusion your essay is trying to establish.	The reader cannot discern which statement in your essay, if any, constitutes the thesis statement. The reader is deeply confused as to what conclusion your essay is trying to establish.
2. Clarity of analysis of relevant literature (Weight = 1)	You examine at least one philosopher's views on the subject of your thesis. You explain the philosopher's views and supporting arguments clearly, so that the reader knows exactly what you think the philosopher says.	You examine at least one philosopher's views on the subject of your thesis. Your explanation of the philosopher's views and supporting arguments is unclear in a few minor respects.	You examine at least one philosopher's views on the subject of your thesis. Your explanation of the philosopher's views and supporting arguments is unclear about one or two key points.	You examine at least one philosopher's views on the subject of your thesis, but your explanation of their views and supporting arguments is unclear about several key points.	Either you do not examine the views and arguments of other philosophers about the subject of your thesis, or your explanation of their views and supporting arguments is deeply unclear, confusing, and hard to follow.
3. Detail of analysis of relevant literature (Weight = 1)	You examine at least one philosopher's views on the subject of your thesis. Your explanation of the philosopher's views and supporting arguments covers all the key points of their position.	You examine at least one philosopher's views on the subject of your thesis. Your explanation of the philosopher's views and supporting arguments is generally thorough, but leaves out one or two key points.	You examine at least one philosopher's views on the subject of your thesis. Your explanation of the philosopher's views and supporting arguments leaves out several key points.	You examine at least one philosopher's views on the subject of your thesis. Your explanation of the philosopher's views and supporting arguments does not give the reader a clear impression of the philosopher's overall views and arguments.	Either you do not examine the views and arguments of a philosopher about the subject of your thesis, or your explanation of the philosopher's positions is so sketchy that the philosopher's views are not recognizable to the reader.

Criteria	Excellent (5.0)	Good (4.0)	Satisfactory (3.5)	Marginal (3.00)	Unsatisfactory (1.5)
4. Accuracy of analysis of relevant literature (Weight = 1)	You examine at least one philosopher's views on the subject of your thesis. You analyze the philosopher's views and supporting arguments accurately and charitably.	You examine at least one philosopher's views on the subject of your thesis. Your analysis is inaccurate or uncharitable in some minor respects.	You examine at least one philosopher's views on the subject of your thesis. Your account of the philosopher's views or arguments is inaccurate or uncharitable in some serious respects.	You examine at least one philosopher's views on the subject of your thesis, but your examination displays little or no understanding of the philosopher's views or arguments.	Either you do not examine the views and arguments of a philosopher, or the views that you examine are not directly relevant to the topic of your thesis statement.
5. Evaluation of relevant philosophical literature (Weight = 3)	You clearly state whether or not the arguments of the philosopher(s) you have examined adequately support their views. You give clear, convincing reasons to support your evaluation of the arguments.	You clearly state whether or not the arguments of the philosopher(s) you have examined adequately support their views. Your reasons for evaluating the arguments as you do are clear, but not entirely convincing.	You clearly state whether or not the arguments of the philosopher(s) you have examined adequately support their views. Your reasons for evaluating the arguments as you do are unclear and unconvincing.	You clearly state whether or not the arguments of the philosopher(s) you have examined adequately support their views. You do not give reasons for evaluating the arguments as you do.	You do not state or defend an evaluation of whether the arguments of the philosopher(s) you have examined adequately support their views. The reader has no idea what you think of the arguments you have examined.
6. Clarity of argument supporting thesis (Weight = 4)	The reader can easily tell which statements in your essay are intended to function as evidence in support of your thesis. Each premise in the argument supporting your thesis is clearly stated.	The reader can easily tell which statements in your essay are intended to function as evidence in support of your thesis. One or two of the premises in the argument supporting your thesis are not clearly stated.	The reader can determine which statements in your essay are intended to function as evidence in support of your thesis. Several of the premises in the argument supporting your thesis are not clearly stated.	It is not obvious to the reader which statements in your essay are intended to function as evidence in support of your thesis. Several of the premises in the argument supporting your thesis are not clearly stated.	It is not obvious to the reader which statements in your essay are intended to function as evidence in support of your thesis. Most or all of the premises in the argument supporting your thesis are not clearly stated.

Criteria	Excellent (5.0)	Good (4.0)	Satisfactory (3.5)	Marginal (3.00)	Unsatisfactory (1.5)
7. Rigor of argument supporting thesis (Weight = 4)	The premises in your argument for your thesis are plausible and are arranged in a clear, logical order. The reader can easily tell that the argument as a whole strongly supports your thesis.	The premises in your argument for your thesis are arranged in a clear, logical order. Some premises either are implausible or offer insufficient support to your thesis.	The reader can follow the logic of your argument with effort. Some of your premises either are implausible or offer insufficient support to your thesis.	The logical flow of your argument is very confusing. Several of your premises either are open to serious, obvious objections that you do not address or offer insufficient support to your thesis.	The logic of your argument is deeply flawed. It offers little or no evidence in support of your thesis.
8. Grammar and style (Weight = 2)	Your essay contains few or no errors of grammar or style. It presents no grammatical or stylistic obstacles to the reader's understanding.	Your essay contains a handful of minor errors of grammar or style that do not seriously hinder the reader from comprehending your essay.	Your essay contains several serious errors of grammar or style. These hinder, but do not prevent, the reader from comprehending your essay.	Your essay contains many serious errors of grammar or style. These make it extremely difficult for the reader to comprehend your essay.	Your essay contains so many serious errors of grammar or style that it is generally not possible for the reader to understand what you are saying.
9. Documentation of works cited (Weight =1)	You give specific page references every time you quote, paraphrase, or refer to a specific passage of another author's work. Your essay includes a list of references which contains the full bibliographical details for every work cited.	You give specific page references almost every time you quote, paraphrase, or refer to a specific passage of another author's work. Your essay includes a list of references which contains the full bibliographical details for every work cited.	You usually give specific page references when you quote, paraphrase, or refer to a specific passage of another author's work. Your essay includes a list of references which contains the full bibliographical details for every work cited.	Either you frequently fail to give specific page references when you quote, paraphrase, or refer to a specific passage of another author's work or your essay does not include a list of references which contains the full bibliographical details for every work cited.	Either your essay generally lacks specific page references to works that you quote, paraphrase, or refer to or your essay lacks a list of references which contains the bibliographical details of the works that you cite.

Criteria	Excellent (5.0)	Good (4.0)	Satisfactory (3.5)	Marginal (3.00)	Unsatisfactory (1.5)
10. Format (Weight = 1)	The format of your title page, the body of your essay, your references to works cited, and your list of references all conform precisely to the guidelines stated in the essay handout.	The format of your title page, the body of your essay, your references to works cited, or your list of references violate the guidelines stated in the essay handout in one or two minor respects.	The format of your title page, the body of your essay, your references to works cited, and your list of references contain more than two minor violations of the guidelines stated in the essay handout.	The format of your title page, the body of your essay, your references to works cited, and your list of references contain at least one major violation of the guidelines stated in the essay handout.	The format of your title page, the body of your essay, your references to works cited, and your list of references contain more than one major violation of the guidelines stated in the essay handout.

Research Group Seminar Grading Rubrics

Seminar Essay Grading Rubric

Criteria	Excellent (5.0)	Good (4.0)	Satisfactory (3.5)	Marginal (3.0)	Unsatisfactory (1.5)
1. Thesis Statement (Weight = 2)	Your essay's first paragraph includes a clear, concise thesis statement about the author's argument in the assigned reading and a clear, succinct summary of your argument in support of your thesis.	Your essay's first paragraph contains a clear, concise thesis statement and a summary of your argument in support of your thesis that is either somewhat unclear or needlessly long.	Your essay's first paragraph contains a thesis statement that is somewhat unclear or imprecise. The reader has a general sense of what the thesis of your essay is, but is uncertain about some details.	Your essay's first paragraph contains a thesis statement that is seriously confusing or ambiguous. The reader is confused about what the thesis of your essay is.	It is not clear which statement in your essay's first paragraph, if any, constitutes your thesis statement. The reader is deeply confused as to what conclusion you intend to establish in your essay.
2. Clarity of analysis of the author's position and argument (Weight = 2)	You explain the author's overall conclusion and supporting argument clearly. You distinguish clearly between the author's conclusions and the evidence that the author provides to support her or his conclusions.	Your explanation of the author's overall conclusion and supporting argument is generally clear. However, your explanation of either the position or the argument is unclear in a few minor respects.	Your explanation of the author's overall conclusion and supporting argument is fairly clear. However, your explanation of either the position or the argument is unclear in one or two important respects.	Your explanation of the author's overall conclusion and supporting argument is unclear in several important respects. A reader who is unfamiliar with the author's position and argument would have a hard time following your explanation.	Your explanation of the author's overall conclusion and supporting argument either is generally unclear, confusing, and hard to follow or is irrelevant to the author's actual position and argument.

Criteria	Excellent (5.0)	Good (4.0)	Satisfactory (3.5)	Marginal (3.0)	Unsatisfactory (1.5)
3. Detail of analysis of the author's position and argument (Weight = 2)	You explain the author's overall conclusion and supporting argument thoroughly, covering all of the key points.	Your explanation of the author's overall conclusion and supporting argument is generally thorough, but it omits one or two key points.	Your explanation of the author's overall conclusion and supporting argument omits several key points.	Your explanation of the author's overall conclusion and supporting argument is sketchy, at best. The reader can only make out the most general outline of the author's argument.	Your explanation of the author's overall conclusion and supporting argument either omits almost all the key points of the argument or is irrelevant to the author's actual position and argument.
4. Accuracy of Analysis of Author's Position and Argument (Weight = 2)	You state the author's overall conclusion and supporting argument accurately and charitably.	Your statement of the author's overall conclusion and supporting argument is inaccurate or uncharitable in some minor respects.	Your statement of the author's overall conclusion and supporting argument is inaccurate or uncharitable in some important respects.	Your essay demonstrates little or no understanding of the author's overall conclusion or the author's supporting argument for the conclusion.	Either you do not address the author's overall conclusion, or what you say about the author's overall conclusion is not relevant to your topic.
5. Evaluation of Author's Position and Argument (Weight = 6)	You clearly state whether or not the author's argument for his or her conclusion is adequate. You give clear, convincing reasons to support your evaluation of the author's argument.	You clearly state whether or not the author's argument for his or her conclusion is adequate. Your reasons for evaluating the author's argument as you do are clear, but not entirely convincing.	You clearly state whether or not the author's argument for his or her conclusion is adequate. Your reasons for evaluating the author's argument as you do are unclear and unconvincing.	You clearly state whether or not the author's argument for his or her conclusion is adequate. You do not give reasons for evaluating the author's argument as you do.	You do not state or defend an evaluation of the author's argument for his or her conclusion. The reader has no idea what you think of the author's arguments in support of his or her conclusion.
6. Documentation of Sources (Weight = 2)	You provide a specific page reference every time you quote, paraphrase, or mention a specific passage of another author's work. All of your citations follow the guidelines contained in the essay handout.	You provide a specific page reference almost every time you quote, paraphrase, or mention a specific passage of another author's work. All of your citations follow the guidelines contained in the essay handout.	You usually provide a specific page reference when you quote, paraphrase, or mention a specific passage of another author's work. Most of your citations follow the guidelines contained in the essay handout.	You frequently fail to provide a specific page reference when you quote, paraphrase, or mention a specific passage of another author's work. Most of your citations follow the guidelines contained in the essay handout.	You usually fail to provide a specific page reference when you quote, paraphrase, or mention a specific passage of another author's work.

Criteria	Excellent (5.0)	Good (4.0)	Satisfactory (3.5)	Marginal (3.0)	Unsatisfactory (1.5)
7. Grammar and Style (Weight = 2)	Your essay contains few or no errors of grammar or style. It presents no grammatical or stylistic obstacles to the reader's understanding.	Your essay contains a handful of minor errors of grammar or style that do not seriously hinder the reader from comprehending your essay.	Your essay contains several serious errors of grammar or style. These hinder, but do not prevent, the reader from comprehending your essay.	Your essay contains many serious errors of grammar or style. These make it extremely difficult for the reader to comprehend your essay.	Your essay contains so many serious errors of grammar or style that it is generally not possible for the reader to understand what you are saying.
8. Format (Weight = 1)	The format of your essay conforms precisely to the guidelines stated in the essay handout.	The format of your essay violates the guidelines stated in the essay handout in one or two minor respects.	The format of essay contains more than two minor violations of the guidelines stated in the essay handout.	The format of your essay contains at least one major violation of the guidelines stated in the essay handout.	The format of your essay contains more than one major violation of the guidelines stated in the essay handout.
9. Length (Weight = 1)	Your essay is within 50% of the recommended length stated in the essay handout; that is, it is 600-1900 words long.		Your essay is 50-100% in excess of the recommended length stated in the essay handout; that is, it is 1900-2500 words long.		Your essay is 100% or more in excess of the recommended length stated in the essay handout; that is, it is over 2500 words long.

Response Essay Grading Rubric

Criteria	Excellent (5.0)	Good (4.0)	Satisfactory (3.5)	Marginal (3.0)	Unsatisfactory (1.5)
1. Thesis Statement (Weight = 2)	Your essay's first paragraph includes a clear, concise thesis statement about your fellow student's argument in the assigned reading and a clear, succinct summary of your argument in support of your thesis.	Your essay's first paragraph contains a clear, concise thesis statement and a summary of your argument in support of your thesis that is either somewhat unclear or needlessly long.	Your essay's first paragraph contains a thesis statement that is somewhat unclear or imprecise. The reader has a general sense of what the thesis of your essay is, but is uncertain about some details.	Your essay's first paragraph contains a thesis statement that is seriously confusing or ambiguous. The reader is confused about what the thesis of your essay is.	It is not clear which statement in your essay's first paragraph, if any, constitutes your thesis statement. The reader is deeply confused as to what conclusion you intend to establish in your essay.

Criteria	Excellent (5.0)	Good (4.0)	Satisfactory (3.5)	Marginal (3.0)	Unsatisfactory (1.5)
2. Clarity of analysis of your fellow student's claim and supporting argument (Weight = 2)	You explain your fellow student's claim and supporting argument clearly. You distinguish clearly between your fellow student's conclusions and the evidence that your fellow student provides to support her or his conclusions.	Your explanation of your fellow student's claim and supporting argument is generally clear. However, your explanation of either the position or the argument is unclear in a few minor respects.	Your explanation of your fellow student's claim and supporting argument is fairly clear. However, your explanation of either the position or the argument is unclear in one or two important respects.	Your explanation of your fellow student's claim and supporting argument is unclear in several important respects. A reader who is unfamiliar with your fellow student's position and argument would have a hard time following your explanation.	Your explanation of your fellow student's claim and supporting argument either is generally unclear, confusing, and hard to follow or is irrelevant to your fellow student's actual position and argument.
3. Detail of analysis of your fellow student's claim and supporting argument (Weight = 2)	You explain your fellow student's claim and supporting argument thoroughly, covering all of the key points.	Your explanation of your fellow student's claim and supporting argument is generally thorough, but it omits one or two key points.	Your explanation of your fellow student's claim and supporting argument omits several key points.	Your explanation of your fellow student's claim and supporting argument is sketchy, at best. The reader can only make out the most general outline of your fellow student's argument.	Your explanation of your fellow student's claim and supporting argument either omits almost all of the key points of the argument or is irrelevant to your fellow student's actual position and argument.
4. Accuracy of Analysis of Your Fellow Student's Claim and Supporting Argument (Weight = 2)	You state your fellow student's claim and supporting argument accurately and charitably.	Your statement of your fellow student's claim and supporting argument is inaccurate or uncharitable in some minor respects.	Your statement of your fellow student's claim and supporting argument is inaccurate or uncharitable in some important respects.	Your essay demonstrates little or no understanding of your fellow student's claim or your fellow student's supporting argument for the claim.	Either you do not address a claim made by your fellow student in the seminar essay, or what you say about your fellow student's claim is not relevant to your topic.
5. Evaluation of Your Fellow Student's Claim and Supporting Argument (Weight = 6)	You clearly state whether or not your fellow student's argument for his or her claim is adequate. You give clear, convincing reasons to support your evaluation of your fellow student's argument.	You clearly state whether or not your fellow student's argument for her or his claim is adequate. Your reasons for evaluating your fellow student's argument as you do are clear, but not entirely convincing.	You clearly state whether or not your fellow student's argument for his or her claim is adequate. Your reasons for evaluating your fellow student's argument as you do are unclear and unconvincing.	You clearly state whether or not your fellow student's argument for his or her conclusion is adequate. You do not give reasons for evaluating your fellow student's argument as you do.	You do not state or defend an evaluation of your fellow student's argument for his or her claim. The reader has no idea what you think of your fellow student's arguments in support of his or her claim.

Criteria	Excellent (5.0)	Good (4.0)	Satisfactory (3.5)	Marginal (3.0)	Unsatisfactory (1.5)
6. Documentation of Sources (Weight = 2)	You cite a specific page reference every time you quote, paraphrase, or mention a specific passage of another author's work. All of your citations follow the guidelines contained in the essay handout.	You cite a specific page reference almost every time you quote, paraphrase, or mention a specific passage of another author's work. All of your citations follow the guidelines contained in the essay handout.	You usually cite a specific page reference when you quote, paraphrase, or mention a specific passage of another author's work. Most of your citations follow the guidelines contained in the essay handout.	You frequently fail to cite a specific page reference when you quote, paraphrase, or mention a specific passage of another author's work. Most of your citations follow the guidelines contained in the essay handout.	You usually fail to cite a specific page reference when you quote, paraphrase, or mention a specific passage of another author's work.
7. Grammar and Style (Weight = 2)	Your essay contains few or no errors of grammar or style. It presents no grammatical or stylistic obstacles to the reader's understanding.	Your essay contains a handful of minor errors of grammar or style that do not seriously hinder the reader from understanding your essay.	Your essay contains several serious errors of grammar or style. These hinder, but do not prevent, the reader from understanding your essay.	Your essay contains many serious errors of grammar or style. These make it extremely difficult for the reader to understand your essay.	Your essay contains so many serious errors of grammar or style that it is generally not possible for the reader to understand your essay.
8. Format (Weight = 1)	The format of your essay conforms precisely to the guidelines stated in the essay handout.	The format of your essay violates the guidelines stated in the essay handout in one or two minor respects.	The format of essay contains more than two minor violations of the guidelines stated in the essay handout.	The format of your essay contains at least one major violation of the guidelines stated in the essay handout.	The format of your essay contains more than one major violation of the guidelines stated in the essay handout.
9. Length (Weight = 1)	Your essay is within 50% of the recommended length stated in the essay handout; that is, it is 250-750 words long.		Your essay is 50-100% in excess of the recommended length stated in the essay handout; that is, it is 750-1000 words long.		Your essay is 100% or more in excess of the recommended length stated in the essay handout; that is, it is over 1000 words long.

Group Research Project Grading Rubrics

Group Annotated Bibliography Grading Rubric

Criterion	Excellent (5.0)	Good (4.0)	Satisfactory (3.5)	Marginal (3.0)	Unsatisfactory (1.5)
1. Documentation of sources (weight = 2)	Your bibliography contains the full bibliographical details for every work cited. It conforms in all respects to the <i>Chicago Manual of Style</i> .	Your bibliography contains the full bibliographical details for every work cited. It conforms in most respects to the <i>Chicago Manual of Style</i> .	Your bibliography contains the full bibliographical details for most works cited. It conforms in most respects to the <i>Chicago Manual of Style</i> .	Your bibliography contains most bibliographical details for most works cited. It generally conforms in respects to the <i>Chicago Manual of Style</i> .	Either your bibliography frequently omits relevant bibliographical details or it does not generally conform to the <i>Chicago Manual of Style</i> .
2. Clarity of summaries (weight = 5)	You examine what at least 5 peer-reviewed philosophical sources say about the assigned reading that is your topic. You summarize what the sources say about the assigned reading clearly, so that the reader knows exactly what you think the sources say.	You examine what at least 5 peer-reviewed philosophical sources say about the assigned reading that is your topic. Your summary of what the sources say about the assigned reading is unclear in a few minor respects.	You examine what at least 5 peer-reviewed philosophical sources say about the assigned reading that is your topic. Your summary of what the sources say about the assigned reading is unclear about one or two key points.	You examine what at least 3 peer-reviewed philosophical sources say about the assigned reading that is your topic. Your summary of what the sources say about the assigned reading is unclear about several key points.	Either you do not examine what at least 3 peer-reviewed philosophical sources say about the assigned reading that is your topic, or your summary of what the sources say about the assigned reading is deeply unclear, confusing, and hard to follow.
3. Detail of summaries (weight = 5)	You examine what at least 5 peer-reviewed philosophical sources say about the assigned reading that is your topic. Your summary covers the key points of their position.	You examine what at least 5 peer-reviewed philosophical sources say about the assigned reading that is your topic. Your summary is generally thorough, but leaves out one or two key points.	You examine what at least 5 peer-reviewed philosophical sources say about the assigned reading that is your topic. Your summary leaves out several key points.	You examine what at least 3 peer-reviewed philosophical sources say about the assigned reading that is your topic. Your summary does not give the reader a clear impression of the philosopher's overall views and arguments.	Either you do not examine what at least 3 peer-reviewed philosophical sources say about the assigned reading that is your topic, or your summary is so sketchy that the philosopher's views are not recognizable to the reader.

Criterion	Excellent (5.0)	Good (4.0)	Satisfactory (3.5)	Marginal (3.0)	Unsatisfactory (1.5)
4. Accuracy of summaries (weight = 5)	You examine what at least 5 peer-reviewed philosophical sources say about the assigned reading that is your topic. You analyze the philosopher's views and supporting arguments accurately and charitably.	You examine what at least 5 peer-reviewed philosophical sources say about the assigned reading that is your topic. Your analysis is inaccurate or uncharitable in some minor respects.	You examine what at least 5 peer-reviewed philosophical sources say about the assigned reading that is your topic. Your account of the philosopher's views or arguments is inaccurate or uncharitable in some serious respects.	You examine what at least 3 peer-reviewed philosophical sources say about the assigned reading that is your topic, but your examination displays little or no understanding of the philosopher's views or arguments.	Either you do not examine what at least 3 peer-reviewed philosophical sources say about the assigned reading that is your topic, or the sources that you examine are not directly relevant to the assigned reading that is your target.
5. Length of summaries (weight = 2)	Your summaries of what the sources say about the assigned reading that is your topic are all within 50% of the recommended length; that is, they are 75-225 words in length.		Your summaries of what the sources say about the assigned reading that is your topic are all within 50% to 100% in excess of the recommended length; that is, they are 225-300 words in length.		At least one of your summaries of what the sources say about the assigned reading that is your topic is more than 100% in excess of the recommended length; that is, it is over 300 words in length.
6. Format (weight = 1)	The format of your annotated bibliography conforms precisely to the guidelines stated in the assignment handout.	The format of your annotated bibliography violates the guidelines stated in the assignment handout in one or two minor respects.	The format of your annotated bibliography contains more than two minor violations of the guidelines stated in the assignment handout.	The format of your annotated bibliography contains at least one major violation of the guidelines stated in the assignment handout.	The format of your annotated bibliography contains more than one major violation of the guidelines stated in the assignment handout.

Group Oral Presentation Grading Rubric

Criteria	Excellent (5.0)	Good (4.0)	Satisfactory (3.5)	Marginal (3.0)	Unsatisfactory (1.5)
1. Analysis of Assigned Reading (Weight = 3)	Focuses the attention of the audience sharply on one aspect of the assigned reading. Describes that aspect of the assigned reading clearly and accurately.	Focuses the attention of the audience sharply on one aspect of the assigned reading. Describes that aspect of the assigned reading accurately, but somewhat unclearly.	Focuses the attention of the audience on one aspect of the assigned reading. Misrepresents the assigned reading in some minor respects.	Focuses the attention of the audience on one aspect of the assigned reading. Misrepresents the assigned reading in at least one serious respect.	Does not focus the attention of the audience on one aspect of the assigned reading.

Criteria	Excellent (5.0)	Good (4.0)	Satisfactory (3.5)	Marginal (3.0)	Unsatisfactory (1.5)
2. Analysis of Relevant Philosophical Literature (Weight = 6)	Focuses the attention of the audience sharply on one or two critical questions about the assigned reading that are raised in the relevant philosophical literature. Explains clearly and thoroughly why the questions arise and why they are important to consider.	Focuses the attention of the audience sharply on one or two critical questions about the assigned reading that are raised in the relevant philosophical literature. Explains thoroughly, but somewhat unclearly, why the questions arise and why they are important to consider.	Focuses the attention of the audience on one or two critical questions about the assigned reading that are raised in the relevant philosophical literature. Explains somewhat sketchily why the questions arise and why they are important to consider.	Focuses the attention of the audience on one or two critical questions about the assigned reading that are raised in the relevant philosophical literature. Fails to explain either why the questions arise or why they are important to consider.	Does not focus the attention of the audience on one or two critical questions about the assigned reading that are raised in the relevant philosophical literature.
3. Critical Questions for Discussion (Weight = 3)	Raises 3 or 4 critical questions about the assigned reading for class discussion. The questions are based on the analysis of the relevant philosophical literature, open-ended, clear, live, and substantive.	Raises 3 or 4 critical questions about the assigned reading for class discussion. The questions are based on the analysis of the relevant philosophical literature, open-ended, live, and substantive.	Raises 3 or 4 critical questions about the assigned reading for class discussion. The questions are based on the analysis of the relevant philosophical literature, open-ended, and substantive.	Raises 3 or 4 critical questions about the assigned reading for class discussion. The questions are based on the analysis of the relevant philosophical literature and open-ended.	Does not raise 3 or 4 critical questions about the assigned reading for class discussion.
4. Delivery (Weight = 2)	Demonstrates appropriate verbal and nonverbal behavior. Sounds well prepared and rehearsed. Successfully transitions between each main point. Maintains credibility and coherence.	Demonstrates appropriate verbal and nonverbal behavior. Sounds well prepared and rehearsed. Successfully transitions between each main point.	Demonstrates appropriate verbal and nonverbal behavior. Successfully transitions between each main point.	Demonstrates appropriate verbal and nonverbal behavior.	Does not demonstrate appropriate verbal and nonverbal behavior.
5. Preparedness (Weight = 2)	Presents a clear, focused, well-organized slideshow. Completes the presentation within 15-20 minutes.	Presents a focused, well-organized slideshow. Completes the presentation within 15-20 minutes.	Presents a well-organized slideshow. Completes the presentation within 15-20 minutes.	Presents a slideshow. Completes the presentation within 15-20 minutes.	Does not complete the presentation within 15-20 minutes.

Criteria	Excellent (5.0)	Good (4.0)	Satisfactory (3.5)	Marginal (3.0)	Unsatisfactory (1.5)
6. Structure (Weight = 2)	Develops clearly identifiable main points that structure and guide speech. Follows the required organizational pattern. Uses organizational pattern to reinforce main ideas of speech. Uses helpful transitions and signposts. Successfully executed a coherent, unified presentation.	Develops clearly identifiable main points that structure and guide speech. Follows the required organizational pattern. Uses helpful transitions and signposts. Successfully executed a coherent, unified presentation.	Develops clearly identifiable main points that structure and guide speech. Follows the required organizational pattern. Uses helpful transitions and signposts.	Follows the required organizational pattern. Uses helpful transitions and signposts.	Either does not follow the required organizational pattern or does not use helpful transitions and signposts.
7. Documentation of Sources (Weight = 2)	Clearly attributes all ideas and words that are not the speaker's own to a specific work by naming the author and title of the source.	Clearly attributes almost all ideas and words that are not the speaker's own to a specific work by naming the author and title of the source.	Clearly attributes most ideas and words that are not the speaker's own to a specific work by naming the author and title of the source.	Frequently does not clearly attribute ideas and words that are not the speaker's own to a specific work by naming the author and title of the source.	Usually does not clearly attribute ideas and words that are not the speaker's own to a specific work by naming the author and title of the source.

Group Slideshow Grading Rubric

Criterion	Excellent (5.0)	Good (4.0)	Satisfactory (3.5)	Marginal (3.0)	Unsatisfactory (1.5)
1. Title slide (weight = 1)	The title slide clearly indicates the topic of your presentation and the name of each member of your research group.	The title slide clearly indicates the name of each member of your research group. The topic of your presentation is somewhat unclear.	The title slide makes an effort to identify both the topic of your presentation and the identities of the members of your research group, but both are somewhat unclear.	The title slide makes an effort to identify either the topic of your presentation or the identities of the members of your research group.	Your slideshow lacks a title slide that attempts to identify your presentation topic and the identities of the members of your research group.

Criterion	Excellent (5.0)	Good (4.0)	Satisfactory (3.5)	Marginal (3.0)	Unsatisfactory (1.5)
2. Body slides (weight = 4)	The body slides clearly and accurately illustrate your presentation of the positions and supporting arguments of the assigned reading and the relevant philosophical literature.	The body slides illustrate your presentation of the positions and supporting arguments of the assigned reading and the relevant philosophical literature accurately, but somewhat unclearly.	The body slides' illustration of your presentation of the positions and supporting arguments of the assigned reading and the relevant philosophical literature contains minor inaccuracies.	The body slides' illustration of your presentation of the positions and supporting arguments of the assigned reading and the relevant philosophical literature contains one or two major inaccuracies.	The body slides' illustration of your presentation of the positions and supporting arguments of the assigned reading and the relevant philosophical literature contains several major inaccuracies.
3. Discussion questions slide (weight = 2)	The discussion questions slide clearly states 3 or 4 discussion questions about your presentation topic.	The discussion questions slide states 3 or 4 discussion questions about your presentation topic, but at least 1 question is not stated clearly.	The discussion questions slide states 3 or 4 discussion questions about your presentation topic, but more than 1 question is not stated clearly.	The discussion questions slide states fewer than 3 or more than 4 discussion questions about your presentation topic	Your slideshow does not contain a discussion questions slide.
4. Bibliography slide (weight = 2)	Your bibliography slide clearly states all of the bibliographical details of all sources to which you refer in your presentation in the format specified in the assignment handout.	Your bibliography slide clearly states the bibliographical details of all sources to which you refer in your presentation, but at least 1 source is not presented in the format specified in the assignment handout.	Your bibliography slide clearly states the bibliographical details of all sources to which you refer in your presentation, but more than 1 source is not presented in the format specified in the assignment handout.	Your bibliography slide omits the bibliographical details of at least 1 source to which you refer in your presentation.	Your slideshow does not contain a bibliography slide.
5. Clarity (weight = 3)	All of your slides clearly support and illustrate the points that your research group is trying to make in its oral presentation.	Almost all of your slides clearly support and illustrate the points that your research group is trying to make in its oral presentation.	Most of your slides clearly support and illustrate the points that your research group is trying to make in its oral presentation.	Your slides frequently fail to support and illustrate clearly the points that your research group is trying to make in its oral presentation.	The audience generally cannot make out how your slideshow is supposed to support and illustrate the points that your research group is trying to make in its oral presentation.

Criterion	Excellent (5.0)	Good (4.0)	Satisfactory (3.5)	Marginal (3.0)	Unsatisfactory (1.5)
6. Simplicity (weight = 3)	All of your slides present simply the points that your research group is trying to make in its oral presentation.	Almost all of your slides present simply the points that your research group is trying to make in its oral presentation.	Most of your slides present simply the points that your research group is trying to make in its oral presentation.	Your slides frequently contain an overwhelming or confusing amount of information about the points that your research group is trying to make in its oral presentation.	The audience generally is overwhelmed and confused by the amount of information presented in your slides.
7. Focus (weight = 3)	All of your slides help focus the attention of the audience on the oral presentation of your research group.	Almost all of your slides help focus the attention of the audience on the oral presentation of your research group.	Most of your slides help focus the attention of the audience on the oral presentation of your research group.	Your slides frequently fail to focus the attention of the audience on the oral presentation of your research group.	Your slides generally distract the attention of the audience away from the oral presentation of your research group.
8. Documentation of sources (weight = 2)	You include a specific page reference in the format specified by the assignment handout every time that you quote, paraphrase, or mention a specific passage of the assigned reading or another source in the relevant philosophical literature.	You include a specific page reference in the format specified by the assignment handout almost every time that you quote, paraphrase, or mention a specific passage of the assigned reading or another source in the relevant philosophical literature.	You include a specific page reference in the format specified by the assignment handout most of the times when you quote, paraphrase, or mention a specific passage of the assigned reading or another source in the relevant philosophical literature.	You frequently fail to include a specific page reference in the format specified by the assignment handout when you quote, paraphrase, or mention a specific passage of the assigned reading or another source in the relevant philosophical literature.	You usually fail to include a specific page reference in the format specified by the assignment handout when you quote, paraphrase, or mention a specific passage of the assigned reading or another source in the relevant philosophical literature.

Individual Response Essay Grading Rubric

Criteria	Excellent (5.0)	Good (4.0)	Satisfactory (3.5)	Marginal (3.0)	Unsatisfactory (1.5)
1. Clarity about collaboration (weight = 2)	You clearly explain how your research group collaborated on each part of the Group Research Project.	Your explanation of how your research group collaborated on each part of the Group Research Project is generally clear, but it is unclear about a few minor points.	Your explanation of how your research group collaborated on each part of the Group Research Project is unclear about several important points.	Your explanation of how your research group collaborated on each part of the Group Research Project is frequently unclear, confusing, and hard to follow.	Your explanation of how your research group collaborated on each part of the Group Research Project is generally unclear, confusing, and hard to follow.

Criteria	Excellent (5.0)	Good (4.0)	Satisfactory (3.5)	Marginal (3.0)	Unsatisfactory (1.5)
2. Detail about collaboration (weight = 2)	You explain thoroughly how your research group collaborated on each part of the Group Research Project, responding to each of the questions in the writing prompt.	Your explanation of how your research group collaborated on each part of the Group Research Project is generally thorough, but it fails to address at least one item in the writing prompt.	Your explanation of how your research group collaborated on each part of the Group Research Project fails to address more than one item in the writing prompt.	Your explanation of how your research group collaborated on each part of the Group Research Project is sketchy, at best. The reader can only make out the most general outline of how your group functioned.	Your explanation of how your research group collaborated on each part of the Group Research Project fails to address almost every item of the writing prompt.
3. Clarity about computer applications (weight = 2)	You clearly explain how your research group used computer applications in preparing each part of the Group Research Project.	Your explanation of how your research group used computer applications in preparing each part of the Group Research Project is generally clear, but it is unclear about a few minor points.	Your explanation of how your research group used computer applications in preparing each part of the Group Research Project is unclear about several important points.	Your explanation of how your research group used computer applications in preparing each part of the Group Research Project is frequently unclear, confusing, and hard to follow.	Your explanation of how your research group used computer applications in preparing each part of the Group Research Project is generally unclear, confusing, and hard to follow.
4. Detail about computer applications (weight = 2)	You explain thoroughly how your research group used computer applications in preparing each part of the Group Research Project, responding to each of the questions in the writing prompt.	Your explanation of how your research group used computer applications in preparing each part of the Group Research Project is generally thorough, but it fails to address at least one item in the writing prompt.	Your explanation of how your research group used computer applications in preparing each part of the Group Research Project fails to address more than one item in the writing prompt.	Your explanation of how your research group used computer applications in preparing each part of the Group Research Project is sketchy, at best. The reader can only make out the most general outline of how your group functioned.	Your explanation of how your research group used computer applications in preparing each part of the Group Research Project fails to address almost every item of the writing prompt.
5. Clarity about powers of computer applications (weight = 2)	You clearly explain the powers of the computer applications your research group used in preparing each part of the Group Research Project.	Your explanation of the powers of the computer applications your research group used in preparing each part of the Group Research Project is generally clear, but it is unclear about a few minor points.	Your explanation of the powers of the computer applications your research group used in preparing each part of the Group Research Project is unclear about several important points.	Your explanation of the powers of the computer applications your research group used in preparing each part of the Group Research Project is frequently unclear, confusing, and hard to follow.	Your explanation of the powers of the computer applications your research group used in preparing each part of the Group Research Project is generally unclear, confusing, and hard to follow.

Criteria	Excellent (5.0)	Good (4.0)	Satisfactory (3.5)	Marginal (3.0)	Unsatisfactory (1.5)
6. Detail and accuracy about powers of computer applications (weight = 2)	Your description of the powers of the computer applications your research group used in preparing each part of the Group Research Project is thorough and accurate. It highlights all of the key powers of the applications.	Your description of the powers of the computer applications your research group used in preparing each part of the Group Research Project is accurate, so far as it goes. Your description highlights most of the key powers of the applications.	Your description of the powers of the computer applications your research group used in preparing each part of the Group Research Project is basically accurate, so far as it goes. Your description highlights some of key powers of the applications.	Your description of the powers of the computer applications your research group used in preparing each part of the Group Research Project misrepresents the powers of the applications in some minor respects.	Your description of the powers of the computer applications your research group used in preparing each part of the Group Research Project misrepresents the powers of the applications in at least one major respect.
7. Clarity about dangers of computer applications (weight = 2)	You clearly explain the dangers of the computer applications your research group used in preparing each part of the Group Research Project.	Your explanation of the dangers of the computer applications your research group used in preparing each part of the Group Research Project is generally clear, but it is unclear about a few minor points.	Your explanation of the dangers of the computer applications your research group used in preparing each part of the Group Research Project is unclear about several important points.	Your explanation of the dangers of the computer applications your research group used in preparing each part of the Group Research Project is frequently unclear, confusing, and hard to follow.	Your explanation of the dangers of the computer applications your research group used in preparing each part of the Group Research Project is generally unclear, confusing, and hard to follow.
8. Detail and accuracy about dangers of computer applications (weight = 2)	Your description of the dangers of the computer applications your research group used in preparing each part of the Group Research Project is thorough and accurate. It highlights all of the key dangers of the applications.	Your description of the dangers of the computer applications your research group used in preparing each part of the Group Research Project is accurate, so far as it goes. Your description highlights most of the key dangers of the applications.	Your description of the dangers of the computer applications your research group used in preparing each part of the Group Research Project is basically accurate, so far as it goes. Your description highlights some of key dangers of the applications.	Your description of the dangers of the computer applications your research group used in preparing each part of the Group Research Project misrepresents the dangers of the applications in some minor respects.	Your description of the dangers of the computer applications your research group used in preparing each part of the Group Research Project misrepresents the dangers of the applications in at least one major respect.

Criteria	Excellent (5.0)	Good (4.0)	Satisfactory (3.5)	Marginal (3.0)	Unsatisfactory (1.5)
9. Documentation of sources (weight = 1)	You provide a specific page reference every time you quote, paraphrase, or mention a specific passage of another author's work. All of your citations follow the guidelines contained in the essay handout.	You provide a specific page reference almost every time you quote, paraphrase, or mention a specific passage of another author's work. All of your citations follow the guidelines contained in the essay handout.	You usually provide a specific page reference when you quote, paraphrase, or mention a specific passage of another author's work. Most of your citations follow the guidelines contained in the essay handout.	You frequently fail to provide a specific page reference when you quote, paraphrase, or mention a specific passage of another author's work. Most of your citations follow the guidelines contained in the essay handout.	You usually fail to provide a specific page reference when you quote, paraphrase, or mention a specific passage of another author's work.
10. Grammar and style (weight = 1)	Your essay contains few or no errors of grammar or style. It presents no grammatical or stylistic obstacles to the reader's understanding.	Your essay contains a handful of minor errors of grammar or style that do not seriously hinder the reader from comprehending your essay.	Your essay contains several serious errors of grammar or style. These hinder, but do not prevent, the reader from comprehending your essay.	Your essay contains many serious errors of grammar or style. These make it extremely difficult for the reader to comprehend your essay.	Your essay contains so many serious errors of grammar or style that it is generally not possible for the reader to understand what you are saying.
11. Format (weight = 1)	The format of your essay conforms precisely to the guidelines stated in the essay handout.	The format of your essay violates the guidelines stated in the essay handout in one or two minor respects.	The format of essay contains more than two minor violations of the guidelines stated in the essay handout.	The format of your essay contains at least one major violation of the guidelines stated in the essay handout.	The format of your essay contains more than one major violation of the guidelines stated in the essay handout.
12. Length (weight = 1)	Your essay is within 50% of the recommended length stated in the essay handout; that is, it is 375-1125 words long.		Your essay is 50-100% in excess of the recommended length stated in the essay handout; that is, it is 1125-1500 words long.		Your essay is 100% or more in excess of the recommended length stated in the essay handout; that is, it is over 1500 words long.

Final Examination Grading Rubrics

Final Examination Short Answer Grading Rubric

Scores (out of 5 points)	Criteria
5 points	The answer is clearly stated, thorough, and substantially correct.
4 points	The answer is fairly clear and basically correct.
3 points	The answer is seriously unclear or displays limited understanding of the subject of the question.
0-2 points	The answer displays little or no understanding of the subject of the question.

Final Examination Essay Grading Rubric

Criteria	Excellent (32-35 pts.)	Good (28-31 pts.)	Satisfactory (25-27 pts.)	Marginal (21-24 pts.)	Unsatisfactory (0-20 pts.)
1. Articulation of your answer to the question	Your answer to the question is clearly and thoroughly stated. Your discussion of the political theorists whose work you mention is clear and accurate.	Your answer to the question is clearly and thoroughly stated. Your discussion of the political theorists whose work you mention is generally clear, but occasionally inaccurate.	Either your answer to the question or your discussion of the political theorists whose work you mention is unclear about some important points.	Both your answer to the question and your discussion of the political theorists whose work you mention are unclear, confusing, and hard to follow.	Either you do not make an effort to answer the question as stated or your answer is irrelevant to the question.
2. Argumentative support for your answer to the question	Your argument in support of your answer to the question is clearly stated and convincing.	Your argument in support of your answer to the question is clearly stated, but it is not convincing.	Your argument in support of your answer to the question is unclear and unconvincing.	You fail to argue in support of at least one part of your answer to the question.	Either you fail to argue in support of more than one part of your answer or the argument that you provide is irrelevant to your answer.

Class Participation Grading Rubric

Grade	Criteria
A	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Regular class attendance; • Regular participation in large and small group discussions; and • Frequent thoughtful, insightful, or provocative contributions to large group discussions
B	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Regular class attendance; and • Regular participation in large and small group discussions.
C	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Regular class attendance; • Regular participation in small group class discussions; and • Limited participation in large group class discussions.
D	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Irregular class attendance; or • Limited participation in large and small group class discussions; or • Occasional disruption of class activities.
F	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Infrequent class attendance; or • Frequent disruption of class activities.

Course Schedule

Date	Assignment
Jan. 11	Course Introduction
Jan. 13	John Locke, <i>Second Treatise of Civil Government</i> , Chapter V, available through BlueLine ; Quiz
Jan. 17	Last date to add a class for Spring Semester 2017
Jan. 18	John Stuart Mill, <i>Utilitarianism</i> , Chapter V, available through BlueLine ; Quiz
Jan. 20	John Rawls, "Justice as Fairness", in Goodin & Pettit, eds., pp. 185-200; Quiz Research groups set their research group seminar schedules in class Last date to drop a class for Spring Semester 2017
Jan. 25	John Rawls, "Justice as Fairness", in Goodin & Pettit, eds., pp. 185-200 Research groups discuss and submit their preferred group research project topics in class
Jan. 27	Research Group Seminar 1 on Rawls Robert Nozick, "Distributive Justice", in Goodin & Pettit, eds., pp. 201-228; Quiz Requests for disability accommodations are due to be submitted to the instructor
Feb. 1	Robert Nozick, "Distributive Justice", in Goodin & Pettit, eds., pp. 201-228
Feb. 3	Research Group Seminar 2 on Nozick Brian Barry, "Chance, Choice, and Justice", in Goodin & Pettit, eds., pp. 229-238; Quiz
Feb. 8	Group Research Project Workshop 1
Feb. 9	Last date to apply for Pass/No Pass status Last date to apply to change from credit to audit
Feb. 10	Brian Barry, "Chance, Choice, and Justice", in Goodin & Pettit, eds., pp. 229-238
Feb. 15	Research Group Seminar 3 on Barry Michael Sandel, "The Procedural Republic and the Unencumbered Self", in Goodin & Pettit, eds., pp. 239-247; Quiz
Feb. 17	Michael Sandel, "The Procedural Republic and the Unencumbered Self", in Goodin & Pettit, eds., pp. 239-247
Feb. 22	Research Group Seminar 4 on Sandel Iris Marion Young, "Polity and Group Difference" in Goodin & Pettit, eds., pp. 248-263; Quiz
Feb. 24	Iris Marion Young, "Polity and Group Difference" in Goodin & Pettit, eds., pp. 248-263
Mar. 1	Group Research Project Workshop 2 Group Annotated Bibliography due
Mar. 3	Graham, "Autonomy, Individualism, and Social Justice," <i>Journal of Value Inquiry</i> 36.1 (2002), pp. 43-57 Graham, "After the Buses Stop Running: Distributive Justice or Dialogue" (RAML E-Reserve); Quiz
Mar. 6-10	Spring Break – No class meetings
Mar. 15	Jurgen Habermas, "The Public Sphere", in Goodin & Pettit, eds., pp. 103-106; Quiz Major Essay Topic Statement due
Mar. 17	Robert A. Dahl, "Procedural Democracy", in Goodin & Pettit, eds., pp. 107-125; Quiz
Mar. 22	Major Essay Workshop
Mar. 24	Robert A. Dahl, "Procedural Democracy", in Goodin & Pettit, eds., pp. 107-125 Major Essay Outline due
Mar. 29	Group Oral Presentation 1 on Dahl Cass R. Sunstein, "Preferences and Politics", in Goodin & Pettit, eds., pp. 126-143; Quiz
Mar. 31	Cass R. Sunstein, "Preferences and Politics", in Goodin & Pettit, eds., pp. 126-143
Apr. 5	Group Oral Presentation 2 on Sunstein Jon Elster, "The Market and the Forum", in Goodin & Pettit, eds., pp. 144-158; Quiz
Apr. 7	Jon Elster, "The Market and the Forum", in Goodin & Pettit, eds., pp. 144-158 Major Essay Draft due

Date	Assignment
Apr. 12	Group Presentation 3 on Elster Joshua Cohen, "Deliberation and Democratic Legitimacy", in Goodin & Pettit, eds., pp. 159-170; Quiz
Apr. 14	Joshua Cohen, "Deliberation and Democratic Legitimacy", in Goodin & Pettit, eds., pp. 159-170
Apr. 19	Group Presentation 4 on Cohen Anne Phillips, "Dealing with Difference", in Goodin & Pettit, eds., pp. 171-181; Quiz
Apr. 21	Anne Phillips, "Dealing with Difference", in Goodin & Pettit, eds., pp. 171-181 Martha Minow, "Justice Engendered", in Goodin & Pettit, eds., pp. 501-521; Quiz Major Essay Final Version due
Apr. 26	Martha Minow, "Justice Engendered", in Goodin & Pettit, eds., pp. 501-521
Apr. 28	Review for Final Examination
May 1-5	Final Examination , date and time TBA