

	Definitions (5%)	Explanation (15%)	Support (25%)	Counterarguments (5%)	Examples (5%)
A	All key terms are clearly defined; definitions make sense, and all potentially controversial elements of the definition are explained and justified. There are no excessive or superfluous definitions.	The views of others (both what they say and why they say it) are clearly described and explained. All relevant features of their views are included.	Your own arguments have clear and adequate support, and it's clear how the support relates to the claims being made.	Where appropriate, counterarguments to your own view are presented. These counterarguments are strong and treated charitably. Responses are clear and convincing.	Where examples are used, they are clear and lively, and they add to the understanding of the points being made. It is obvious how they relate to the main claims of the paper.
C	Key terms are generally defined, although the definitions may be too brief to demonstrate understanding or difficult to follow. Insufficient support is provided for the definitions. Some superfluous definitions.	The explanations of others' views are too brief and/or unclear to demonstrate understanding. May be uncharitable to others. May leave out important parts of others' views.	There is support for arguments, but it is sometimes difficult to figure out exactly what it is. An effort has been made, but the support is generally inadequate. Many key claims are asserted but not argued for.	Counterarguments are considered, but they're very weak. The paper deals with counterarguments uncharitably or incorrectly. Responses are inadequate.	Examples are present, but there are too many or too few of them. Their relevance to the point is not explained. They are either overly detailed or not detailed enough, distracting from rather than adding to the paper.
F	Key terms are generally not defined. If there are definitions, they are incorrect and/or not explained; or there are many superfluous definitions.	Others' views are not explained, or are explained extremely uncharitably, or the explanations are extremely difficult to follow.	The paper mostly consists of assertions, with almost no argument. Where support is provided, it is extremely difficult to figure out how it is supposed to connect to the main claims.	Obvious counterarguments are not considered.	There are either no examples, where examples are necessary, or there are long, drawn-out examples where none are necessary.

This is the rubric I will use to grade all of your written work in this class. When I grade the take-home exams, I will only grade them using the categories that apply to each question. (For example, if a question asks you to explain someone else's reasoning, I will be grading you primarily on Explanation. If a question asks you to explain someone else's reasoning, provide a counterargument, and support that counterargument, I will be grading you on Explanation, Support, and Counterarguments.) When I grade the final paper, I will grade it using all of these categories. If you have questions about how I am grading a particular question, or about how to use this rubric to interpret your grades, I encourage you to speak with me outside of class.

	Use of literature (15%)	Organization (10%)	Mechanics (3%)	Question (10%)	Accuracy (7%)
A	Literature is used appropriately and makes sense within the context of the paper. When used, quotations are neither too short nor too long. The significance of concepts and quotations from the literature is clearly explained.	The paper's introduction clearly lays out the main thesis and the rest of the paper. The different topics flow naturally and are clearly marked with transitional sentences. The conclusion presents the main findings of the paper.	Citations are used wherever appropriate. Grammar, spelling, and syntax all work.	All parts of the question are answered completely.	All views are presented accurately, charitably, and completely.
C	Too many quotations or too few. Literature used is somewhat disconnected from the argument it's supporting. The significance of quotations is sometimes not explained.	The paper has an introduction and a conclusion, but they are ineffective. Ideas are sometimes disjointed or difficult to follow.	Citations are generally present but sometimes missing. Some grammatical or spelling errors.	Several parts of the question are rushed through, or one part of the question has been completely unanswered.	Some mistakes in the presentation of the views, but the argument is relatively unaffected by them.
F	The paper either uses no literature or is mostly composed of quotations, which are clearly out of place.	The introduction and conclusion are completely absent or off-topic. Ideas do not connect with each other at all. The paper is very difficult to follow.	Citations are nonexistent. Grammatical, etc. errors significantly interfere with the readability of the essay.	Significant parts of the question are completely left unanswered.	The views presented are extremely uncharitably distorted or completely incorrect.

Additional deductions

- Up to ten percent off for improper formatting. (The amount of the deduction is based on whether your improper formatting gives you an unfair advantage, e.g., if you single- rather than double-space to work around the length requirements. Formatting errors that do not give you an unfair advantage will receive smaller deductions.)
- Up to two percent off for each of the following smaller mistakes: significant improper citation, failure to anonymize, font much too large or too small, etc.
- Three percent off for every day the assignment is late (including if it's late on the day it's due).