Marking Rubric

Marking Criteria	Mark	Marking Scheme	Explanatory Comments re purpose of individual criteria
Identify the correct disposition as a final conclusion	/3	• If the final conclusion correctly reflects the disposition in the sample answer (and includes nothing more), 3 marks should be awarded. • If the final conclusion correctly reflects the disposition in the sample answer but it is part of a compound conclusion, 2 marks should be awarded. • If the final conclusion incorrectly reflects the disposition in the sample answer either specifically or as part of a compound conclusion or a paraphrase, 1 mark should be awarded. • If there is no disposition included, zero marks should be awarded.	The purpose of this criterion is to assess the correctness of the disposition as the *final conclusion* to ensure it reflects the sample answer. The *final conclusion* is the conclusion to the argument that contains the disposition. The *disposition* is the statement either 'appeal allowed' or 'appeal dismissed' (identically stated or paraphrased). A *compound conclusion* in relation to this criterion is a *final conclusion* that contains something more than either 'appeal allowed' or 'appeal dismissed' (identically stated or paraphrased). A *final conclusion* is *wrong* if the *disposition* contained within the *final conclusion* reflects the opposite of the sample answer. For example, if the *disposition* in the *final conclusion* is 'appeal allowed', but the sample answer is 'appeal dismissed', then the *final conclusion* is *wrong*.
Correct identification of the premises leading to the final conclusion	/3	• If the premises of the final argument are exactly the same (identical or paraphrase) as the sample answer, 3 marks should be awarded. • If the premises of the final argument are mostly the same (identical or paraphrase) as the sample answer, 2 marks should be awarded. • If the premises of the final argument are only partly the same (identical or paraphrase) as the sample answer, 1 mark should be awarded. • If the premises of the final argument are not the same (identical or paraphrase) as the sample answer, zero marks should be awarded.	The purpose of this criterion is to assess the correctness of the *premises* contained within the *final argument* to ensure they reflect the sample answer. The *final argument* is the argument that contains the *final conclusion* The *premises* within the *final argument* do not include the *final conclusion*. The criterion requires an assessment of same-ness across the *premises* in the *final argument*. This is a measure of how many of the *premises* in the given answer are the *same* as the sample answer. In this criterion, *same* is established through the meaning of the *premises* used. A *premise* may be the *same* if either the exact *premise* is used or an equivalent paraphrase is used. In this criterion the assessment of the *premises* as being either *mostly* or *partly* the same is based on the measurement of same-ness. For example: where the given answer includes more *premises* in the *final argument* that are the same as the sample answer (but not all *premises* are the same), this would be mostly the same; where the given answer includes less *premises* in the *final argument* that are the same as the sample answer (but has at least one *premise* is the same), this would be partly the same. This criterion relates to the *premises* of the *final argument*. It does not relate to the *final conclusion* within that argument or the *disposition*. Accordingly, an incorrect *final conclusion* does not mean that 3 marks cannot be awarded. (The final conclusion is assessed in *Identify the correct disposition as a final conclusion*.) This criterion does not relate to any *prior arguments*. (Prior arguments are defined and assessed in the criterion: *Correct identification of prior argument premises (identical or paraphrase) leading to conclusion*.) This criterion does not assess the *form* of the argument. The *form* of the argument is required to be a broadly modus ponens structure, but marks are *not* awarded in this category for the precision of the formal structure. (This is assessed in the category: *Correct use of a modus ponens format is expressed across the whole argument*

			chain.)
Correct identification of prior argument premises (identical or paraphrase) leading to conclusion	/6	● If the terms of the prior arguments are exactly the same (identical or paraphrase) as the sample answer, 6 marks should be awarded. ● If the terms of the prior arguments are mostly the same (identical or paraphrase) as the sample answer, 4 marks should be awarded. ● If the terms of the prior arguments are only partly the same (identical or paraphrase) as the sample answer, 2 marks should be awarded. ● If the terms of the prior arguments are not the same (identical or paraphrase) as the sample answer, zero marks should be awarded.	The purpose of this criterion is to assess the correctness of the *terms* of the *prior arguments* against the sample answer. The *prior arguments* are any arguments that come before the *final argument*. The *terms* of the *prior arguments* are the premises and conclusions that make up the prior arguments. The criterion requires an assessment of same-ness across the *terms* of the *prior argument*. This is a measure of how many of the *premises* or *conclusions* in the given answer are the *same* as the sample answer. In this criterion, *same* is established through the meaning of the terms used. A term may be the *same* if either the exact term is used or an equivalent paraphrase is used. This criterion relates to the *content* of the entire *prior arguments* – and not only to the content of individually similar terms within the *prior arguments*. Accordingly, and for example, the *prior arguments* in the given answer could be considered to be the *same* as the sample answer even though the sample answer may include three arguments and the given answer contain four arguments (thus being awarded full marks) – provided that the the terms are considered the same across the *content* of the entire *prior arguments* viewed as a whole. This criterion does not relate to any *final arguments*. (Final arguments are defined and assessed in the criterion: *Correct identification of a final argument leading to the final conclusion*.) This criterion does not assess the *form* of the argument. The *form* of the argument is required to be a broadly modus ponens structure, but marks are *not* awarded in this category for the precision of the formal structure. (This is assessed in the category: *Correct use of a modus ponens format is expressed across the whole argument chain*.)
Correct attribution of of argument terms' location in providing reconstructed argument	/3	● If the location attributed to similar (paraphrased or identical) argument terms in the whole argument is the same in the given answer and sample answer, 3 marks should be awarded. ● If the location attributed to similar (paraphrased or identical) argument terms in the whole argument is mostly the same, 2 marks should be awarded. ● If the location attributed to similar (paraphrased or identical) argument terms in the whole argument is partly the same, 1 mark should be awarded. ● If the location attributed to similar (paraphrased or identical) argument terms in the whole argument is not the same,, zero marks should be awarded.	The purpose of this criterion is to assess the correctness of the *location attributed to similar (paraphrased or identical) argument terms* in the *whole argument*. The *location attributed to similar (paraphrased or identical) argument terms* can include reference to specific paragraph numbers or ranges of paragraph numbers (in any format) or to the identification/reference of an instance where there has been an inference. The *whole argument* consists of both the *final argument* and the *prior arguments*. The criterion requires an assessment of same-ness in the statement of the *location attributed to similar (paraphrased or identical) argument terms*. In this criterion, *same* is established through the identification of the *location attributed to similar (paraphrased or identical) argument terms* that exactly matches the given answer. However, as there may be multiple instances of a claim being made in a document, the attribution of any one of the locations listed in the sample answer will be considered to be the same. In any instances where there is in the given answer no provision *location attributed to similar (paraphrased or identical) argument terms* for any one or all of the terms in the whole argument, the failure to provide a *location*

				attributed to similar (paraphrased or identical) argument terms in each instance will be taken to be <u>not</u> the same as the answers in the sample answer.
Correct use of a modus ponens format is expressed across the whole argument chain	/5	- If a precise modus ponens format is adopted across the whole argument chain, 5 marks should be awarded. - If a precise modus ponens format is adopted across most of the whole argument chain and an imprecise modus ponens format is adopted across the remainder, 4 marks should be awarded. - If a precise modus ponens format is adopted across only a part of the whole argument chain and an imprecise modus ponens format is adopted across the remainder, 3 marks should be awarded. - If an imprecise modus ponens format is adopted across the whole argument chain, 2 marks should be awarded. - If an imprecise modus ponens format is adopted across some of the whole argument chain and no modus ponens format is adopted across the remainder, 1 marks should be awarded. - If no modus ponens format is adopted across the whole argument chain, zero marks should be awarded.		The purpose of this criterion is to assess the correctness and precision of the use of a *modus ponens argument form* expressed *across* the *whole argument chain*. The *modus ponens argument form* is: If [P], then [Q]. [P]. Therefore, [Q]. The *whole argument* consists of both the *final argument* and the *prior arguments*. The *whole argument chain* includes both the *whole argument* as well as the links established in any *argument chain*. An *argument chain* is *created* where two or more arguments are linked by the conclusion to one argument being used as a premise in a subsequent argument. The criterion requires an assessment of same-ness in the form of the arguments in the given answer against the *modus ponens argument form*. A *modus ponens argument form* is *precise* where, for example, the [P] in the argument is exactly replicated in all parts of that argument. Given the number of terms within the whole argument chain, the assessment of same-ness requires a holistic view of all of the arguments in the whole argument chain.
TOTAL	**/20**			