Rubric

100 points	Excellent	Good	Needs Improvement	Marginal
Thesis [10]	A clear statement of the main conclusion of the paper.	The thesis is obvious, but there is no single clear statement of it.	The thesis is present, but must be uncovered or reconstructed from the text of the paper.	There is no thesis.
Argumentation: Clear premises + support [35]	Each reason for believing the thesis is made clear, and, as much as possible, presented in single statements. Also clear which premises are to be taken as given, and which will be supported by sub-arguments. The premises that are taken as given are at least plausibly true. Paper provides sub-arguments for controversial premises. The premises clearly support the thesis, and the author is aware of exactly the kind of support they provide. The argument is either valid as it stands, or, if invalid, the thesis,the thesis, based on the premises, is likely to be or plausibly true.	The premises are all clear, although each may not be presented in a single statement. Also pretty clear which premises are to be taken as given, and which will be supported by sub-arguments. The paper provides sub-arguments for controversial premises. The premises that are taken as given are at least plausibly true. The premises support the thesis, and the author is aware of the general kind of support they provide. The argument is either valid as it stands, or, if invalid, the thesis, based on the premises, is likely to be or plausibly true.	The premises must be reconstructed from the text of the paper. It is not made clear which premises are to be taken as given, and which will be supported by sub-arguments. There are no sub-arguments, or, if there are sub-arguments, the premises for these are not made clear. The paper does not provide sub-arguments for controversial premises. The plausibility of the premises that are taken as given is questionable. The premises somewhat support the thesis, but the author is not aware of the kind of support they provide. The argument is invalid, and the thesis, based on the premises, is not likely to be or plausibly true.	There are no premises-the paper merely restates the thesis. Or, if there are premises, they are much more likely to be false than true. The premises do not support the thesis.
Considering counter arguments [20]	Author precisely articulates and charitably considers and evaluates a number of viable, alternative positions & counterarguments (both obvious & novel ones) vis-à-vis their own position and arguments; responds to these alternatives adeptly & insightfully.	Author articulates and charitably considers and evaluates some viable, alternative positions and counterarguments (perhaps only obvious ones) vis-à-vis the author's own position and argument; provides a plausible response to them.	Author considers and evaluates some alternative positions and counterarguments vis-à-vis their own position, though these opposing views are not really plausible or viable, and they may not be fully articulated;	Author barely considers or recognizes the possibility of alternative positions or counterarguments at all (whether viable or not); responses to such alternatives and counterarguments are

			provides some coherent response to them.	largely imprecise, vague, ambiguous.
Understanding: Text/source material [15]	The paper contains highly accurate and precise summarization, description, and/or paraphrasing of the text(s) / source material. The paper uses appropriate textual support for these.	The summarization, description, and/or paraphrasing of text is fairly accurate and precise, and has textual support, but other passages may have been better choices.	The summarization, description, and/or paraphrasing of text is fairly accurate, but not precise, and the textual support is inappropriate.	The summarization, description, and/or paraphrasing of text is inaccurate and/or has no textual support.
Clarity and style [20] Note: some of this is captured by Argumentation category above	The reader can easily understand the author's argument, explanation, analysis and exposition with no extraneous interpretive effort. The structure of the paper is manifestly clear. The writing is also both precise and concise --- but without sacrificing clarity or glossing over important details. Important technical terminology/concepts are clearly defined and explained.	Writing is easy-to-follow and clear. The reader can understand the argument, explanation, analysis and exposition with little interpretive effort. The author, to some extent, balances concision with clarity and important nuance/detail. Word choice is thoughtful, and technical terminology/ concepts are defined, explained, and employed with relative clarity and precision.	Writing is somewhat readable, but sometimes difficult to follow and unclear. The reader may have difficulty understanding the author's argument & text without significant interpretive effort. Author's writing may not properly balance concision, clarity, & detail. Words may be chosen with some, minimal thoughtfulness, and technical concepts are not well-defined, explained, orprecisely employed.	Author's prose is ultimately too-often difficult to follow and unclear. The reader may find it very difficult to understand the author's text even with significant interpretive effort. Author's writing fails to strike a good balance between concision, clarity, & detail. Words are neither well nor thoughtfully chosen, & technical terms/ concepts are imprecisely employed and either inaccurately explained or left nearly undefined.

Adapted by Yongming Han from Maralee Harrel, *Teaching Philosophy* 28:1 (2005), Orfeas Zormpalas'point distribution, and parts of Micah T. Lewin's rubric.