

Kyle David Bennett, Ph.D. | Assistant Professor of Philosophy | Caldwell University
PH 318 Philosophy of Law & Society | Presentation Grading Rubric

Writing	Comprehension of material	Analysis or criticism of material	Application of ideas in course
Deals with structure and flow of paper, proper formatting, sentence structure, word choice, and mechanics: spelling, punctuation, typography	Deals with clear and accurate presentation of material, ability to discuss it concisely, and creative discussion of the material in your own words.	Deals with insightful analysis of arguments, classification of positions, critique of sources, comparison of strengths and weakness in arguments, and ability to synthesize strong points	Deals with your ability to move beyond the current discussion or debate and apply the course material to a new problem or pressing issue.
5: There are essentially no grammatical, syntactical, or structural errors. The prose is excellent and it is reader-friendly. Very polished and sophisticated, graceful even.	5: Very dense, accurate, and concise discussion of the material. This paper demonstrates your ability to summarize and describe what thinkers are doing with their arguments and why they are arguing in such a way.	5: This is an excellent, insightful analysis of individual positions. Moreover, you've creatively compared and/or synthesized the strong points of a variety of sources and ideas.	5: This moves convincingly beyond the sources to address the original problem more adequately. You raise a significant new problem in the field or something that's been overlooked. Or you've applied this material to a significant problem in another field.
4: It is without errors, but lacking in sophistication. Or it is reader-friendly but marred by more than a few errors. The flow may be awkward.	4: Dense and accurate report of the main ideas. This paper demonstrates your ability to describe another person's views clearly.	4: This is a fine analysis of sources. You've also insightfully juxtaposed sources and reasonably assessed the strengths and weaknesses of each.	4: This clearly and convincingly develops or advances the problem. Or you've creatively applied it to a new problem.
3: Marked by flaws in structure, grammar, word choice, or mechanics. But otherwise, it is adequate.	3: This is a largely accurate account of the main sources and ideas we've discussed. But you've relied too much on quoting the sources or paraphrasing them instead of discussing and explaining them.	3: This is a fair analysis and critique of the material. You've also put forward some insightful comparisons or syntheses.	3: You've made reasonable or tentative development but not with fully convincing argumentation.
2: Marked by serious errors in more than one category. This is serious enough to affect comprehension of the argument.	2: There are major inaccuracies here. You're also missing some main points. Or you've quoted or paraphrased too much.	2: Some of your analyses or arguments are mistaken or some of your criticisms are misplaced. You've failed to see connections between sources.	2: You make a variety of moves toward development or application but you haven't provided adequate arguments for any of them.
1: This is unsatisfactory. There are major errors overall and it is nearly unintelligible.	1: There are major inaccuracies here. You've failed to grasp the main points and/or you've quoted or paraphrased too much	1: You've failed to see the insight in the arguments. Because of this, your associations among authors are mistaken and/or your criticisms are misplaced.	1: This fails to make any credible application or development of course material.