

# Introduction to Philosophy of Physics

## Grading rubric

---

### Evaluation criteria (specified in the prompt)

I expect to receive essays which are well-structured, clearly argued, and show signs of independent thinking. As a general rule, essays carefully working out a smaller point tend to receive higher grades than essays superficially covering vast philosophical territories. This is a finger exercise, not a commission of a symphony.

### General guidelines

The relative weight assigned to the following categories is intended to give you a good idea of what virtues I want an assignment to exhibit, not to pretend that there exists some automatic mechanism for grading philosophy assignments. Each category is evaluated at either three or five levels of quality, depending on the relative weight of the category.

The papers must be

- within the indicated word limit, with the word count clearly indicated,
- on topic either as specified in the prompt or as agreed upon with me beforehand,
- submitted on time,
- properly referenced.

Papers which fail to meet these standards will receive a general deduction.

### Grading standards

The standards for paper grading are as follows:

1. Writing (10%)
  - well written (10 points): easy to read with short, clear sentences, no recurring grammatical errors
  - fairly written (5): no recurring errors, though not easy to read (e.g., difficult sentence structure)
  - poorly written (0): very difficult to read or recurring grammatical errors
2. Organisation (10%)
  - clearly organised (10): clear paragraphs and transitions, structure of paper reflects structure of argument
  - somewhat organised (5): reader is sometimes lost
  - poorly organised (0): reader is often lost
3. Exposition (30%)
  - excellent exposition (30): mastery of material, conveys complete comprehension to reader
  - good exposition (25): no major mistake, conveys main line of argument to reader
  - fair exposition (20): no major mistake, shows grasp of material, but conveys it inadequately

- poor exposition (10): major mistakes or doesn't show grasp of main argument
- misfire (0): completely off target

4. Critique: effectiveness (30%)

- highly effective (30): effectively overturns a major claim, or casts the argument into doubt
- effective (25): makes well-supported point and shows understanding of what has been achieved
- somewhat effective (20): lacks development or makes minor argumentative errors or doesn't understand what's been accomplished
- somewhat ineffective (10): has promise of amounting to more than mere counter-assertion
- ineffective (0): makes large argumentative errors or amounts to mere counter-assertion or doesn't engage with exposition or is opaque to reader

5. Critique: originality (20%)

- creative (20): shows significant creativity and originality
- thoughtful (10): shows that author has thought about issue independently
- unoriginal (0): rehashes reading or class material