GRADING RUBRIC
Tono Ramirez
De Anza College

	4 (Excellent) Paper features all of the following	**3 (Satisfactory) Paper features one or more of the following:**	**2 (Poor/Needs Improvement) Paper features one or more of the following:**	**1 (Unnaceptable) Paper features one or more of the following:**
Organization	Paper contains a thesis that clearly establishes the scope, aims and main conclusion of the paper. Paper contains a conclusion paragraphs that explicitly highlights the key achievements from the discussion. Ideas are clearly and logically organized, and transitional words/phrases clearly show how the ideas contained in different paragraphs are related.	Thesis is present, but not clear/explicit. An organizational plan is evident, but not made explicit to the reader. The reader has to do extra work to infer the organizational plan.	Ideas are contained in discrete paragraphs, but the relationship between these paragraphs is unclear. Significant re-ordering of ideas is required to clarify the 'train of thought' in this paper.	Ideas are raised randomly throughout the paper. No organizational plan is evident.
Clarity	Paper is free of awkward prose and typos. Diction is consistently appropriate and correctly used.	Writing is mostly clear, but sentence structure and/or diction occasionally distracts the attention of the reader.	Significant proofreading and revision is needed to clarify claims made in the paper. Reader can infer the *ideas* behind your sentences, but has to work hard to do so.	Awkward prose/grammatical errors make sentences entirely unintelligible.

Concision	Discussion is free of irrelevant content. Redundant claims are avoided	Discussion features some irrelevant and/or redundant claims that occasionally distract from the aim of the paper.	Significant portions of the discussion are irrelevant or redundant. Editing is needed to keep discussion 'on point'.	Discussion is primarily comprised of claims that have nothing to do with the aim of the paper.
Substantive Accuracy	All theories are correctly described, and accurately attributed to their respective authors. Key concepts/terms are used correctly throughout the discussion. Descriptions are thorough, capturing all premises and conclusions of key arguments.	Descriptions of theories/concepts are largely accurate, but feature some error/misunderstanding. The views of one or more relevant philosophers are somewhat misrepresented. Descriptions of key arguments are accurate, but somewhat incomplete.	One or more significant concepts/theories are incorrectly/inconsistently/ incompletely described. Key features of theories are omitted.	Deep confusion about key concepts/theories is evident in this paper.
Critical Comparison	The central points of agreement and/or difference between all views/philosophers discussed are made explicit.	Key differences/ similarities are implied, but not made explicit. Discussion shows that you *recognize* the relationship between different views, but you could say more to make the details of this relationship clear.	Some important similarity or difference between the views raised in your discussion goes unacknowledged/ unrecognized.	Discussion makes little/no attempt to compare the views/philosophers raised in the paper.