

Ethics! RUBRIC

How unit exams are assessed.

	Excellent	Good	Acceptable	Mediocre	Unacceptable
Criteria for Each Response to a Short-Essay Problem					
Clarity	This response to the short-essay problem follows the conventions of standard written English, with no errors hindering comprehension.	This response to the short-essay problem generally follows the conventions of standard written English, with errors not hindering comprehension.	This response to the short-essay problem generally follows the conventions of standard written English, with small errors hindering comprehension.	This response to the short-essay problem barely follows the conventions of standard written English, which hinders comprehension.	This response to the short-essay problem does not follow the conventions of standard written English, with major errors hindering comprehension.
	All words are chosen for their precise meanings	Most words are chosen for their precise meanings	Words do not seem chosen for their precise meanings.	Words are not chosen for their precise meanings.	Responses do not acknowledge that key words have precise meanings.
Originality	This response to the short-essay problem expresses everything clearly in the student's own words without ever directly quoting the text, the professor, or any other outside sources.	This response to the short-essay problem generally expresses everything in the student's own words, though there is occasional material that could have been better paraphrased.	This response to the short-essay problem is mostly in the student's own words, but there is also material that should have been better paraphrased.	This response to the short-essay problem expresses little in the student's own words, but has significant and lengthy material that should have been better paraphrased.	This response to the short-essay problem has nothing written in the student's own words, but consists nearly entirely of quotations or poorly paraphrased material.
Academic Integrity*	This responses to the short-essay problem properly cites and/or acknowledges all sources using APA-style formatting. As relevant, the completed unit exam includes "References" and "Acknowledgments" sections at the end.	This responses to the short-essay problem cites and/or acknowledges sources, but with small errors in the APA-style formatting.	This response to the short-essay problem cites and/or acknowledges sources, but with important omissions or incorrect formatting.	This response to the short-essay problem displays no effort to cite and/or acknowledge sources.	This response to the short-essay problem commits plagiarism or another academic integrity violation.

* Depending on the severity of the circumstances, a mark of mediocre or unacceptable for academic integrity may also result in the instructor reporting a possible academic integrity violation to the Chair of the Philosophy Department, the Dean of the College of Arts and Sciences, and the Academic Integrity Office (see the Academic Integrity section in the syllabus).

Ethics! RUBRIC

The rest of the unit exam criteria.

	Excellent	Good	Acceptable	Mediocre	Unacceptable
Criteria for Each Response to a Short-Essay Problem (Continued)					
Comprehension	This response to the short-essay problem demonstrates an accurate and complete understanding of the problem being addressed.	This response to the short-essay problem demonstrates a generally accurate and nearly complete understanding of the problem being addressed.	This response to the short-essay problem demonstrates a reasonable, though imperfect, understanding of the problem being addressed.	This response to the short-essay problem does not demonstrate an adequate understanding of the problem being addressed.	This response to the short-essay problem fails to address the problem itself or demonstrates a very limited grasp of that problem.
Focus	This response to the short-essay problem maintains tight focus on addressing the central issue and avoids being sidetracked.	This response to the short-essay problem generally maintains focus with very minor digressions from the central issue.	This response to the short-essay problem generally maintains focus but occasionally digresses from the central issue.	This response to the short-essay problem has limited focus with several digressions from the central issue.	This response to the short-essay problem lacks focus, substantially digressing from the central issue or addressing another issue entirely.
Competence	This response to the short-essay problem incorporates pertinent details from the videos and assigned readings (like definitions, applications, and arguments).	This response to the short-essay problem generally incorporates details from the videos and assigned readings (like definitions, applications, and arguments).	This response to the short-essay problem incorporates some details from the videos and assigned readings (like definitions, applications, and arguments) but not in a thorough manner.	This response to the short-essay problem barely incorporates details from the videos and assigned readings.	This response to the short-essay problem does not incorporate pertinent details from the videos or assigned readings.
	Those details help provide explanation and/or evidence for key claims.	However, some relevant explanation and/or evidence for key claims is missing.	That lack of thoroughness leaves a few key claims without explanation and/or evidence.	Without those details, many key claims are without explanation and/or evidence.	Without those details, most key claims are without explanation and/or evidence.
Analysis	This response to the short-essay problem does significantly more than restate the problem and offer a brief response.	This response to the short-essay problem does much more than restate the problem and offer a brief response.	This response to the short-essay problem does more than restate the problem and offer a brief response.	This response to the short-essay problem does a little more than restate the problem and offer a brief response.	This response to the short-essay problem merely restates the problem and offers an irrelevant or undeveloped response.
	It displays a great deal of clarity of thought, depth of reflection, and insight into the issue.	It generally displays clarity of thought, depth of reflection, and insight into the issue.	It displays basic knowledge of the issue with some depth of reflection and insight.	It displays rudimentary knowledge of the issue with limited depth of reflection and insight.	It may lack clarity, be confused, omit significant information, or be otherwise incomplete.