

## Introduction to Philosophy (Taught Course)

I include the following materials for the most recent time I have taught Introduction to Philosophy (Fall 2014): syllabus, course schedule, and sample paper-prompts with grading rubrics.

### **P100: Introduction to Philosophy**

#### **Course Goal**

By the end of the semester, you will think like a philosopher:

- you will understand & analyze important questions, concepts, & texts; and,
- you will explain & critically assess answers & arguments responding to philosophical questions.

#### **Course Description**

In this course, we shall consider philosophical questions such as the following: How should I live? What can I know? What really exists? What is the human condition? To engage with such questions, we will critically engage with how philosophers in the past have addressed them. These include Socrates, Plato, Aristotle, René Descartes, Immanuel Kant, Bertrand Russell, Jean-Paul Sartre, Simone de Beauvoir, and Martin Luther King, Jr. I hope that this course will foster an appreciation for philosophical thinking and cultivate critical thinking skills of general benefit. These skills include: questioning, conceptual analysis, application of ethical theories, close-reading of texts, argument identification & explanation, argument evaluation, considering alternative perspectives, and recognizing the limits to what one knows.

#### **Learning Outcomes**

To complete successfully this course's final assessment, classes and assignments will prepare you to do the following:

- A. Identify, ask, and explain the significance of philosophical questions
- B. Analyze concepts and definitions as a philosopher
- C. Analyze and interpret texts to make comprehensible key concepts and claims
- D. Identify and reconstruct arguments presented in philosophical texts
- E. Critically evaluate philosophical claims and arguments
- F. Formulate arguments and reasons in support of your own views and insights

#### **Required Texts**

Plato. 2002. *Five Dialogues: Euthyphro, Apology, Crito, Meno, Phaedo*. Second Edition.

Translated by G. M. A. Grube and revised by John M. Cooper. Indianapolis: Hackett Publishing Company. ISBN: 978-0-87220-633-5.

Russell, Bertrand. 1912. *The Problems of Philosophy*. Indianapolis: Hackett Publishing Company. ISBN: 978-0-87220-098-2.

All other required readings will be made available in Canvas under "Files".

## Assignments

### Participation Exercises

There will be 20 smaller assignments throughout the semester. Most will be exercises to accompany the reading before class, and these will only be accepted—barring any emergencies—in-class on the day of the assigned reading. Others will be in-class exercises, and hence will also require your presence in class. Each assignment will be equally weighted. They will be graded with the following rubric:

√++ (100% credit)	√+ (85% credit)	√ (65% credit)	0 (0% credit)
Terrific: <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• responds fully to prompt</li><li>• explains main points; provides clear &amp; developed ideas</li></ul>	Very good: <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• responds fully to prompt</li><li>• identifies major points; unclear or underdeveloped ideas</li></ul>	Needs work: <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• responds only partially to prompt</li><li>• fails to identify major points; very unclear; no development of ideas</li></ul>	Failing <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Incomplete</li><li>• Off topic</li></ul>

### Task-Papers

There will be five “task-papers”, i.e. papers in which you exercise various tasks that are involved in philosophical thinking. Mastery of each of these tasks will be expected on the final exam, so these papers must be taken seriously. There will be three kinds of task-papers. The first focuses on *conceptual analysis*, testing you to understand, apply, and critically think about Socratic definitions. The second focuses on *reading*, requiring that you summarize difficult philosophical texts and ask critical questions. The third focuses on *reasoning*, requiring that you critically assess philosophical arguments. For each of these three types of task papers, I shall provide a grading rubric with the assignment’s instructions.

### Final Exam

Your task during the final exam will be to think philosophically by critically examining a new philosophical text of roughly 1-2 pages in length. You will write an essay in which you perform five tasks, corresponding to skills we have focused on throughout the semester. Namely, you will be asked to do the following:

- 1) identify the main question addressed in the passage and explain its philosophical importance;
- 2) analyze and explain the meaning of key concepts in the passage;
- 3) identify and explain the passage’s main conclusion and argument for that conclusion;
- 4) critically examine that argument and its premises, while considering how the author of the passage might respond to criticisms; and,

5) articulate whether you think the argument is good, giving reasons in support of your final assessment.

Earlier assignments in the course will prepare you for the final exam by homing in on the specific skills that will be demanded of you. Additionally, we shall have a mock exam in class the week prior to finals week.

To give you a sense of my expectations for what you should be able to do by the end of the course, I provide my grading rubric for the final exam at the end of the syllabus.

### **Submission Rules, Late Penalties, Postponement, and Rescheduling of Assignments**

*Submission Rules:* Papers are to be submitted **through Canvas by 9:00 a.m. of the due date** (note that this is 30 minutes *before* class starts). Instructions for submitting to Canvas will be distributed along with the assignment instructions.

*Late Penalties:* The penalty for papers that are turned in late is *one letter grade per day*. That is, for a paper received after 9:00 a.m. of the due date but before 9:00 a.m. of the following day, there will be a penalty of one letter grade. For a paper received in the next 24 hour period after the latter time, there will be a penalty of two letter grades, and so on. *No credit* will be given for In-class Exercises, Quizzes, and Homework that are turned in late. Exceptions to this policy will be made only in cases of verified illness or emergency.

*Postponement and Rescheduling:* Any postponement or rescheduling of papers or exams must be requested in advance of due dates and examination times and will be granted only in cases of verified illness or emergency.

## **Grades**

### **Grading Scale for Letter Grades**

Papers will be marked with letter grades. The following scale will be used to calculate the numerical equivalences for determining the final grade:

A+ = 98%	B+ = 88%	C+ = 78%	D+ = 68%	
A = 95%	B = 85%	C = 75%	D = 65%	F = 0%
A- = 92%	B- = 82%	C- = 72%	D- = 62%	

### **Weighting of Assignments for the Final Grade**

After the calculation of the above numerical equivalences, the final grade will be computed on the basis of the following weighting:

15% - Participation Assignments	10% - Conceptual Analysis Task-Paper
10% - Reading Task-Paper 1	10% - Reasoning Task-Paper 1
15% - Reading Task-Paper 2	15% - Reasoning Task-Paper 2
25% - Final Exam	

## Academic Misconduct

Academic misconduct—including, but not limited to, cheating and plagiarism—will be taken very seriously in this course. It is expected that you both know and follow the code of academic conduct, which can be found at the following URL:

<http://www.indiana.edu/~code/code/responsibilities/academic/index.shtml>

For any instances of suspected academic misconduct, I will follow the disciplinary procedures given at the following URL:

<http://www.indiana.edu/~code/bloomington/discipline/academic/index.shtml>

These procedures give a faculty member discretion in imposing an academic sanction. The standard academic sanction for academic misconduct in this course will be a **final grade of F** reported to the Registrar (see Step One of the above-cited disciplinary procedures for the status such an F has on a transcript). Finally, as required by the above disciplinary procedures, a written report of the incident will be submitted to the Dean of Students, who might impose a further university-wide sanction.

If you have any questions about these matters, e.g. what counts as plagiarism, please ask me.

## Grading Rubric for Final Exam

The final exam in this course will be assessed based on the performance across the four criteria given in the left-hand column. A full letter grade will be deducted automatically for ignoring or superficially covering any of the five tasks given above.

	<b>EXCELLENT (A+ through B+)</b>	<b>SATISFACTORY (B through C-)</b>	<b>UNSATISFACTORY (D through F)</b>
<b>Comprehension of Passage's Central Concepts &amp; Claims</b> <i>(Important)</i>	Demonstrates a thorough understanding of the text's central concepts & claims; identifies key question(s) of the passage	Expresses an adequate but not thorough understanding of the text's central concepts & claims; identifies key question(s) of the passage	Exhibits a lack of understanding of the text's main concepts & claims; fails to identify key question(s) of the passage
<b>Analysis &amp; Interpretation of Passage's Argument</b> <i>(Most Important)</i>	Thoroughly analyzes key concepts & questions; faithfully & clearly reconstructs the author's argument with textual support	Adequately analyzes key concepts & questions; reconstructs the author's argument but with errors, unclarity, or lack of textual support	Superficially or confusedly analyzes key concepts & questions; fails to reconstruct an argument matching the passage
<b>Reasoning &amp; Evaluation</b> <i>(Very Important)</i>	Provides persuasive & detailed support for every main claim in the essay; raises creative considerations in critical assessing the passage's argument	Provides support for most but not every main claim in the essay; some reasoning lacks depth or persuasiveness	Little to no support given for major claims; most reasoning is superficial and unpersuasive
<b>Writing</b> <i>(Least Important)</i>	Clear & concise writing; use of simple & direct language; few to no grammatical or spelling errors	Mostly comprehensible writing but sometimes hard to follow; some unclear wording or phrasing; several grammatical or spelling errors	Writing is often incomprehensible; unclear wording and phrasing throughout; an abundance of grammatical or spelling errors

## Schedule of Readings and Assignments

Please note that this schedule will be revised if needed during the semester. In such a case, I will provide you with a revised schedule.

### Week 1

Tue Aug 26     *Introduction*

### UNIT 1: WHAT IS PHILOSOPHY?

**Skills: Philosophical Questioning and Conceptual Analysis**

Thu Aug 28     *Socrates and Definitions*  
Plato, *Meno*, pp. 58-70 (line numbers 70a-80d)  
**CONCEPTUAL ANALYSIS TASK-PAPER DISTRIBUTED**

### Week 2

Tue Sept 2     *Workshop on Reading Texts*  
Plato, *Euthyphro*, pp. 1-20

Thu Sept 4     *In-Class Peer Review*  
**DRAFT OF CONCEPTUAL ANALYSIS TASK-PAPER DUE**

### Week 3

Tue Sept 9     *Socrates' Defense*  
Plato, *Apology*, pp. 21-44  
**CONCEPTUAL ANALYSIS TASK-PAPER DUE**  
**READING TASK-PAPER #1 DISTRIBUTED**

### UNIT 2: ETHICAL THEORIES

**Skills: Reading Philosophical Texts and Applying Theories**

Thu Sept 11     *Defining Justice and Virtue Ethics*  
Plato, *Republic*, 327a-336a  
Aristotle, "The Nature of Virtue"

### Week 4

Tue Sept 16     *Utilitarianism*  
Shane Gronholz, "[Introduction to Consequentialism](#)"  
Jeremy Bentham, Selection from *An Introduction to the Principles of Morals and Legislation*

Thu Sept 18     *Utilitarianism, continued*

### Week 5

Tue Sept 23      *Kantian Ethics*  
Onora O'Neill, "A Simplified Account of Kant's Ethics"  
Andrew Chapman, "[Introduction to Deontology: Kantian Ethics](#)"

Thu Sept 25      *Kantian Ethics, continued*

**Week 6**

Tue Sept 30      *Virtue Ethics Reconsidered*  
Rosalind Hursthouse, "Normative Virtue Ethics"  
**READING TASK-PAPER #1 DUE**

Thu Oct 2        *Existentialism*  
Jean-Paul Sartre, selection from "Existentialism is a Humanism"

**Week 7**

Tue Oct 7        *Existentialism, continued*  
Simone de Beauvoir, selection from *The Ethics of Ambiguity*

**UNIT 3: METAPHYSICS**

**Skills: Reading Philosophical Texts and Identifying Arguments**

Thu Oct 9        *What are Arguments?*  
Morton, "Sources of Conviction", pp. 35-49  
**READING TASK-PAPER #2 ASSIGNED**

**Week 8**

Tue Oct 14      *Arguments for God's Existence*  
Morton, "Sources of Conviction", pp. 49-58  
Anselm, "Ontological Argument"  
Gaunilo, "Reply on Behalf of the Fool"

Thu Oct 16      *Workshop on Identifying Arguments*  
Samuel Clarke, "Cosmological Argument"

**Week 9**

Tue Oct 21      *The Argument from Design and Objections to Arguments for God's Existence*  
Ernest Nagel, "Does God Exist?"  
**READING TASK-PAPER #2 DUE**

Thu Oct 23      *Materialism and Dualism*  
Morton, "Materialism and Dualism", pp. 311-320; 326-332  
**REASONING TASK-PAPER #1 ASSIGNED**

**UNIT 4: EPISTEMOLOGY**  
**Skills: Evaluating Arguments**

**Week 10**

Tue Oct 28      *How Can I Know Anything?*  
Morton on Doubt, pp. 21-27  
Plato, *Meno*, 80d-86c (pp. 70-78)

Thu Oct 30      *Teaching and Learning*  
Plato, *Meno*, pp. 78-92 (86c-100b)  
Plato, *Republic*, "Allegory of the Cave"

**Week 11**

Tue Nov 4      *Appearance, Reality, and the Existence of Matter*  
Russell, Chapters 1 & 2 of *The Problems of Philosophy*

Thu Nov 6      *The Nature of Matter and Idealism*  
Russell, Chapters 3 & 4 of *The Problems of Philosophy*  
**REASONING TASK-PAPER #1 DUE**

**Week 12**

Tue Nov 11      *Types of Knowledge and the Problem of Induction*  
Russell, Chapters 5 & 6 of *The Problems of Philosophy*

Thu Nov 13      *Types of Knowledge Continued*  
Russell, Chapter 7 of *The Problems of Philosophy*  
**REASONING TASK-PAPER #2 ASSIGNED**

**UNIT 5: SOCIAL AND POLITICAL PHILOSOPHY**

**Week 13**

Tue Nov 18      *Socrates on Civil Disobedience*  
Plato, *Crito*, pp. 45-57

Thu Nov 20      *MLK Jr. on Civil Disobedience*  
Martin Luther King, Jr., "[Letter From Birmingham Jail](#)"

**THANKSGIVING BREAK**

**Week 14**

Tue Dec 2      *Special Topics in Social & Political Philosophy*  
TBD (in early November, the class will vote on the topics covered this week)  
**REASONING TASK-PAPER #2 DUE**

Thu Dec 4      *Special Topics in Social & Political Philosophy*  
TBD

## CONCLUSION

### **Week 15**

Tue Dec 9      *Exam Practice*

Thu Dec 11     *Wrap-up*

### **Finals Week**

Tue Dec 16     **FINAL EXAM: 8:00-10:00 a.m.**

# Conceptual Analysis Task-Paper

Due through Canvas on Tuesday, September 9 by 9:00am

In class, we discussed three criteria for a good definition. Your goals in this assignment are to exhibit your understanding of these three requirements and to think critically on your own by attempting to define a concept. To accomplish these goals, you must perform the following tasks:

(1) State each of the three criteria for a good definition and describe/explain/elaborate in your own words. (The second criterion has two distinct aspects, so make sure to explain each.)

(2) To exhibit further your understanding of how each criterion works, construct definitions of a concept that **fail** to satisfy the criteria. This requires the following steps.

(2a) Pick **one** of the following concepts to define: 'game', 'murder', or 'chair'.

(2b) Give a definition for that concept that fails to satisfy the first criterion for a good definition, and explain why it fails to satisfy the first criterion.

(2c) For the same concept, come up with another definition that fails to meet one aspect of the second criterion, and explain why it fails.

(2d) Construct a definition of the same concept that fails to satisfy the other aspect of the second criterion, and explain why it fails.

(2e) Finally, give a definition of the same concept that does not meet the third criterion, and explain why it fails.

(3) Using the same concept you chose for (2), try to construct a definition that **succeeds** in satisfying all three criteria for a good definition. **Do not consult a dictionary, Wikipedia, or similar sources: the task is for you to think things through on your own.** You should not merely give a definition and state that it meets the criteria. Rather, you should do the following. First, give a definition that you initially think is good. Then, *pretend as if you are Socrates, poking holes in your proposed definition.* But you should not merely poke holes in your initial definition; rather *you should try to use each criticism or objection to come up with a revision to the initial definition.* After revising the definition, you should evaluate whether the new definition meets all three criteria. You might then find a new problem with the definition and revise it yet again. After revising your definition several times, you should present a final definition that, to the best of your ability, comes as close as possible in satisfying all three criteria. If you can't construct a definition that meets all three criteria, explain why you can't do any better.

The paper should be **roughly 1,000 words**. Since you are submitting it electronically, you don't need to be fussy with formatting of the text. Just make sure to make it double-spaced with normal font, font size, and margins. Please put the assignment's title and your name as the first two lines of text, i.e. not as a header or footer. Please consult the syllabus for additional course policies, e.g. those concerning lateness

## Grading Rubric for Conceptual Analysis Task-Paper

	EXCELLENT (A+ through B+)	SATISFACTORY (B through C-)	UNSATISFACTORY (D through F)
<b>Part (1): Comprehension of the three criteria for a Socratic definition (<i>important</i>)</b>	Demonstrates a thorough understanding of the three criteria; accurately presents the three criteria in one's own terms; uses creative illustrations	Expresses an adequate but not thorough understanding of the three criteria; uses language that is inapt, inaccurate, or taken directly from class to explain the three criteria; uses illustrations presented in class	Exhibits a lack of understanding of the three criteria; fails to provide illustrations
<b>Part (2): Definitions that fail the criteria (<i>most important</i>)</b>	Provides definitions (4 total) that clearly fail to satisfy each of the three criteria; clearly & accurately explains why each definition fails a particular criterion	Provides 1-2 definitions that don't fail the intended criteria; explains with errors or unclarity why some of the definitions fail	Fails to provide 1 or more definitions for part (2) of the assignment; definitions provided don't illustrate the relevant criteria
<b>Part (3): Attempt to come up with a satisfactory definition (<i>very important</i>)</b>	Makes <i>more than one</i> attempt to come up with a satisfactory definition; explains the reasoning behind the proposed definitions; offers persuasive reasons for why the final proposed definition succeeds <i>or</i> still fails (you can still get an A+ even if your final definition fails)	Makes only one attempt to come up with a satisfactory definition; unclearly or only superficially explains the reasoning behind proposed definitions; offers unpersuasive reasons for why the final proposed definition succeeds or fails	Makes no attempt to come up with a final satisfactory definition; or makes an attempt without providing any reasoning leading to or supporting the final definition
<b>Writing &amp; Mechanics (<i>least important</i>)</b>	Clear & concise writing; use of simple & direct language; few to no grammatical or spelling errors	Mostly comprehensible writing but sometimes hard to follow; some unclear wording or phrasing; several grammatical or spelling errors	Writing is often incomprehensible; unclear wording and phrasing throughout; an abundance of grammatical or spelling errors

# Reading Task-Paper #1 (Hursthouse)

*Due on Canvas by Tuesday, September 30 at 9:00am*

The selected passage for this Reading Task-Paper comes from Rosalind Hursthouse's article "Normative Ethics". For the purposes of this task-paper, all you need to focus on is Section 1 of that paper, entitled "1. Right Action".

The requirements are the following:

- (1) Write a summary/outline of approximately 100-300 words of the selected passage. The summary and outline must first **state the overall aim(s), result(s), or conclusion(s)** of the passage in the first few sentences.
- (2) To explain how the author arrives at the overall aim(s), result(s), conclusion(s), you must **divide the passage into subsections within your summary/outline**. You must offer a short summary or characterization of each subsection, making clear how it constitutes a separable step that contributes to the overall aim(s) of the passage. This will usually require making clear the transitions between subsections. There is no one right way to divide up the reading into subsections, i.e. I don't expect that you arrive at some particular number of subsections, but there are better and worse ways for dividing it up. While working on the assignment, you might find that your initial divisions are unsatisfactory, so don't be surprised if you must modify these.
- (3) Second, following the summary/outline, write a list of **at least five study or critical questions total**, organized by the subsections you give in your outline. However, you must have **at least one question per subsection** of your outline (of course, you may also have more than one question per subsection). Additionally, you must ask **at least one question concerning the passage as a whole**. You might find that these additional requirements result in more than five questions. **A good 'study question'** is one whose answer would help a careful reader to understand better the passage. Such questions include those whose answers would clarify the meanings of crucial concepts, draw out the author's assumptions, explain the author's reasoning, and so on. **A good 'critical question'** is one that challenges the assumptions, premises, or reasoning contained in the passage. Both questions should go beyond what your summary and outline state, i.e. they should not be answerable on the basis of your summary or outline. You do not need to know how best to answer the questions you submit. It is suggested that you come up with many more questions than required, and then select from these the best or most interesting ones.

Since you are submitting the paper electronically, you don't need to be fussy with formatting of the text. Just make sure to make it double-spaced with normal font, font size, and margins. Please put the assignment's title and your name as the first two lines of text, i.e. not as a header or footer. Please consult the syllabus for additional course policies, e.g., those concerning lateness.

## Grading Rubric for Reading Task-Papers

	EXCELLENT (A+ through B+)	SATISFACTORY (B through C-)	UNSATISFACTORY (D through F)
<b>Part (1): Identification of the Author's Overall Aim(s)</b> <i>(very important)</i>	Demonstrates an accurate & thorough understanding of the author's main aim(s), result(s), and conclusion(s)	Expresses an adequate but slightly inaccurate or incomplete understanding of the author's main aim(s), result(s), and conclusion(s); uses language that is inapt	Exhibits a lack of understanding of the author's main aim(s), result(s), and conclusion(s)
<b>Part (2): Outline divided into Subsections</b> <i>(most important)</i>	Subsection divisions are made in a coherent way that makes explicit the structure of the author's reasoning; clearly & accurately explains the reasoning within each subsection; makes clear how all the subsections contribute to the author's main aim(s)	Subsection divisions illuminate the passage but are either somewhat unclear or incomplete; some inaccurate explanation of the subsections; makes clear how some but not all the subsections contribute to the author's main aim(s)	Fails to provide subsections; subsection divisions are incomplete; inaccurately characterizes the subsections; fails to make clear how any of the subsections contribute to the author's main aim(s)
<b>Part (3): Study/Critical Questions</b> <i>(important)</i>	Provides five or more questions (at least one for each subsection and at least one for the passage as a whole); <u>every</u> question goes beyond the summary and counts as either a good "study question" or a good "critical question"	Provides five or more questions (at least one for each subsection and at least one for the passage as a whole); <u>only some</u> of the questions go beyond the summary and count as either a good "study question" or a good "critical question"	Fails to provide five or more questions; fails to provide at least one for each subsection; fails to provide at least one question for the passage as a whole); none of the questions count as good "study" or "critical" questions
<b>Writing &amp; Mechanics</b> <i>(least important)</i>	Clear & concise writing; use of simple & direct language; few to no grammatical or spelling errors	Mostly comprehensible writing but sometimes hard to follow; some unclear wording or phrasing; several grammatical or spelling errors	Writing is often incomprehensible; unclear wording and phrasing throughout; an abundance of grammatical or spelling errors

# Reasoning Task-Paper #1 (Plato's *Meno*)

*Due on Canvas or via Email by Thursday, November 6 at 9:00am*

In roughly 700-900 words, write a paper addressing the following points in order.

**Introduction:** *Briefly* introduce the reader to the paper's topic, structure, and conclusions.

**Part One:** Explain the following argument that Socrates gives in the *Meno* (lines 89d-96d):

(P1) If virtue can be taught, then there are teachers of virtue.

(P2) There are no teachers of virtue.

(C) Therefore, virtue cannot be taught.

In presenting this argument, make sure to summarize briefly Socrates' main reasons for accepting (P1) and (P2).

**Part Two:** By means of the following steps, evaluate the first premise (P1) of the argument:

(a) Give at least two reasons for doubting (P1).

(b) Discuss whether the doubts you raise in (a) are strong enough to outweigh Socrates' reasons for accepting (P1), and decide on that basis whether you accept (P1)

**Part Three:** By means of the same steps as in Part Two, evaluate the second premise (P2):

(a) Give at least two reasons for doubting (P2).

(b) Discuss whether the doubts you raise in (a) are strong enough to outweigh Socrates' reasons for accepting (P2), and decide on that basis whether you accept (P2)

**Part Four:** On the basis of your conclusions from Parts Two and Three, evaluate Socrates' argument as a whole. Do you accept his conclusion (C)? Why or why not? Carefully summarize your reasons for accepting it or not.

Since you are submitting the paper electronically, you don't need to be fussy with formatting of the text. Just make sure to make it double-spaced with normal font, font size, and margins. Please put the assignment's title and your name as the first two lines of text, i.e. not as a header or footer. Please consult the syllabus for additional course policies, e.g., those concerning lateness.

## Grading Rubric for Reasoning Task-Papers

	<b>EXCELLENT (A+ through B+)</b>	<b>SATISFACTORY (B through C-)</b>	<b>UNSATISFACTORY (D through F)</b>
<b>Part One: Explanation of Socrates' Argument (<i>important</i>)</b>	Demonstrates an accurate & thorough understanding of Socrates' reasoning for both (P1) and (P2)	Expresses an adequate but slightly inaccurate or incomplete understanding of Socrates' reasoning for (P1) and (P2); uses language that is inapt or misleading	Exhibits a lack of understanding of the Socrates' reasoning
<b>Part Two: Evaluation of (P1) (<i>very important</i>)</b>	Presents and elaborates on two persuasive reasons for doubting (P1); raises interesting responses in Socrates' defense	Presents two reasons for doubting (P1), but they are unclear, under-elaborated, or unpersuasive; only minimally engages in weighing the reasons for doubt with Socrates' reasons	Fails to provide two reasons for doubting (P1); reasons for doubting (P1) are merely stated but not explained; reasons are nonsensical
<b>Part Three: Evaluation of (P2) (<i>very important</i>)</b>	Presents and elaborates on two persuasive reasons for doubting (P2); raises interesting responses in Socrates' defense	Presents two reasons for doubting (P2), but they are unclear, under-elaborated, or unpersuasive; only minimally engages in weighing the reasons for doubt with Socrates' reasons	Fails to provide two reasons for doubting (P2); reasons for doubting (P2) are merely stated but not explained; reasons are nonsensical
<b>Part Four: Overall Evaluation of the Argument (<i>important</i>)</b>	Summarizes well but concisely the main points of reasoning raised in the paper; offers & explains persuasive reasons for accepting or rejecting (C)	Summarizes inadequately the main points of reasoning raised in the paper; fails to offer or explain reasons for accepting or rejecting (C)	Fails to summarize the main points of reasoning raised in the paper; only repeats the points made in the earlier sections of the paper
<b>Writing &amp; Mechanics (<i>least important</i>)</b>	Clear & concise writing; use of simple & direct language; few to no grammatical or spelling errors	Mostly comprehensible writing but sometimes hard to follow; some unclear wording or phrasing; several grammatical or spelling errors	Writing is often incomprehensible; unclear wording and phrasing throughout; an abundance of grammatical or spelling errors