

# Cover Sheet: Request 10897

## PHM3600 Philosophy of Education

### Info

Process	Course New/Close/Modify Ugrad Gen Ed
Status	Pending
Submitter	Palmer,John Anderson,III palmerj@ufl.edu
Created	4/4/2016 3:41:53 PM
Updated	4/12/2016 11:03:44 AM
Description	GenEd Humanities (H)

### Actions

Step	Status	Group	User	Comment	Updated
Department	Approved	CLAS - Philosophy 011615000	Witmer, Gene		4/4/2016
Added PHM3600syllabus.pdf					4/4/2016
College	Approved	CLAS - College of Liberal Arts and Sciences	Pharies, David A		4/12/2016
No document changes					
General Education Committee	Pending	PV - General Education Committee (GEC)			4/12/2016
No document changes					
Office of the Registrar					
No document changes					
Catalog					
No document changes					
College Notified					
No document changes					

## Course|Gen\_Ed|New-Close-Modify for request 10897

### Info

**Request:** PHM3600 Philosophy of Education  
**Submitter:** Palmer,John Anderson,III palmerj@ufl.edu  
**Created:** 4/4/2016 3:41:53 PM  
**Form version:** 1

### Responses

**Course Prefix and Number** PHM3600  
**Course Title**Philosophy of Education  
**Request Type**Change GE/WR designation (selecting this option will open additional form fields below)  
**Effective Term**Earliest Available  
**Effective Year**Earliest Available  
**Credit Hours** 3  
**Prerequisites**Sophomore or higher standing or PHI 2010 or PHI 2100 or PHI 2630 or PHM 2204 or philosophy major or minor.  
**Current GE Classification(s)**None  
**Current Writing Requirement Classification** None  
**One-semester Approval?**No  
**Requested GE Classification**H  
**Requested Writing Requirement Classification**None

**PHM 3600: PHILOSOPHY OF EDUCATION**  
**SPRING 20##**

**INSTRUCTOR**

Dr. Jaime Ahlberg  
Office Hours: W 10am-12pm (and by appointment)  
Office: 332 Griffin-Floyd Hall (tel. 352-392-2084)  
e-mail: [jlahlberg@ufl.edu](mailto:jlahlberg@ufl.edu)

**TIME AND LOCATION**

MWF 1:55-2:45pm (Period 7)  
LEI 0242

**COURSE DESCRIPTION AND OBJECTIVES**

The purpose of this course is to introduce students to contemporary thinking on a range of issues in the philosophy of education. Most of the course will focus on the values that should guide the content and distribution of educational opportunities in wealthy modern industrial democracies like our own. Although “education” is a vague term, covering everything involved in raising children to adulthood (and more), our main (but not exclusive) focus will be on schooling, including the schooling of children and of adults. Specifically, we will focus on: the aims and purposes of education, educational authority, the distribution of educational opportunity, and the special role of higher education in our society.

**GENERAL EDUCATION OBJECTIVES AND LEARNING OUTCOMES**

This course is a Humanities (H) subject area course in the UF General Education Program. Humanities courses provide instruction in the history, key themes, principles, terminology, and theory or methodologies used within a humanities discipline or the humanities in general. Students will learn to identify and to analyze the key elements, biases and influences that shape thought. These courses emphasize clear and effective analysis and approach issues and problems from multiple perspectives. A minimum grade of C is required for general education credit.

PHM 3600 accomplishes these goals by familiarizing students with the fundamental concepts and themes that organize current thinking about the aims and distribution of educational goods in Western democracies like our own. Some of the central concepts students will analyze include: education, autonomy and rational self-governance, talent and disability, human rights and capabilities, educational equality versus adequacy, democratic education. Some of the themes this course will address include: the tension between parental, state, cultural, and children’s interests in education; the role and moral permissibility of private schooling in a democratic state; the obligations of universities (public and/or private) to their students and to the wider community within which they are nested and supported; the contribution of educational goods to a life well-lived. The methods employed in this course are philosophical. We will primarily engage in conceptual analysis and argumentation. Since the issues addressed in this course are of

contemporary importance and every student has experienced and continues to experience educational goods, the course encourages students to appreciate both the ways in which education has been essential to shaping their lives and to the state of our community, and how the meaning and importance of education stand in need of critical scrutiny. On every topic we address, there will be readings that offer different, and sometimes conflicting, arguments regarding the best way to identify and think about the issues at stake. Students will be pressed to evaluate these different ways of approaching the issues and to begin to develop their own philosophical arguments regarding the concepts and themes posed.

The General Education Student Learning Outcomes (SLO's) divide into three areas: **content** – students demonstrate competence in the terminology, concepts, theories and methodologies used within the discipline; **communication** – students communicate knowledge, ideas and reasoning clearly and effectively in written and oral forms appropriate to the discipline; and **critical thinking** – students analyze information carefully and logically from multiple perspectives, using discipline-specific methods, and develop reasoned solutions to problems.

Students will demonstrate achievement of the **content** SLO's by competently employing the key terms, concepts, and theories in class discussion, in discussion posts, in a presentation to the class about a reading, and in three critical essays. Students will demonstrate their competence in the philosophical methodology used in the course by interpreting and evaluating readings' passages and concepts in class discussion, discussion posts, and essays. Students will demonstrate achievement of the **communication** SLO's by participating actively and regularly in class discussion, by contributing to the course e-discussion page on a weekly basis, and by writing three 1,300-1,500 word essays. Both the discussion posts and the essays will be evaluated according to the criteria specified in the rubrics included as an appendix to this syllabus, among which are criteria pertaining to the effective organization and exposition of the written assignments, as well as the clear and effective evaluation of the ideas presented. The discussion posts, in particular, will serve as practice for interpreting and communicating about difficult philosophical concepts and arguments with one's classmates. Students are expected to respond to each others' posts in a way that reveals they have thought carefully about the ideas of their peers, and in a way that furthers the conversation. Students will demonstrate achievement of the **critical thinking** SLO's through class discussion and e-posts, and most substantially by writing three 1,300-1,500 word essays on assigned topics designed to test students' critical thinking abilities. The essays will be graded according to the rubric included at the conclusion of this syllabus document, which specifies as criteria for assessment competent command of the relevant texts and material discussed in class, perspicuous identification of the issues raised by the assigned topics, and development of a response that cogently supports the students' claims with little or no irrelevance.

Sample essay prompts include:

- How does the topic of education expose tensions between parents' rights and the rights of children? How ought we to try to resolve these tensions, or if they are unresolvable, how ought we to negotiate them when they arise?
- Why does Callan think that a liberal democracy should promote the autonomy of its citizens through the educational system? Does he provide a persuasive argument?

- What is autonomy as described by Callan and/or Feinberg, and should an educational system promote or facilitate it in any way? Do any difficulties that might arise from the promotion and/or facilitation of autonomy in a pluralistic society like our own?
- What is a child’s right to an open future as described by Joel Feinberg, and what is its relationship to a right to exit? Ought children’s right to an open future inform the aims of education in a society like our own? If so why, and if not, why not?
- How does Elizabeth Anderson arrive at her conclusion that ““every student with the potential and interest should receive a K-12 education sufficient to enable him or her to succeed at a college that prepares its students for postgraduate education” (597)? What implications does her view have for students from socioeconomically disadvantaged backgrounds? Do you think she has the right view about how primary and secondary education should be distributed to children?
- Should all children have access to identical sorts of educational goods and opportunities, or should students with different traits have access to different sorts of goods or opportunities? Be sure to consider the cases of children with disabilities, and children with exceptional talent.
- How should we think about the morality of sending one’s children to private school (of the sort Adam Swift imagines), given the current educational environment? Be sure to consider the positions of Swift, Anderson, and Clayton & Stevens.
- Assuming that *Paying for the Party* is correct in its analysis of the ways in which MU exacerbates class inequalities, is that a troubling result? Does a public flagship university like UF have any responsibilities regarding its implication in perpetuating social class inequality? If so, what kind of responsibility, and why?
- What do you think *Paying for the Party* helps to reveal about the appropriate aims and values of large state universities? Elaborate on the nature and scope of two aims and/or values of institutions of higher education and critically evaluate the (moral) benefits and (moral) costs of incorporating those aims into the mission statements of public universities.

## TEXTS

### **Required**

1. Annette Lareau *Unequal Childhoods: Class, Race, and Family Life* 2<sup>nd</sup> ed. (Berkeley: University of California Press, 2011)
2. Elizabeth A. Armstrong and Laura T. Hamilton *Paying for the Party: How College Maintains Inequality* (Cambridge, Mass: Harvard University Press, 2013)
3. Readings posted on the course e-learning site (Canvas)

### **Recommended**

4. Anthony Weston, *A Rulebook for Arguments*, 4<sup>th</sup> Edition
5. A terrific guide to general writing rules is Strunk and White’s *The Elements of Style*. The first edition is available online for free: <http://www.bartleby.com/141/>

## REQUIREMENTS AND GRADING

### **Grade Distribution**

- |                                    |                |
|------------------------------------|----------------|
| 1. Group Presentation              | 20%            |
| 2. Discussion Posts                | 20%            |
| 3. 3 Essays (1300-1500 words each) | 60% (20% each) |

## Grading Scale

This course will employ the following grading scale:

A	4.0	94-100
A-	3.67	90-93
B+	3.33	87-89
B	3.0	84-86
B-	2.67	80-83
C+	2.33	77-79
C	2.0	74-76
C-	1.67	70-73
D+	1.33	67-69
D	1.0	64-66
D-	0.67	60-63
E	0.0	0-59

Students should note that a final course grade of “C” does not meet requirements imposed by many degree programs, or fulfill general education requirements. For more information on UF’s grading policies, see: <https://catalog.ufl.edu/ugrad/current/regulations/info/grades.aspx>

## Group Presentations

I will organize the class into 7 groups. Approximately every other week on a Thursday class, a group will be responsible for presenting on that day’s reading. The group will have to present its interpretation of the main argument in the piece, as well as explain key terms and concepts. The group should also prepare some discussion questions for the class in order to facilitate class participation on the reading. Presentations should last around 15 minutes, not including time for facilitation. I encourage the use of visual aids and power point, handouts, and writing on the board.

## Discussion Posts

You must prepare a brief response to the class readings and lectures and post it on the course e-learning discussion page every week. You must post it by Monday at noon (addressing that Tuesday’s material), in order for everyone to have a chance to read the posts before class on Tuesday. By Friday, you are required to respond to at least two of your classmate’s posts in order to receive full credit for that week’s e-posting. Please see the Discussion Post Assessment Rubric attached to the end of this syllabus document for how posts will be graded.

## Essays

During the semester you will be required to write three essays, each 1300-1500 words long (approximately 6 double-spaced pages). Paper topics will be distributed two weeks prior to the due date. All papers must be typed, double-spaced with one-inch margins, 12 pt Times New Roman. You must include a word-count at the top of your first page. Please also include your name, the date you hand in the assignment, and title your essays. If it is difficult for you to choose a title, consider that a clue that you may need to focus your essay more.

Each paper is to be uploaded onto the course's e-learning site in Canvas. You can log in and find the course web page here: [elearning.ufl.edu](http://elearning.ufl.edu). The papers will be graded electronically and returned to you electronically. I will consider allowing you to turn in a paper late without penalty only if you have a valid and/or documented reason for doing so. If you turn in a paper without a valid and/or documented reason, 1/3 of a letter grade will be deducted for each day it is late (including weekend days!). We will discuss the paper topics and requirements more as the course progresses, and the due dates listed on the Reading and Assignment Schedule should be considered provisional.

Please see the Grading Rubric for Essays at the end of this syllabus document. It details the various criteria against which your writing will be evaluated. Please note that the rubric references a recommended text for the course: Anthony Weston's *Rule Book for Arguments*. Weston's book is useful because it provides examples of both successful and poor writing and argumentative techniques.

**Full details of all assigned readings and of all writing assignments will be posted in the Canvas e-learning site during the course of the semester.**

### **Classroom Policies and Attendance**

Regular attendance will be essential to your success in the course. Students are expected to attend class and to have done all assigned reading in advance. Failure to do so will adversely affect students' ability to perform well in this course. **The use of laptop computers, smart phones, or other electronic devices during class is not permitted.** Requirements for class attendance and make-up exams, assignments, and other work are consistent with university policies specified at: <https://catalog.ufl.edu/ugrad/current/regulations/info/attendance.aspx>.

Students are expected to arrive to class on time and behave in a manner that is respectful to the instructor and to fellow students. Opinions held by other students should be respected in discussion, and conversations that do not contribute to the discussion should be held at minimum.

### **OTHER POLICIES AND INFORMATION**

#### **Academic Honesty**

UF students are bound by The Honor Pledge, which states, "We, the members of the University of Florida community, pledge to hold ourselves and our peers to the highest standards of honor and integrity by abiding by the Honor Code. On all work submitted for credit by students at the University of Florida, the following pledge is either required or implied: "On my honor, I have neither given nor received unauthorized aid in doing this assignment." The Honor Code (<http://www.dso.ufl.edu/scr/process/student-conduct-honor-code/>) specifies a number of behaviors that are in violation of this code and the possible sanctions. Furthermore, you are obligated to report any condition that facilitates academic misconduct to appropriate personnel. If you have any questions or concerns, please consult with the instructor. Plagiarism on any assignment will automatically result in a grade of "E" for the course. Plagiarism is defined in the University of Florida's Student Honor Code as follows: "A student shall not represent as the student's own work all or any portion of the work of another. Plagiarism includes (but is not limited to): a. Quoting oral or written materials, whether published or unpublished, without proper

attribution. b. Submitting a document or assignment which in whole or in part is identical or substantially identical to a document or assignment not authored by the student." Students found guilty of academic misconduct will be prosecuted in accordance with the procedures specified in the UF honesty policy.

### **Canvas e-Learning Environment**

This course is supplemented by online content in the e-Learning environment known as "Canvas." To login to the e-Learning site for this course, go to <https://elearning.ufl.edu/>, click the **e-Learning in Canvas** button, and on the next page enter your Gatorlink username and password. You can then access the course e-Learning environment by selecting "PHM 3600" from the **Courses** pull-down menu at the top of the page. If you encounter any difficulties logging in or accessing any of the course content, contact the UF Computing Help Desk at (352) 392-4537. Do not contact the course instructor regarding computer issues.

### **Online Course Evaluation**

Students are expected to provide feedback on the quality of instruction in this course based on 10 criteria. These evaluations are conducted online at <https://evaluations.ufl.edu>. Evaluations are typically open during the last two or three weeks of the semester. Students will be given specific times when they are open. Summary results of these assessments are available to students at <https://evaluations.ufl.edu/results>.

### **Accommodation for Students with Disabilities**

Students with disabilities requesting accommodations should first register with the Disability Resource Center (352-392-8565, [www.dso.ufl.edu/drc/](http://www.dso.ufl.edu/drc/)) by providing appropriate documentation. Once registered, students will receive an accommodation letter which must be presented to the instructor when requesting accommodation. Students with disabilities should follow this procedure as early as possible in the semester.

### **Campus Health and Wellness Resources**

- U Matter, We Care: If you or a friend is in distress, please contact [umatter@ufl.edu](mailto:umatter@ufl.edu) or 352 392-1575 so that a team member can reach out to the student.
- Counseling and Wellness Center: <http://www.counseling.ufl.edu/cwc/Default.aspx>, 392-1575; and the University Police Department: 392-1111 or 9-1-1 for emergencies.
- *Sexual Assault Recovery Services (SARS)*. Student Health Care Center, 392-1161.
- *University Police Department*, 392-1111 (or 9-1-1 for emergencies). <http://www.police.ufl.edu/>

### **Campus Academic Resources**

- *E-learning technical support*, 352-392-4357 (select option 2) or e-mail to [Learning-support@ufl.edu](mailto:Learning-support@ufl.edu). <https://lss.at.ufl.edu/help.shtml>.
- *Career Resource Center*, Reitz Union, 392-1601. Career assistance and counseling. <http://www.crc.ufl.edu/>
- *Library Support*, <http://cms.uflib.ufl.edu/ask>. Various ways to receive assistance with respect to using the libraries or finding resources.
- *Teaching Center*, Broward Hall, 392-2010 or 392-6420. General study skills and tutoring. <http://teachingcenter.ufl.edu/>
- *Writing Studio*, 302 Tigert Hall, 846-1138. Help brainstorming, formatting, and writing papers. <http://writing.ufl.edu/writing-studio/>
- *Student Complaints Campus*: [https://www.dso.ufl.edu/documents/UF\\_Complaints\\_policy.pdf](https://www.dso.ufl.edu/documents/UF_Complaints_policy.pdf)
- *On-Line Students Complaints*: <http://www.distance.ufl.edu/student-complaint-process>



**Tentative Lecture Reading and Assignment Schedule**

*Please come to class having already read the assignments listed for that day.*

Date	Assignment
<b>Week 1</b> 8/26, 8/28	Introduction to the Course <b>Education and the Family</b> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. In-class viewing of an excerpt from <i>21 Up</i></li> <li>2. Annette Lareau, <i>Unequal Childhoods</i> Chs. 1 and 2 (pp. 1-32)</li> </ol>
<b>Week 2</b> 9/2, 9/4	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. <i>Unequal Childhoods</i> Part I: Organization of Daily Life (pp. 33-103)</li> <li>2. <i>Unequal Childhoods</i> Part II: Language Use (pp. 107-160)</li> </ol>
<b>Week 3</b> 9/9, 9/11	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. <i>Unequal Childhoods</i> Part III: Families and Institutions (pp. 163-197)</li> <li>2. <i>Unequal Childhoods</i> Part III: Families and Institutions (pp. 198-257)</li> </ol> <p style="text-align: center;"><u>Group 1 Presentation on pp. 198-257</u></p> <p><i>Recommended:</i>  <i>Unequal Childhoods Part IV: Unequal Childhoods and Unequal Adulthoods</i>                      (pp. 261-341)</p>
<b>Week 4</b> 9/16, 9/18	<b>Education for Autonomy and Exit Rights</b> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Feinberg, “The Child’s Rights to an Open Future” (pp. 124-151)</li> <li>2. Callan, excerpt from <i>Creating Citizens: Political Education and Liberal Democracy</i> (pp.34-69)</li> </ol>
<b>Week 5</b> 9/23, 9/25	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Feinberg &amp; Callan, continued</li> <li>2. Okin, ““Mistresses of their Own Destiny”: Group Rights, Gender, and Realistic Rights of Exit” (pp. 205-230)</li> </ol> <p style="text-align: center;"><u>Group 2 Presentation on Okin</u></p>
<b>Week 6</b> 9/30, 10/2	<b>Educational Responsibilities</b> <i>Educational Equality and Adequacy</i> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Debra Satz, “Equality, Adequacy, and Education for Citizenship” (pp. 623-648)</li> <li>2. Elizabeth Anderson, “Fair Opportunity in Education: A Democratic Equality Perspective” (pp. 595-622)</li> </ol> <p style="text-align: center;"><b>Essay # 1 Due on Friday 10/3, uploaded to Canvas by 11:59pm</b></p>
<b>Week 7</b> 10/7, 10/9	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>3. Christopher Jencks, “Whom Must we Treat Equally for Educational Opportunity to be Equal?” (pp. 518-533)</li> </ol> <p style="text-align: center;"><u>Group 3 Presentation on Jencks</u></p>
<b>Week 8</b> 10/14, 10/16	<i>Impairment, Disability, and Excellence</i> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Lorella Terzi, “A Capability Perspective on Impairment, Disability, and Special Needs” (pp. 197-223)</li> </ol>

	2. Ahlberg, "Educational Justice for Students with Cognitive Disabilities" (pp. 150-175)
<b>Week 9</b> 10/21, 10/23	1. Laura Purdy, "Educating Gifted Children" (pp.192-199) 2. Joel Kupperman, "Perfectionism and Educational Policy" (pp. 111-119)  <u>Group 4 Presentation on Kupperman</u>
<b>Week 10</b> 10/28, 10/30	<b>School Choice</b> 1. Swift, "The Morality of School Choice" (pp. 7-21) 2. Anderson, "Re-Thinking Equality of Opportunity: Comment on Adam Swift's How Not to be a Hypocrite" (pp. 99-110)
<b>Week 11</b> 11/4, 11/6	1. Swift and Anderson, continued 2. Clayton and Stevens, "School Choice and the Burdens of Justice" (pp. 111-126)  <u>Group 5 Presentation on Clayton and Stevens</u>  <b>Essay #2 Due on Friday, 11/6 by 11:59pm uploaded onto Canvas</b>
<b>Week 12</b> 11/13	<b>Higher Education</b> 1. Armstrong and Hamilton, <i>Paying for the Party</i> Introduction, chs. 1 and 2 (pp. 1-73) 2. <i>Paying for the Party</i> chs. 3-5 (pp.74-147)
<b>Week 13</b> 11/18, 11/20	1. <i>Paying for the Party</i> chs. 6-7 (pp. 148-208) 2. <i>Paying for the Party</i> chs. 8-9 (pp. 209-252)  <u>Group 6 Presentation on Chs. 8-9 of <i>Paying for the Party</i></u>
<b>Week 14</b> 11/25	1. Michael McPherson and Morton Owen Schapiro, "Moral Reasoning and Higher Education" (pp. 1-8)
<b>Week 15</b> 12/2, 12/4	1. Gutmann, <i>Democratic Education</i> ch. 6 (pp. 172-193) 2. Sandy Baum, "Taking Fairness Seriously in College Admissions and Financial Aid" (pp. 46-50) 3. Harry Brighouse, "Ethical Leadership in Hard Times: The Moral Demands on Universities" (pp. 50-56)  <u>Group 7 Presentation on Brighouse</u>  <b>Essay # 3 Due on Friday, 12/4 by 11:59pm uploaded onto Canvas</b>
<b>Week 16</b> 12/9	Catch-up and Wrap-Up

Essay Assessment Rubric					
	Excellent	Good	Needs Improvement	Unacceptable	
<b>Thesis</b>	A clear statement of the main conclusion of the paper. (Weston Rules 34, 35, 36)  9-10 points	The thesis is obvious, but there is no single clear statement of it.  7-8 points	The thesis is present, but must be uncovered or reconstructed from the text of the paper.  5-6 points	There is no thesis.  0 points	10pts
<b>Exposition</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The paper contains accurate and precise summarization, description and/or paraphrasing of text</li> <li>• Key concepts and theories are accurately and completely explained</li> <li>• When appropriate, good, clear examples are used to illuminate concepts and issues and/or support arguments.</li> <li>• The paper uses appropriate textual support for these.</li> </ul> 36-40 points	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The summarization, description and/or paraphrasing of text is fairly accurate and precise.</li> <li>• Key concepts and theories are explained.</li> <li>• Examples are clear, but may not be well chosen.</li> <li>• The paper has textual support, but other passages may have been better choices.</li> </ul> 32-35 points	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The summarization, description and/or paraphrasing of text is fairly accurate, but not precise.</li> <li>• Key concepts and theories are not explained.</li> <li>• Examples are not clear, and may not be well chosen or appropriate.</li> <li>• The textual support is inappropriate.</li> </ul> 28-31 points	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The summarization, description and/or paraphrasing of text is inaccurate.</li> <li>• Key concepts and theories may be identified but are not explained.</li> <li>• Examples are not clear, are inappropriate, and/or do not illuminate concepts and issues.</li> <li>• No textual support.</li> </ul> 0-27 points	40pts
<b>Evaluation</b>	The paper evaluates the position in question by: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• checking for support in the argument (Weston chs. 2, 3, 5)</li> <li>• checking for the argument's internal consistency</li> <li>• considering objections to one's own argument regarding the position in question: presenting 1 or more plausible and appropriate objections, and</li> </ul>	The paper evaluates the position in question by: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• checking for support in the argument</li> <li>• checking for the argument's internal consistency</li> <li>• considering objections to one's own argument, though the objections may be ill chosen and/or not thoroughly responded to.</li> </ul>	The paper evaluates the position in question by considering its plausibility in a weak or superficial way. It does not check for the support offered in the argument or the argument's internal consistency.	The paper evaluates the position in question by whether the author agrees or disagrees with it.	

	responding to them thoroughly. (Weston Rules 11, 32, 33, 37)				
	36-40 points	32-35 points	28-31 points	0-27 points	40pts
<b>Writing: Mechanics Flow Coherence</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● All sentences are complete and grammatical.</li> <li>● Paper has been spell-checked and proofread, and has no errors, and no rhetorical questions or slang.</li> <li>● All words are chosen for their precise meanings and are used consistently. (Weston Rules 4, 6)</li> <li>● All of the content of the paper is relevant to the main line of argument; no extraneous material. (Weston Rules 4, 5)</li> <li>● Ideas are developed in a natural order. Premises fit together naturally and it is easy to identify the main line of argument and to understand what is being said. (See Weston Rule 2)</li> <li>● All new or unusual terms are well-defined.</li> <li>● Information (names, facts, etc.) is accurate.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● All sentences are complete and grammatical.</li> <li>● Paper has been spell-checked and proofread, and has very few errors, and no rhetorical questions or slang.</li> <li>● Most words are chosen for their precise meanings.</li> <li>● Most of the content of the paper is relevant to the main line of argument; extraneous material is at a minimum.</li> <li>● Ideas are mostly developed in a natural order. It is not hard to understand what is being said.</li> <li>● Most new or unusual terms are well-defined.</li> <li>● Information (names, facts, etc.) is accurate.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● A few sentences are incomplete and/or ungrammatical.</li> <li>● Paper has several spelling errors, rhetorical questions and/or uses of slang.</li> <li>● Words are not chosen for their precise meanings.</li> <li>● May be substantial extraneous material.</li> <li>● Ideas are not always developed in a natural order. It is sometimes difficult to identify the line of argument or to understand what is being said.</li> <li>● New or unusual terms are not well-defined.</li> <li>● Information (names, facts, etc.) is mostly accurate.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● Many sentences are incomplete and/or ungrammatical.</li> <li>● Paper has many spelling errors, rhetorical questions and/or uses of slang.</li> <li>● Words are not chosen for their precise meanings.</li> <li>● Substantial extraneous material.</li> <li>● Ideas are not developed in a natural order. Premises do not fit together naturally and it is difficult to identify the line of argument or to understand what is being said.</li> <li>● New or unusual terms are not defined.</li> <li>● Information (names, facts, etc.) is inaccurate.</li> </ul>	
	9-10 points	7-8 points	5-6 point	0-4 points	10pts

**Discussion Board Rubric**

Criteria	Ratings				Pts
Original post responds to prompt	Excellent: All questions clearly & fully answered. 3 pts	Good: All questions answered, but not clearly or fully OR only some questions answered clearly and fully. 2 pts	Needs improvement: Unclear/incomplete answers to some questions only. 1 pts	Unacceptable: No answers or answers are extremely unclear. 0 pts	3 p
Original post is substantive	Excellent: Post sufficiently long, yet succinctly engages with content accurately and clearly; new ideas explained and relevant. 3 pts	Good: Post is sufficiently long, attempts to engage content with only minor inaccuracies/relevance; new ideas underdescribed, not thoroughly explained. 2 pts	Needs improvement: Underdeveloped response, only superficially engages module content or contains major errors; new ideas unclear, not made relevant. 1 pts	Unacceptable: Unsupported statement of opinion only OR short statement; does not engage module content; no new ideas presented. 0 pts	3 p
Writing mechanics	Excellent: Complete and grammatical sentences, no errors, no slang or rhetorical questions. 3 pts	Good: Complete and grammatical sentences, very few errors no slang or rhetorical questions. 2 pts	Needs improvement: A few incomplete or ungrammatical sentences; multiple spelling errors; uses rhetorical questions and/or slang. 1 pts	Unacceptable: Many incomplete and/or ungrammatical sentences; many spelling errors, rhetorical questions and/or slang. 0 pts	3 p
Writing flow and coherence	Excellent: All words are precise, all writing is relevant to the prompt. All new and unusual terms well-defined. 3 pts	Good: Most words are precise, most content is relevant to the prompt. Most new and unusual words well-defined. 2 pts	Needs improvement: Words not precise; may contain extraneous materials. New and unusual terms not well-defined. 1 pts	Unacceptable: Words not precise; substantial extraneous material. New or unusual terms not defined. 0 pts	3 p
Responds to Peers	Excellent: Substantive replies to at least two peers, furthered the conversation. 3 pts	Good: Substantive replies to two peers. 2 pts	Needs improvement: Substantively replied to 1 peer OR replied to many peers non substantively. Conversation may or may not have been furthered. 1 pts	Unacceptable: Did not reply. 0 pts	3 p
Total Points: 15					