Daniel Immerman Intro to Moral Philosophy

Paperling 5

Instructions: submitting this assignment requires two things. First, you should email it to me (my email address is immerman@ksu.edu) with the subject "Paperling 5". You should do this by **9** AM on September **29**. I will confirm with an email that I have received it. You should also print out a copy and bring it to class on September **29**. It should be a paragraph long. In class, we will talk over the assignment and then you will fill out a short self-assessment before turning it in. I like to grade as anonymously as possible, so please do not put your name on the top of the paper, but instead put it on the opposite side of the page or on a second page. If you have any questions about how to complete the assignment, please let me know.

You should bring an object to class that you think is either beautiful or ugly. If you think your object is beautiful, why do you think it's beautiful? If you think it is ugly, why do you think it's ugly? (Note: make sure not to just state your view, but also defend it; try to convince the reader that you're right!)

Late policy: I will accept late Paperlings, but take off 3 points if they're between 0 and 3 days late, and 6 points if they're more than 3 days late. After a week, they will no longer be accepted.

Daniel Immerman Introduction to Moral Philosophy

Paperling 5 Rubric

Clarity and precision	(3) You are quite clear and precise.	(1.5) For the most part, you are clear and precise, but at times you could be clearer or more precise.	(0) There are lots of times when you are not clear or precise.
Interpretation	(2) Insofar as you discuss other authors, you are accurate and charitable in your interpretation.	(1) Insofar as you discuss other authors, you are sometimes accurate and charitable in your interpretation.	(0) Insofar as you discuss other authors, you regularly are inaccurate or uncharitable in your interpretation.
Depth	(3) Discusses issues in depth, considering objections and responses, rather than talking through a number of points quickly.	(1.5) Discusses several issues in a moderate amount of depth.	(0) Discusses a large number of issues very quickly.
Plausibility	(2) Your claims are fairly plausible and/or you make sure to defend the ones that are questionable	(1) Your have some rather questionable claims you don't defend	(0) You have a large number of questionable claims you don't defend.
Concision	(2) No unnecessary sentences or words. Everything regarding what other authors say is necessary to explain the points you'll be making.	(1) Occasional extra words or sentences. Sometimes adds unnecessary remarks about what other authors say.	(1) Often adds extra words or sentences or talks about irrelevant points.
Self-assessment (Note: you'll be performing this in class on the day the paper is due.)	(3) You accurately self assess.	(1.5) You are somewhat accurate in how you self-assess.	(0) You are totally inaccurate in how you self-assess.