

Daniel Immerman  
Phil Mind

### Reading Response Paper 1

Instructions: this assignment has one required part and one optional part. The required part should be printed out and turned in at the start of class on a day of your choice between January 18 and February 15. This part should be under 700 words. 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 can't print double-sided)**. The second part is due 24 hours later and should be emailed to me. It does not count as turned in until you get an email confirming that I have received it. It can be as long as you like. Neither of these parts can be turned in late. If you have any questions about how to complete the assignment, please let me know.

- In the first part, you should answer one of the reading questions for that day's class. You can only pick reading questions marked with an asterisk. I will grade this part using my standard paper grading rubric, which I've attached to this assignment sheet. Because this is the first paper, I will give you one and a half free points on it. (So e.g. if you got a 12 according to the rubric, you'll get a 13.5 on the paper).
- In the second (optional) part, you should reflect on what you did well and poorly on the paper, in light of our class discussion of the question you wrote on plus any other thoughts you might have now that a little time has passed. I'll give you a point for this no matter what so long as you do it, plus a bonus if you are especially accurate in your reflection.

*Note: if you want some tips about writing philosophy papers, check out the links page on the course website, i.e. <http://www3.nd.edu/~dimmerma/teaching/43901-01/links.html>*

Paper Rubric - Phil Mind - Daniel Immerman

<b>Structuring</b>	(3) It is extraordinarily clear what the main goal of your paper is and what you are doing at each point in it. Things follow in a logical order.	(2) It is quite clear what the main goal of your paper is and what you are doing at each point in it. Things for the most part follow in a logical order.	(1) It is somewhat unclear what the main goal of your paper is and what you are doing at each point in it. Things sometimes fail to follow in a logical order.	(0) It is massively unclear what the main goal of your paper is and there are several points in which it is unclear what you are doing in it. Things often fail to follow in a logical order.
<b>Clarity and Precision</b>	(3) Extremely clear and precise. This includes telling me exactly how your arguments go, exactly where you object to arguments you object to, etc.	(2) You are rather clear and precise.	(1) There are a fair number of places in which you fail to be clear and precise.	(0) Your paper is massively unclear and imprecise.
<b>Answering Prompt</b>	(2) Answered all parts of the prompt.	(1) Answered most parts of the prompt.	(0) Ignored the prompt.	<b>Note: you only are eligible for points in rows after the first two if you get one or more points in each of the first two rows.</b>
<b>Interpretation</b>	(2) Maximally accurate and charitable in interpretation, presenting keen insight into other author's ideas.	(1) Fairly accurate and charitable in interpretation.	(0) A number of problems in accuracy or charity of interpretation.	
<b>Depth</b>	(2) Discusses issues in depth, considering objections and responses, rather than talking through a number of points quickly.	(1) Discusses several issues in a moderate amount of depth.	(0) Discusses a large number of issues very quickly.	
<b>Persuasion</b>	(2) The points you make in defense of your main claims are all extremely plausible, or if somewhat implausible, you consider and respond to the most important objections to them.	(1) The points you make in defense of your main claims are, for the most part, fairly plausible.	(0) The points you make in defense of your main claims are rather implausible.	
<b>Concision</b>	(1) No unnecessary sentences or words. Everything regarding what other authors say is necessary to explain the points you'll be making.	(.5) Occasional extra words or sentences. Sometimes adds unnecessary remarks about what other authors say.	(0) Often adds extra words or sentences or talks about irrelevant points.	
<b>Creativity</b>	(2) You make some extremely creative points.	(1) Your points are rather creative.	(0) Your points are not especially creative, but rather fairly standard.	
<b>Ambition</b>	(1) Your conclusions are extremely surprising.	(.5) Your conclusions are rather controversial.	(0) Your conclusions are not particularly controversial, but rather fairly mainstream.	