

Assessment 1

The Use of Philosophy of Science

Self-Assessment Rubric

Please use the following rubric to assign a point value to your essay. For each category—Style, Explanation, Assessment—assign the point value that best characterizes your essay. To calculate your grade, add up the assigned point values, and then multiply this sum by 4. (For example, if Style = 3, Explanation = 8, and Assessment = 7, your grade would be 72%. First, sum these numbers: $3+8+7=18$, and then multiply by 4: $18*4=72$.)

Read your essay aloud, at full volume, as if you were reading to someone else. The extra sensory input—aural and visual—will help make salient to you the relevant features of your essay.

Style	Comments
5.0: A	The paper has few to no grammatical mistakes (no spelling errors, fragments, excessively long sentences, obscure sentences, etc.). The paper is clearly written (avoids unfamiliar or complicated words when familiar or simpler ones will do, avoids ambiguous terms, gives illustrative examples, etc.). It avoids rhetorical questions and uses paragraphs in an intelligent way (one key idea per paragraph). There are proper citations. Each sentence is necessary to support or explain some other sentence.
4.0: B	The paper contains more than a few minor grammatical errors (an occasional misspelled word or misplaced comma, etc.). There are some awkwardly phrased sentences or other minor stylistic deficiencies.
3.0: C	The paper has a few significant, or minor but recurring, grammatical errors. The paper has a large number of awkwardly phrased sentences, bad transitions, or unhelpful citations. The paper uses rhetorical questions as a way to make claims.
2.0: D	The paper has many significant, recurring grammatical errors. The author's meaning is difficult to discern because of awkward writing.
1.0: F	The paper is a stylistic disaster.

Explanation	Comments
10.0: A+ 9.0: A	The explanation of Feynman’s analogy contains a clear thesis about the usefulness of ornithology to birds—e.g., “Ornithology is entirely useless to birds,” or “Ornithology is somewhat useless to birds,” or “Ornithology is incredibly useful to birds,” etc. There are reasons given to support the thesis, as well as specific examples to illustrate the reasons.
8.0: B	The explanation of Feynman’s analogy contains a clear thesis about the usefulness of ornithology to birds. There are reasons given to support the thesis, but there are no specific examples that illustrate these reasons.
7.0: C	The explanation of Feynman’s analogy contains a clear thesis about the usefulness of ornithology to birds, but reasons in support of this thesis are obscure or absent.
6.0: D	The explanation of Feynman’s analogy does not contain a clear thesis.
5.0: F	The explanation of Feynman’s analogy is obscure or absent.



Assessment	Comments
10.0: A+ 9.0: A	The assessment of Feynman’s analogy contains a clear thesis—e.g., “Feynman’s analogy is correct” or “Feynman’s analogy is incorrect.” There are reasons given to support the thesis. These reasons involve identification of questions or tasks appropriate to philosophy of science (from the assigned readings), as well as a defense of whether these questions or tasks are useful to scientists. There are specific examples that illustrate the questions and tasks, and a discussion of whether these specific questions and tasks are useful to scientists.
8.0: B	The assessment of Feynman’s analogy contains a clear thesis. There are reasons given to support the thesis. While these reasons involve identification of questions or tasks appropriate to philosophy of science (from the assigned readings), they do not address whether these questions and tasks are useful to scientists.
7.0: C	The assessment of Feynman’s analogy contains a clear thesis. There are reasons given to support the thesis. However, the reasons do not identify specific questions and tasks appropriate to philosophy of science.
6.0: D	The assessment of Feynman’s analogy does not contain a clear thesis.
5.0: F	The assessment of Feynman’s analogy is obscure or absent.