**Rubric for peer assessment of papers**

In giving feedback on the paper you’re reading, please be as direct and informative as possible, while still remaining respectful to the author(s). Try to be as helpful as you’d like *your* reviewer(s) to be to *you*. Since this course isn’t graded on a “curve,” writing appropriate comments can only boost your own grade and, hopefully, that of the authors whose paper you’re reviewing!

Grade each of the following ten categories with a scale of 1-10 (where 1 is highly unsatisfactory and 10 is excellent). Write comment relevant to categories (A)-(I) right in the margin where the problems occur. Also feel free to write “good point,” “nicely put,” etc., next to particularly good sentences or paragraphs.

A. Do the authors include an introductory paragraph that states clearly what they will address and argue in the paper (without giving the actual argument in this paragraph)?

B. Is the paper sufficiently grounded in the text – with an appropriate number of direct quotations or paraphrases of passages identified with page and/or line numbers? (As noted on the syllabus, this is a *very* common way to lose points on a paper.)

C. Do the authors clearly and accurately convey the philosopher’s relevant views?

D. Do the authors offer a well-reasoned criticism of what’s under discussion?

E. Is the paper organized in a logical way that makes for an effective presentation of the philosopher’s views and the authors’ criticisms of them? Although logical organization is of paramount importance, *bullet-points* are to be avoided wherever possible.

F. Does the paper avoid unnecessary repetition?

G. Does the paper avoid giving unnecessary, extraneous information (e.g., irrelevant biographical information about the philosopher or the authors) that detracts from the authors’ main points?

H. Does the paper end with a concluding paragraph that summarizes its findings or suggests further implications, but without just repeating what was said in the body?

I. (Very important!) Does the paper avoid spelling, grammatical, and punctuation errors? Are all of the sentences complete? Such errors distract the reader from understanding what the authors are trying to say, and also convey the impression of carelessness or even incompetence. Please keep an eye out for the following common punctuation errors:

Wrong: The **author’s** made some good arguments in their paper.

Right: The **authors** made some good arguments in their paper.

Wrong: The **authors** argument is cogent.

Right (with a single author): The **author’s** argument is cogent.

Right (with more than one author): The **authors’** arguments are cogent.

Wrong: **Socrates** legacy was the survival of critical thinking.

Right: **Socrates’** legacy was the survival of critical thinking.

Wrong: I put the book back in **it’s** place.

Right: I put the book back in **its** place.

Wrong: **Its** an important question.

Right: **It’s** an important question.

Wrong: They did **they’re** jobs well.

Right: They did **their** jobs well.

Wrong: **Their** trying to do a good job.

Right: **They’re** trying to do a good job.

Wrong: If someone jumped off a cliff, would you **to**?

Right: If someone jumped off a cliff, would you**, too**?

Wrong: I have **to** many books in my bag.

Right: I have **too** many books in my bag.

Wrong: That’s the way **too** do it.

Right: That’s the way **to** do it.

J. Do the authors *go into sufficient length* in doing (A)-(I)? (While a longer paper is not necessarily better than a shorter one, there is such a thing as a paper that’s simply too short to accomplish the tasks at hand.) When possible, indicate this by writing something like “needs more explanation,” etc.

Give some general comments at the end.