

## Standard 1 - Existentialist Themes

**Overarching Standard:** *I can use concepts from existential philosophy to explain how a variety of human behavior relates to the idea of freedom and consider the ramifications this relationship has for the construction of meaning.*

Meeting the overarching standard for the course is a bit like climbing a ladder: you start at the bottom and make your way up, rung by rung. Each step is a necessary prerequisite to the one that follows, so you cannot skip steps along the way. In other words, you need to show me that you can walk before you run! Progress toward the overarching standard will be measured via your understanding of individual philosophers and their philosophical concepts, which are listed below:

- 1.A - Fyodor Dostoyevsky
- 1.C - Jean-Paul Sartre
- 1.E - David Abram
- 1.B - Søren Kierkegaard
- 1.D - Simone de Beauvoir
- 1.F - Franz Fanon

There will be multiple opportunities to demonstrate 3-level understandings (e.g. quizzes and short prompts), 4-level and 5-level understandings (formal essays), and 6-level understandings (independent research) for each thinker in the course, which will be assessed according to the rubric on the following page. Proficiency for each philosopher will be set by the highest score achieved in that category. At the end of the term, the three philosophers in which you have demonstrated the highest level of proficiency will be averaged to determine the grade for Standard 1, which is worth 60% of the final grade for the course. For an example, consider the hypothetical student below:

Assignment	Standard 1.A	Standard 1.B	Standard 1.C	Standard 1.D	Standard 1.E	Standard 1.F
<b>Total Competency</b>	5	6	4	3	2	6
<b>Recall Quiz #1</b>	3	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
<b>Essay #1</b>	4	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
<b>Recall Quiz #2</b>	N/A	3	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
<b>Essay #2</b>	N/A	4	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
<b>Essay #2 Revision</b>	N/A	6	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
<b>Recall Quiz #3</b>	N/A	N/A	2	N/A	N/A	N/A
<b>Recall Quiz #4</b>	N/A	N/A	N/A	3	N/A	N/A
<b>Recall Quiz #5</b>	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	2	N/A
<b>Recall Quiz #6</b>	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	3
<b>Essay #3</b>	5	N/A	4	N/A	N/A	6
<b>Standard 1 Final Grade</b>	5.66					

**Standard 1 Rubric**

<b>(6) Advanced Understanding</b>	<b>(5) Proficient Understanding</b>	<b>(4) Developing Understanding</b>	<b>(3) Emerging Understanding</b>	<b>(2 or Lower) Insufficient Evidence</b>
In addition to 3, 4, and 5-level understandings, I can compile component ideas into a new whole or propose alternative solutions	In addition to 3 and 4-level understandings, I can analyze effectiveness, limitations, and new insights that result from the application of concepts to new contexts	In addition to 3-level understandings, I can accurately apply concepts to new contexts.	I can consistently recall and demonstrate an understanding of previously learned concepts.	I cannot recall previously learned concepts.

## Standard 2 - Argumentative Writing

Rather than receiving a single grade for formal essays in the course, you will receive separate marks for four different standards that pertain to argumentative writing (in addition to relevant concepts from Standard 1), all of which are outlined in the rubric on the following page. Your current level of competency in each standard will be calculated by averaging your two highest marks in that category. For example, consider the hypothetical student in the table below:

Assignment	Standard 2.A	Standard 2.B	Standard 2.C	Standard 2.D
<b>Total Competency</b>	5.5	5	4.5	6
<b>Essay #1</b>	4	4	3	5
<b>Essay #2</b>	5	4	4	5
<b>Essay #2 Revision</b>	5	5	5	6
<b>Essay #3</b>	6	5	4	6

For Standard 2.A, the top two marks are 5 and 6, so the overall competency would be 5.5. Note that revisions are factored into the total competency. At the end of the term, the final grade for Standard 2 will be calculated with the following weight and range (using this formula, the above student would receive a grade of 5 for Standard 2):

- Standard 2.A - Thesis/Argument (20%)
  - Standard 2.B - Evidence/Analysis (35%)
  - Standard 2.C - Organization (35%)
  - Standard 2.D - Mechanics (10%)
- 6 - 5.5 to 6
  - 5 - 4.5 to 5.5
  - 4 - 3.5 to 4.5
  - 3 - 2.5 to 3.5
  - 2 - 1.5 to 2.5
  - 1 - 1 to 1.5
  - 0 - Less than 1

## Standard 2 - Argumentative Writing

	<b>2.A - Thesis/Argument</b>	<b>2.B - Evidence/Analysis</b>	<b>2.C - Organization</b>	<b>2.D - Mechanics</b>
<b>(6) Advanced</b>	I can present a clear, arguable, and precise thesis based on the topic or text(s). I can maintain strong focus, using the entire essay to support and develop the thesis thoroughly.	I can cite a variety of relevant, selective, and valid evidence to support my main argument. My analysis fully explains how the evidence supports my argument and thoroughly considers my argument's specific strengths and weaknesses.	My organizational structure establishes cohesion and clarity. My paragraphs have clear, distinct points and are arranged in a logical sequence that supports my central argument. My transitional words/phrases are clear and serve to enhance the relationships between ideas/paragraphs. My essay includes a clear, direct introduction that provides relevant context for my argument and a conclusion that follows from and supports the argument presented.	I demonstrate accuracy throughout in grammar, punctuation, and spelling. My sentence structure is complex yet clear, helping contribute to the overall flow.
<b>(5) Proficient</b>	I can present a clear, arguable, and specific thesis statement based on the topic or text(s). I can maintain focus, using most of the essay to support and develop the thesis.	I can cite a variety of relevant and valid evidence to support my main argument. My analysis explains how the evidence supports my argument and considers my argument's strengths and weaknesses.	My organizational structure is clear. My paragraphs have points and are arranged in a logical sequence that generally supports my central argument. My transitional words/phrases show the relationship between ideas/paragraphs. My essay includes an introduction that provides context for my argument and a conclusion that generally supports the argument presented.	I have isolated errors in grammar, punctuation, and spelling, but they are not overly distracting. My sentence structure is clear and effective.
<b>(4) Developing</b>	I can present an arguable thesis based on the topic or text(s), but it may be unclear or underdeveloped. I can maintain general focus on thesis though I may stray off-topic at times.	I can cite evidence to support my main argument, though it is not always relevant, varied, or specific. My essay may use too much or too little evidence. My analysis may not fully explain how my evidence supports my argument and the consideration of my argument's strengths and weaknesses is general or underdeveloped.	My essay uses a basic organizational structure. My paragraphs have points, though the relationships between paragraphs are not always clear or do not support my central argument. My transitional words/phrases may be missing. My essay includes an introduction though it lacks clarity or contextual information. My essay includes a conclusion though it may tend toward summary.	I have errors in grammar, punctuation, and spelling. My sentences are occasionally incomplete, structured incorrectly, or too simplistic.
<b>(3) Emerging</b>	I can present a thesis but it is overly simplistic, vague, or unarguable. I do not maintain focus on thesis or fully develop it.	I can cite evidence but it is unclear, irrelevant, or contradicts my main argument. My analysis does not explain how my evidence supports the argument and does not consider strengths or weaknesses. My analysis may summarize evidence.	My essay does not have a clear organizational structure. My paragraphs may have multiple points, unclear points, or no points. My relationships between paragraphs are not evident. My transitional words/phrases are missing. My introduction is unclear and lacks contextual information and my conclusion summarizes or cites ideas not supported by the argument presented.	I have frequent errors in grammar, punctuation, and spelling. My sentences are often incomplete, structured incorrectly, or too simplistic.
<b>(2 or Lower) Insufficient Evidence</b>	I do not present a thesis.	I do not cite or analyze evidence.	My essay does not have an organizational structure. My paragraphs (including introduction and conclusion) are missing or have no points.	My grammatical errors and sentence structure prevent my main points from getting across.

### Standard 3 - Class Discussion

Class discussion will be assessed much like argumentative writing. Every four full discussions, students will receive a mark indicating their level of competency based on the rubric below. The overall grade for this standard will be calculated by averaging your two highest marks in the category. For example, consider the hypothetical student in the table below:

Assignment	Standard 3
<b>Total Competency</b>	6
<b>Discussions 1-4</b>	3
<b>Discussions 5-8</b>	5
<b>Discussions 9-12</b>	6
<b>Discussions 13-16</b>	5

The top two marks are a 5 and a 6, so the overall competency would be a 5.5. At the end of the term, the final grade for Standard 3 will be calculated with the following range

**6** - 5.5 to 6      **5** - 4.5 to 5.5      **4** - 3.5 to 4.5      **3** - 2.5 to 3.5      **2** - 1.5 to 2.5      **1** - 1 to 1.5      **0** - Less than 1

<b>(6) Advanced</b>	Student contributions to discussion are consistent, selective, and intentional. Student regularly supports observations with evidence, makes connections to previous comments/assignments/texts, poses calculated questions that open new lines of inquiry, and takes calculated risks in developing new ideas. Student actively listens for patterns that run across peers' comments and identifies them in an attempt to move the conversation forward.
<b>(5) Proficient</b>	Student contributes to discussion on a regular basis, supports observations with evidence, makes connections to previous comments/assignments/texts, poses questions, and attempts to develop new ideas. Student actively listens to peers and responds to their ideas.
<b>(4) Developing</b>	Student contributes to discussion though is less intentional when doing so, often repeating points that have already been made. Student occasionally supports observations with evidence, makes connections to previous comments/assignments/texts, and poses questions. Student listens to peers and responds to them.
<b>(3) Emerging</b>	Student contributions to discussion lack intentionality. Student rarely supports observations with evidence, does not make connections to previous comments/assignments/texts, and does not pose questions. Student rarely listens to or responds to peers.
<b>(2 or Lower) Insufficient Evidence</b>	Student does not participate in discussion.