

Grading Guidelines

The course grade is based on two 5-page essays, which are weighted equally. The first essay should present Frege’s logicist program, the problem which Russell’s result poses for it, and Frege and Russell’s responses to this problem. This essay may be entirely expository, and requires no critical discussion. The second essay should focus on one of the five modern responses to logicism discussed in the second half of the course. This essay may be written as a continuation of the first essay, and so may presuppose that the reader is familiar with the material presented there. Both essays should be intelligible to any student of philosophy. The second essay should contain some amount of critical and independent engagement with the material. The two essays will be assessed as a unit, and given a single grade. This grade will be assigned on the basis of the following criteria:

Grade	Knowledge of the Subject Area	Discussion and Argumentation	Relevance	Language and Structure	References
A	In-depth understanding of all of the relevant material, which is correctly presented.	An excellent discussion, with a stringent argumentation which is easy to follow. Shows a high degree of independent thinking.	The discussed material is highly relevant for the assigned topic.	Clear language without grammatical or typographical mistakes. Correct use of technical terms and symbols. Very well-structured and easy to read.	Correct citation of references according to a recognized format.
B	Very good understanding of all of the relevant material, which is correctly presented.	A very good discussion with a coherent argumentation which is easy to follow. A very good degree of independent thinking.	Very good selection of material for the assigned topic.	Clear language with few grammatical and typographical mistakes. Correct use of technical terms and symbols. Well-structured and easy to read.	
C	Good understanding of the most relevant material. The content is largely correct.	A good discussion with a coherent argumentative structure. A reasonable degree of independent thinking in the most important areas.	The discussed material is relevant to assigned topic.	Mostly clear language with some grammatical and typographical mistakes. Mainly correct use of technical terms, with only occasional mistakes in using symbols. Well-structured.	Citation of references with some omissions or incongruities.
D	Some correctly presented material, with certain misunderstandings.	A discussion with a somewhat incoherent argumentative structure. Limited degree of independent thinking.	The discussed material bears a certain amount of relevance to assigned topic.	Understandable language with grammatical and typographical mistakes. Technical terms are used, but also mis-used, with some mistakes in using symbols. A certain amount of structure.	
E	The material is superficially presented, with significant misunderstandings.	An attempt at an argumentatively structured discussion which is lacking in coherence. Very limited degree of independent thinking.	The discussed material bears little relevance to assigned topic.	Understandable language with many grammatical and typographical mistakes. Technical terms not used or used incorrectly, with incoherent use of symbols. Poorly structured.	Merely partial or largely incongruous citation of references.