












- A. Prompts or instruments used to collect the data
- B. Rubrics used to evaluate the data
- C. Relevant assessment-related documents (optional)

	<b>Caps to me</b>	<b>Miles to nes</b>	<b>Benchmark</b>
	4	3 2	1
<b>Context of and Purpose for Writing</b>	Demonstrates a thorough understanding of context, audience, and purpose that is responsive to the assigned task(s) and focuses all elements of the work.	Demonstrates adequate consideration of context, audience, and purpose and a clear focus on the assigned task(s) (e.g., the task aligns with audience, purpose, and context).	Demonstrates awareness of context, audience, purpose, and to the assigned tasks(s) (e.g., begins to show awareness of audience's perceptions and assumptions).
<i>Includes considerations of audience, purpose, and the circumstances surrounding the writing task(s).</i>			
	Uses appropriate, relevant,		
<b>Content Development</b>			
<b>Genre and Disciplinary Conventions</b>			
<i>Formal and informal rules inherent in the expectations for writing in particular forms and/or academic fields (please see glossary).</i>			
<b>Sources and Evidence</b>	Demonstrates skillful use of high-quality, credible, relevant sources to develop ideas that are appropriate for the discipline and genre of the writing.	Demonstrates consistent use of credible, relevant sources to support ideas that are situated within the discipline and genre of the writing.	Demonstrates an attempt to use credible and/or relevant sources to support ideas that are appropriate for the discipline and genre of the writing.
			Demonstrates an attempt to use sources to support ideas in the writing.
<b>Control of Syntax and Mechanics</b>	Uses graceful language that skillfully communicates meaning to readers with clarity and fluency, and is virtually error-free.	Uses straightforward language that generally conveys meaning to readers. The language in the portfolio has few errors.	Uses language that generally conveys meaning to readers with clarity, although writing may include some errors.
			Uses language that sometimes impedes meaning because of errors in usage.

		<b>Context of and Purpose for Writing</b>	<b>Content Development</b>	<b>Genre and Disciplinary Conventions</b>	<b>Sources and Evidence</b>	<b>Control of Syntax and Mechanics</b>
	Covington	4	3	4	4	4
	Covington	4	3	4	4	4
	Covington	4	3	3	3	3
	Covington	3	2	2	3	3
	Covington	2	3	3	3	4
	Covington	2	2	2	2	2
	Covington	3	2	2	2	3
	Knecht	4	3	3	2	3
	Knecht	4	4	4	4	3
	Knecht	3	4	2	3	3
	Knecht	4	3	3	3	2
	Knecht	4	4	4	4	4
	Knecht	4	2	2	2	2
	Knecht	3	2	2	2	2
	Knecht	4	4	4	4	3
	Knecht	3	1	1	1	1
	Knecht	3	1	1	1	1

**ANOVA**

	Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
--	----------------	----	-------------	---	------







interesting research question that probably cannot be answered because national security concerns restrict access to files. Before you start down a road of inquiry, check to see if enough evidence is available to answer the question.

### *Research Design*

Research design refers to the methods and evidence you will use to write your paper. Your research design should include the following:

- 1) Your research question and why it is important.
- 2) Your working thesis or set of hypotheses.
- 3)

*International Security; International Studies Quarterly; Journal of Peace Research; Journal of Conflict Resolution; International Studies Review; Political Science Quarterly; Public Opinion Quarterly; Security Studies.*

Your paper should largely be non-normative. Normative views should be left to the conclusion.

**Stay on track.** Many papers wander away from the main point. Write your research question and your answer on a separate piece of paper and refer to it often. If you find you are spending a lot of time on an issue that is unrelated to your question and thesis, stop and refocus.

**Defeat rival hypotheses.** Foreign policy events are overdetermined, meaning that there are multiple explanations for each phenomenon. As a result, there will always be other theories and perspectives that will challenge your own. A good rhetorical

### **Task 6. Peer Review (Due Apr 11)**

You are expected to review each other's papers and provide comments. All comments should be made electronically using Blackboard. Your comments should be constructive, yet firm, yet encouraging, editor.

#### **Paper Requirements**

Your paper will be graded on the quality of the writing as well as the quality of the argument.

**TERM PAPER ASSIGNMENT CLASSICAL POLITICAL THEORY**  
DR. COVINGTON, FALL 2015

**Overview**

Per the syllabus, students will complete substantial research and writing in the final project for this course. The purpose of this project is most centrally to provide students with the opportunity to enter into scholarly dialogue in an area their own choosing, seeking to make a substantive

importance. Do not be interested in, think others should be interested in, and has implications for how we approach contemporary politics. In the final version of your paper, this is not just a claim; it is a puzzle, not just assert it. (This requires some framing and some detail). Make this interesting! It is academic research, but this introduction should not be a list of sources.

- 2) **Build a bibliography of highly relevant sources:** Identify no fewer than 12 highly relevant academic sources (peer-reviewed journal articles, scholarly books, book chapters) that speak directly to the issue you want to resolve. (The bibliography of any highly relevant source will be a great starting point for finding other good sources. Again, relevance is the hallmark here.) Please note: book reviews and reference works do *not* count towards your 12-work total, though if you use these be sure to include them in your bibliography. The bibliography will eventually be placed at the end of your paper. (The annotated bibliography is only for your paper proposal; you will not need to include annotations on your final bibliography).
- 3) **Write a literature review:** This should sum up very succinctly the range of answers that other scholars have concluded regarding the research question to a more specific articulation of it all based on existing research. What are the broad fault lines of agreement and disagreement about it among scholars? What burning questions have been sufficiently answered? Insufficiently? Are there different methods of approaching this issue? Use this section to distill and clarify the issues based on existing research. This should be done succinctly and synthetically, avoiding any hint of a laundry-list approach to the authors. (If you are not sure what a well-synthesized literature review looks like, please ask!) The literature review identifies what remains controversial with regard to your puzzle, helping to focus your inquiry. *At the end of this stage, you should demonstrate your knowledge of relevant literature and articulate exactly what*



- 6) **Write the main body of the paper:** The bulk of your paper should implement your research design, seeking to answer your research question/puzzle in light of the best evidence you can find. This will involve both scholarly literature (in more depth and with more of a critical eye than in your literature review) and your own analytical engagement with the philosophical texts in question. Be sure to account for the best evidence on each side of your research question, analyzing and evaluating each component of your inquiry (i.e. be as balanced and objective as possible). Where a Christian perspective sheds unique light on your subject, work to reveal this analytically and objectively, as opposed to comparing the text to Scripture/doctrine. (I.e., demonstrate with your analysis any difficulties with unbelieving views of God, reason, human nature, etc.) **As you follow the structure outlined in your research design, clearly identify this structure with subheadings, and conclude each sub-section of the body of your paper by relating it to your research question and hypothesis.** *By the end of this stage you should have implemented your research design, completing the tasks that allow you to answer your research question.*
- 7) **Write a conclusion:** To what extent is your question resolved and what is the import of your conclusions? Here you should: 1) re-state your conclusions succinctly, 2) relate them to your question and thesis, 3) highlight their import for political life, and 4) acknowledge further questions that remain unanswered. *By the end of this section you should have clearly stated your research findings and reflected on their significance.*
- 8) **Write an outline:** This should consist of a hierarchically-organized, one-page outline of full-sentence declarative statements summarizing the *argument* of your paper (this will necessarily emphasize the body of the paper). I strongly encourage you to look at each paragraph of your argument, significant re-organizing of the paper itself to better structure its argument, and substantial editing and revision to make the point of each paragraph clearer. While the outline will be included at the beginning of your paper, it does not count against your word-count.
- 9) **Revision and Polishing:** Every paper should go through multiple rounds of revision, editing for content, clarity, grammar and usage. I highly recommend using the writing center in the library. Remember: be clear, brief, and precise.

**Dates:**

Week of 10/26-10/30 ô Complete proposal and meet with Prof. Covington during office (Tuesday & Thursday) hours to review it. Each proposal should include a 1-3 paragraph explanation of your research question/puzzle and its import, plus an annotated bibliography of at least 8 highly relevant sources.

Week of 11/2-11/6 ô Complete Draft of Literature Review & Research Design; meet with Dr. Covington during office hours (Tuesday & Thursday) to review these together (submit materials at the meeting).

Friday, November 20 ô Complete Paper Drafts Due. These will be submitted to Dr. Covington and to your peer reviewer via e-mail.

Tuesday, November 24 ô Completed Peer Reviews Due (submit via e-mail)

Friday, December 4 ô Final Drafts Due by hard-copy to Deane Hall mailbox and by e-mail.

**Format:**

12-point font, standard margins (1-1.25in.), double spaced, 4500 words maximum for individual papers, 6000 words for co-authored papers. Please put the word count on front page.

Your paper should have an appropriate title and a title page, followed by a **one-page outline of your argument**. Neither the title page, the outline, nor the bibliography counts against your word-count.

Please use in-text parenthetical citations (as per APSA standard) and a works cited. I will distribute a handout detailing this method.

**SEMESTER PROJECT AMENDING THE CONSTITUTION**  
AMERICAN POLITICAL THOUGHT (POL-132) SPRING 2016

**Goal:** To develop an argument for an amendment to the Constitution that addresses a significant need in the American polity.

**Explanation:** This assignment asks you to *identify and explain* a constitutional amendment to meet that need, and *defend* the amendment proposal through a carefully constructed practical and theoretical argument.

**Examples of Topics for New Amendments (your options are not limited to these!):**

- Clarifying Constitutional Powers of War and Foreign Relations
- Debates in Constitutional Interpretation
- Fixing Federalism: Reconciling Individual and Corporate Liberty
- Clarifying the Equal Protection Clause

**See the Appendix for examples of past amendments (failed ones might be adapted for this project).**

**Some ( ) T0 TfN0**

Cpqvjgt"ugpug"kp"y jkej" {qwt"rtqrqucnou" fghgpug"ujqwnf" hqnnqy"vjg"tcvkhkecvkqp"fgdcvg"ku"vjcv"kp" fghgpding your position, you should have a *clear argument*: you are arguing to change the constitution in a specific way; you are not just identifying the possible benefits and liabilities of such a change. Stake out a position! At the same time, your argument should be carefully nuanced, accounting for a range of counter-arguments and resisting the urge to be polemic. *The depth and development of your theoretical and practical arguments will constitute one of the major evaluative criteria for these papers.*

### **Project Parameters and Guidelines**

You may work on this project alone or in groups of up to 3 people.

- If working alone, the project should be about 3000 words (10 pages)
- If working in a group of 2, the project should be about 4500 words (15 pages)
- If working in a group of 3 the project should be about 6000 words (20 pages)
- NOTE: These are very low page numbers/word counts. Quality, concision, focus, and clarity will be crucial for a successful paper.

### Paper Structure:

- Every paper should follow a clear, logical structure that includes the three major components: establishing the need, proposing a solution, and, most extensively, defending that solution.
- You should include a one-page outline after the title page, offering full-sentence, argument-summarizing declarative sentences  
eqxgtpi" {qwt"gpvktg"ct i w o gpv"\* fqpupøv"eqwpv" hqt" {qwt"y qtf"eqwpv+0

### Sources

- You should take advantage of contemporary and historical research on the issue in question. Given the potential breadth of such research, only the most relevant texts should be selected. Depending on your proposed amendment, some empirical research may be helpful; if so, do locate and include it. However, I strongly recommend engaging contemporary theoretical debates in academic journals/books. You may also find thev"øetquuxgtö"uqwtegu"\*nkmg" *First Things*) are helpful. While the total number of sources that

