

## **ECE/Philosophy 316**

## **RESPONSE PAPER 1**

Assigned: September 4, 2008  
Draft Due: September 11, 2008  
Final Version Due: September 25, 2008

### **Focus**

For Response Paper #1, focus your writing on a careful analysis of one of the following articles found in the introductory volume of assigned readings:

1. Pritchard and Holtzapple, "Responsible Engineering: *Gilbane Gold* Revisited"
2. Graham, "Palchinsky's Travels"
3. Fleming, "Engineers of Death"
4. *Time Investigation: The V-22*
5. Greenwood, "Attributes of a Profession"
6. Alpern, "Moral Responsibility for Engineers"
7. Davis, "A History of Engineering in the United States"

### **Content**

As you write your paper, summarize clearly the important ideas in the article, identify the author's implicit assumptions or perspectives, and evaluate the strengths and weaknesses of the author's arguments. Your analysis may either support or contravene the author's arguments, but the goal of your analysis is to take a definitive position, which you then support with substantive argumentation and sound reasons. End your paper with a strong conclusion, summarizing your work and the position you have taken.

### **Format**

In order to receive full credit for your work, both the draft and the final version of your paper must be at least three full pages in length. The text should be double-spaced, in 12-point font, with one-inch margins. Use a separate cover page with a clear and engaging title, along with your name and submission date. Remember to include your draft with the final version.

**GRADING CRITERIA**  
**22 Points**

*Thesis Statement and Outline*

- 3: Clear thesis statement and a well-crafted outline for the reader to follow.
- 2: Thesis stated with a basic outline to guide the reader.
- 1: Inadequate statement of thesis and outline.

*Clarity and Organization*

- 3: Overall organization is clear with appropriate transitions. Paragraph structure is integrally related to the thesis statement and outline. Paragraphs are coherent and ideas are clear.
- 2: Attention to the principles of cohesion and coherence would strengthen the paper.
- 1: Lack of organizational structure interferes with the clarity of the paper.

*Understanding of the Article*

- 3: Accurate and substantive understanding, emphasizing important points.
- 2: Basic understanding, but may miss some major points.
- 1: Misunderstands the author.

*Arguments and Counter-Arguments*

- 3: Identifies fundamental assumptions of the article and respectfully engages the author's position through the development of substantive counter-arguments.
- 2: Identifies strengths and weaknesses of the article.
- 1: Inadequate analysis of the article.

*Moral Analysis*

- 3: Substantive probing of the ethical issues at stake in the article.
- 2: Some discussion of the ethical implications involved.
- 1: Lack of sustained moral analysis.

*Sentences and Diction*

- 3: Graceful sentences with appropriate variety of structures. Words are chosen precisely. Writing is vigorous and engaging.
- 2: Occasionally awkward or vague. Active verbs are used, with few superfluous or poorly chosen words. Some pronouns without clear referents.
- 1: Several cumbersome and unclear sentences. Wordy, excessive nominalizations, weak verbs.

*Mechanics and Grammar*

- 3: No significant errors of spelling, grammar, punctuation, or usage.
- 2: Minor errors of mechanics and grammar.
- 1: Numerous errors in grammar and substandard usage.

*Format:*

- 1: Double-spaced, in 12-point type, with one-inch margins. Submitted on time. Three full pages minimum in length. Separate title page with name and submission date. Draft included with final version.