

Unit 1 Exam

The final exam will be conducted on Wednesday, December 13. The exam will be modeled after IB paper number 1.

On the day of the exam, I will choose one of the following stimuli for you to write on.

Since this exam is modeled on IB paper 1A, I have adapted the following description from the IB philosophy course syllabus:

With explicit reference to the stimulus and your own knowledge, discuss a philosophical issue related to the question of what it means to be human.

For the purposes of this exam, the issue you discuss must directly relate to the unit on freedom, although documents from other units that apply can certainly still be used.

The essay must directly address the stimulus material and provide a clear philosophical analysis of that material which is based on concepts raised in the class discussions and readings.

The essay must directly address the stimulus material and provide a clear philosophical analysis of that material which is based on concepts raised in the class discussions and readings.

Your essay must be in standard form - an introduction (with a thesis that makes a clear argument), several well developed body paragraphs, and a conclusion. The body of the essay should be well organized and clearly developed and should define any and all terms and ideas used in your argument. Essays should address and resolve counterarguments in a convincing fashion (use ACAR!). All arguments should be supported with direct reference to the sources used in class. Please use parenthetical references to cite the sources used.

Essays will be assessed using the IB rubric on the back of this sheet. Spelling and mechanics will not count towards your grade.

You may have a single 8.5 x 11 outline during the exam. The outline will be submitted on the day of the exam and will count as three annotations. The outline should contain **at least** 5 direct quotes from documents we have used in class. Please highlight the quotations so they are easily identifiable

Stimuli



IB Paper 1A Assessment instrument

Marks	Level descriptor
0	The work does not reach a standard described by the descriptors below.
1–5	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The response is poorly structured, or where there is a recognizable essay structure there is minimal focus on the task. The philosophical issue raised by the stimulus material is implied but not explicitly identified. There is minimal or no explanation of how the issue relates to the stimulus material or links to the question of what it is to be human. There is little relevant knowledge demonstrated, and the explanation is superficial. Philosophical vocabulary is not used, or is consistently used inappropriately. The essay is descriptive and lacking in analysis.
6–10	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> There is some attempt to follow a structured approach, although it is not always clear what the answer is trying to convey. The philosophical issue raised by the stimulus material is implied but not explicitly identified. There is some limited explanation of how the issue relates to the stimulus material or links to the question of what it is to be human. Knowledge is demonstrated but lacks accuracy and relevance, and there is a basic explanation of the issue. Philosophical vocabulary is used, sometimes appropriately. There is some limited analysis but the response is more descriptive than analytical. There is little discussion of alternative interpretations or points of view. Few of the main points are justified.
11–15	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> There is a clear attempt to structure the response, although there may be some repetition or a lack of clarity in places. The philosophical issue raised by the stimulus material is explicitly identified. There is a basic explanation of how the issue relates to the stimulus material and to the question of what it is to be human. Knowledge is mostly accurate and relevant, and there is a satisfactory explanation of the issue. Philosophical vocabulary is used, sometimes appropriately. The response contains analysis, but this analysis lacks development. There is some discussion of alternative interpretations or points of view. Many of the main points are justified.
16–20	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The response is structured and generally organized, and can be easily followed. The philosophical issue raised by the stimulus material is explicitly identified. There is good justification of how the issue relates to the stimulus material and to the question of what it is to be human. The response contains accurate and relevant knowledge. There is a good explanation of the issue. Philosophical vocabulary is mostly used appropriately. The response contains critical analysis. There is discussion and some assessment of alternative interpretations or points of view. Most of the main points are justified.
21–25	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The response is well structured, focused and effectively organized. The philosophical issue raised by the stimulus material is explicitly identified. There is a well-developed justification of how the issue relates to the stimulus material and to the question of what it is to be human. The response contains relevant, accurate and detailed knowledge. There is a well-developed explanation of the issue. There is appropriate use of philosophical vocabulary throughout the response. The response contains well-developed critical analysis. There is discussion and assessment of alternative interpretations or points of view. All, or nearly all, of the main points are justified. The response argues from a consistently held position about the issue.