

Ethical Analysis Rubric – Examples of Quality Analysis

Categories	Level of Quality		
	Low	Average	High
<i>Gather the facts (who, what, where, when, how and why)</i>	Some relevant facts not identified. Facts are incorrect.	Facts identified, but some may not be relevant to case or may be slightly misinterpreted.	All relevant facts identified appropriately. Who, what, where, when, how and why were all addressed, as appropriate. Unavailable facts that were relative to the ethical outcome were also identified. Facts were assembled before
<i>Define the ethical issues</i>	Central ethical issues not defined appropriately or completely. Misunderstanding of the issues related to the case.	Central issues are identified, but not clearly explained. Peripheral issues not identified.	Central issues are all identified and used as basis for ethical evaluation; other issues are identified
<i>Identify the affected parties (stakeholders)</i>	Affected parties are not identified completely. Major players critical to analysis are not identified. Perspectives of players are missing.	Major players are identified, but some minor players may be missing. Perspectives are not complete.	Critical affected parties (both direct and indirect) are identified. Perspectives of all critical stakeholders are identified.
<i>Identify the consequences of each possible action</i>	Critical consequences of actions are missing. Actions are not connected with consequences, but are instead random and illogical. Relative weights of actions and consequences are not identified.	All critical consequences are identified, but some minor consequences are missed. Consequences are related to actions, but relative weights are not clearly articulated or inappropriate.	All critical consequences are identified and connected with actions. More minor consequences are also considered. Relative weights of the various consequences explicitly articulated with rational thought.
<i>Identify the obligations or duties</i>	Not all relative codes and laws have been identified, or the relationship of those laws are	All major codes and laws have been identified that influence the ethical analysis, but some	All relative codes and laws that influence the ethical analysis have been identified. Other

	not clear to the issues. The obligations and rights of all players have not been addressed fully.	other relative duties have been missed. The importance of the duties has not been fully articulated.	duties relative to the analysis that are not necessarily dictated by laws are recognized. The relative importance of this aspect has explicitly articulated with rational thought.
<i>Consider your character and integrity</i>	Major aspects of character of the players have been missed. The importance of the integrity of the players has been grossly underestimated or overlooked.	Some aspects of character and integrity of the players with respect to the ethical issues have not been fully addressed or explored. An analysis of importance of this aspect has been done, but is incomplete.	The role of character of the players in the ethical analysis have been addressed and explored in detail. The relative importance of this aspect has explicitly articulated with rational thought.
<i>Think creatively about potential actions</i>	An incomplete analysis is presented and acceptable potential actions have not been explored fully.	The analysis of the three approaches has been made, but is incomplete. Acceptable actions have been stated, but may not be clear or complete.	The influence of the three approaches to analysis have been explored fully and articulated clearly. Possible actions that stay within acceptable ethical boundaries have been presented in detail.
<i>Check your gut</i>	A fundamental flaw in the ethical analysis exists that leads to a conclusion that violates basic moral societal values, yet student does not recognize this problem.	Student has done comparison of the outcome of the ethical assessment with conventional morality, but does not articulate comparisons fully. The outcome is in line with conventional morality.	Student has done comparison of the outcome of ethical assessment with conventional morality and has clearly articulated the comparisons. The outcome is in line with conventional morality.
<i>Decide on the proper ethical action and be prepared to deal with opposing arguments</i>	Analysis was not carried out sufficiently and is fundamentally flawed. Solution may be trivial or illogical.	Solution and ethical analysis is logical and clear, but does not show great reflection or insight. The analysis may be superficial at some level.	Solution and ethical analysis is logical and clearly presented at a level that reflects extensive reflection and insight.

Assessment Rubric: Ethics Case Studies

Ethics is brought up in several courses across the curriculum, but we have opted to use the ethics case studies from CHBE 412 as the direct evidence for assessing Outcome F:

F. ...understanding of professional and ethical responsibility.

Outcome F. ...understanding of professional and ethical responsibility.

Outcome element	Unacceptable (0)	Marginal (1)	Acceptable (2)	Exceptional (3)	Points
Able to analyze a situation for potential ethical problems.	Students show no awareness of potential ethical problems in their response to the case studies.	Students appear to be aware of some ethical problems in the case studies but are not using appropriate tools to analyze the problem(s).	Students demonstrate understanding of the major ethical problems in the case studies and are applying the tools they have learned to analyze the situation.	Students are able to analyze a complex ethical situation and demonstrate an understanding of major and subtle ethical problems in the case studies.	
Awareness of the AIChE Code of Ethics.	No evidence that the students are aware of the AIChE Code of Ethics.	Students appear to be aware of the AIChE Code of Ethics, but are not making use of it as they approach ethical problems.	Students are aware of the AIChE Code of Ethics, and use it to when faced with a potentially unethical situation.	Students are aware of the AIChE Code of Ethics, and use it to routinely to work in a professional and ethical manner.	
Awareness of their responsibility to work in an ethical and professional manner.	No evidence that the students consider ethics or professionalism as they consider the case studies.	The responses to the case studies indicate that the students do not fully understand what it means to work in an ethical and professional manner.	The responses to the case studies indicate that the students are aware that engineers have a responsibility to work in an ethical and professional manner.	The students demonstrate ethical and professional engineering work in their responses to the case studies.	

Assessing the assessment tool...

After completing the assessment of the ethics case studies, please complete the following items.

This assessment rubric was: [useless] -- | -- [marginal] -- | -- [helpful] -- | -- [awesome]

Suggestions for improving this tool...

Ethical Considerations Rubric

Date: _____

Rater: _____

Course: _____

Student: _____

TRAIT	Unacceptable	Acceptable	Exemplary	Score
Identifies Dilemma	Has a vague idea of what the dilemma is and is uncertain what must be decided	Identifies the dilemma, including pertinent facts, and ascertains what must be decided	Describes the dilemma in detail having gathered pertinent facts. Ascertain exactly what must be decided	
Considers Stakeholders	Is unsure as to who should be involved in the decision-making process	Determines who should be involved in the decision making process and accurately identifies all the stakeholders	Determines who should be involved in the decision making process and thoroughly reflects on the viewpoints of the stakeholders	
Analyzes Alternatives and Consequences	Begins to appraise the relevant facts and assumptions and identifies some alternatives.	Clarifies at least two alternatives and predicts their associated consequences in detail.	Clarifies a number of alternatives and evaluates each on the basis of whether or not there is interest and concern over the welfare of all stakeholders	
Chooses an Action	Has difficulty identifying and appropriate course of action from among alternatives	Formulates an implementation plan that delineates the execution of the decision	Formulates an implementation plan that delineates the execution of the decision and that evidences a thoughtful reflection on the benefits and risks of action	

DIRECTIONS FOR INSTRUCTOR USE OF THE ETHICS ASSESSMENT RUBRIC

Attached you will find the ethics assessment rubric developed by the College of Business and Technology's Assessment Team. This rubric is intended for use in evaluating student knowledge and performance regarding an ethical dilemma/issue in the profession. Instructors are encouraged to share copies of the assessment rubric with students in advance of the students' participation in assignments so that they will understand what is expected of them on the assignment.

Instructors should familiarize themselves with the categories of student performance covered in the rubric before use of the rubric to evaluate student work. To use the rubric, instructors should place check marks in the boxes corresponding to their evaluation of the various dimensions (i.e., can locate profession's code of ethics, etc.) of student performance.

The rubric is set up with three levels of performance (i.e., does not meet expectations, meets expectations, exceeds expectations) that can be achieved by the student during the ethics exercise/assignment.

- Does not meet expectations:
 - 0 = The student does not demonstrate sufficient knowledge, skills or abilities with respect to this dimension and therefore, does not meet the instructor's expectations.
- Meets expectations:
 - 1 = The student demonstrates sufficient knowledge, skills or abilities with respect to this dimension, and thereby basically meets the instructor's expectations.
- Exceeds expectations:
 - 2= The student demonstrates greater knowledge, skills, or abilities than expected by the instructor, and thereby exceeds the instructor's expectations with respect to this dimension.

If a dimension contained in the rubric is not applicable for a given assignment, the instructor should simply leave that dimension blank.

ETHICS RUBRIC

	Does Not Meet Expectations	Meets Expectations	Exceeds Expectations
PROFESSIONAL CODE(S) OF ETHICS			
Student can articulate the primary tenets of the profession's code of ethical conduct.	<input type="checkbox"/> 0	<input type="checkbox"/> 1	<input type="checkbox"/> 2
Student is familiar with code(s) of ethics and standard(s) of professional practice within the discipline.	<input type="checkbox"/> 0	<input type="checkbox"/> 1	<input type="checkbox"/> 2
Student can state the application of the code of ethics in the practice of the profession.	<input type="checkbox"/> 0	<input type="checkbox"/> 1	<input type="checkbox"/> 2
Student is familiar with the ETSU Honor Code.	<input type="checkbox"/> 0	<input type="checkbox"/> 1	<input type="checkbox"/> 2
ANALYSIS			
Student is able to recognize an ethical dilemma or issue within his profession.	<input type="checkbox"/> 0	<input type="checkbox"/> 1	<input type="checkbox"/> 2
Student can identify stakeholders in an ethical dilemma/issue and can demonstrate awareness of differing perspectives of those stakeholders.	<input type="checkbox"/> 0	<input type="checkbox"/> 1	<input type="checkbox"/> 2
Student is able to recognize and analyze ethical dimensions/complexities of a dilemma.	<input type="checkbox"/> 0	<input type="checkbox"/> 1	<input type="checkbox"/> 2
Student is able to identify alternative courses of action/solutions regarding an ethical dilemma.	<input type="checkbox"/> 0	<input type="checkbox"/> 1	<input type="checkbox"/> 2
Student is able to evaluate both immediate and long-term risks/consequences of alternative courses of action.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/> 1	<input type="checkbox"/> 2
Student is able to identify the law(s) relevant to an ethical dilemma and understands what is necessary to comply with the law(s).	<input type="checkbox"/> 0	<input type="checkbox"/> 1	<input type="checkbox"/> 2
Student can formulate practices or policies to try to prevent recurrence of dilemma or issue.	<input type="checkbox"/> 0	<input type="checkbox"/> 1	<input type="checkbox"/> 2
Student can demonstrate understanding of the need for checks and balances in the organization (e.g., internal controls, disclosure requirements).	<input type="checkbox"/> 0	<input type="checkbox"/> 1	<input type="checkbox"/> 2
COMMUNICATION			
Student is able to identify organizational mechanisms for reporting unethical activities/behavior.	<input type="checkbox"/> 0	<input type="checkbox"/> 1	<input type="checkbox"/> 2
Student can state his/her rights and options in regard to reporting unethical activities/behaviors.	<input type="checkbox"/> 0	<input type="checkbox"/> 1	<input type="checkbox"/> 2
OVERALL ASSESSMENT			
Overall, the student:	<input type="checkbox"/> 0	<input type="checkbox"/> 1	<input type="checkbox"/> 2

Rubric for Ethics Audit

Ethics Skill	Unacceptable	Acceptable	Excellent
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> can identify an ethical issue in a problem or case 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> unable to identify 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> can identify the ethical issue but unclear elaboration 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> identification of the ethical issue and explain the underlying principle being violated
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> can use problem solving stages to arrive at a resolution for an ethical issue 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> unable to use stages 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> uses stages but incomplete or brief 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> thorough and complete description of stages to resolve the issue
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> can identify the stakeholders involved in an ethical issue 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> unable to identify stakeholders 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> can identify stakeholders but unclear on impact 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> identify and describe potential impacts
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> can state the approach to ethics being used (e.g., justice, utilitarian, etc.) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> unable to state approach 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> able to state approach but unclear or minimal description of approach 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> clear and elaborated statement of approach
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> can explain how ethical reasoning develops (e.g., Kohlberg, Belenky, Perry or other theory) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> unable to explain 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> general explanation of development 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> detailed explanation of development
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> can describe how to promote development of an ethical organizational climate 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> unable to describe 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> can describe but vague or incomplete 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> thorough description
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> can describe the impact of unethical behavior in an organization 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> unable to describe impact 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> can describe 2 impacts 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> can describe 3 or more
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> can identify risks to participants in research 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> unable to identify risks 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> can identify but unclear explanation 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> clear identification and explanation
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> can suggest ways of reducing risks to participants in research 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> unable to make suggestions 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> makes suggestions but not elaborate 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> clear and elaborated suggestions
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> can describe how to conduct an ethics audit in an organization 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> unable to describe audit 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> can describe audit but is incomplete or vague 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> thorough explanation of audit
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> can locate and know a code of ethics for their field or management specialty 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> unable to locate code 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> can locate and generally describe the code 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> able to locate and describe code in detail

ETHICAL REASONING VALUE RUBRIC

for more information, please contact value@aacu.org



The VALUE rubrics were developed by teams of faculty experts representing colleges and universities across the United States through a process that examined many existing campus rubrics and related documents for each learning outcome and incorporated additional feedback from faculty. The rubrics articulate fundamental criteria for each learning outcome, with performance descriptors demonstrating progressively more sophisticated levels of attainment. The rubrics are intended for institutional-level use in evaluating and discussing student learning, not for grading. The core expectations articulated in all 15 of the VALUE rubrics can and should be translated into the language of individual campuses, disciplines, and even courses. The utility of the VALUE rubrics is to position learning at all undergraduate levels within a basic framework of expectations such that evidence of learning can be shared nationally through a common dialog and understanding of student success.

Definition

Ethical Reasoning is reasoning about right and wrong human conduct. It requires students to be able to assess their own ethical values and the social context of problems, recognize ethical issues in a variety of settings, think about how different ethical perspectives might be applied to ethical dilemmas and consider the ramifications of alternative actions. Students' ethical self identity evolves as they practice ethical decision-making skills and learn how to describe and analyze positions on ethical issues.

Framing Language

This rubric is intended to help faculty evaluate work samples and collections of work that demonstrate student learning about ethics. Although the goal of a liberal education should be to help students turn what they've learned in the classroom into action, pragmatically it would be difficult, if not impossible, to judge whether or not students would act ethically when faced with real ethical situations. What can be evaluated using a rubric is whether students have the intellectual tools to make ethical choices.

The rubric focuses on five elements: Ethical Self Awareness, Ethical Issue Recognition, Understanding Different Ethical Perspectives/Concepts, Application of Ethical Principles, and Evaluation of Different Ethical Perspectives/Concepts. Students' Ethical Self Identity evolves as they practice ethical decision-making skills and learn how to describe and analyze positions on ethical issues. Presumably, they will choose ethical actions when faced with ethical issues.

Glossary

The definitions that follow were developed to clarify terms and concepts used in this rubric only.

- Core Beliefs: Those fundamental principles that consciously or unconsciously influence one's ethical conduct and ethical thinking. Even when unacknowledged, core beliefs shape one's responses. Core beliefs can reflect one's environment, religion, culture or training. A person may or may not choose to act on their core beliefs.
- Ethical Perspectives/ concepts: The different theoretical means through which ethical issues are analyzed, such as ethical theories (e.g., utilitarian, natural law, virtue) or ethical concepts (e.g., rights, justice, duty).
- Complex, multi-layered (gray) context: The sub-parts or situational conditions of a scenario that bring two or more ethical dilemmas (issues) into the mix/ problem/ context/ for student's identification.
- Cross-relationships among the issues: Obvious or subtle connections between/ among the sub-parts or situational conditions of the issues present in a scenario (e.g., relationship of production of corn as part of climate change issue).

ETHICAL REASONING VALUE RUBRIC

for more information, please contact value@aacu.org



Definition

Ethical Reasoning is reasoning about right and wrong human conduct. It requires students to be able to assess their own ethical values and the social context of problems, recognize ethical issues in a variety of settings, think about how different ethical perspectives might be applied to ethical dilemmas, and consider the ramifications of alternative actions. Students' ethical self-identity evolves as they practice ethical decision-making skills and learn how to describe and analyze positions on ethical issues.

Evaluators are encouraged to assign a zero to any work sample or collection of work that does not meet benchmark (cell one) level performance.

	Capstone 4	Milestones		Benchmark 1
		3	2	
Ethical Self-Awareness	Student discusses in detail/analyzes both core beliefs and the origins of the core beliefs and discussion has greater depth and clarity.	Student discusses in detail/analyzes both core beliefs and the origins of the core beliefs.	Student states both core beliefs and the origins of the core beliefs.	Student states either their core beliefs or articulates the origins of the core beliefs but not both.
Understanding Different Ethical Perspectives/Concepts	Student names the theory or theories, can present the gist of said theory or theories, and accurately explains the details of the theory or theories used.	Student can name the major theory or theories she/he uses, can present the gist of said theory or theories, and attempts to explain the details of the theory or theories used, but has some inaccuracies.	Student can name the major theory she/he uses, and is only able to present the gist of the named theory.	Student only names the major theory she/he uses.
Ethical Issue Recognition	Student can recognize ethical issues when presented in a complex, multilayered (gray) context AND can recognize cross-relationships among the issues.	Student can recognize ethical issues when issues are presented in a complex, multilayered (gray) context OR can grasp cross-relationships among the issues.	Student can recognize basic and obvious ethical issues and grasp (incompletely) the complexities or interrelationships among the issues.	Student can recognize basic and obvious ethical issues but fails to grasp complexity or interrelationships.
Application of Ethical Perspectives/Concepts	Student can independently apply ethical perspectives/ concepts to an ethical question, accurately, and is able to consider full implications of the application.	Student can independently (to a new example) apply ethical perspectives/ concepts to an ethical question, accurately, but does not consider the specific implications of the application.	Student can apply ethical perspectives/ concepts to an ethical question, independently (to a new example) and the application is inaccurate.	Student can apply ethical perspectives/ concepts to an ethical question with support (using examples, in a class, in a group, or a fixed-choice setting) but is unable to apply ethical perspectives/ concepts independently (to a new example.).
Evaluation of Different Ethical Perspectives/Concepts	Student states a position and can state the objections to, assumptions and implications of and can reasonably defend against the objections to, assumptions and implications of different ethical perspectives/ concepts, and the student's defense is adequate and effective.	Student states a position and can state the objections to, assumptions and implications of, and respond to the objections to, assumptions and implications of different ethical perspectives/ concepts, but the student's response is inadequate.	Student states a position and can state the objections to, assumptions and implications of different ethical perspectives/ concepts but does not respond to them (and ultimately objections, assumptions, and implications are compartmentalized by student and do not affect student's position.)	Student states a position but cannot state the objections to and assumptions and limitations of the different perspectives/ concepts.



Home
Sample Case

Sample Ethics Case Analysis Rubric*

70 Possible Points

The grade is derived by assessing each section. The blue fonts indicate the grade for that section. *Score = 64*

0	1	3	5
Examine the ethical dilemma			
<p>Does not identify the dilemma and does not ascertain exactly what must be decided</p>	<p>Identifies the dilemma or ascertains exactly what must be decided</p>	<p>Identifies the dilemma (including pertinent facts) and ascertains exactly what must be decided</p>	<p>Describes the dilemma in detail evidencing the gathering of pertinent facts and information and ascertains exactly what must be decided</p>
<p>Does not determine who should be involved in the decision making process for this case and does not identify the interested stakeholders</p>	<p>Determines who should be involved in the decision making process for this case or identifies some of the interested stakeholders</p>	<p>Determines who should be involved in the decision making process for this case and accurately identifies all of the interested stakeholders evidencing the student began to reflect on the viewpoints of these key players as well as their value systems and discussed what each of these stakeholders would like the student to decide as a plan of action</p>	<p>Determines who should be involved in the decision making process for this case and accurately identifies all of the interested stakeholders evidencing the student thoroughly reflected on the viewpoints of these key players as well as their value systems and thought through what each of these stakeholders would like the student to decide as a plan of action</p>
			<p>Thoroughly assesses</p>

0	1	3	5
<p>Does not address how the student can generate the greatest good</p>	<p>Begins to discuss how the student can generate the greatest good</p>	<p>Describes how the student can generate the greatest good</p>	<p>how the greatest good can be achieved</p>
<p>Thoroughly comprehend the possible alternatives available</p>			
<p>Does not delineate any alternatives</p>	<p>Delineates 1 alternative</p>	<p>Delineates 2 alternatives</p>	<p>Delineates 3 alternatives</p>
<p>Does not clarify consequences</p>	<p>Clarifies one alternative and predicts the associated consequences in detail</p>	<p>Clarifies two alternatives and predicts their associated consequences in detail</p>	<p>Clarifies 3 alternatives and predicts their associated consequences in detail</p>
<p>Hypothesize ethical arguments</p>			
<p>Does not determine which of the 5 approaches apply to this dilemma</p>	<p>Identifies an applicable approach</p>	<p>Identifies an applicable approach identifying the moral principles that can be brought into play to support a conclusion as to what ought to be done ethically in this case or similar cases</p>	<p>Identifies an applicable approach identifying the moral principles that can be brought into play to support a conclusion as to what ought to be done ethically in this case or similar cases and ascertains whether the approaches generate converging or</p>

diverging conclusions about what ought to be done

0

1

3

5

Investigate,
compare, and
evaluate the
arguments for each
alternative

Does not appraise
the relevant facts and
assumptions
prudently

Begins to appraise
the relevant facts and
assumptions
prudently

Appraises the
relevant facts and
assumptions
prudently noting the
evaluation of any
ambiguous
information

Appraises the
relevant facts and
assumptions
prudently noting the
evaluation of any
ambiguous
information and
explores any
unjustifiable factual
or illogical
assumptions, or
debatable conceptual
issues

Does not rate the
ethical reasoning and
arguments for each
alternative

Rates the ethical
reasoning and
arguments for some
of the alternatives

Rates the ethical
reasoning and
arguments for most
of the alternatives

Rates the ethical
reasoning and
arguments for all of
the alternatives

Does not give
evidence that the
student reflected on
any of the
alternatives

Gives evidence that
the student began to
reflect on the
alternatives

Evidences the
reflection on the
alternatives by
evaluating each
alternative on the
basis of whether or
not there is interest
and concern over the
welfare of all key
players

Evidences the
reflection on the
alternatives by
evaluating each
alternative on the
basis of whether or
not there is interest
and concern over the
welfare of all key
players and
determines which
alternative will
produce the greatest
good or the least
amount of harm for

<p>Does not refer to their professional codes of ethical conduct.</p>	<p>Begins to refer to their professional codes of ethical conduct</p>	<p>Refers to their professional codes of ethical conduct</p>	<p>the greatest number of people</p> <p>Refers to their professional codes of ethical conduct and determines if it supports their reasoning</p>
<p>0</p> <p>Choose</p> <p>the alternative you would recommend</p>	<p>1</p>	<p>3</p>	<p>5</p>
<p>Does not make a decision about the best alternative available</p>	<p>Determines the best alternative available</p>	<p>Determines the best alternative available and describes how their decision maximizes the benefit and minimizes the risk for everyone involved</p>	<p>Determines the best alternative available, describes how their decision maximizes the benefit and minimizes the risk for everyone involved, and they challenge their decision as they think others might, and defend it by from the ethical arguments they predict others would use</p>
<p>Act</p> <p>on your chosen alternative</p>	<p>Begins to formulate</p>	<p>Formulates an</p>	<p>Formulates an</p>

Does not formulate an implementation plan

an implementation plan

implementation plan that delineates the execution of the decision

implementation plan that delineates the execution of the decision and evidences a design that will maximize the benefits and minimize the risks while taking into account all of the resources necessary for implementation including personnel and money

0

1

3

5

Problem

Solving, decision-making, and critical thinking skills

Does not problem solve or use critical thinking skills

Evidences the beginning of problem solving and critical thinking

Uses problem solving and critical thinking skills during case analysis

Uses problem solving and critical thinking skills throughout the entire case analysis

Has difficulty making decisions

Is able to make minor decisions.

Is able to make major decisions

Is able to make major decisions with rationale

Procedures for Analyzing Ethical Dilemmas

Note: The information contained here is generic in nature and is provided as a guide to help you complete this assignment. Your seminar instructor may have additional information about how this assignment is to be completed.

Although the book "Applying Moral Theories", third edition, may not be used in your SET seminar section, it has much information which is valuable in completing this assignment. The four moral standards discussed in the Harris text might sometimes give converging answers to some questions in ethics, however, in dilemmas such as these they tend to give diverging answers. It is up to us, as reflective moral judges, to determine which standard applies and takes priority in each case.

The recommended procedure for analyzing ethical cases is to apply a variant of the design/problem-solving loop. In the process one attempts to reason systematically to a rationally defensible moral judgment using ethical principles and moral rules. The basic steps in the procedure are as follows:

1. Identify the Issues
2. Outline the Options
3. Construct Ethical Arguments
4. Evaluate the Arguments
5. Make a Decision

Step 1: Identify the Issues

1. What are the major moral or ethical issues raised by this case?
2. What are the major factual issues raised by this case?
3. What are the major conceptual issues raised by this case?
4. Who are the major stakeholders in this case? (stakeholders refers to all individuals whose interest could be affected by the decision made in the case).
5. How are the issues in this case related to the application of technology?

Step 2: Outline the Options

1. What are the main alternative actions or policies that might be followed in responding to the ethical issues in this case?
2. What are the major views on the conceptual issues raised by this case?
3. What facts are unknown or controverted that might be relevant to deciding this case (may require research to determine some facts).

Step 3: Construct Ethical Arguments

1. Determine which of the four moral standards discussed by Harris (egoism, natural law, utilitarianism, and respect for persons) apply to this case?
 2. Identify the moral principles or high-level rules that can be invoked to support a conclusion as to what ought to be done ethically in this case or similar cases?
 3. Determine whether the different moral standards yield converging or diverging judgments about what ought to be done?
-

Step 4: Evaluate the Arguments for each Option

1. Weigh the ethical reasons and arguments for each option in terms of their relative importance, assigning weights to each consideration where:
 - 3 = very important consideration
 - 2 = somewhat important consideration
 - 1 = a consideration of only minor importance
 2. Determine whether there are any unwarranted factual assumptions that need to be examined in each argument.
 3. Determine whether there are any unresolved conceptual issues in each argument.
 4. Determine whether any of the arguments involve fallacies or logical errors.
-

Step 5: Make a Decision

1. Decide which of the identified options you would recommend or judge to be the ethically best way to deal with the issue presented in this case based upon which option has the strongest ethical reasons behind it.
 2. Determine how a critic of your position might try to argue against it using other ethical reasons, and present a rebuttal or counter-argument in defense of your judgment.
-

Guidelines For Preparing Ethical Case Analyses

It is useful to discuss your case with at least one other person before you sit down to write up your case analysis. Following your case discussion, students are required to prepare a short analysis of the case that was discussed in which you develop and defend your own ethical analysis of the case. The purpose of these essays/reports is to give you a chance to work out your own view about the issues raised by the case and to practice the procedure for analyzing ethical dilemmas. Students who were not present in class for the discussions of the case are required to submit a written case analysis, but they will not have had the benefit of the discussion.

The papers are due on the date established by your instructor. Because these are short essays/reports, you must be very economical in what you say about the case. We strongly suggest that you organize your essay/report around the procedural steps for ethical analysis used in the class discussion. In evaluating your case analyses instructors will apply the following grading rubric which follows the procedure. In each case, the first bullet represents poor performance, the second bullet represented adequate or average performance, and the third bullet represents superior performance.

Evaluation of Case Analysis

1. Identification of Issues

1. Failed to identify all major ethical, factual and conceptual issues.
2. Identified most but not all of the major issues.
3. Identified all major issues and stakeholders and the relation to technology.

2. Identification of Options

1. Failed to identify all of the relevant and practical options.
2. Identified most of the relevant practical options, but overlooked some related conceptual problems and issues.
3. Correctly identified all of the relevant practical options and all of the related conceptual problems and issues.

3. Construction of Ethical Arguments

1. Failed to apply moral standards and principles correctly.
2. Applied some moral standards and principles correctly, but overlooked others that are also relevant or misapplied some ethical principles.
3. Correctly applied all of the relevant moral standards and ethical principles that are relevant to the case.

4. Evaluation of Arguments

1. Failed to provide weightings of various ethical arguments and reasons.
2. Provided some evaluation of reasons and arguments, but overlooked important factual or logical errors in some reasons.
3. Provided appropriate and defensible evaluations for all relevant arguments noting wherever necessary factual assumptions, logical errors, or conceptual confusions.

5. Ethical Decision

1. Decision reached is not justified by the arguments and reasons used.
2. Decision reached is justified by ethical arguments and reasons, but failed to identify and respond to reasonable ethical counter-arguments.
3. Decisions reached is justified by arguments and reasons used and care is taken in responding to reasonable counter-arguments.

6. Overall Presentation

1. Sloppy presentation with numerous spelling and grammatical errors.
2. Generally competent presentation marred with a few spelling, punctuation and grammatical errors.
3. Craftsmanship and style exhibited throughout the entire essay/report

Remember the object of this essay/report is to lay out and defend a particular decision about a controversial case. Thus, it is important that you take a position, even if you personally remain unsure about what you really think is ethically best. Your papers will be evaluated not in terms of whether your instructor personally agrees with your ethical judgment about the case, but by how well you are able to articulate and argue for a moral judgment about the case using known facts and relevant ethical principles. Your seminar instructor will go over the details of any specific requirement for her/his sections. Make certain to follow their particular directions/instructions for this assignment.

Good luck with this assignment!