

Ethics Rubric Criteria and Levels of Performance

	Principle <i>(Principled Solution)</i> Offers a <u>clear</u> and <u>compelling</u> formulation of one (or more) <u>moral principle(s)</u> .	Argumentation <i>(Reasoned Justification)</i> 1. Presents an <u>argument</u> a) that is <u>sound</u> and <u>valid</u> , <u>and</u> b) whose <u>conclusion</u> is explicitly based on one (or more) of the moral principles identified. <i>And</i> 2. Adduces <u>moral intuitions</u> (or counterfactuals, factual considerations, probable consequences) in a way that <u>effectively</u> supports the conclusion defended.	Objectivity <i>(Competing Perspectives)</i> 1. Adduces an argument for (or principles, moral intuitions, counterfactuals, factual considerations or probable consequences supporting) the <u>logical opposite</u> of the conclusion defended. <i>And</i> 2. In doing so, makes a <u>strong case</u> for that logical opposite. <i>And</i> 3. Then <u>casts doubt</u> on that strong case, thus further strengthening the conclusion defended.	What if ...? <i>(Engagement, Creativity)</i> Adduces <u>relevant counterfactuals</u> , factual considerations or probable consequences effectively and creatively, revealing a) full <u>intellectual engagement</u> of the scenario, <i>and</i> b) <u>creative</u> and <u>independent</u> thinking.
3	1. Formulates one (or more) <u>moral principle(s)</u> but formulates it (them) either a) not clearly, <i>or</i> b) only incompletely, <i>or</i> c) without explicit recognition of its (their) status as principle(s). <i>Or</i> 2. Announces one (or more) <u>moral intuition(s)</u> that—while not explicitly based on a moral principle—is (are) nevertheless clearly reflective of a moral principle.”	1. Presents an <u>argument</u> a) whose soundness and validity are questionable, <i>or</i> b) in which the role (as major premise) of the moral principle(s) identified is <u>not fully</u> recognized. <i>And</i> 2. Adduces <u>moral intuitions</u> (or counterfactuals, factual considerations, probable consequences) in a way that relates them <u>ineffectively</u> to the conclusion defended (e.g., by simply presenting a list of them).	1. Adduces arguments for (or principles, moral intuitions, counterfactuals, factual considerations or probable consequences supporting) the <u>logical opposite</u> of the conclusion defended. a) <u>haphazardly</u> (e.g., as a token effort to argue the other side), <i>or</i> b) without making a serious attempt to then cast doubt on the case these contravening considerations support.	Adduces <u>relevant counterfactuals</u> , factual considerations or probable consequences, <i>but</i> does this a) <u>ineffectively</u> (e.g., by simply presenting a list of them), <i>or</i> b) <u>haphazardly</u> (e.g., as a token effort at illustrating the case). c) <u>elliptically</u> (e.g., failing to actually <u>make</u> the point the consideration in question is supposed to illustrate).
2	1. Formulates <u>no</u> clearly identifiable <u>moral principle(s)</u> , <i>or</i> 2. Formulates such principle(s) either a) <u>randomly</u> (e.g., as just another thing that came to mind), <i>or</i> b) with <u>no</u> apparent <u>recognition</u> of its (their) status as principle(s). <i>Or</i> 3. Announces <u>no moral intuition(s)</u> , <i>or</i> 4. Announces moral intuition(s) only <u>unconvincingly</u> (e.g., in a way that does not clearly reflect a moral principle underlying them).	1. Presents <u>no</u> argument, <i>or</i> 2. Presents an argument a) that is <u>unsound</u> or <u>invalid</u> , <i>or</i> b) in which the moral principle(s) identified (if any) play(s) <u>no significant logical role</u> in the defense of the conclusion. <i>Or</i> 3. Adduces <u>moral intuitions</u> (or counterfactuals, factual considerations, probable consequences, if any) <i>either</i> a) <u>aimlessly</u> (e.g., in an unprincipled ‘shotgun’ approach), <i>or</i> b) in a way that is outright <u>incoherent</u> .	1. Adduces <u>no relevant counterfactuals</u> , factual considerations or probable consequences. <i>Or</i> 2. Adduces <u>counterfactuals</u> , factual considerations or probable consequences <u>aimlessly</u> (e.g., in an unprincipled ‘shotgun’ approach).	1. Adduces <u>no arguments</u> for (or principles, moral intuitions, counterfactuals, factual considerations or probable consequences supporting) the <u>logical opposite</u> of the conclusion defended. <i>Or</i> 2. Adduces such <u>contravening considerations</u> a) <u>randomly</u> (e.g., as just another thing that came to mind), <i>or</i> b) leaves <u>contravening considerations</u> adduced (if any) <u>in force</u> , without attempting to cast doubt on them.
1				