	Excellent	Good	Needs Improvement	Unacceptable
ORGANIZATION (15 points)				
Topic (5 points)	There is a clear thesis/policy about one of the ethical challenges in the assignment. (5)	There is some mismatch between the thesis/policy and the ethical challenge in the assignment (4)	The ethical challenge from the assignment is discussed, but there is no clear thesis/policy (3.5)	The ethical challenge from the assignment is not addressed by the paper (3)
Introduction (2.5 points)	Thesis is clear, and contained in the introduction. The topic is introduced with minimal fluff. It is made clear how the paper will get to this conclusion, not in a detailed outline of the paper, but rather in a concise summary of the steps in argument. (2.5)	Thesis is contained in the introduction. The topic is introduced with little fluff. It is generally clear how the paper will get to this conclusion, not in a detailed outline of the paper, but rather in a description of the steps in argument. (2)	Thesis is not contained in the introduction. The topic is introduced with too much fluff. The flow of the paper is described as an outline, and not as a description of the steps in argument. (1.75)	Only the topic is introduced, with no description of the paper. Or, the paper is described inaccurately. (1.5)
Transitions and Narrative Structure (5 points)	It is very easy to follow the narrative of the paper. Each paragraph introduces a new idea that flows naturally from the previous one, with appropriate connective tissue between the last sentence of one and the first sentence of another. (5)	It is generally easy to follow the narrative of the paper. Usually, new ideas are introduced in new sections and flow naturally from the other. (4)	It is somewhat difficult to follow the narrative of the paper. Paragraphs often jump from one idea to another without any clear transition. (3)	It is impossible to follow the argument. Ideas are discussed apparently at random, or not at all. (2)
Conclusion (2.5 points)	The paper uses the conclusion to tie up loose ends. For example, the paper briefly considers the implications of the acceptance of the conclusion for a larger argument, or for a larger issue or problem. Or the paper explains what further work may need to be done in this area. (2.5)	The paper uses the conclusion to tie up some loose ends, but combines this with a restatement of the introduction. (2)	The conclusion is merely a restatement of the introduction. (1.75)	The conclusion is missing. (1.5)

PRESENTATION (10 points)				
Spelling, Grammar, and Rhetoric (5 points)	All sentences are complete and grammatical. All words are chosen for their precise meanings. Paper has been spell-checked and proofread, and has no errors, and no rhetorical questions or slang. (5)	All sentences are complete and grammatical. Most words are chosen for their precise meanings. Paper has been spell-checked and proofread, and has very few errors, and no rhetorical questions or slang. (4)	A few sentences are incomplete and/or ungrammatical. Words are not chosen for their precise meanings. Paper has several spelling errors, rhetorical questions and/or uses of slang. (3)	Many sentences are incomplete and/or ungrammatical. Paper has many spelling errors, rhetorical questions and/or uses of slang. (2)
Clarity (5 points)	The paper is written in a way that a person who had never taken the course (with the perquisite level of background knowledge) would be able to easily understand all the ideas. (5)	The paper is written in a way that a person who had never taken the course (with the perquisite level of background knowledge) would mostly be able to understand, but would ask clarifying questions. (4)	The paper is written in a way that a person who had never taken the course (with the perquisite level of background knowledge) would have a hard time understanding, and would ask many substantial questions. (3)	The paper is written in a way that a person who had never taken the course (with the perquisite level of background knowledge) would find it impossible to understand. (2)
UNDERSTANDING (25 points)				
Course Materials and Terminology (12.5 points)	The paper contains highly accurate and precise summarization, description and/or paraphrasing of the course materials, texts, and terminology. (12.5)	The summarization, description and/or paraphrasing of course materials, texts, and terminology is fairly accurate and precise. (10)	There are inaccuracies or misunderstandings of the course material and terminology (8.75)	There are serious confusions about the course material and terminology, or none of the course material is used. (7.5)
Ideas (12.5 points)	The ethical challenges and theories are presented accurately and demonstrate high fluency with the ideas. (12.5)	The ethical challenges and theories are presented fairly accurately and demonstrate good competence with the ideas (10)	Some of the ethical challenges and/or theories are presented inaccurately, and show some misunderstandings of the ideas. (8.75)	There are deep inaccuracies that reveal a serious misunderstanding of the ethical theories and/or challenges (7.5)

ARGUMENTS (25 points)				
Structure and Internal Consistency (10 points)	The paper very clearly articulates a set of reasons (premises) to adopt the thesis/policy which are broken down into the simplest possible units to easily establish, distinguishes which reasons (premises) are empirical and which are normative, and does not use more reasons than necessary. All premises are consistent. (10)	The paper pretty clearly articulates a set of reasons (premises) to adopt the thesis/policy which are broken down into very simple units to easily establish, distinguishes which reasons (premises) are empirical and which are normative, and but some reasons may be superfluous. All premises are consistent. (8)	There are reasons (premises) to adopt the thesis/policy, but they are vague and it is difficult to identify how they relate to each other and/or the thesis. There are potential inconsistencies in the reasons offered. (7)	There are no reasons offered, or if there are, they are vague and/or internally incoherent. (6)
Strength / Validity (10 points)	If we assume that all the normative and empirical reasons (premises) are true, then the policy is almost guaranteed to follow (10)	If we assume that all the normative and empirical reasons (premises) are true, then the policy is likely to follow, but there is still room for disagreement (8)	Some people who accept all the normative and empirical reasons (premises) of the argument may still reasonably dispute the thesis/policy (7)	It is easy to imagine many people who accept all the normative and empirical reasons (premises) of the argument but reject the thesis/policy (6)
Consideration of Alternatives / Counter-Arguments (5 points)	The paper considers both obvious and unobvious counter-examples, counter-arguments, and/or opposing positions, and provides original and/or thoughtful responses. (5)	The paper considers obvious counter-examples, counter-arguments, and/or opposing positions, and provides responses. (4)	The paper may consider some obvious counter-examples, counter-arguments, and/or opposing positions, but some obvious ones are missed. Responses are non-existent or mere claims of refutation. (3.5)	No counter-examples, counter-arguments, or opposing positions are considered. (3)

EVALUATION (25 points)				
Examples / Case Studies (10 points)	Examples are relevant, insightful, and well-used. (10)	Examples are relevant and well-used. (8)	Examples are only somewhat relevant, and/or not well-used. (7)	Examples are missing, irrelevant an/or misused. (6)
Evidence (10 points)	Materials are provided to very effectively persuade the reader to accept each reason (premise) of the argument, most likely making use of reliable secondary sources. (10)	Materials are provided which may lead the reader to accept each reason (premise) of the argument as plausible, most likely making use of reliable secondary sources. (8)	Some materials may be presented to lead the reader to accept the premises, but these materials are largely ineffective. (7)	There are no materials provided to persuade the reader of the premises, or the materials are completely irrelevant (6)
Implications (5 points)	Surprising and important predictions of the thesis/policy are discussed for practical changes that must be made to current industry standards and/or corporate practices (5)	Some interesting predictions of the thesis/policy are discussed for practical changes to current industry standards and/or corporate practices, but there are more important ones that have been omitted. (4)	There may be some implications of the thesis/policy discussed, but these are largely uninteresting or trivial. (3)	There are no implications of the thesis/policy discussed, or these implications are fundamentally mistaken (3)
GRADE	**A (90-100 points)**	**B (80-89 points)**	**C (70-79 points)**	**D (60-69 points)**