

	<b>Excellent</b>	<b>Good</b>	<b>Needs Improvement</b>	<b>Unacceptable</b>
Organization (5 points)	The material is organized in a crystalline narrative structure which presents the ethical challenge, a policy solution (which contrasts with alternatives), and normative arguments for why the company should adopt this policy over others. (5)	The material is organized in a coherent narrative structure which presents the ethical challenge, a policy solution, and normative arguments for why the company should adopt this policy. Transitions and relationships between sections may sometimes be unclear. (4)	All of the relevant material is present, but the separation of content and the narrative flow of information needs improvement.  (3.5)	The relevant material is either missing or presented in a disorganized way.  (3)
Presentation (5 points)	An excellent delegation of speaking among members and practiced consideration of time constraints. The language used is clear and easy to follow. All supporting materials (i.e., PPT slides) are relevant and well-designed. (5)	There is a good delegation of speaking among members and good use of time. The language used is clear and easy to follow, but could have been improved in placed. All supporting materials (i.e., PPT slides) are relevant and well-designed. (4)	The presentation reflects rushed or superficial planning. The language and/or supporting materials is often confusing and difficult to follow.  (3.5)	There has been minimal effort and planning put into this presentation. The language and/or materials are extremely confusing.  (3)
Understanding (10 points)	The paper contains highly accurate and precise summarization, description and/or paraphrasing of the course materials, texts, and terminology. The ethical challenges and theories are presented accurately and demonstrate high fluency with the ideas. (10)	The summarization, description and/or paraphrasing of course materials, texts, and terminology is fairly accurate and precise. The ethical challenges and theories are presented fairly accurately and demonstrate good competence with the ideas (8)	There are inaccuracies or misunderstandings of the course material and terminology. Some of the ethical challenges and/or theories are presented inaccurately, and show some misunderstandings of the ideas.  (7)	There are serious confusions about the course material and terminology, or none of the course material is used. There are deep inaccuracies that reveal a serious misunderstanding of the ethical theories and/or challenges  (6)

<p>Arguments (10 points)</p>	<p>The presentation 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. If we assume that all the normative and empirical reasons (premises) are true, then the policy is almost guaranteed to follow (10)</p>	<p>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. 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)</p>	<p>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. Some people who accept all the normative and empirical reasons (premises) of the argument may still reasonably dispute the thesis/policy. (7)</p>	<p>There are no reasons offered, or if there are, they are vague and/or internally incoherent. 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)</p>
<p>Evaluation (10 points)</p>	<p>Examples are relevant, insightful, and well-used. 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. AND/OR 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 (10)</p>	<p>Examples are relevant and well-used. 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. AND/OR 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. (8)</p>	<p>Examples are only somewhat relevant, and/or not well-used. Some materials may be presented to lead the reader to accept the premises, but these materials are largely ineffective. There may be some implications of the thesis/policy discussed, but these are largely uninteresting or trivial. (7)</p>	<p>Examples are missing, irrelevant an/or misused. There are no materials provided to persuade the reader of the premises, or the materials are completely irrelevant. There are no implications of the thesis/policy discussed, or these implications are fundamentally mistaken (6)</p>
<p><b>GRADE</b></p>	<p><b>A</b> <b>(40 points)</b></p>	<p><b>B</b> <b>(32 points)</b></p>	<p><b>C</b> <b>(28 points)</b></p>	<p><b>D</b> <b>(24 points)</b></p>