Final Assignment, VUSM 400, The Ethical Life, (01/16/17)

Final Assignment

1. Write a persuasive essay that answers an ethical question within applied ethics.
2. Defend your response using Rick Kyte's four-way method for ethical decision-making.
3. Support your argument with at least 8 appropriate sources (e.g., Kyte text, newspaper reports, books, professional/trade magazines, articles from peer-reviewed journals).

   - Relevant web sites can be used but only **two web sites** will count toward the 8.
   - Reference works can be used (e.g., Cambridge online dictionary of philosophy) but these **do not count** toward the 8.
   - Students are strongly encouraged to utilize a few sources that explicitly apply an ethical framework/analysis to the topic.

Your paper should extend at least **ten** double-spaced pages (excluding the bibliography) in 12 point, Times New Roman font, and **no more than fourteen** pages.

Follow these steps in preparing to write the paper:

1. Clearly articulate the question and explain the context of the question and what makes it an *ethical* issue.
   - What is the ethical question/debate?
   - Why is this question important and morally relevant?

2. Define, explain, and apply the 4-way method of ethical decision-making from Kyte.

3. Clearly articulate at least one position that is in opposition to your perspective and recommendations.
   - What are the ethical arguments against your position or recommendations?

4. Critically distinguish and evaluate differing positions on the moral problem you explore, then defend one moral perspective/view point on the issue.
   - Which arguments are stronger than others and why?
   - What makes the position you identity with more morally defensible than other views?

5. Develop a clear, specific recommendation that will clarify/resolve/lessen the problem or respond to the ethical question you posed. Justify this recommendation.

An Ethical Life **Four-Way Method Questions**

Truth
What are the facts?
Who are the parties involved?
What are the relevant laws?
What is the institutional/company policy?
What are the relevant professional standards?
What are the possible solutions to the problem?

Consequences
What are those most likely to be affected?
How are they likely to be affected?
Which solution will be most beneficial and/or least harmful to those affected?

Fairness
Do the proposed solutions treat others the way you would want to be treated?
Do the proposed solutions treat all involved with respect and dignity?
Are the proposed solutions motivated by goodwill?
Do the proposed solutions enhance or diminish the autonomy of all involved?

Character
Can the proposed solutions be enacted virtuously (i.e., compassionately, wisely, courageously)?
Will doing the proposed actions tend to make the agent(s) more or less virtuous?
Can the proposed solutions be implemented in a way that builds trusting relationships?
How would your proposed response affect the character of those involved in the long run?
What would be the long-term consequences on the character of those involved?

Proposed revised course SLOs (16.01.2017)

1. Students will demonstrate knowledge of major ethical approaches.
2. Students will demonstrate the ability to logically analyze and evaluate ethical problems.
3. Students will integrate ethical approaches and use these to recommend solutions.
4. Students will use primary and secondary sources effectively and responsibly.
5. Students will write a persuasive paper on a problem in applied ethics.

Instructor Guidelines

1. Scaffold the final paper by having students submit drafts of sections.
2. Practice the four-way method throughout the semester.
3. Consider scheduling a visit to the library to review relevant research methods and sources with a reference librarian.
4. Discuss how to use different kinds of sources and integrate these into the paper.

The Ethical Life Learning Outcomes Rubric (01.2017)

LIVE Outcomes	TEL SLOs	Assignment Criteria	0	1	2	3	4
CTa: Explanation of issues	3. reason logically	**Argument**: **1. Clarity of main idea**	No clear thesis is developed and/or moral nature of the problem is unclear.	Only introduces the issue or problem.	Introduces the issue or problem but only implies its moral relevance.	Partly explains the issue or problem and partly explains what makes it a moral issue.	Clearly explains the issue or problem and identifies its moral relevancy.
ERb: Understanding ethical perspectives	1. knowledge of major ethical perspectives	**Argument**: **2. Moral Analysis** -Applying the 4-way method	No models of moral analysis applied. Paper consists of largely undefended assertions. No consideration given to moral complexity of the position being examined or relevant polices.	Defines moral issue/dilemma and incompletely defines key concepts, policies, and facts (Truth). (may show some bias)	Defines moral issue/dilemma—defining key concepts and presenting relevant policies and facts (Truth). (may show some bias)	Explains moral issue/dilemma—defining key concepts and presenting relevant policies and facts (Truth).	Explains moral issue/dilemma in a fair and balanced way—defining key concepts and relevant policies and facts (Truth).
ERd: application of ethical perspectives	2a. integrate ethical perspectives with case studies			Misrepresents the 4-way method of moral analysis (consequences, fairness, and character).	Partly explains and utilizes some of the 4-way method of moral analysis (consequences, fairness, and character).	Partly explains and utilizes the 4-way method of moral analysis (consequences, fairness, and character).	Explains and utilizes the 4-way method of moral analysis (consequences, fairness, and character).
ERe: evaluating ethical perspectives (ethical merit) CTc: influence of context and assumptions (feasibility) CTd: position (counter positions) CTe: conclusions and related outcomes (position / recommendation)	2b. propose a defensible solution.	**Argument**: **3. Critical Moral Evaluation** -Defending a position	Paper makes no attempt to consider alternative ethical perspectives, or trivializes these positions without examining them. Student makes no attempt to defend their view or give any feasible recommendations.	Recommends a response to the problem.	Recommends a response to the problem and begins to defend it.	Recommends a clear response to the problem and partly defends it.	Recommends a clear and specific response to the problem and explains how it would work.
	3. reason logically	*Here is how this solution is ethical. Here is how its ethics compare to those of another possible response.*		Incompletely defends own moral perspective, and incompletely evaluates or distorts the merit of at least one major counter argument.	Incompletely defends own moral perspective, and incompletely evaluates the merit of at least one major counter argument.	Defends own moral perspective and evaluates the merit of at least one major counter argument.	Defends own moral perspective and fairly evaluates the merit of at least one major counter argument.

WCb: content development (avoids redundancies) WCc: genre and disciplinary conventions (organization) CTe: conclusions and related outcomes	5. write an in-depth analysis of a moral problem	**Organization:** **4. Flow of ideas**	Paper lacks any intelligible organization or internal coherency. Much of the paper is filled with personal examples that are longwinded and not directly relevant. No attempt to direct the reader to conclusion.	Rarely moves logically from one claim to the next. Few transitions. Most claims lack appropriate and relevant content.	Sometimes moves logically from one claim to the next. Some transitions clarify logical relationships. Some claims lack appropriate and relevant content.	Usually moves logically from one claim to the next. Most transitions clarify logical relationships. Supports most claims with appropriate and relevant content.	Moves logically from one claim to the next. Transitions clarify logical relationships. Supports claims with appropriate and relevant content.
ILa: extent of information (appropriate sources) ILc: evaluate sources ILd: use information effectively to accomplish a specific purpose ILe: use information ethically and legally WCd: sources and evidence (synthesis)	4. Identify, locate, evaluate and responsibly use information to communicate effectively.	**5. Use of Sources**	No identifiable ethical positions are cited nor are any secondary sources critically integrated. The wrong ideas are attributed to authors and the paper risks plagiarism. Plagiarized. Note when the bibliography is not included.	Includes fewer than required number of sources (8 plus Kyte). Uses several sources that are less credible and relevant. Sometimes cites sources accurately. Quotes more than paraphrases or summarizes. Avoids plagiarism. Juxtaposes information from sources. Includes incomplete and inaccurate bibliography.	Includes fewer than required number of sources (8 plus Kyte). Integrates some sources that are less credible and relevant. Usually cites sources accurately. Quotes more than paraphrases or summarizes. Avoids plagiarism. Juxtaposes information from sources to support the thesis. Includes a mostly accurate bibliography.	Includes required number of sources (8 plus Kyte) Integrates credible, relevant sources. Mostly cites sources accurately. Generally chooses well when to paraphrase, summarize, and quote. Avoids plagiarism. Synthesizes information from sources to support the thesis. Includes a mostly accurate bibliography.	Includes required number of sources (8 including Kyte). Skillfully integrates credible, relevant sources. Cites sources accurately. Aptly paraphrases, summarizes, and quotes. Avoids plagiarism. Synthesizes information from sources to support the thesis. Includes an accurate bibliography.
WCa: context of and purpose for writing WCc: genre and disciplinary conventions WCe: control of syntax and mechanics	5. write an in-depth analysis	**6. Style**	Grammatical errors make it difficult to understand. Tone is sarcastic and/or dogmatic, employing inappropriate language at times. Vague expression. Language shows a lack of concern for argument or explicit reasoning.	Language seldom fits the expectations of a persuasive and well-reasoned paper. Grammatical, spelling, or diction errors that hinder clarity. Voice inconsistent and vague.	Language usually fits the expectations of a persuasive and well-reasoned paper. Some grammatical, spelling, or diction errors. Voice may be inconsistent and vague.	Language mostly fits the expectations of a persuasive and well-reasoned paper. Occasional grammatical, spelling, or diction errors. Voice may be inconsistent or generic.	Precise language that consistently fits the expectations of a persuasive yet scholarly paper with an emphasis on reasoned argument. Few and minor grammatical, spelling, or diction errors. Distinct, consistent voice.