Online Ethics Center
FOR ENGINEERING AND SCIENCE

Undergraduate Case Analysis Rubric

Description

This rubric can be used for guiding undergraduate case analysis for the course "
Genomics, Ethics, and Society."

Body

Criteria	Levels of Achievement				
	Completely Inadequate	**Slightly Inadequate**	**Competent**	**Excellent**	**Total Points**
Problem identification	**1.5 Points** Fails to identify the main ethical issues; Does not show understanding of why different approaches may be taken to this problem and why stakeholders may disagree.	**2 Points** Some difficulties in identifying the main ethical issues; some difficulties understanding why different approaches may be taken to this problem and why stakeholders may disagree.	**2.5 Points** Some success identifying the main ethical issues; Shows some understanding of why different approaches may be taken to this problem and why stakeholders may disagree	**3 Points** Accurately identifies main ethical issues; Shows good understanding of why different approaches may be taken to this problem, and why stakeholders may disagree.	**3**

Criteria	Levels of Achievement				Total Points
	Completely Inadequate	Slightly Inadequate	Competent	Excellent	
Providing empirical information and use of sources	**1.5 Points** Fails to provide any, or accurate empirical information; makes empirical claims with no evidence to back them up; uses no or inappropriate sources.	**2 Points** Some difficulties in identifying sufficient or relevant information; insufficient support for empirical claims from reliable sources; us of few or somewhat inappropriate sources.	**2.5 Points** Some success in making sufficient and relevant empirical claims and in providing sufficient support for them from a reasonable number of reliable sources.	**3 Points** Accurately identifies sufficient and relevant empirical information, and draws on support from sufficient and reliable sources.	**3**
Engages with appropriate range of value concerns	**1.5 Points** Fails to discuss a range of appropriate values that might be at stake (eg justice, suffering, privacy, liberty, naturalness).	**2 Points** Discusses a very limited range of appropriate values that may be at stake(eg justice, suffering,liberty, privacy, naturalness).	**2.5 Points** Some success in discussing a range of appropriate value sthat might be at stake (eg justice, suffering, liberty, privacy, naturalness).	**3 Points** Successfully discusses a range of appropriate values that might be at stake (eg justice, suffering, liberty, privacy, naturalness).	**3**
Open-minded and fair discussion	**1.5 Points** Assumes basic position without arguing for it; shows obvious bias; is unfair in argument; sets up straw man arguments.	**2 Points** Basic position is only partially defended; some biases evident; occasional unfairness in argument; a tendency to caricature others' arguments.	**2.5 Points** Sufficient reasons to support basic position; no biases evident; no unfairness in argument; no caricature of others' arguments	**3 Points** Basic position effectively justified; fair presentation of others' positions; charitable interpretation of others' arguments.	**3**

	Levels of Achievement				
Criteria	**Completely Inadequate**	**Slightly Inadequate**	**Competent**	**Excellent**	**Total Points**
Thinking critically about own and others' views	**1.5 Points** Complete lack of critical thinking about sources and arguments used; doesn't offer objection to own argument.	**2 Points** Insufficient degree of critical thinking about sources and arguments used; considers limited objections to own argument.	**2.5 Points** Some degree of critical thinking about sources and arguments used; some objections to own argument.	**3 Points** Engages critically with sources and arguments used, and offers plausible objections to his or her own argument.	3
Makes an appropriate argument	**1.5 Points** Fails to make an argument at all; fails to make an ethical argument; argument fails to answer the prompt; no creativity is expressed.	**2 Points** Argument is weak and difficult to follow; argument doesn't clearly draw on ethical ideas; some disassociation between prompt and response; little creativity is expressed.	**2.5 Points** A comprehensible argument is present; the argument makes an ethical case and addresses the prompt; some creativity is expressed where relevant.	**3 Points** A clear and rigorously developed argument is present; the argument directly addresses ethical questions and clearly responds to the prompt; the argument displays creativity where relevant.	3

Criteria	Levels of Achievement				Total Points
	Completely Inadequate	**Slightly Inadequate**	**Competent**	**Excellent**	
Writing Quality	**0.8 Points** Poor spelling and grammar throughout. Writing is barely coherent. No indication of what the argument will be or how the case study analysis will be structured at the beginning of the analysis.	**1.2 Points** Some spelling and grammar errors. Does not express opinions or ideas clearly.Only vague guidance as to how the case study analysis will be structured at the beginning of the analysis.	**1.6 Points** Few grammatical or spelling errors. Ideas are expressed reasonably clearly. Some guidance as to what the argument will be and how the case analysis will be structured at the beginning of the analysis.	**2 Points** Consistently uses correct grammar with rare misspellings. Expresses ideas in a clear and concise manner. Clear guidance given as to what the argument will be and how the case study analysis will be structured at the beginning of the analysis.	2
					20

Rights

Use of Materials on the OEC

Resource Type

Assessment Tools

Topics

Evaluation and Assessment

Discipline(s)

Teaching Ethics in STEM