

CMSC 304 Ethical Analysis #2 – Grading Rubric

Grading note: You will receive a holistic letter grade that is consistent with the grades in the rubric categories, but is not necessarily a simple weighted sum of those grades. Students receiving all “Exceptional” scores will receive at least an A (95); all “Satisfactory,” at least a B-- (80); all “Marginal,” at least a passing grade of C-- (70); all “Inadequate,” no higher than a D (65).

A/B/C/D: 95/85/75/64; “++”=+5, “+”=+3, “-”=-3, “--”=-5 (e.g., B+ = 88)

		Exceptional	Satisfactory	Marginal	Inadequate
Writing Quality (approx. 15%)	Grammar, spelling, format	Few if any errors	A noticeable number of errors	Many errors; paper does not appear to have been carefully proofread	Distracting or excessive errors, or does not meet requirements
	References and citations	Sources attributed correctly; sparing use of quotations	Sources mostly attributed correctly; sparing use of quotations	Excessive use of quotations and/or missing attributions	No attributions of external sources and/or missing bibliography
Presentation Quality (approx. 50%)	Thesis	Meaningful, well thought out thesis that synthesizes multiple themes	Clear thesis	Thesis is too shallow or not supportable	Thesis is not apparent or a simple restatement of source material
	Quality of arguments	Arguments support the thesis, present solid evidence, and flow logically	Arguments support the thesis, have some evidence, and mostly make sense	Arguments have logical flaws, are not supported by evidence, or are not connected to thesis	Arguments or missing or do not make sense; evidence is not used; arguments do not support thesis
	Organization and clarity	Paper is easy to read; paragraphs have a clear topic	Clarity is sometimes lacking or paper is not always easy to follow	Many paragraphs lack topic or purpose; paper is difficult to read	No meaningful paragraph structure; paper is extremely difficult to read
Ethical Framework Content (approx. 35%)	Policies	Clear, comprehensive set of alternative policies is presented and analyzed	Some reasonable alternative policies are presented and analyzed	Policies are minimal or not well analyzed	Policies do not make sense or do not address the key issues
	Principles and values	Clear discussion of the principles and values involved in the ethical decisions	Some discussion of principles and values	Some principles and values are discussed but not clearly tied to policies or decisions	Principles and values are not clearly identified and discussed
	Stakeholders and consequences	Stakeholders and consequences are thoroughly identified and discussed	Key stakeholders, and the most obvious consequences, are identified and discussed	Important stakeholders and/or consequences are omitted from the discussion	No meaningful discussion of stakeholders and consequences
	Laws	All relevant laws are clearly identified and discussed knowledgeably and in depth	Some relevant laws are mentioned and connected to the ethical decisions	Laws are mentioned but not clearly connected to the ethical issue	No meaningful discussion of laws and legal issues