

ETHICAL REASONING VALUE RUBRIC

for more information, please contact value@aacu.org



The VALUE rubrics were developed by teams of faculty experts representing colleges and universities across the United States through a process that examined many existing campus rubrics and related documents for each learning outcome and incorporated additional feedback from faculty. The rubrics articulate fundamental criteria for each learning outcome, with performance descriptors demonstrating progressively more sophisticated levels of attainment. The rubrics are intended for institutional-level use in evaluating and discussing student learning, not for grading. The core expectations articulated in all 15 of the VALUE rubrics can and should be translated into the language of individual campuses, disciplines, and even courses. The utility of the VALUE rubrics is to position learning at all undergraduate levels within a basic framework of expectations such that evidence of learning can be shared nationally through a common dialog and understanding of student success.

Definition

Ethical Reasoning is reasoning about right and wrong human conduct. It requires students to be able to assess their own ethical values and the social context of problems, recognize ethical issues in a variety of settings, think about how different ethical perspectives might be applied to ethical dilemmas and consider the ramifications of alternative actions. Students' ethical self-identity evolves as they practice ethical decision-making skills and learn how to describe and analyze positions on ethical issues.

Framing Language

This rubric is intended to help faculty evaluate work samples and collections of work that demonstrate student learning about ethics. Although the goal of a liberal education should be to help students turn what they've learned in the classroom into action, pragmatically it would be difficult, if not impossible, to judge whether or not students would act ethically when faced with real ethical situations. What can be evaluated using a rubric is whether students have the intellectual tools to make ethical choices.

The rubric focuses on five elements: Ethical Self Awareness, Ethical Issue Recognition, Understanding Different Ethical Perspectives/Concepts, Application of Ethical Principles, and Evaluation of Different Ethical Perspectives/Concepts. Students' Ethical Self Identity evolves as they practice ethical decision-making skills and learn how to describe and analyze positions on ethical issues. Presumably, they will choose ethical actions when faced with ethical issues.

Glossary

The definitions that follow were developed to clarify terms and concepts used in this rubric only.

- **Core Beliefs:** Those fundamental principles that consciously or unconsciously influence one's ethical conduct and ethical thinking. Even when unacknowledged, core beliefs shape one's responses. Core beliefs can reflect one's environment, religion, culture or training. A person may or may not choose to act on their core beliefs.
- **Ethical Perspectives/concepts:** The different theoretical means through which ethical issues are analyzed, such as ethical theories (e.g., utilitarian, natural law, virtue) **OR** ethical concepts (e.g., rights, justice, duty).
- **Making Connections and Complexity:** Obvious subtle connections between / among the issues present in a scenario (e.g. relationship of production of corn as a part of climate change).
- **Independently:** ability to provide accurate support in one's own words (e.g. using a new example) to demonstrate ethical perspective.
- **Intellectually honest:** Evaluation of a perspective / concept to maintain a position but not objectively evaluating.

Ethical Reasoning VALUE RUBRIC

for more information, please contact value@aacu.org



Evaluation of Different Ethical Perspectives/Concepts	. Student states a position and can state the objections to, assumptions and implications of different ethical perspectives/concepts and does respond to them. The response is not <u><i>intellectually honest</i></u> .	Student states a position and can state the objections to, assumptions and implications of different ethical perspectives/concepts and does respond to them. But the response is not <u><i>intellectually honest</i></u> .	Student states a position and can state the objections to, assumptions and implications of different ethical perspectives/concepts but does not respond to them and they do not affect the students' position.	Student states a position but cannot state objections to and assumptions and limitations of the different perspectives/ concepts.
--	--	--	--	---