### University of Detroit Mercy
### Submission Form for Core Curriculum Course Proposals

Use this form to submit an existing Detroit Mercy course for review. (An existing course is defined as a course that has been approved by the relevant department and/or college’s approval process.)

*Please Note: This file is an MS Word document in the form of a table. The table will automatically expand as needed. Remember to save your work frequently. Use Ctrl + Click to follow links.*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1. Name of faculty member proposing course inclusion in Core <em>(please type or print clearly)</em></th>
<th>Department of faculty member</th>
<th>Application Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mark Schumack&lt;br&gt;Beth Oljar</td>
<td>Mechanical Engineering&lt;br&gt;Philosophy</td>
<td>3rd version of proposal&lt;br&gt;Feb. 24, 2017</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>2. Course acronym and number&lt;br&gt;<em>ENGR 1000</em>&lt;br&gt;<em>For new course offerings, include the course number only if one has been assigned through the registrar</em></th>
<th>Full course name</th>
<th>Pre-requisites: none</th>
<th>Co-requisites: none</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Engineering Ethics</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>3. Catalog description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>This course explores the moral dimensions of engineering, which arise because of the effects of this technical profession on both human and non-human well-being. The achievements of engineers are morally significant not only because of their benefits, but because of the harm (or risk of harm) they often involve. Taught by both an engineer and an ethicist, the course combines a specific focus on the ethical complexities of engineering as a profession with a more general grounding in the study of morality as a universal feature of human experience. (2 credit hours)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
4. Core Curriculum learning outcomes to be fulfilled by this course. Place a √ by the learning outcome(s) for which this course is being proposed.

The proposed course must fulfill all of the learning outcomes listed under each given outcome area. See the document “Detroit Mercy Outcomes-Based Core Curriculum Structure.”

With the exceptions of B1 and B2, any course submitted for Knowledge Areas A-F of the Core must fulfill the first two Learning outcomes for Integrating Theme 1: IT1.1 and IT1.2. See “University of Detroit Mercy Outcomes-Based Core Curriculum Structure,” p. XX. These courses, however, cannot be proposed for IT1. Do not, therefore, check the box next to IT1 unless the proposal includes how the course aims to fulfill all nine of the IT1 outcomes.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Knowledge Areas</th>
<th>√ Check here</th>
<th>Knowledge Area Sub-Categories</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A. Communication Skills</td>
<td></td>
<td>A1. Written Communication</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>A2. Oral Communication</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B. Mathematical/Statistical</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Knowledge</td>
<td></td>
<td>B1. Quantitative and Symbolic Reasoning</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>B2. Statistical and Probabilistic Reasoning</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C. Scientific Knowledge</td>
<td></td>
<td>C1. Physical Sciences</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>C2. Social Sciences</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D. Religious &amp; Philosophical</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Knowledge</td>
<td></td>
<td>D1. Philosophical Knowledge</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>D2. Religious Knowledge</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>D3: PHL/RELS elective</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E. Essential Humanities</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>E1: Historical Experience</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>E2: Literary Experience</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>E3: Aesthetic Experience</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F. Ethics &amp; Social Responsibility</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>F1. Ethics</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Integrating Themes</th>
<th>√ Check here</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>IT1: Reading, Writing, and Research Across the Curriculum</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IT2: Critical Thinking</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IT3: Cultural Diversity</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IT4: Human Difference</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IT5: Personal Spiritual Development</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IT6: Spirituality and Social Justice</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
5. Course syllabus

✓ A full course syllabus is attached OR ___ a generic course syllabus is attached (for multiple sections). The syllabus must follow the approved McNichols Campus Syllabus Guidelines and must include the relevant UDM Core Curriculum learning outcomes verbatim.

6. Methods of assessment. Assessment of learning outcomes should be embedded into the course. Attach the assessment rubric(s) that will be used and/or include a description of how the learning outcomes will be assessed. Assessment of learning outcomes may be accomplished in a wide variety of ways, including but not limited to, questions within an exam, papers, assignments, presentations, portfolios, etc.

___ Rubric is attached.

Description (not required if rubric is attached)

See attached Course Assessment description beginning on page 15 of this proposal.

7. Instructor qualifications. Describe the academic qualifications for an instructor expected to teach sections of this course. Proposal author(s) should consult the Higher Learning Commission document “Determining Qualified Faculty Through HLC’s Criteria for Accreditation and Assumed Practices” with special attention to the highlighted portion on page 3. The qualifications here must be generic, and state the minimal qualifications required for ANY instructor of the course.

The course will be team taught through the departments of Philosophy and Engineering. The instructor provided by philosophy must have at least an MA in philosophy and some experience teaching ethics. The instructor provided by Engineering must have a Ph.D. in Engineering.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>8. Course section offerings expected</th>
<th>Fall Term</th>
<th>Winter Term</th>
<th>Summer Term(s)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>All sections offered should meet the Core learning outcomes and include appropriate assessment of those outcomes.</td>
<td>One section</td>
<td>One section</td>
<td>One section</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Multiple sections</td>
<td>Multiple sections</td>
<td>Multiple sections</td>
<td>Multiple sections</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

9. Signatures

- Faculty member proposing course for Core

Date: 2/24/2017

- Chair of department or departmental curriculum committee

Date: Feb 24, 2017

Important Note: Course proposals that are new to the department/college should first go through the normal departmental/college approval process.

10. After completing this Submission Form and gathering all required accompanying materials, the proposal author must review and complete the "Checklist for Core Curriculum Course Proposals." The completed Checklist must accompany this Submission Form.
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CHECKLIST FOR CORE CURRICULUM COURSE PROPOSALS

BEFORE SUBMITTING YOUR PROPOSAL, REVIEW AND COMPLETE THIS CHECKLIST. FAILURE TO FOLLOW AND COMPLETE THIS CHECKLIST WILL RESULT IN A DELAY IN CONSIDERING YOUR PROPOSAL.

Course Acronym and Number_ ENGR 1000 __________________________________________________

Full Course Name: __Engineering Ethics__________________________________________________

1. ☑ This is a course which currently exists at the University of Detroit Mercy.  
   (If this is a new course, stop here and submit the course for review by the applicable College/School Curriculum Committee and Dean.)

2. ☑ The Full Course Name included above and included in all materials matches the course name in the Detroit Mercy catalog.

For the Submission Form for Course Curriculum Course Proposals:

3. ☑ On page 1, the Catalog description (no. 3) is identical to the description in the Detroit Mercy catalog.

4. ☑ On page 1, the Catalog description (no. 3) is identical to the course description in the syllabus provided in the proposal.

5. ☑ On page 2, the box or boxes next to the area(s) of the Core for which the course is being submitted is/are checked.

6. ☑ On page 2, the box next to IT1 is checked only if all 9 of the Learning Outcomes for IT1 are stated and addressed in the Proposal. See further explanation on the top of page 2 of the Submission Form.

7. ☑ On page 3, before describing Instructor Qualifications (no. 5), the proposal author(s) have consulted the Higher Learning Commission document “Determining Qualified Faculty Through HLC’s Criteria for Accreditation and Assumed Practices” with special attention to the highlighted portion on page 3.

8. ☑ On page 3, the Instructor Qualifications (no. 5) are generic—that is, they state the minimal qualifications required for ANY instructor who may teach the course.

9. ☑ The syllabus submitted (p. 3, no. 6) lists, verbatim, all Learning Outcomes required for the area of the Core for which the course is being submitted.

10. ☑ Assessment of learning outcomes (including IT1.1 and IT1.2 for courses proposed for Knowledge Areas B-F) is embedded in the course and the proposal clearly states how all required learning outcomes will be assessed either through a rubric—which is included in the proposal or in the attached syllabus--or other ways which are clearly described (page 3, no. 7).
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11. ☑ On page 3, the faculty member proposing the course has provided his/her signature.

12. ☑ On page 3, the Department Chair has provided her/his signature.

The Course Syllabus Submitted for the Proposal (page 3, no. 6) Must Follow the McNichols Campus Syllabus Guidelines:

McNichols Campus Syllabus Guidelines

The University of Detroit Mercy recognizes the importance of syllabi as documents that reflect the creativity and intellectual endeavors of its faculty. Faculty have the right to determine the substance of their syllabi within the guidelines of their college/school/program. Therefore, with the exception of informational statements regarding compliance with University policies and of individual college/school and/or program policies, this document refers to the format of syllabi and not to content.

Rationale
A course syllabus is a student’s contract with the instructor and the University. A course syllabus should indicate clearly to students what is expected of them in the course and how they are to be evaluated. Each student must receive a copy of the course syllabus no later than the first face-to-face or online class session either in hard copy or electronic format.

Note
This document describes the minimum guidelines for a course syllabus. Individual colleges/schools and programs may require additional information.

13. ☑ Official course title and number; section number; number of credit hours; classroom number; days and times of class meetings; proposed class timeline or schedule; and course prerequisites/corequisites, if appropriate. In addition, for an online or hybrid course: synchronous meeting times; online office hours;* any face-to-face sessions, if appropriate.

14. ☑ Instructor’s name and title; office location; telephone number; udmercy.edu email address; office hours; names of teaching assistants and/or other instructors,* if applicable. For online course: name and contact information of the program director/chair or respective Dean to address student questions, concerns, or complaints.

15. ☑ Catalog description of the course; any additional instructor-generated description of the course.

16. ☑ Learning outcomes (broader, programmatic statements) and objectives (more specific, course-based statements) that indicate what a student should be able to achieve upon completion of the course and compliance with the instructor’s requirements.

17. ☑ All required texts and materials (including computer and internet resources, if applicable); assigned readings; supplemental texts; internet links for any specific assigned online readings or resources.
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18. ☑ Any required meetings anticipated outside of regularly scheduled meeting times including, but not limited to, observations, service learning, small group assignments, etc.

19. ☑ A "subject-to-change" statement covering the tentative class timeline/schedule and the entire syllabus.

*crossed-out items are not required for Core Curriculum Course Proposals

20. ☑ Policies regarding attendance and absences; class participation; classroom and/or online decorum; assignment deadlines; cancelled sessions; formation of and participation in team/group projects (if applicable), etc.

21. ☑ Basic description of grading and, if applicable, the weights assigned to each course component.

22. ☑ Statement of, or link to, relevant university and college/school policies and procedures (e.g., mission statements, student handbooks, academic integrity standards and/or policies).

23. ☑ Disability Support Services Statement as follows:

Disability Support Services and Accommodations:

If you need an accommodation because of a disability, have emergency medical information to share, or if you need special arrangements in case the building must be evacuated, please contact:

Emilie Wetherington, Director
Disability Support Services.
McNichols Campus Library, Room 328
Email: gallegem@udmercy.edu
Phone: 313-993-1158

It is very important for students to be proactive with regard to requesting their disability accommodations every semester. Students are encouraged to have open communication with their professors. However, it is never a requirement for students to disclose their disabilities to anyone except the Director of Disability Support Services, and only if they wish to request accommodations. You must be registered with Disability Support Services and your faculty must receive official notification from the DSS office before they can make arrangements for your accommodations.

24. ☑ Licensure Statement. Federal Regulations mandate a statement indicating one of the following must be included in the syllabus of any online program that will require licensure in the home state of the student:

Notice that the institution’s online program either does or does not qualify the student for licensure in her/his state of residence
Or

Notice that the institution cannot confirm whether or not the online program meets licensure requirements in the student's state of residence and a list of current contact information for any applicable licensing boards.

25. ☑️ A statement that important messages (such as cancellation of a class session) will be communicated through Blackboard and/or UDM email addresses.

26. ☑️ A current statement regarding Title IX protections. For further information, consult with Marjorie Lang, Title IX Coordinator. <Link to current Title IX language>
ENGR 1000-01: Engineering Ethics  CRN 11152  Fall 2017
MEETING: TR 11:20-12:35 in Chemistry 114

INSTRUCTORS:
Beth Oljar  Office: Briggs 306  Phone: (313) 993-3388  E-mail: oljarea@udmercy.edu
Office Hours: M and W from 2:30-4:00 pm; T and F from 9:30-11:00 am

Mark Schumack  Office: Engineering 216  Phone: (313) 993-3370
E-mail: schumamr@udmercy.edu  Office Hours: TWR 2 - 5

Course Description: This course explores the moral dimensions of engineering, which arise because of the effects of this technical profession on both human and non-human well-being. The achievements of engineers are morally significant not only because of their benefits, but because of the harm (or risk of harm) they often involve. Taught by both an engineer and an ethicist, the course combines a specific focus on the ethical complexities of engineering as a profession with a more general grounding in the study of morality as a universal feature of human experience. (2 credit hours)

Prerequisites: None.  Corequisites: None.

Required Textbooks:

Both texts are available in the university bookstore but rental and electronic options are available as well. The textbook (in whatever format you have it) must be brought to every class session.

Course Web page: http://knowledge.udmercy.edu/ All important course communications, including cancellation of classes, will be via our BlackBoard page and UDM email addresses.

Core Curriculum and Course/ABET Outcomes:
After taking this course, students will be able to:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Core Outcome</th>
<th>ABET outcome</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>F1.1 Define basic norms of other-regarding (moral) conduct.</td>
<td>C, F</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F1.2 Recognize the moral dimension of everyday human interactions and experiences.</td>
<td>C, F, H, J</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F1.3 Recognize at personal, professional, and societal levels the significant moral interests and claims of individuals and the common good.</td>
<td>C, F, H, J</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F1.4 Compare and contrast basic theories of moral reasoning by evaluating their strengths and weaknesses.</td>
<td>F, H</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
F1.5 Formulate and support ethical judgments by assessing relevant values, principles, virtues, rights, and responsibilities of all concerned.  
C, F, H, J

IT1.1 Develop a purposeful writing process appropriate to the argumentative and analytic nature of academic work that includes generating ideas, focusing, drafting, and revising-revision being a process that involves reflection, editing, feedback and publishing for a particular audience.  
G

IT1.2 Comprehend and practice ethical methods to avoid plagiarism and infringement of copyright regulations.  
G

IT6.1 Appraise and evaluate the goals, values and conceptions of social justice.  
H, J

IT6.2 Cultivate an understanding of the dynamics of economic, political, and social injustice.  
C, F, H, J

IT6.3 Investigate remedies to social injustice.  
H, J

Computer Usage: Microsoft Office or equivalent. Internet browsers. YouTube.

Grading and Course Requirements:  
Chapter Quizzes and Assignments  40%  
Writing assignments  40%  
Class Participation  20%

Chapter Quizzes and Assignments: For each of the chapters in the text, there will be a quiz and/or homework assignment to ensure that you understand the key concepts and ideas in the reading. Questions will include true/false, multiple choice, and short answer questions.

Writing Assignments:  
• There will be a 5-7 page term paper, with detailed instructions provided.  
• There will be some shorter 1 paragraph to 1 page responses to specific questions.

Class Participation: During class, we will pick students at random to comment on the material. However, we would also emphasize that the skills of moral awareness, imagination, communication, reasonableness, and hope – all of which are central to careful moral thinking and living – are best developed in conversation with others. In addition, we expect that you will have a lot of questions (and probably some confusion) as you begin to think about morality in a philosophical way, so coming to class with questions and comments about the reading will help you with every part of your grade.

Tentative Calendar (Re-do specific dates below for Fall 2017)  
* NOTE: The schedule is tentative and will be adjusted as the course progresses.

Week 1: Introduction to Ethics and Professionalism (B and M)  
Tuesday 8/30: Introduction to the course; Morality Quiz and Discussion  
Thursday 9/1: Ethics and Professionalism  
Reading(s): Martin & Schinzinger Chapter 1
Week 2: Moral Reasoning and Codes of Ethics (B and M)
Tuesday 9/6: Moral Choices and Ethical Dilemmas
Thursday 9/8: Codes of Ethics
Reading(s): Martin & Schinzinger Chapter 2

Week 3: Moral Theory and Moral Frameworks (B)
Tuesday 9/13: Introduction to Moral Theory and Moral Frameworks
Thursday 9/15: Revised Schedule for Celebrate Spirit – class meets from 10:30-11:20 am.
Reading(s): Shafer-Landau, Introduction (read this first, please)
Martin & Schinzinger Chapter 3

Week 4: Utilitarianism (B)
Tuesday 9/20: Finish discussion of Martin & Schinzinger Chapter 3 (if needed)
Reading(s): Shafer-Landau, Chapter 9

Week 5: Utilitarianism (B)
Tuesday 9/27: Finish the attractions of utilitarianism, begin discussion of problems
Thursday 9/29: Problems for Utilitarianism
Reading(s): Shafer-Landau, Chapters 9 and 10

Week 6: Kantianism (B)
Tuesday 10/4: The Kantian Perspective: Justice and Fairness
Thursday 10/6: The Kantian Perspective: Justice and Fairness / Autonomy and Respect
Reading(s): Shafer-Landau, Chapter 11

Week 7: Kantianism (B)
Tuesday 10/11: No classes – Fall Break!
Thursday 10/13: The Kantian Perspective: Autonomy and Respect
Reading(s): Shafer-Landau, Chapter 12

Week 8: Engineering as Social Experimentation (M)
Tuesday 10/18: How can we view engineering as social experimentation?
Thursday 10/20: Engineers as responsible experimenters
Reading(s): Martin & Schinzinger Chapter 4

Week 9: Safety and Risk (M)
Tuesday 10/25: Concepts of safety and risk
Thursday 10/27: Assessing and reducing risk
Reading(s): Martin & Schinzinger Chapter 5

Week 10: Workplace Responsibilities and Rights (M)
Tuesday 11/1: Confidentiality and conflicts of interest
Thursday 11/3: Teamwork and rights
Reading(s): Martin & Schinzinger Chapter 6
Week 11: Truth and Truthfulness (M)
Tuesday 11/8: Whistle-blowing
Thursday 11/10: Honesty and integrity
Reading(s): Martin & Schinzinger Chapter 7

Week 12: Computer and Environmental Ethics (M)
Tuesday 11/15: Computer Ethics
Thursday 11/17: Environment Ethics: sustainable development, corporate practice and government policy
Reading: Martin & Schinzinger Chapter 8
Martin & Schinzinger Chapter 9

Week 13: Environmental Ethics (B)
Tuesday 11/22: Moral frameworks
Thursday 11/24: No classes – Thanksgiving Break!
Reading(s): Martin & Schinzinger Chapter 9

Week 14: Global Justice (B)
Tuesday 11/29: Multinational Corporations
Thursday 12/1: Weapons Development and Peace
Reading(s): Martin & Schinzinger Chapter 10

Week 15: Open
Tuesday 12/6:
Thursday 12/8:

Final Exam: None

Grading Scale:
A  100 – 95
A-  94 – 91
B+  90 – 87
B   86 – 83
B-  82 – 79
C+  78 – 75
C   74 - 71
C-  70 - 67
D+  66 - 63
D   62 - 59
F   58 - 0

Homework Policies: Late work will be penalized 10% of the points possible for every 24 hours that it is late.

Electronic Devices: Absolutely no use of cell phones during class sessions.
ATTENDANCE AND PARTICIPATION POLICY: Lecture attendance is mandatory and will be noted by the instructors. Students are responsible for ALL material covered in lectures and on the syllabus, even if there is not enough time to cover it in lecture. Active participation in class and on team projects is mandatory. You are allowed 3 absences during the semester (not including university or instructor cancellation of a class session). Any unexcused absence beyond 3 will result in lower participation grade.

If you cannot attend a class, prior notice is required for an excused absence.

Examples of acceptable excuses:

- Medical emergency (one of the rare cases where advance notice may not be possible).
- Death / funeral in the family (typically, an email can be sent to the instructor before class meets).
- Travel associated with varsity sports (requires notification from the athletic department).
- Other extenuating circumstances deemed acceptable by the instructor (rare).

Examples of unacceptable excuses (this is not an exhaustive list; it is only illustrative):

- Homework due in another class and the student skips class to finish.
- The student does not get along with classmates and decides to not show up for class.
- The student was nervous about having to speak in class.
- The student had a computer problem.

PARTICIPATION STANDARDS:
Positive Attributes: Enters into class discussions, asks questions and offers suggestions, visits office hours as needed to check course direction, provide evidence of thoughtful reading and reflection on the texts.

Negative Attributes: Skips class, shows up late, does not pay attention in class, asks no questions, makes no comments, provides little or no evidence of thoughtful reading and reflection on the texts.

IMPORTANT DATES:

- September 5  Last day to drop without a “W”
- November 21  Last day to withdraw from class
- October 10-11  No classes (Fall Break)
- November 23-25  No classes (Thanksgiving Break)

ACADEMIC INTEGRITY: Among the most serious academic offenses is plagiarism. While students should always make every effort to acknowledge sources fully and appropriately in accordance with the contexts and genres of their writing, a student who attempts—even if inadequately—to identify and credit her or his source may not have intentionally plagiarized. In such cases where the instructor determines that the plagiarism was unintentional, it is recommended that the instructor meet with the student and resolve the issue between themselves.
In an instructional setting, intentional plagiarism occurs when a writer deliberately uses someone else’s language, ideas, or other original (not common-knowledge) material without acknowledging its source. This definition applies to texts published in print or on-line, to manuscripts, and to the work of other student writers. It also includes work purchased or obtained from other students or from other sources.

Moreover, this policy may also apply to cases in which a student repeatedly refuses to employ the conventions of proper documentation of sources. Any documented case of plagiarism will be dealt with according to the policies of the College of Engineering and Science. Every writing assignment is to be turned in through Blackboard and will be checked against other students’ assignment using SafeAssign.

**DISABILITY SUPPORT SERVICES AND ACCOMMODATIONS:** If you need an accommodation because of a disability, have emergency medical information to share, or if you need special arrangements in case the building must be evacuated, please contact:

Emilie Wetherington, Director
Disability Support Services.
McNichols Campus Library, Room 328 Email: gallegem@udmercy.edu
Phone: 313-993-1158

It is very important for students to be proactive with regard to requesting their disability accommodations every semester. Students are encouraged to have open communication with their professors. However, it is a personal choice and never a requirement for students to disclose their disabilities to anyone except the Director of Disability Support Services, and only if they wish to request accommodations. You must be registered with Disability Support Services and your faculty must receive official notification from the DSS office before they can make arrangements for your accommodations.

**TITLE IX PROTECTIONS:**

UDM is committed to fostering a safe, productive learning environment. Detroit Mercy’s Title IX policy prohibits sex and gender-based discrimination including sexual or gender-based harassment, sexual exploitation, sexual assault, intimate partner violence/dating violence, stalking, cyberstalking, and retaliation.

If you have encountered any form of sexual misconduct (e.g. sexual assault, sexual harassment, stalking, domestic or dating violence), you are encouraged to report this to Detroit Mercy’s Title IX coordinator, Ms. Marjorie Lang at langma@udmercy.edu or at 313.993.1802. The Title IX office is located on the 5th floor of the Fisher Academic Center on the McNichols Campus. If you speak with a faculty member about an incident, that faculty member must notify Detroit Mercy’s Title IX coordinator. The Title IX coordinator is available to assist you in understanding all of your options and in connecting you with all possible resources on and off campus.
Learning Outcomes for IT-6:
IT6.1: Appraise and evaluate the goals, values, and conceptions of social justice.
IT6.2: Cultivate an understanding of the dynamics of economic, political, and social injustice.
IT6.3: Investigate remedies to social injustice.

Discussion of and quizzes on the readings below will be used to assess IT6.1 and IT6.2: see attached pdf file “IT-6 Readings ENGR 1000”:

Theoretical readings on social justice: these provide students with the basic theoretical framework for understanding and addressing issues of social justice: (1) that social identity groups occupy different positions or social locations relative to each other in society, such that one group’s privilege mean another group’s disadvantage; (2) social group identities or categories (such as racial and gender identity) have been used historically to justify perpetuating the advantages of privileged groups at the expense of others; (3) these social identity categories are socially constructed within a particular set of historical circumstances, (4) this legacy of historical inequality requires a theory of oppression.

Bell: “Theoretical Foundations for Social Justice Education”


A useful resource on engineering and social justice is:
Engineering and Social Justice | Center For The Study Of Ethics In The Professions
http://ethics.iit.edu/projects/engineering-social-justice

Using the following two resources, plus the readings above, write a two page essay explaining what it means to say that the Flint Water Crisis (or the Hurricane Katrina Response) is an example of environmental racism. (This will be used to assess IT6.3)

Environmental racism - Wikipedia
https://en.m.wikipedia.org/wiki/Environmental_racism

A Question of Environmental Racism in Flint

Write a two page essay answering the following question: How do these two organizations in particular demonstrate a commitment to social justice? (This will be used to assess IT6.3)

Our commitments | Engineering, Social Justice, and Peace
http://esjp.org/about-esjp/our-commitments

Engineers Without Borders – USA http://www.ewb-usa.org/
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## Course Assessment:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Course Learning Outcome</th>
<th>Course Content and Assessment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| **Outcome F1.1**: Define basic norms of other-regarding (moral) conduct | Chapters 1 and 2, Martin/Schinzinger, with Quiz on Chapter 1 Introduction, Shafer-Landau Morality Quiz  
• Students will demonstrate understanding of the distinction between the normative and the descriptive, and will also be able to differentiate metaethics, value theory, and normative ethics  
• Students will understand that engineering’s ethical implications are based on the effects of the profession on the quality of both human and non-human life.  
• Students can distinguish between cultural, legal, and moral requirements. |
| **Outcome F1.2**: Recognize the moral dimension of everyday human interactions and experiences | Reading, discussion, and quizzes on Chapters 4-9 of Martin/Schinzinger, plus quizzes  
• These chapters concern key concepts in human moral experience in general (safety and risk, confidentiality/whistleblowing, honesty, environmental concerns, teamwork) with a specific application to the context of engineering.  
• Students will recognize the relationship between professional ethics (including codes of ethics) and more general and universal moral concepts and principles.  
• Because students are moral agents before they are engineers, the challenges of being an ethical engineer arise from the challenges of being an ethical human being. Critical reflection on the latter set of challenges will help students meet the former set of challenges. |
| **Outcome F1.3:** Recognize at personal, professional, and societal levels the significant moral interests and claims of individuals and the common good. | Reading, discussion, and quizzes on Chapters 4-9 of Martin/Schinzinger, plus quizzes
In examining situations involving safety and risk, confidentiality/whistleblowing, honesty, environmental concerns, and teamwork, students will come to understand the different levels of moral concern: their own individual integrity, the needs of their families, the needs of their employers, the standards of their profession as engineers, and the demands of good citizenship. |
|---|---|
| **Outcome F1.4:** Compare and contrast basic theories of moral reasoning by evaluating their strengths and weaknesses. | Reading, discussion, and quizzes on Chapters 1-3 of Martin/Schinzinger
Reading, discussion, and quizzes on Chapters 9-12 of Shafer-Landau
- Students will understand the differences between kinds of moral theories and the questions they address
- Students will understand the difference between and strengths and weaknesses of the utilitarian, Kantian, and Aristotelian approaches to ethics. |
| **Outcome F1.5:** Formulate and support ethical judgments by assessing relevant values, principles, virtues, rights, and responsibilities of all concerned. | Term Paper Assignment evaluating the Volkswagen Emissions Scandal from both utilitarian and Kantian perspectives.
Specific class discussions of case studies. |
| **Outcome IT1.1:** Develop a purposeful writing process appropriate to the argumentative and analytic nature of academic work that includes generating ideas, focusing, drafting, and revising—revision being a process that involves reflection, editing, feedback and publishing for a particular audience. | Term Paper Assignment |
| **Outcome IT1.2:** Comprehend and practice ethical methods to avoid plagiarism and infringements of copyright regulations. | Term Paper Assignment |
| **Outcome IT6.1:** Appraise and evaluate the goals, values and conceptions of social justice. | See page 14 of Course Proposal for discussion of the assessment of the F6 outcomes. |
**Outcome IT6.2:** Cultivate an understanding of the dynamics of economic, political, and social injustice.

**Outcome IT6.3:** Investigate remedies to social injustice.

**Assessment Materials:** Quizzes and Term Paper Assignment: pp. 18 - 29
Ethics as the Philosophical Study of Morality

1) Smith murders Jones for not accepting Smith’s bid on a construction project.

   Morally right or good  Morally wrong or bad

2) When Susan says good night to Mike at her door, he forces his way into her apartment and rapes her on her kitchen floor.

   Morally right or good  Morally wrong or bad

3) Amy spends a lot of her time taking her elderly mother on various errands, such as grocery shopping and doctor’s visits.

   Morally right or good  Morally wrong or bad

4) A professor threatens to fail a student unless she grants him sexual favors.

   Morally right or good  Morally wrong or bad

5) Although you have a cold and would rather stay home in bed, you keep your promise to help a friend move on a rainy day.

   Morally right or good  Morally wrong or bad

6) A slaveowner ‘buys’ several men and women at a slave auction.

   Morally right or good  Morally wrong or bad

7) The Nazis killed millions of people in their concentration camps.

   Morally right or good  Morally wrong or bad

8) A candidate for a faculty position at a university lies about his qualifications (such as whether he has his Ph.D).

   Morally right or good  Morally wrong or bad

9) A mid-level manager at a company always ‘looks out for’ and defends those who work for him and helps them improve their work.

   Morally right or good  Morally wrong or bad

10) While at the beach, you notice a small child struggling in deep water, so you swim out to offer assistance.

    Morally right or good  Morally wrong or bad
Quiz questions for Chapter 1 (Martin & Schinzinger)
20 points. Correct answers highlighted in green.

[1 point] 1. What point about moral values in engineering is illustrated by the Guatemalan chicken coop example on pp. 2-3?
   (a) moral values are just another burden to engineering projects.
   (b) even chickens deserve humane living conditions.
   (c) morality has nothing to do with increasing chicken and egg production.
   (d) the standards of excellence in an engineering project ARE moral values.

[1 point] 2. The dispute between Ford and Bridgestone/Firestone over the Ford Explorer tires is an example of a ____________ issue in ethics.
   (a) macro
   (b) micro

[1 point] 3. The claim that SUV’s are among the most harmful vehicles on the road is an example of a ____________ issue in ethics.
   (a) macro
   (b) micro

[1 point] 4. What aspect of engineering organizations can make it difficult to deal with the complexity of the engineering tasks in Figure 1-2? (p. 6)
   (a) their codes of ethics get in the way.
   (b) engineers don’t like re-evaluating prior decisions.
   (c) the silo mentality.
   (d) none of the above.

[1 point] 5. Consider the statement that one ethical belief of the Nazis was that Jewish people were subhuman. In what sense is ‘ethical’ being used here?
   (a) the descriptive sense.
   (b) the normative sense.

[1 point] 6. Consider the statement that the actions taken by the Nazis (genocide) were not ethical. In what sense is ‘ethical’ being used here?
   (a) the descriptive sense.
   (b) the normative sense.

[1 point] 7. True False According to the text, we can easily define morality by looking up the word ‘morality’ in the dictionary.

[1 point] 8. True False According to the text, any attempt to define morality inevitably leads us into thinking about ethical theory.
Quiz questions on Chapter 3 of Martin & Schinzinger (correct answers in bold)

T F 1. Moral theories seek to provide comprehensive perspectives on our moral experience that will clarify, organize, and guide our moral reflection.

T F 2. Conduct-centered moral theories focus on the sorts of character traits we should have; such theories focus on being rather than doing.

T F 3. Agent-centered moral theories focus on identifying those actions are that are right or obligatory; such theories focus on doing rather than being.

T F 4. Consequentialist moral theories define right action entirely in terms of the outcomes or results of the action.

T F 5. Unlike legal rights, human or natural rights are not created and given to us by governments, but instead are rights we have because we are human.

T F 6. Utilitarianism tells us to respect the rational autonomy of persons by acting only on moral principles we can envision applying to everyone.

T F 7. Kant’s version of duty ethics tells us to respect the rational autonomy of persons by acting only on moral principles we can envision applying to everyone.

T F 8. According to Aristotle’s version of virtue ethics, human beings seek eudaimonia (happiness), and the virtues are required for us to achieve it.

T F 9. The only virtues that matter in engineering are proficiency virtues.

T F 10. “Responsible professionalism” is the name given to the most comprehensive virtue in engineering, which includes a number of overlapping sub-categories of virtues.

11. Which of the following theories of ethics is deontological or non-consequentialist?
   (a) rights ethics
   (b) duty ethics
   (c) both (a) and (b)
   (d) neither (a) nor (b).

12. Which of the following best captures the libertarian view of rights?
   (a) both liberty and welfare rights exist.
   (b) only liberty rights exist.
   (c) only welfare rights exist.
   (d) all of the above.

13. Which moral theory directs us to maximize overall good while impartially considering the interests of everyone affected?
   (a) ethical egoism
   (b) utilitarianism
   (c) virtue ethics
   (d) duty ethics
Quiz Questions on Chapter 4 of Martin/Schinzinger: Engineering as Social Experimentation

1. True   False   According to the authors, engineering as social experimentation is similar to laboratory experimentation because both types of experiments occur under controlled conditions.

2. True   False   One difference between “engineering experimentation” and “standard experimentation” is that the main objective of engineering projects is not to gain knowledge.

3. True   False   A person’s decision to purchase a product constitutes informed consent.

4. Which of the following conditions does not characterize informed consent?
   A. consent is voluntary
   B. consent is based on information, understandably given, that a rational person would want
   C. the consenter is competent to process the information and make rational decisions
   D. the consenter has signed a legally binding waiver

5. True   False   An engineer who uses the excuse “I only work here” may be refusing to acknowledge her moral accountability.

6. The text states that “representatives of the nuclear industry can be heard expressing their impatience with critics who worry about reactor malfunction while engaging in statistically more hazardous activities such as driving automobiles and smoking cigarettes.” The authors imply that the nuclear representatives are wrong because they
   A. overlook the human preference for voluntary over involuntary risks
   B. believe that the dangers of global warming are overstated
   C. believe that driving an automobile is safer than smoking cigarettes
   D. are disrespectful of people who disagree with them

7. True   False   “Moral autonomy” is the surrendering of one’s convictions to the will of one’s employer.

8. Viewing engineering as social experimentation is most consistent with which of the following canons from engineering codes of ethics?
   A. Act for each employer or client as faithful agents or trustees.
   B. Reject bribery in all its forms.
   C. Hold paramount the safety, health, and welfare of the public.
   D. Continue one’s professional development throughout one’s career.

9. “Comprehensive perspective” means all of the following except:
   A. being aware of the wider implications of one’s work
   B. leaving it up to the government to determine whether a product is safe or not
   C. understanding the context of one’s work
   D. a constant effort to foresee potential problems

10. True   False   Roger Boisjoly, an engineer at Morton-Thiokol working on the space shuttle Challenger, recommended that no launch should occur if the temperature was less than 53 degrees Fahrenheit.
Quiz Questions on Chapters 5 and 6 of Martin/Schinzing:

1. William W. Lowrance defined safety by stating that “a thing is safe if its risks are judged to be acceptable.” According to the authors, this definition is deficient because:
   - the judgment that a thing is safe may be erroneous
   - there may be no judgment regarding the safety of a thing
   - the judgment that a thing is dangerous may be untrue
   - all of the above

2. Judy likes to skateboard without a helmet in concrete skate parks on weekends, but is nervous about getting into an accident when she rides an aging train to work during the week. According to the text, this apparent contradiction in her feelings about risk can be explained by the observation that
   - people are generally less afraid of risks undertaken voluntarily than they are of risks out of their control
   - Judy has never had a skateboarding accident
   - people are less likely to accept risks which are necessary to do their jobs
   - Judy lacks the wider perspective normally attributed to a responsible engineer

3. The addition of a “roll bar” (a structural component that will protect passengers in the event of a roll-over accident) to a vehicle will improve safety but add an additional $350 cost to the base price. This is demonstrated by which curve in Figure 5-1?
   - Curve P
   - Curve S
   - Curve M
   - none of the above

4. True False When weighing options regarding relative risk, people prefer options that are presented in terms of firm gains to options presented in terms of probable gains.

5. The costs associated with warranty claims, legal actions, and loss of customers due to product malfunctions are termed
   - primary costs
   - secondary costs
   - tertiary costs
   - incremental costs

6. Refer to Figure 5-2a and 5-2b. The factor of safety is identical for both cases. Which case represents a situation to be avoided, and why?
   - Figure 5-2a, because the margin of safety is much lower than the difference C - D
   - Figure 5-2a, because the probabilities Pd and Pc are much higher
   - **Figure 5-2b, because the likelihood of failure is higher when the two probability curves overlap**
   - Figure 5-2b, because the probabilities Pd and Pc are much lower

7. True False A conceptual difficulty with a risk-benefit analysis is that both risks and benefits occur in the future.

8. True False A risk-benefit analysis is more easily performed when both the risks and benefits are expressed in the same units.
Quiz Questions on Chapters 7 and 9 of Martin/Schinzinger

1. Which of the following is not an example of whistleblowing?
   a. an employee writes an anonymous memo to a vice president regarding what he believes to be unethical behavior of his immediate supervisors
   b. an engineer speaks with his supervisor about tests from another department that he believes have been filtered to eliminate undesired results
   c. an engineer has evidence of gross misspending on a critical corporate project and, after having gone through organizational channels without result, he informs the local newspaper
   d. none of the above

2. Tom works for an automobile manufacturer. He discovers that a design flaw in a certain vehicle line could, under some conditions, result in loss of full steering control and possible injury or death. He brings the issue before a management team, who, after an investigation, decides not to pursue the issue because the vehicle is no longer in production and recall costs would be very high. Tom decides not to “blow the whistle” by contacting upper management because he fears a backlash that might jeopardize his career. According to the text, Tom’s decision is morally permissible because
   a. management consists of experienced engineers and leaders who may have knowledge that Tom knows nothing about
   b. not a single accident has been attributed to the alleged design flaw
   c. not all of the requirements for obligatory whistleblowing have been met
   d. the potential sacrifice due to his whistleblowing is supererogatory

3. True False The authors define the truthfulness responsibility as follows: “Engineers must be objective and truthful and must not engage in deception.”

4. An engineer discovers discriminatory hiring practices in the human resources (HR) department at his plant. He has long held a grudge against the director of HR concerning an incident where the engineer was publically embarrassed by the director. The engineer decides to go to his management with documented evidence about the discrimination, and accompanies his allegations with complaints about the director’s character. The engineer has violated which of the following common sense rules for effective whistleblowing:
   a. be prompt in addressing objections
   b. keep formal records documenting relevant events
   c. work through normal organizational channels
   d. proceed in a tactful, low-key manner

5. According to the authors, reasons why truthfulness is important include all of the following except
   a. deceit of others undermines their autonomy
   b. dishonesty in engineering can cause financial loss, injury, or death
   c. getting caught means serious consequences for you and your family
   d. untruthfulness corrupts professional judgment

6. As defined in chapter 9, the term “sustainable development” is
   a. development without regard for the health of the environment.
   b. development that meets the needs of the present without compromising the ability of future generations to meet their own needs.
   c. a business plan that ensures the continuing financial success of the company.
Quiz Questions for Chapters 9 and 10 of Shafer-Landau *(correct answers in bold)*

1. True  **False**  Utilitarians think that the *motives or intentions* behind our actions play a role in determining whether our actions are *right* (or optimific).

2. True  **False**  Utilitarians think that the *motives or intentions* behind our actions play a role in determining our *moral character* (that is, whether we are worthy of praise or blame).

3. True  **False**  The term ‘consequentialism’ refers to a single theory.

4. True  **False**  For the consequentialist, the right act is always the one that is optimific.

5. True  **False**  Utilitarianism is a version of consequentialism which tells us to maximize well-being.

6. True  **False**  Consequentialism requires that we know what is good before we can do what is right.

7. True  **False**  According to *Fundamentals of Ethics*, John Stuart Mill thinks that “the greatest good for the greatest number” means that we must always benefit the *greatest number of people*.

8. True  **False**  According to *Fundamentals of Ethics*, John Stuart Mill thinks that “the greatest good for the greatest number” means that we must always choose the action that creates *the greatest amount of happiness*.

9. True  **False**  According to *Fundamentals of Ethics*, John Stuart Mill thinks that we must always do what produces the best situation overall; that is, the greatest balance of happiness over unhappiness.

10. True  **False**  Utilitarians who make rightness depend on the *actual* results of an action (rather than its expected results) have to admit that we sometimes don’t know whether we’re doing the right thing.

11. True  **False**  Utilitarians have one moral standard for judging actions (as right or wrong) and another standard for judging intentions (as praiseworthy or blameworthy).

12. True  **False**  Utilitarianism does *not* require us to be impartial.
Quiz Questions on Kant (Chapters 11 and 12 of Shafer-Landau)

1. Kant has a lot of faith in common sense morality; that is, he thinks ordinary people can generally tell what is right and wrong. True

2. Kant thinks that our emotions are a perfectly reliable guide to what our moral duties are. False

3. Kant thinks our moral duties are escapable or that we can just “opt out” of them if we want to. False

4. Someone who has a good will does his or her duty simply because it is their duty. True

5. Kant thinks that the rightness of an action depends on the intentions and reasons for the action, as expressed in the action’s maxim. True

6. A hypothetical imperative tells you what you ought to do given that you have certain desires or ends. True

7. A categorical imperative tells you what you ought to do given that you have certain desires or ends. False

8. “If you want to go to medical school, then you ought to take Biology classes” is a hypothetical imperative. True

9. “You ought to tell the truth” is a categorical imperative. True

10. Kant thinks that morality consists of hypothetical imperatives. False

11. Kant thinks that morality consists of categorical imperatives. True

12. Kant’s principle of universalizability says that it is okay or permissible for us to act on maxims that cannot be universalized. False

13. A maxim is a principle one gives to oneself when acting, that states what one is going to do and why. True

14. According to Kant, when we act on a maxim that cannot be universalized, we are not being consistent (that is, we are contradicting ourselves). True

15. When universalizing a maxim, we imagine what it would be like for everyone to follow it, and then ask whether the goal of our action can be achieved when everyone follows our maxim. True
Term Paper Assignment: Moral Theory and the Volkswagen Emission Scandal

Optional Roughdrafts Due: in class on Tuesday, November 29
Final Drafts (not optional!) Due: in class on Thursday, December 8

Your task: evaluate the Volkswagen emission scandal from the perspective of both utilitarian and Kantian moral theories. What you are evaluating here is the deliberate decision to install software that would “cheat” emissions tests, by showing lower emissions during testing than were actually occurring during ordinary driving. How would a utilitarian decide whether or not to install the “cheating software”? How would a Kantian decide the same question? Think of yourself as Volkswagen’s Chief Ethicist who has to make a recommendation as to whether or not to install this software.

Suggested length: 5-7 typed double spaced pages, with 1-inch margins and a 12 point font.

Structure of your paper:

I. An introduction in which you do all of the following: (a) state the decision to be discussed; (b) summarize (in a sentence) what the utilitarian would recommend; (c) summarize (in a sentence) what a Kantian would recommend; and (d) indicate which theory you think provides the best analysis.

II. Summary of utilitarianism: here you want to explain the moral theory, and focus particularly on how the utilitarian decides whether or not an act is right.

III. Application of utilitarianism to VW: if you were a good utilitarian employed by VW who had to make this decision, what would you have decided? Was the decision to install the cheating software a justified one from a utilitarian perspective? This will require you to think about what the consequences of deciding to install the software are likely to be, as well as the consequences of deciding not to install it.

IV. Summary of Kantian ethics: here again, you are explaining Kantian ethics. For purposes of this assignment, you may choose EITHER the Principle of Universalizability OR the Principle of Humanity. You do NOT have to explain both.

V. Application of Kant to VW: if you were a good Kantian employed by VW who had to make this decision, what would you have decided? Was the decision to install the cheating software a justified one from a Kantian perspective? If you are explaining Kant’s Principle of Universalizability in Part IV, then in this section you would have to formulate a maxim. Dr. Oljar will provide help on this.

VI: Which theory is right and why? That is, which theory do you think provides the best analysis of the case?

You will be graded on:

• Your understanding and explanation of utilitarianism and Kantian ethics (sections II and IV).
• Your ability to apply these theories to the specific topic of Volkswagen’s emissions testing (sections III and V).
• Your overall writing (including grammar, spelling, syntax, etc) and the organization of your essay.
I. An introduction in which you do all of the following: (a) state the decision to be discussed; (b) summarize (in a sentence) what the utilitarian would recommend; (c) summarize (in a sentence) what a Kantian would recommend; and (d) indicate which theory you think provides the best analysis. [10]

II. Summary of utilitarianism: [15]

III. Application of utilitarianism to VW: [20]

IV. Summary of Kantian ethics: [15]

V. Application of Kant to VW: [20]

VI. Which theory is right and why? [10]

VII. Clarity, Writing, Style, Formatting: [10]
I. Introduction [10]: Excellent: does all of (a) – (d) with sufficient clarity; Above Average: does all of (a) – (d) but with less clarity; Average: does at least 3 of (a) – (d) with clarity; Below Average: does 3 with less clarity or does 2 clearly; Poor: does not complete any of (a) – (d) with clarity.

II. Summary of Utilitarianism [15]:
Excellent: Explains all the key ideas in utilitarianism with a high degree of clarity and completeness (only consequences matter; maximize goodness; optimific action is required – best balance of benefits over drawbacks; impartiality)
Above Average: Clearly and completely explains most of the key ideas in utilitarianism, or explains all key ideas with some clarity issues.
Average: Explains most of the key ideas in utilitarianism but with fairly serious clarity issues.
Below Average: Provides only the most basic explanation of utilitarianism with little or no development of key ideas.
Poor: little or no explanation of utilitarianism; no development of key ideas, or shows serious confusion about the nature of utilitarianism.

II. Application of Utilitarianism [20]:
Excellent makes a clear and compelling utilitarian case for installing or not installing the software. Clearly indicates multiple consequences and who is affected by them. Indicates awareness of maintaining secrecy on the consequences. Decision (install or not) matches the analysis of the consequences. Application demonstrates a strong grasp of the theory. Sufficient detail provided for the reader.
Above Average: does all that “excellent” does with some issues of clarity in expression; or does most of “excellent” with greater clarity. Application demonstrates a good grasp of the theory, but with less than optimal detail for the reader.
Average: does what “above average” does with greater clarity problems, or does slightly less than “above average” with more clarity. Application demonstrates a good grasp of the theory.
Below Average: serious problems with the application; fails to give a clear recommendation or decision doesn’t match it, little to no detailed consideration of consequences; insufficient detail for the reader. Application shows only a fair grasp of the theory.
Poor: no utilitarian case made, no indication of multiple consequences or affected parties, decision doesn’t match recommendation, insufficient detail for the reader. Application shows a poor grasp of the theory.

IV. Summary of Kantian Ethics [15]:
Excellent: Clear statement of the Principle of Universalizability or the Principle of Humanity, explanation of key terms, some additional background details on Kant and whichever principle is discussed. Detail is sufficient for the reader.
Above Average: does all that “excellent” does but clarity issues or less detail, or does most of what “excellent” does with greater clarity and detail.
Average: does most/all of what “above average” does with more clarity problems and even less detail.
Below Average: provides the most basic explanation of Kant with no additional detail or development.
**Poor:** provides only a poor paraphrase of Kant’s principles, no additional detail, shows serious confusion about Kant.

**V. Application of Kant [20]:**

**Excellent:** makes a clear and compelling case that installation decision violates both principles. Provides a clear statement of a maxim and shows it cannot be universalized or clearly explains how the decision treats some persons merely as means. Application demonstrates a strong understanding of the theory, with sufficient detail for the reader.

**Above Average** does all that “excellent” does with some issues of clarity in expression; or does most of “excellent” with greater clarity. Application demonstrates a good grasp of the theory, but with less than optimal detail for the reader.

**Average** does what “above average” does with greater clarity problems, or does slightly less than “above average” with more clarity. Application demonstrates a good grasp of the theory; confusing or incomplete explanation of key terms in the principles.

**Below Average** serious problems with the application; fails to give a clear recommendation, little to no detailed consideration of the principles; insufficient detail for the reader. Application shows only a fair grasp of the theory.

**Poor:** states that Kant would agree with the installation. Application shows a poor grasp of the theory.

**VI. Which theory is right and why? [10] (Authors get the benefit of the doubt here)**

**Excellent:** clearly answers the question and provides detailed support for it. Demonstrates a high degree of thought about the competing theories.

**Above Average:**

**Average**

**Below Average**

**Poor**

**VII. Clarity, Writing, Formatting, Style [10]**

**Excellent**

**Above Average**

**Average**

**Below Average**

**Poor**