<div align="center">Analysis #6: Solution Comparison</div>

Demonstrate your ability to compare and evaluate proposed solutions to a problem. Do this by:
- Reading case study 11.3 *Raising the Ante* (pp.419-420).
- Presenting, clearly and concisely, Phyllis Warren's argument for the claim that **she and her female co-workers should be given back.pay**.
    - The argument should make use of relevant, specific features of the case.
    - The argument should make use of some explicit moral claim, e.g., it is wrong to lie. Note that the moral claim might be implicit but unstated; in that case, you should make it explicit.
- Presenting, clearly and concisely, <u>one</u> of the board's arguments for the claim that **it is not true that Phyllis and her female co-workers should be given back pay**.
    - The argument should make use of relevant, specific features of the case.
    - The argument should make use of some explicit moral claim, e.g., it is wrong to lie. Note that the moral claim might be implicit but unstated; in that case, you should make it explicit.
- Explaining which of the two arguments you think is better and why.

Further Instructions:
- Your analysis should be printed in double-spaced 12 point times new roman (or similar).
- Your analysis should be two paragraphs long and between 300 and 400 words.
- Staple this assignment sheet at the end of your analysis (I use it for grading).
- Turn this assignment in at the beginning of class the day it is due.

Understanding the Rubric (on the back): The numbers next to the areas, e.g. (x.4), indicate the weight of each area. Thus, an area with a weight of (x.4) is twice as important as one with a weight of (x.2). For example:

Area	Unweighted Score	Weighted Score
Information (x.4)	4	1.6
Completeness (x.4)	3	1.2
Clarity (x.2)	2	.4
Total	12/16	3.2 / 4 = 80% = **4.8 / 6**

	0	1	2	3	4
Information (x.4)	- Neither of the arguments presented for or against are even largely accurate, or both arguments are absent.	- One, but not both, of the arguments presented for and against is largely accurate.	- The arguments presented for and against are both largely accurate.	- The arguments presented for and against are both largely accurate and one, but not both, is completely accurate.	- The arguments presented for and against are both completely accurate.
Completeness (x.4)	**None or only one** of the following are present: (1) an argument in favor of back pay, including (2) relevant and specific information from the case, (3) and a moral claim, (4) an argument against back pay, including (5) relevant and specific information from the case, and (6) a moral claim, (7) your position on which argument is superior, and (8) an explanation of why you think that position is superior.	- **Two or three** of the following are present: (1) an argument in favor of back pay, including (2) relevant and specific information from the case, (3) and a moral claim, (4) an argument against back pay, including (5) relevant and specific information from the case, and (6) a moral claim, (7) your position on which argument is superior, and (8) an explanation of why you think that position is superior.	- **Four or Five** of the following are present: (1) an argument in favor of back pay, including (2) relevant and specific information from the case, (3) and a moral claim, (4) an argument against back pay, including (5) relevant and specific information from the case, and (6) a moral claim, (7) your position on which argument is superior, and (8) an explanation of why you think that position is superior.	- **Six or Seven** of the following are present: (1) an argument in favor of back pay, including (2) relevant and specific information from the case, (3) and a moral claim, (4) an argument against back pay, including (5) relevant and specific information from the case, and (6) a moral claim, (7) your position on which argument is superior, and (8) an explanation of why you think that position is superior.	- **All** of the following are present: (1) an argument in favor of back pay, including (2) relevant and specific information from the case, (3) and a moral claim, (4) an argument against back pay, including (5) relevant and specific information from the case, and (6) a moral claim, (7) your position on which argument is superior, and (8) an explanation of why you think that position is superior.
Clarity (x.2)	- Components of analysis cannot be identified, OR - Why the relevant and specific features of the case along with the moral claims are supposed to support/reject back pay is evident for neither argument.	- Components of analysis are identified only with difficulty, AND - Why the relevant and specific features of the case along with the moral claims are supposed to support/reject back pay is EVIDENT but not CLEARLY EXPLAINED for BOTH arguments, OR - Confusing or incomplete claims in key areas.	- Components of analysis are identified only with difficulty, OR - Why the relevant and specific features of the case along with the moral claims are supposed to support/reject back pay is EVIDENT but not CLEARLY EXPLAINED for BOTH arguments, AND - No confusing or incomplete claims in key areas.	- Components of analysis are easily identified, AND -Why the relevant and specific features of the case along with the moral claims are supposed to support/reject back pay is clearly explained for BOTH arguments, AND - No confusing or incomplete claims in key areas.	- Components of analysis are easily identified, AND - Why the relevant and specific features of the case along with the moral claims are supposed to support/reject back pay is clearly explained for BOTH arguments, AND - No confusing or incomplete claims, AND - Unnecessary information is not included.

Total: / 4 =   % =   / 6