

PHL 212 Final Project Guidelines and Rubric

Overview

You must complete an analytical philosophy paper as your final project.

One of the main tasks of this course is the preparation of an ethical decision-making paper based on the theories learned within the class. Based on the knowledge that you have acquired in this course and through your own faculties of reason and insight, you will (1) examine in detail an ethical dilemma of your choosing from the textbook, (2) determine how each of the theories that you have studied in the course would respond to the dilemma, creating an argument for and an argument against your topic, and (3) give your own perspective.

The project is divided into **two milestones**, which will be submitted at various points throughout the course to scaffold learning and ensure quality final submissions. These milestones will be submitted in **Modules One and Three**. The final product will be submitted in **Module Seven**.

This assessment will address the following course outcomes:

- Evaluate philosophical theories for their implications to the process of ethical decision making
- Apply ethical principles to analyses of practical and classical dilemmas using appropriate philosophical concepts
- Construct supporting and refuting arguments for the application of ethical decision making
- Employ personal moral framework for effectively critiquing and defending ethical decisions

Prompt

This paper must be written in a scholarly manner using APA formatting and resources from the library and scholarly websites that end in .gov, .edu, .org, .mil. Nothing will be accepted from open sources such as Wikipedia.

Specifically, the following **critical elements** must be addressed:

- I. **Introduction:** Compose an introduction that provides background information on the topic and premise of the ethical dilemma, its main arguments, and a summary of the evidence used to support the arguments.
 - a. Provide **background** on the dilemma. What subject is it addressing? What are all of the dimensions and sides to the dilemma? Why have you chosen this dilemma?
 - b. Briefly explain the **evidence** that supports the arguments. What evidence do they use to back up their arguments and support their claims? Is the evidence free from bias and assumptions? Does it successfully back up a coherent argument?
- II. Evaluate a **dilemma**
 - a. **Analyze** a dilemma by considering all dimensions and sides
 - i. **Apply** ethical theories to your analysis
 - ii. **Use** philosophical concepts appropriate to your analysis

iii. **Present** a clear explanation of all appropriate dimensions to the selected dilemma

III. Formulate an **argument**

- a. **Assertion:** Take a position
- b. **Reason with facts** as part of the argument. What facts will you employ to back your assertions? What facts seem plausible to you, despite your argument? How will you incorporate those into your argument?
- c. **Critique the evidence** as part of your argument. What evidence supports your argument? What evidence do you have to accept that may not support your argument?

IV. Formulate a **refuting argument (refutation)**

- a. **Assertion:** Take a position
- b. **Reason with facts** as part of the refuting argument. What will you employ to back your assertions? What facts seem plausible to you, despite your refuting argument? How will you incorporate those into your argument?
- c. **Critique the evidence** as part of your refuting argument. What evidence supports your refuting argument? What evidence do you have to accept that may not support your refuting argument?

V. **Reflect** on how you use your critical thinking skills to make decisions.

- a. Discuss the critical thinking skills you used during the **evaluation**. How did you approach formulating your own opinions? How did you incorporate the evidence to make your arguments stronger? What areas did you find more and less difficult to approach?
- b. Discuss how you apply the skills of an ethicist to issues in your **everyday life**. How do you apply different types of reasoning to your decisions? How do you solve challenges using your own moral framework? How do you confront arguments and find solutions?

Milestones

Milestone One: Topic Declaration

In **Module One**, you will submit your topic declaration. Using topics from the textbook, write a one-page paper (in APA format) on your topic with background information on your topic. Upon review, the instructor will decide whether this topic is approved. **This milestone will be graded with the Milestone One Rubric.**

Milestone Two: References

In **Module Three**, you will submit your references. Provide a list of three or more references for approval. **This milestone will be graded with the Milestone Two Rubric.**

Final Submission: Analytical Philosophy Paper

In **Module Seven**, you will submit your final project. It should be a complete, polished artifact containing **all** of the critical elements of the final product. It should reflect the incorporation of feedback gained throughout the course. **This submission will be graded with the Final Project Rubric.**

Guidelines for Submission: The final project submission must be six to eight pages in length (not including cover page and reference page) and written in full APA format. Use double spacing, 12-point Times New Roman font, one-inch margins, and discipline-appropriate citations. Incorporate a minimum of four scholarly resources following APA guidelines for citations and listing references.

Instructor Feedback: This activity uses an integrated rubric in Blackboard. Students can view instructor feedback in the Grade Center. For more information, review [these instructions](#).

Critical Elements	Exemplary (100%)	Proficient (85%)	Needs Improvement (55%)	Not Evident (0%)	Value
Issue Background and History	Meets “Proficient” criteria and includes examples that illustrate all aspects of the issue and critical elements described above	Describes selected topic’s background and history	Describes selected topic’s history but with gaps in background	Does not describe selected topic’s background	5
Introduction: Evidence	Meets “Proficient” criteria and details chosen illustrate the connection between the evidence and the argument	Explains in an overview the evidence that supports the claim’s argument	Explains in an overview the evidence that supports the claim’s argument but explanation is cursory or inaccurate	Does not explain the evidence that supports the claim’s argument	5
Dilemma: Analyze-Apply	Meets “Proficient” criteria and includes specific elements of the relevant theory	Applies the relevant theory considering all sides	Applies the relevant theory followed, but application is cursory	Does not describe nor address the theory which will be followed	5
Dilemma: Analyze-Use	Meets “Proficient” criteria and uses, in complete detail, all philosophical concepts appropriate to the analysis	Uses philosophical concepts, providing details of each	Uses one or two of the philosophical concepts appropriate to the analysis	Does not use the philosophical concepts appropriate to the analysis	5
Dilemma: Analyze-Present	Meets “Proficient” criteria and thoroughly presents all of the appropriate dimensions	Presents many of the appropriate dimensions with some explanation	Presents a skeletal explanation of the appropriate dimensions	Does not present a clear explanation of any appropriate dimensions to the selected dilemma	5
Argument: Assertion	Meets “Proficient” criteria and use of evidence demonstrates insight into both sides of the argument	Takes a position and backs assertions with appropriate evidence	Takes a position but use of evidence to support assertions is cursory or inaccurate	Does not take a position	7.5
Argument: Reason With the Facts	Meets “Proficient” criteria and details and examples demonstrate insight into how the facts can be used on both sides	Reasons with facts for support of the argument	Reasons with facts for support of the argument, but reasoning is cursory or inaccurate	Does not reason with facts for support of the argument	7.5

Argument: Critique the Evidence	Meets “Proficient” criteria and details and examples demonstrate insight into how the evidence can be used on both sides	Critiques the evidence for its support of the argument	Critiques the evidence for its support of the argument, but critique is cursory or inaccurate	Does not critique the evidence for its support of the argument	7.5
Refutation: Assertion	Meets “Proficient” criteria and use of evidence demonstrates insight into both sides of the argument	Takes a position opposite to that of original argument and backs assertions with appropriate evidence	Takes a position opposite to that of original argument but use of evidence to support assertions is cursory or inaccurate	Does not take a position opposite to that of original argument	7.5
Refutation: Reason With the Facts	Meets “Proficient” criteria and details and examples demonstrate insight into how the facts can be used on both sides	Reasons with the facts for support of the counter-argument	Reasons with the facts for support of the counter-argument, but reasoning is cursory or inaccurate	Does not reason with the facts for support of the counter-argument	7.5
Refutation: Critique the Evidence	Meets “Proficient” criteria and details and examples demonstrate insight into how the evidence can be used on both sides	Critiques the evidence for its support of the counter-argument	Critiques the evidence for its support of the counter-argument, but critique is cursory or inaccurate	Does not critique the evidence for its support of the counter-argument	7.5
Reflection: Evaluation	Meets “Proficient” criteria and provides detailed reflection on each question	Discusses critical thinking skills used during the evaluation	Provides skeletal discussion on own use of critical thinking	Does not discuss own use of critical thinking	10
Reflection: Everyday Life	Meets “Proficient” criteria and provides detailed reflection on each question	Discusses application of the skills of an ethicist in everyday life	Discusses application of the skills of an ethicist in everyday life, but discussion is cursory	Does not discuss application of the skills of an ethicist in everyday life	10
Research	Provides at least four sources of scholarly research with proper APA formatting	Provides at least three sources of scholarly research with proper APA formatting	Provides at least two sources of scholarly research with proper APA formatting	Provides only one or no sources of scholarly research with APA formatting issues	5
Articulation of Response	Submission is free of errors related to citations, grammar, spelling, syntax, and organization and is presented in a professional and easy-to-read APA format	Submission has no major errors related to citations, grammar, spelling, syntax, or organization	Submission has major errors related to citations, grammar, spelling, syntax, or organization that negatively impact readability and articulation of main ideas	Submission has critical errors related to citations, grammar, spelling, syntax, or organization that prevent understanding of ideas	5
Earned Total					100%