

The Pittsburgh-Mines (P-M) Engineering Ethics Assessment Rubric*
September 5, 2003

Larry Shuman**, Mary Besterfield-Sacre, Mark Sindelar, Harvey Wolfe (U. of Pittsburgh) and Ronald Miller, Barbara Olds, Carl Mitcham (Colorado School of Mines)

Attribute	Level 1	Level 2	Level 3	Level 4	Level 5
Recognition of Dilemma (Relevance)*	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Doesn't see problem. At best only infers a problem 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Identifies problem(s); may infer that it is an ethical dilemma(s). 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Recognizes obvious ethical dilemma(s). 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Able to recognize less obvious ethical dilemma(s). 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Clearly identifies and frames key ethical dilemmas, or summarizes in broader context
Information (Argumentation)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Uses misinformation. Uses facts incorrectly. Ignores pertinent facts. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Lists facts without judgment or discussion. May be missing key facts. Only identifies certain actors. May recognize, but misinterpret certain facts. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Justifies facts relevant to identified dilemmas. Notes some information is missing. Identifies most key actors. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Recognizes some "unknown facts." Makes assumptions to address missing information. Identifies all relevant actors. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Recognizes and justifies unknown facts in addition to known facts. Identifies primary and secondary actors. May use own expertise to add appropriate information.
Analysis (Complexity and Depth)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> No analysis provided. Defaults to a superior or authority without further elaboration. Takes a definitive and unambiguous position without justification. Any analysis appears to have been done without reference (explicit or implicit) to guidelines, rules or authority. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Authoritative rule driven without justification. Position may be less definitive (e.g., "should do" vs. "must do"). Minimal effort at analysis and justification. Relevant rules ignored. May miss or misinterpret key point or position. If ethical theory is cited, it is used incorrectly. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Applies rules or standards with justification, notes possible consequences or conflicts. Correctly recognizes applicability of ethical concept(s). Recognizes that contexts of concepts must be specified. Coherent approach 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Applies rule or standard considering potential consequences or conflicts. Uses an established ethical construct appropriately. Considers aspects of competence and responsibility of key actors. May cite analogous cases. Partial (incomplete) specification of contexts of concepts.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Correctly applies ethical constructs. May offer more than one alternative resolution. Cites analogous cases with appropriate rationale. Thorough evaluation of competence and responsibility of key actors. Considers elements of risk for each alternative. Explores context of concepts.
Perspective (Fairness)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> No perspective; focus wanders. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Gives one point of view. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Some acknowledgment of multiple perspectives, but favors only one perspective. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Considers relevant, multiple perspectives. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Has a global view of situation Considers consequences of various perspectives..
Resolution (Argumentation)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> None; not responsive to original dilemma. Proposed resolution lacks integrity; dishonest. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Only applies or cites rules with little or no justification; may be using rules out of context. Only states possible resolution(s) Only infers consequences 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Limited ability to use facts to differentiate among alternatives. Proposed resolution is feasible Recognizes recommendation has consequences. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Proposes several alternatives and considers consequences of each. Considers potential of risk to public and/or safety. Incomplete win-win solution suggested. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Resolves case through clear argumentation and consideration of all primary stakeholders. Understands consequences of various actions. Proposes creative middle ground (win-win situation) solution.

* Supported by the National Science Foundation, DUE01 27394 "Assessing Engineering Students' Understanding of Their Professional and Ethical Responsibilities."

** For information, contact Larry Shuman (Shuman@pitt.edu); 323 Benedum Hall, University of Pittsburgh, Pittsburgh, PA 15261.