

**THE UNIVERSITY OF LETHBRIDGE  
FACULTY OF HEALTH SCIENCES  
PUBH 3420 – PUBLIC HEALTH ETHICS  
Course Syllabus – Spring, 2015**

**Instructor:** Sharon Yanicki, RN, PhD candidate  
**Office:** Markin Hall 3053  
**Office Telephone:** 403-332-5233  
**E-mail:** [yanism@uleth.ca](mailto:yanism@uleth.ca)  
**Office Hours:** Monday 1:30 – 3:30 pm or by appointment

**COURSE DESCRIPTION:**

Ethical principles and values are introduced to explore the tension between individualistic notions of human rights and the communitarian concern for the well-being of communities in public health practice. Models and theories of public health ethics will be applied to support critical reasoning and ethical problem solving within the field of public health.

Pre-requisite(s): Third-year standing (a minimum of 60.0 credit hours)

**COURSE LEARNING OUTCOMES:**

Students will be able to:

1. Identify and explore the values underlying public health practice.
2. Describe, compare and apply models and theories commonly used in health ethics, such as: utilitarian, deontological, principle-based, justice (distributive and social), relational, multiculturalism, health policy and environmental.
3. Identify the interests, values, and key ethical tensions at stake in public health activities, cases, programs or policies.
4. Identify and evaluate options available in resolving public health dilemmas.
5. Demonstrate critical reasoning skills and ethical problem solving and justification, both individually and in groups.

**APPROACH TO LEARNING:**

This online course utilizes asynchronous forum discussions, and audiovisual and text-based online learning materials to support students in exploring ideas. Online discussions are designed to support the development of a community of learners (a virtual group supporting collaborative learning).

To create an online community of learners, students are expected to demonstrate openness to the ideas, thoughts, and experiences of others; all class members are to be treated with dignity, respect, and consideration. In addition, students are expected to learn from their peers, and to contribute to the learning of others.

**1. Discussion Forums**

The purpose of discussion forums is to provide students the opportunity to engage in thoughtful reflection, discussion, and debate about aspects of the course content. Weekly discussion forums also support the development of a community of learners.

A case pertaining to the ethical theory being discussed will be posted on Moodle. Generally speaking, each theory will be discussed over the course of a two-week period.

Students will be expected to read the case and review the associated YouTube video recording. Once this is completed, students will then post their responses to the guiding questions and to their colleagues' postings in their assigned Moodle discussion space.

It is expected that students will review and reflect on the guidelines for 'critical reasoning' and the 'facts and values' YouTube video recordings. Students are then expected to apply these guidelines and demonstrate reflection and critical reasoning in their on-line postings.

Throughout the weekly discussion, each student will be required to post:

1. One (1) response to the guiding question(s) provided by starting a new discussion topic. Your posting should provide some new insights and expand upon the comments posted by others on this topic. ***Do not*** repeat the same information your colleagues have already shared.
2. One (1) response to at least one other participant's postings.
3. At least one (1) reference that supports the comments you have made.

These requirements represent the ***minimal*** level of participation expected. You will be graded on meeting these requirements.

**Weekly discussions will begin on Monday morning at 0900h. and conclude Thursday evening at 2100h.**

**Ground rules for discussion forums:** So that in-depth and meaningful discussion might occur, participants must feel safe in presenting their thoughts, feelings, experiences, and opinions. This occurs when:

1. Responses and postings are treated with consideration and respect;
2. Postings are respectfully worded; and
3. The contributions of others are recognized and appreciated.

Disagreement and diversity of opinion are expected and welcomed; however, the discussion forum environment must be accepting and appreciative of these differences.

#### **Respecting Web Space: Tricks for Developing Effective Postings:**

- Develop a response in a Word document before posting it. Check it for completeness, clarity, grammar, and tone.
- Check your post for length. Long messages do not invite readers' engagement and participation.
  - Postings should not exceed 250 words for a response to the guiding discussion question(s).
  - Postings should not exceed 150 words for a response to comments made by your peers.
- Follow an established thread if you are adding to the existing idea/discussion.
- When introducing a new idea, establish a new thread.
- Briefly state at the beginning of the message what the message is about.

#### **CONSENT AND CONFIDENTIALITY:**

***The YouTube video recordings, notes and asynchronous online discussions are NOT to be used or shared for any purpose, or with any person not enrolled in PUBH 3420 this semester.*** The online class environment needs to have the same "what is said in this classroom stays in this classroom" ethos of an in-person course in ethics.

Your registration in this online course constitutes ***implied consent*** to the terms of confidentiality. Any student who is uncomfortable with the participation requirements and delivery method of this course should discuss these concerns with the instructor immediately.

**REQUIRED TEXT:**

There is no required text for this course. Links to all the required readings are embedded in the course content posted in Moodle.

A list of topics and required readings is also posted in Moodle in the document titled 'Class Schedule & Topics.'

**EVALUATION STRATEGIES:**

Description of	Due Date:	% of Final Grade
<b>Participation</b>		
Self-evaluation #1	February 13	5%
Self- evaluation #2	April 3	10%
Postings	February 13 & April 3	15% (6% + 9%)
<b>Critical reasoning assignments</b>		
Critical reasoning	January 23	10%
Critical reasoning	February 27	15%
Critical reasoning	March 27	20%
<b>Final paper</b>		
Paper	April 15	25%

**1. Participation (30% of total course grade: 15% for self-evaluation; 15% for postings)****1.1 Self-evaluation (first evaluation is weighted at 5%; second evaluation is weighted at 10%):**

Professional bodies and associations frequently require that their members engage in reflective practice. In essence, self-evaluation, which is an outcome of reflection, ensures accountability for actions taken and decisions made.

Students will:

- Complete **two (2) self-evaluations**.
- Evaluations will be completed **using the appropriate rubric**.

**1.2 Postings (first set of postings is weighted at 6%; second set of postings is weighted at 9%):**

So that in-depth and meaningful discussion occurs, student postings must: demonstrate consideration and respect, advance the discussion by being thoughtful and insightful, and engage others by being posted throughout the discussion period.

The instructor will randomly select three postings prior to mid-term week and three postings after mid-term to the end of the course. Using the 'posting criteria' rubric, students will receive feedback on the selected postings within a week of each selection timeframe.

**2. Critical Reasoning Schematic (45% of total course grade: Schematic #1 is weighted at 10%; Schematic #2 is weighted at 15%; Schematic #3 is weighted at 20%):**

Contrary to some people's belief, ***ethical decision making is not based solely on opinion*** – indeed, to take the stance that decision making when an ethical dilemma presents itself is based on 'it all depends' is irresponsible. Hence, this exercise is meant to help students develop a systematic approach to ethical decision making.

As such, critical reasoning is centrally concerned with giving reasons for one's beliefs and actions; analyzing and evaluating one's own and other people's reasoning; and devising and constructing better reasoning. Like other skills, critical reasoning skills can be improved and polished with practice. The purpose of this assignment is to provide students with the opportunity to engage in the process of critical reasoning.

Schematic #1:

- Use the first case discussed in Critical reasoning: Facts & values (week 2) for your ***first*** critical reasoning schematic.

Schematic #2:

- Select either the case presented in week 3 or 4 (Utilitarianism) or week 5 or 6 (Deontology) for your ***second*** critical reasoning schematic.

Schematic #3:

- Select either the case presented in week 8 or 9 (Principles) or week 10 or 11 (Distributive justice) for your ***third*** critical reasoning schematic.

***Each schematic will include the following components:*** (It is suggested that you revisit the 'Critical Reasoning' YouTube video recording so that you have complete understanding of the critical reasoning process).

- *What's going on here?*
    - What is the ethical problem?
    - What is at stake and for whom?
    - What values/beliefs might each stakeholder (including you) hold?
    - What assumptions are being made? That is, what information is being taken for granted?
    - What necessary information is needed to make a decision? Provide data, facts, observations, etc.
    - What is your interpretation of the information?
  - *Options for action*
    - What options exist to resolve the problem?
  - *Evaluate the options*
    - What is the best choice of action?
    - Why is this choice of action the best choice?
    - How did the ethical perspective inform the best course of action?
- ❖ ***Identify which case is being presented.***
- ❖ Create a one-page schematic with the above elements. Answer all of the sub-questions.
- ❖ Submit the schematic as a pdf file. Examples of what a schematic might look like are posted in Moodle in the file titled 'Schematic exemplars.'

### 3. Final Paper (25% of total course grade):

Healthcare professionals work in a variety of settings. Indeed, graduates from the public health program might work in health promotion, global health, epidemiology, health surveillance, health policy, infection control, research, and/or other settings. Furthermore, the practice setting might require understanding of ethical challenges in promoting health equity, respecting diversity and addressing emergent public health issues within diverse social, economic, political and environmental contexts. So that students have the opportunity to explore ethical issues that might arise within different practice contexts and/or that are influenced by such factors as multiculturalism and the environment, students will complete the following final paper.

In the folder on the Moodle page titled "***Final paper,***" students will locate and select one topic, on which their final paper will be based. A YouTube recording, and at least one resource associated with the topic will be provided. These items are intended to provide students with foundational knowledge on ethical decision making from a particular lens.

Once the student has reviewed the resources, the student will work through the associated case study using the **critical reasoning framework** (used throughout the course and outlined on page 4 of this document) to resolve the ethical issue.

Topics students can choose from are:

1. Relational ethics
2. Multiculturalism
3. Health Policy

**The fine print:**

- Scholarly literature – in particular, literature from an ethics perspective – that supports your position and assertions. See resources posted in Moodle and the [public health section](#) of the library website.
- A minimum of four (4) applicable scholarly references are required. These will need to be properly referenced using APA 6<sup>th</sup> edition format.
- A maximum of six (6) double-spaced pages, Times New Roman 12-point font (excluding reference page) can be submitted.
- **Due April 15 at 2400 hrs**

**GENERAL INSTRUCTIONS FOR ASSIGNMENTS:**

- 1) All students should familiarize themselves with the Academic Regulations and Policies of the University of Lethbridge (see 2014/2015 U of L Calendar). Of particular interest are the policies pertaining to Student Misconduct, Academic Offenses, and Accommodations for Students with a Disability. ***This is an ethics course: academic integrity is simply not negotiable.***
- 2) All assignments must be submitted electronically to the assignment drop box in Moodle.
- 3) Assignments are due at the specified time and date. As per FOHS policy, ***marks for late assignments will be deducted 5% per day (including weekdays, weekends and holidays).*** This deduction will accumulate up to 7 days following the original due date, at which time the assignment ***will not be marked and a 0% grade will be assigned.***
- 4) Extensions may be granted at the discretion of the instructor, subject to the submission of appropriate documentation (i.e., letter from a nurse, counsellor, or physician, or other required documentation) and must be negotiated within **72 hours** of the assignment due date.
- 5) It is expected that university students are familiar with correct spelling and grammar rules. If you feel that you need help in these areas, you are strongly advised to obtain and use dictionaries and style guides, and/or take advantage of the assistance offered to students by the university's Writing Centre.
- 6) Academic results will be posted in your confidential grades section on Moodle.

**GRADING BREAKDOWN:**

The grading system for this course is consistent with that established in the Faculty of Health Sciences, effective May, 2002.

Letter	GPA	Percent	Letter	GPA	Percent
A+	4.0	95 - 100%	C+	2.3	71 - 74.9%
A	4.0	91 - 94.9%	C	2.0	67 - 70.9%
A-	3.7	87 - 90.9%	C-	1.7	63 - 66.9%
B+	3.3	83 - 86.9%	D+	1.3	59 - 62.9%
B	3.0	79 - 82.9%	D	1.0	55 - 58.9%
B-	2.7	75 - 78.9%	F	0	0 - 54.9%

**PLAGIARISM STATEMENT:**

The University of Lethbridge subscribes to Turnitin.com, a plagiarism detection service. Please be advised that student work submitted for credit in this course may be submitted to this system to verify its originality. *Students are required to submit an electronic version of all assignments in this course.*

**ACCOMMODATIONS FOR STUDENTS WITH A DISABILITY:**

Reasonable accommodations are available for students who have a documented disability. If you have been diagnosed with a disability, there is no need to face the challenge of University without support. Please contact the Accommodated Learning Centre at 403-329-2766 to set up an appointment <http://www.uleth.ca/ross/counselling/index.html>. After registering with the Accommodated Learning Centre, your instructor will be notified by a formal letter of any accommodations you require. In addition, students are responsible for requesting accommodations from the instructor at least **\*two weeks\*** in advance of the evaluation date. The instructor and student are jointly responsible for arranging the resources needed for the evaluation process.

**COPYRIGHT STATEMENT:**

All University of Lethbridge students, faculty and staff must comply with Canadian law and institutional license agreements pertaining to copyright. At the same time, keeping abreast of our copyright obligations and options is a complex task as copyright matters locally and globally are in flux and are likely to remain so for at least the near future.

The University's Copyright website ([www.uleth.ca/copyright](http://www.uleth.ca/copyright)) is a source of current copyright information that includes:

- answers to common copyright questions (see the [FAQs](#)),
- guidance on whether you need permission or a license to copy a particular work (see the [Copyright Permissions Flow Chart](#)),
- guidance on assessing whether fair dealing may apply to specific instances of copying you wish to undertake (see the [Guidelines for Copying under Fair Dealing](#)), and
- a [permissions look-up tool](#) to help you determine the kinds of copying and other uses permitted by the Library's license agreements covering specific online journals and other online resources.

You are encouraged to contact the University Copyright Advisor ([copyright@uleth.ca](mailto:copyright@uleth.ca)) for assistance with any copyright questions or issues.

**PUBH 3420 Public Health Ethics  
Spring, 2015  
Self-Evaluation Form #1**

**Date:** \_\_\_\_\_

**Student:** \_\_\_\_\_

<b>Criterion</b>	<b>Response Supported by Rationale</b>	<b>Supporting Evidence (examples)</b>
<p><b>Preparation:</b> Did I prepare prior to posting and engaging in online discussion? Did I demonstrate an understanding of the concepts of the required readings and video recording?</p>		
<p><b>Contribution:</b> To what degree did I contribute productively to the forum discussion? Have my postings advanced the discussion? Did my postings reflect thoughtfulness? Did my postings invite dialogue?</p>		
<p><b>Respect:</b> Did I demonstrate respect for others by being courteous, using an appropriate 'tone' and appropriate language in my postings? Did I follow the guidelines regarding Moodle space?</p>		
<p><b>Dedication:</b> Were my postings posted on time? Did I post throughout the discussion forum timelines or were my postings grouped all together? Is it easily apparent that I was engaged in the discussion?</p>		
<p><b>Learning:</b> What assumptions did I have when discussing the case(s)? How have these assumptions changed? Have my points of view changed or remained the same? What insights have I developed?</p>		
<p><b>Overall Participation:</b> What are my strengths? What improvements do I need to make in my participation?</p>		
<b>TOTAL MARK</b>		_____/12 x 5% = ____/5

**Comments:**

**PUBH 3420 Public Health Ethics  
Spring, 2015  
Self-Evaluation Form #2**

**Date:** \_\_\_\_\_

**Student:** \_\_\_\_\_

<b>Criterion</b>	<b>Response Supported by Rationale</b>	<b>Supporting Evidence (examples)</b>
<p><b>Preparation:</b> Did I prepare prior to posting and engaging in online discussion? Did I demonstrate an understanding of the concepts of the required readings, and video recording?</p>		
<p><b>Contribution:</b> To what degree did I contribute productively to the forum discussion? Have my postings advanced the discussion? Did my postings reflect thoughtfulness? Did my postings invite dialogue?</p>		
<p><b>Respect:</b> Did I demonstrate respect for others by being courteous, using an appropriate 'tone' and appropriate language in my postings? Did I follow the guidelines regarding Moodle space?</p>		
<p><b>Dedication:</b> Were my postings posted on time? Did I post throughout the discussion forum timelines or were my postings grouped all together? Is it easily apparent that I was engaged in the discussion?</p>		
<p><b>Learning:</b> What assumptions did I have when discussing the case(s)? How have these assumptions changed? Have my points of view changed or remained the same? What insights have I developed?</p>		
<p><b>Overall Participation:</b> What are my strengths? What improvements do I need to make in my participation?</p>		
<b>TOTAL MARK</b>		_____/12 x 10% = _____/10

**Comments:**

**PUBH 3420 Public Health Ethics**  
**Spring, 2015**  
**Posting Criteria #1**

Date: \_\_\_\_\_

Student: \_\_\_\_\_

Criterion	2	4	6
<p><b>Preparation:</b>            Was preparation demonstrated prior to posting and engaging in online discussion?            Was an understanding of the concepts of the required readings, and video recording demonstrated?</p>	Preparation prior to posting was clearly lacking. Minimal understanding of the ethical concepts was evident	Satisfactory preparation prior to posting was evident Satisfactory understanding of the ethical concepts was evident	Superior preparation prior to posting was evident Superior understanding of the ethical concepts was evident
<p><b>Contribution:</b>            To what degree did (name of student)'s postings contribute productively to the forum discussion?            Did their postings advance the discussion?            Did their postings reflect thoughtfulness?            Did their postings invite dialogue?</p>	Postings minimally contributed to forum discussion No new insights were brought forward to advance the discussion All postings simply agreed with comments already made Postings inconsistently invited dialogue	Postings clearly contributed to forum discussion New insights were sometimes brought forward that advance the discussion Some postings simply agreed with comments already made while others invited further exploration of alternate points of view Most postings invited dialogue through questioning and providing thoughtful comments	Posting consistently contributed to forum discussion New insights were consistently brought forward and advanced the discussion Postings were thoughtful; they invited exploration of alternate points of view Postings consistently invited dialogue by adding relevant questions and comments
<p><b>Respect:</b>            Did (name of student) demonstrate respect for others by being courteous, using an appropriate 'tone' and appropriate language in their postings?            Did (name of student) following the guidelines regarding Moodle space?</p>	Postings at times lack courtesy Tone of postings at times incorporates slang, is unprofessional, lacks clarity, and does not consider readers' perceptions and experiences. Further, the posting was poorly written with frequent misspellings and/or improper use of terminology Posted guidelines for using Moodle were inconsistently followed	Postings were frequently courteous Tone of postings frequently invites others to respond, i.e. professional, clear, and considerate of readers' perceptions and experiences Posted guidelines for using Moodle were frequently followed	Postings were always courteous The tone of postings invited others to respond, (i.e. professional, clear, and considerate of readers' perceptions and experiences) Posted guidelines for using Moodle were consistently followed
<p><b>Dedication:</b>            Are (name of student)'s postings posted on time?            Did (name of student) post throughout the discussion forum timelines or are his/her postings grouped all together?            Was it easily apparent that (name of student) engaged in the discussion?</p>	Postings were frequently not on time Selected postings demonstrated low to moderate level of engagement throughout the week Required number of postings per week were frequently not followed	Postings were mostly on time Selected postings demonstrated engagement throughout the week The required number of postings per week were frequently followed	Postings were always on time Selected postings demonstrated a high level of engagement throughout the week Required number of postings per week were consistently followed
<b>TOTAL MARK</b>			____/24 x 6% = ____/6

**Comments:**

**PUBH 3420 Public Health Ethics**  
**Spring, 2015**  
**Posting Criteria #2**

Date: \_\_\_\_\_

Student: \_\_\_\_\_

Criterion	2	4	6
<p><b>Preparation:</b>            Did (name of student) prepare prior to posting and engaging in online discussion? Is it obvious that s/he understands the concepts of the required readings, and video recording?</p>	Preparation prior to posting is clearly lacking Minimal understanding of the ethical concepts is evident	Satisfactory preparation prior to posting is evident Satisfactory understanding of the ethical concepts is evident	Superior preparation prior to posting is evident Superior understanding of the ethical concepts is evident
<p><b>Contribution:</b>            To what degree did (name of student) contribute productively to the forum discussion? Have his/her postings advanced the discussion? Do his/her postings reflect thoughtfulness? Do his/her postings invite dialogue?</p>	Posting minimally contributes to forum discussion No new insights brought forward to advance the discussion All postings simply agree with comments already made Postings inconsistently invite dialogue	Posting clearly contributes to forum discussion New insights are sometimes brought forward that advance the discussion Some postings simply agree with comments already made while others invite further exploration of alternate points of view Most postings invite dialogue through questioning and providing thoughtful comments	Posting consistently contributes to forum discussion New insights are consistently brought forward and advance the discussion Postings are thoughtful; they invite exploration of alternate points of view Postings consistently invite dialogue by posing relevant questions and comments
<p><b>Respect:</b>            Did (name of student) demonstrate respect for others by being courteous, using an appropriate 'tone' and appropriate language in their postings? Is (name of student) following the guidelines regarding Moodle space?</p>	Postings at times lack courtesy Tone of postings at times incorporates slang, is unprofessional, lacks clarity, and does not consider readers' perceptions and experiences. Further, the posting is poorly written with frequent misspellings and/or improper use of terminology Posted guidelines for using Moodle are inconsistently followed	Postings are frequently courteous Tone of postings frequently invites others to respond, i.e. professional, clear, and considerate of readers' perceptions and experiences Posted guidelines for using Moodle are frequently followed	Postings are always courteous Tone of postings invites others to respond, i.e. professional, clear, and considerate of readers' perceptions and experiences Posted guidelines for using Moodle are consistently followed
<p><b>Dedication:</b>            Are (name of student)'s postings posted on time? Does (name of student) post throughout the discussion forum timelines or are his/her postings grouped all together? Is it easily apparent that (name of student) is engaged in the discussion?</p>	Postings are frequently not on time Selected postings demonstrate low to moderate level of engagement throughout the week Required number of postings per week is frequently not followed	Postings are mostly on time Selected postings demonstrate engagement throughout the week Required number of postings per week is frequently followed	Postings are always on time Selected postings demonstrate a high level of engagement throughout the week Required number of postings per week is consistently followed

Criterion	2	4	6
<p><b>Learning:</b>            Did (name of student) identify his/her assumptions when discussing the case(s)?            Did (name of student) discuss how his/her assumptions have changed?            Did (name of student) discuss if his/her points of view have changed or if they have remained the same?            Did (name of student) describe having developed new insights throughout the course?</p>	<p>Assumptions were inconsistently identified in the postings            Inconsistently identified and discussed if there were changes in assumptions and points of view            Inconsistently identified new insights in the case(s)</p>	<p>Assumptions were frequently identified in the postings            Frequently discussed if there were changes in assumptions and points of view            Frequently identified new insights in the case(s)</p>	<p>Assumptions were consistently identified in the postings            Consistently identified and discussed if there were changes in assumptions and points of view.            Consistently identified new insights in the case(s)</p>
<b>TOTAL MARK</b>			____/30 x 9% = ____/9

**Comments:**

**Critical Reasoning Schematic**  
**PUBH 3420 – Public Health Ethics**  
**Spring, 2015**

<b>Criteria:</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>6</b>	<b>8</b>
<b>Components addressed in the schematic</b>	Critical reasoning framework was not used	Three or more components have been missed.	One - two components have been missed.	All components were addressed.
<b>Thoroughness of information</b>	Information was inaccurate/incomplete	Information was missing in three or more components.	Some information was missing in two components.	Information provided was comprehensive.
<b>Process of critical reasoning is demonstrated</b>	Critical reasoning processes were illogical, scattered, or incomplete	Demonstration of the process used for critical reasoning lacked flow.	Logical demonstration of the process used for critical reasoning was demonstrated.	Logical and comprehensive demonstration of the process used for critical reasoning was demonstrated.
<b>Schematic is visually appealing</b>	Unable to follow schematic	Difficult to follow, or is wordy, or was messy.	Somewhat easy to follow.	Clean, concise, and easy to follow.
Total				/32

**Comments:**

**Total:**    /32 x appropriate weighting (i.e. either 10%, 15%, or 20%) = your mark

**PUBH 3420 – Public Health Ethics**  
**Marking Rubric**  
**Spring 2015**  
**Final Paper**

Student name: \_\_\_\_\_

Student ID #: \_\_\_\_\_

	1- Beginning	2- Developing	3- Competent	4- Accomplished
Organization and Development of Ideas	<input type="checkbox"/> Introduction did not provide direction for the paper <input type="checkbox"/> Thesis statement is absent <input type="checkbox"/> Integration of materials with original analysis was poor <input type="checkbox"/> Overall organization of the paper was poor	<input type="checkbox"/> Introduction provided direction for the paper, but the critical reasoning framework was not applied throughout the paper <input type="checkbox"/> Thesis statement is present but only vaguely identifies the topic of the paper <input type="checkbox"/> Integration of materials with original analysis was uneven <input type="checkbox"/> Overall organization of the paper was acceptable	<input type="checkbox"/> Critical reasoning framework identified and developed, although framework was not always fully developed. <input type="checkbox"/> Thesis statement was present but wordy. <input type="checkbox"/> Integration of materials with original analysis was smooth <input type="checkbox"/> Overall organization of the paper was good	<input type="checkbox"/> Critical reasoning framework identified and developed throughout paper <input type="checkbox"/> Thesis statement concisely identified the topic of the paper <input type="checkbox"/> Integration of materials with original analysis was skillful <input type="checkbox"/> Overall organization of the paper was excellent
Content and Knowledge	<input type="checkbox"/> Minimal scholarly references (references did not meet specified requirements) <input type="checkbox"/> Quotations were not supportive of the arguments <input type="checkbox"/> Awareness of ethical nuances of topic was weak. <input type="checkbox"/> Understanding of ethical terms is weak <input type="checkbox"/> Topic/problem was vague and unclear; a description rather than an evaluation of the topic was presented	<input type="checkbox"/> Incorporated a limited range of scholarly references <input type="checkbox"/> Quotations were used in a superficial manner or excessive use of direct quotes. Personal voice was missing <input type="checkbox"/> Awareness of ethical nuances of topic was acceptable <input type="checkbox"/> Understanding of ethical terms was acceptable <input type="checkbox"/> Topic /problem is superficially presented; evaluation of the topic was acceptable	<input type="checkbox"/> Incorporated an adequate range of scholarly references <input type="checkbox"/> Quotations adequately illustrated arguments. <input type="checkbox"/> Awareness of ethical nuances of topic was good. <input type="checkbox"/> Understanding of ethical terms is good. <input type="checkbox"/> Topic/problem was clearly presented, but lacked critical analysis; evaluation of the topic was good	<input type="checkbox"/> Incorporated a broad range of scholarly references <input type="checkbox"/> Quotations insightfully illustrated arguments <input type="checkbox"/> Awareness of ethical nuances was excellent. <input type="checkbox"/> Understanding of ethical terms was excellent <input type="checkbox"/> Topic/problem was clearly presented and critically analyzed; evaluation of the topic was excellent
Synthesis of ideas and depth of argument	<input type="checkbox"/> Summary of the literature predominated <input type="checkbox"/> Stereotypical or ineffective thinking about the topic <input type="checkbox"/> Assumptions pertaining to the topic/problem are incorrect <input type="checkbox"/> Evidence for making claims is lacking and/or questionable <input type="checkbox"/> Reasons for adopting/rejecting options are lacking and/or weak	<input type="checkbox"/> Mostly a review of the literature and common observations <input type="checkbox"/> Raises good ideas without following through; general understanding of the topic. <input type="checkbox"/> Assumptions pertaining to the topic/problem were inappropriate <input type="checkbox"/> Evidence for making claims was acceptable. <input type="checkbox"/> Reasons for adopting/rejecting options were acceptable	<input type="checkbox"/> Some original insights arose from the use of the literature <input type="checkbox"/> Solid understanding of the topic demonstrated by comprehensive coverage <input type="checkbox"/> Assumptions pertaining to the topic/problem were questionable. <input type="checkbox"/> Evidence for making claims was good. <input type="checkbox"/> Reasons for adopting/rejecting options were good	<input type="checkbox"/> Thorough analysis and examination of the topic/problem from multiple perspectives <input type="checkbox"/> Mastery of the topic and its content; provided subtle and perceptive insights <input type="checkbox"/> Assumptions pertaining to the topic/problem were reasonable <input type="checkbox"/> Evidence for making claims was excellent <input type="checkbox"/> Reasons for adopting/rejecting options were excellent
Expression of Ideas	<input type="checkbox"/> Grammatical and spelling errors interfere with expression of ideas. <input type="checkbox"/> Multiple and repeated errors in APA format. <input type="checkbox"/> Expression of ideas frequently unclear and confusing	<input type="checkbox"/> Significant grammatical errors including incomplete sentence structure, poor usage of terms, colloquial expressions and spelling errors <input type="checkbox"/> Significant APA format errors <input type="checkbox"/> Inconsistent clarity, wordiness or duplication of ideas	<input type="checkbox"/> Minor grammatical errors, colloquial expressions and occasional spelling errors <input type="checkbox"/> Minor APA format errors <input type="checkbox"/> Generally clear, succinct and logical expression of ideas and easy to read	<input type="checkbox"/> No grammatical or spelling errors <input type="checkbox"/> No APA format errors <input type="checkbox"/> Logical, succinct development of ideas, excellent expression of ideas, and engaging and enjoyable to read

**COMMENTS**

FINAL GRADE = /16 x 25 = /25