

| | Excellent | Good | Needs Improvement | Unacceptable |
|---------------------------------------|--|---|--|---|
| Structure (5 points) | The material is organized in a clear narrative structure which presents the ethical challenge, a solution in the form of standards (which contrasts with alternatives), and normative arguments for why the company should adopt these standards over others. (5) | The material is organized in a coherent narrative structure which presents the ethical challenge, a solution in the form of standards, and normative arguments for why the company should adopt these standards. Transitions and relationships between sections may sometimes be unclear. (4) | All of the relevant material is present, but the separation of content and the narrative flow of information needs improvement. (3.5) | The relevant material is either missing or presented in a disorganized way. (3) |
| Understanding (10 points) | The report contains an accurate and precise description and/or paraphrasing of the relevant technical and ethical ideas from the course. (10) | The description and/or paraphrasing of ethical and technical ideas is fairly accurate and precise. (8) | There are inaccuracies or misunderstandings of the technical or ethical ideas. (7) | There are serious confusions about the technical or ethical ideas. (6) |
| Arguments and Evidence (10 points) | The report very clearly articulates a set of reasons to adopt the standards which are broken down into the simplest possible units to easily establish. All premises are consistent. If we assume that all the normative claims and evidence supporting them are true, then these standards are the ones any rational person would prefer. (10) | The report pretty clearly articulates a set of reasons to adopt the standards which are broken down into very simple units to easily establish, but some reasons may be superfluous. All premises are consistent. If we assume that all the normative reasons are true, then the standards are plausible, but there is still room for disagreement (8) | There are reasons (premises) to adopt the standards, but they are vague and it is difficult to identify how they relate to each other. There are potential inconsistencies in the reasons offered. Some people who accept all the normative claims and evidence may still reasonably dispute the standards. (7) | There are no reasons offered, or if there are, they are vague and/or internally incoherent. It is easy to imagine many people who accept all the normative claims and evidence but reject the standards. (6) |

Rubric for Ethics Reports

Derek Leben

Carnegie Mellon University

| | | | | |
|---------------------------------------|---|--|---|---|
| Practical Implications (10 points) | It is very clear how the standards recommended in the report can be implemented, and what implications there are for generalizing to acceptable and unacceptable designs or deployments. (5) | Some interesting predictions are discussed for implementation, but there are more important ones that have been omitted. It's not clear how the standards generalize across various applications. (4) | There are few details about implications for implementing the standards, or implications for different applications. (3.5) | There are no details about what the standards predict in practice. (3) |
| GRADE | A (30 points) | B (24 points) | C (21 points) | D (18 points) |