



**ATENEIO DE MANILA
UNIVERSITY
Loyola Schools**

COURSE SYLLABUS

A. COURSE INFORMATION

COURSE NUMBER	PHILO 13	UNITS	3
COURSE TITLE	Ethics	PREREQUISITE	None
DEPARTMENT	Philosophy	SCHOOL	Humanities
SCHOOL YEAR	2025-2026	SEMESTER	Second
INSTRUCTOR	Ranilo B. Hermida, Ph.D., Associate Professor		
CONTACTS	<u>rhermida@ateneo.edu</u> – 0998-976-5774		

B. COURSE DESCRIPTION

Ethics is an introductory course designed to cultivate among the students a mature moral deliberation and judgment. It is part of the Core Curriculum of the Loyola Schools. Its focus is on ethical theories, their basic principles, and the ultimate ground of moral obligation. The ethical theories embody the reflections of great thinkers on the basic moral questions. Although these theories were the attempts of past thinkers to wrestle with the moral questions of their time, they provide us with a tradition by which we can understand our present moral situation. **(Adapted from the *Undergraduate Study at Ateneo de Manila University Loyola Schools*, 2019 Version, p. 27)**

WHERE THE COURSE IS SITUATED WITHIN THE FORMATION STAGES IN THE FRAMEWORK OF THE LOYOLA SCHOOLS CURRICULA	
✓	FOUNDATIONS: Exploring and Equipping the Self
	ROOTEDNESS: Investigating and Knowing the World

✓	DEEPENING: Defining the Self in the World
	LEADERSHIP: Engaging and Transforming the World

C. COURSE LEARNING OUTCOMES

By the end of this course, the students should be able to:

CLO 1:	Articulate the meaning and context of the fundamental concepts and principles of selected moral theories
CLO 2:	Clarify the implications of the ethical concepts and principles for their own conduct and decision making
CLO 3:	Generate insights through a systematic reflection on their personal experiences in light of ethical theories
CLO 4:	Formulate a reasoned stand on ethical issues and problems, and a deliberated assessment of moral cases

D. COURSE OUTLINE

COURSE OUTLINE	COURSE LEARNING OUTCOMES	ESTIMATED LEARNING HOURS*
Module 1 – The Moral Dimension <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Freedom–Happiness–Accountability ▪ Moral Theories ▪ Requirements of Morality: Rationality and Impartiality 	1, 4	1.5
Module 2 – Moral Theories for the Short Essay <p>Confucius (551-479 BC) ▪ Historical Context ▪ The Moral Tao ▪ Pursuit of Moral Character: <i>Chih</i> and <i>Wen</i> ▪ <i>Jen-Chih-Yung</i> ▪ <i>T'ien Ming</i> – The Will or Mandate of Heaven ▪ Morality and Politics</p> <p>Plato (428-348 BC) ▪ The Good Life and <i>Epimeleisthai</i> ▪ Knowledge and Virtue ▪ Teleology and Psychology ▪ Temperance-Courage-Wisdom ▪ Moral Evil ▪ Meaning of Virtue ▪ “The Ring of Gyges” ▪ Justice and the Inward Man</p>	1, 2	6

Module 3 – Reflection Process <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Rationale and Structure ▪ Encounter-Significance-Insights-Response ▪ Format and Style of Presentation ▪ Rubrics for Marking ▪ Sample Papers 	2, 3	1.5
Module 4 – Moral Theories for the Reflection Paper <p>Aristotle (384-322 BC) ▪ Doctrine of Teleology ▪ The Concept of the Good ▪ The Human Function ▪ Morality and Happiness ▪ The Choice of Lives ▪ The Way to Happiness ▪ The Doctrine of the Mean ▪ Moral Virtues ▪ Deliberation and Motivation ▪ The Voluntary Act ▪ Learning to be Ethical ▪ Responsibility for Character</p> <p>Augustine (354-430 AD) ▪ Human Knowledge ▪ The Nature of God ▪ Doctrine on Creation ▪ The Moral Quest and the Human Condition ▪ The Role of Love ▪ Evil and Disordered Love ▪ Free Will as the Cause of Evil ▪ The Need for Grace</p>	1, 2, 3	6
Module 5 – Moral Case Analysis <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Value and Duty ▪ Rationale and Structure ▪ The Case Narrative ▪ The Moral Quality of the Action ▪ The Moral Accountability of the Agent ▪ Format and Style of Presentation ▪ Rubrics for Marking ▪ Sample Papers 	2, 4	1.5
Module 6 – Moral Theories for the Analysis Paper <p>Thomas Aquinas (1225-1274) ▪ Morality, Teleology, and Happiness ▪ The Role and Nature of the Will ▪ The Moral Constitution of the Man ▪ The Norm of Morality ▪ Four Laws: Eternal-Natural-Human-Divine ▪ <i>Actus Humanus</i> vs <i>Actio Hominis</i> ▪ The Morality of the Act: <i>Objectum-Finis Operantis-Circumstantia</i> ▪ Interior and Exterior Acts of the Will ▪ Repetition, Extent, and Intensity ▪ Foreseen and Unforeseen Consequences of the Act ▪ Modifiers of Voluntariness: Violence-Fear-Concupiscence- Ignorance</p>	1, 2, 4	21

Immanuel Kant (1724-1804) ▪ Morality and Autonomy ▪ Morality and Rationality ▪ The Good Will as the Foundation of Morality ▪ Acting “Out of Duty” – The Right Motive: “The Three Shopkeepers” ▪ Good Will and Duty ▪ Extrinsic and Intrinsic Conformity to Duty: Legality vs Morality ▪ “The Story of Edmund Ross” ▪ Hypothetical and Categorical Imperatives ▪ Criterion and Directive for Action ▪ Laws of the Categorical Imperative: Universality-Subjectivity-Autonomy ▪ The Postulates of Morality		
---	--	--

**The learning hours indicated above are approximate estimates of classroom activities, and do not include the time for study and work by the students on the assessment tasks, and the consultation periods for the course papers and the final oral examination.*

E. COURSE TIMETABLE

WEEK	SESSION	DATE	CLASS ACTIVITY
I	1	09 Jan, Fri	PRIMA NON DATUR
II	2	13 Jan, Tue	▪ Class Cards ▪ Dyads and Triads <i>Introductory Lecture: The Moral Dimension</i>
	3	16 Jan, Fri	<i>Lecture-Discussion: Confucian Ethics</i>
III	4	20 Jan, Tue	<i>Lecture-Discussion: Confucian Ethics</i>
	5	23 Jan, Fri	<i>First Essay: Assignments and Instructions</i>
IV	6	27 Jan, Tue	First Essay: Outline Consultation Online
	7	30 Jan, Fri	<i>Lecture-Discussion: Platonic Ethics</i>
V	8	03 Feb, Tue	<i>Lecture-Discussion: Platonic Ethics</i>
	9	06 Feb, Fri	<i>Second Essay: Assignments and Instructions</i> First Essay: Submission Deadline
VI	10	10 Feb, Tue	Second Essay: Outline Consultation Online
	11	13 Feb, Fri	<i>Lecture-Discussion: Aristotelian Ethics</i>
VII	12	17 Feb, Tue	<i>Lecture-Discussion: Aristotelian Ethics</i>
	13	20 Feb, Fri	<i>Reflection Paper: Process and Content</i> Second Essay: Submission Deadline

VIII	14	24 Feb, Tue	<i>Lecture-Discussion: Augustinian Ethics</i>
	15	27 Feb, Fri	<i>Lecture-Discussion: Augustinian Ethics</i>
IX	16	3 Mar, Tue	Reflection Paper: Outline Consultation Online
	17	06 Mar, Fri	Reflection Paper: Outline Consultation Online
X	18	10 Mar, Tue	<i>Lecture-Discussion: Thomistic Ethics</i>
	19	13 Mar, Fri	<i>Lecture-Discussion: Thomistic Ethics</i>
XI	20	17 Mar, Tue	<i>Lecture-Discussion: Thomistic Ethics</i> Reflection Paper: Submission Deadline
	21	20 Mar, Fri	<i>Lecture-Discussion: Thomistic Ethics</i>
XII	22	24 Mar, Tue	<i>Lecture-Discussion: Thomistic Ethics</i>
	23	27 Mar, Fri	<i>Analysis Paper: Framework and Questions</i>
XIII	24	31 Mar, Tue	HOLY WEEK BREAK
	25	03 Apr, Fri	
XIV	26	07 Apr, Tue	<i>Lecture-Discussion: Kantian Ethics</i> Narrative Proposal: Submission Deadline
	27	10 Apr, Fri	<i>Lecture-Discussion: Kantian Ethics</i>
XV	28	14 Apr, Tue	<i>Lecture-Discussion: Kantian Ethics</i>
	29	17 Apr, Fri	<i>Analysis Paper Outline Preparation</i>
XVI	30	21 Apr, Tue	Analysis Paper: Outline Consultation Onsite
	31	24 Apr, Fri	Analysis Paper: Outline Consultation Onsite
XVII	32	28 Apr, Tue	<i>Paper Defense: Schedule and Instructions</i> Analysis Paper: Submission Deadline
XVIII	32	05 May, Tue	<i>Analysis Paper Marking</i> <i>Paper Defense Preparation</i>
XIX	33	11-15 May	Analysis Paper Defense

F. ASSESSMENT TASKS – GRADING SYSTEM – SUBMISSION DATES

All course papers should follow the prescribed style and format, namely: Letter Size Paper (8.5 x 11), Arial 12, double-spacing, 1-inch margin on all sides, and the entire text justified. They should be submitted in Word format only and uploaded to Turnitin.

ASSESSMENT TASKS	WEIGHT	CLO
<p>First Essay</p> <p>The class will be formed into dyads, and each dyad will write an essay on a question from the ethics of Confucius. The dyads and questions will be announced during the “<i>First Essay: Assignments and Instructions</i>” session on 23 January 2026, Friday.</p> <p>The Submission Deadline for the First Essay is on 06 February 2026, Friday, 5:00 pm.</p>	15%	1, 2
<p>Second Essay</p> <p>The class will be formed into dyads, and each dyad will write an essay on a question from the ethics of Plato. The dyads and questions will be announced during the “<i>Second Essay: Assignments and Instructions</i>” session on 06 February 2026, Friday.</p> <p>The Submission Deadline for the Second Essay is on 20 February 2026, Friday, 5:00 pm.</p>	15%	
<p>Reflection Paper</p> <p>Each student will write a paper on a specific concept or principle in the ethics of either Aristotle or Augustine, using the prescribed framework for the reflection process. The paper should be between 1,000 and 1,500 words.</p> <p>The instructions for the reflection paper will be discussed during the “<i>Reflection Paper: Process and Content</i>” session on 20 February 2026, Friday.</p> <p>The Submission Deadline for the Reflection Paper is on 17 March 2026, Tuesday, 5:00 pm.</p>	30%	1, 2, 3

<p>Analysis Paper</p> <p>The class will be formed into triads, and each triad will analyze an actual case in terms of the <i>moral quality of the action</i> and the <i>moral accountability of the agent</i>, applying principles from the ethics of either Thomas Aquinas or Immanuel Kant or both. The paper should be between 1,500 and 2,000 words.</p> <p>The framework and questions for the moral analysis will be discussed during the “<i>Analysis Paper: Framework and Questions</i>” session on 27 March 2026, Friday.</p> <p>The Submission Deadline for the Analysis Paper is on 28 April 2026, Tuesday, 5:00 pm.</p>	20%	1, 2, 4
<p>Paper Defense</p> <p>The triads will defend their analysis paper in an oral examination regarding their evaluation of the case and the principles used to support their arguments. The oral examination will be from May 8 to 15, 2026.</p>	20%	1, 2, 4

Quality Point Value	Letter Mark
3.76-4.00	A
3.26-3.75	B+
2.76-3.25	B
2.26-2.75	C+
1.76-2.25	C
1.00-1.75	D

Nota Bene:

1. The policies on the format and style and prompt submission of the paper shall be strictly enforced. The paper will incur a deduction of 1-point for late submission, and .5-point for noncompliance with the format and style.
2. The mark of the group papers shall be the mark of each member of the dyad or triad. The mark of the triad in the oral paper defense will apply similarly to all the members.

3. Individuals and groups are welcome to request a remarking of their paper. The request should be accompanied with an explanation – based on the Rubrics for Marking – about which parts should be reviewed, and why they deserve a reconsideration. The second mark – whether it is higher or lower than the first – shall be the final mark of the paper.
4. Questions and clarifications on the course papers may be raised during the following sessions: a) “*First Essay: Assignments and Instructions*,” b) “*Second Essay: Assignments and Instructions*,” c) “*Reflection Paper: Process and Content*,” d) “*Analysis Paper: Framework and Questions*.”
5. The consultation on the essays and the reflection paper will be done through email. The proposed outline for the paper should be sent as an attachment in Word document. The outline will be returned with comments and suggestions for revision or improvement.

The consultation on the analysis paper will be done in the classroom, according to the date and time allotted for each triad. All the members of the triad should be present during the consultation.

6. The marking of assessments and the computation of the final grade is according to “Section V: Grading System” of the *Ateneo de Manila College Student Handbook 2024 Edition*, Volume I, pp. 25-28.
7. To get a passing mark in the course, the student should have accomplished at least 70% of the assessment tasks. Please refer to the percentages of the grades assigned to each of the assessment tasks.
8. Only students who have submitted at least 70% of the assessment tasks may request for an incomplete grade (INC) to make up for missed tasks in the course. The highest possible mark for the missed tasks is C or 2.0. The policy on the INC as found on p. 27 of the *Ateneo de Manila College Student Handbook 2024 Edition*, Volume I, will be followed.

G. TEACHING AND LEARNING METHODS

TEACHING AND LEARNING METHODS
Module 1 – The Moral Dimension <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ “Meet and Greet” ▪ Syllabus Discussion ▪ Lecture: The Moral Dimension ▪ Lecture Notes ▪ PowerPoint Presentation

Module 2 – Moral Theories for the Short Essay

Confucius

- Lecture: Confucian Ethics ▪ Required Readings ▪ Lecture Notes ▪ PowerPoint Presentation ▪ Group Discussion ▪ Online Consultation on the Proposed Essay Outline (Formative Assessment) ▪ Submit Short Essay (Summative Assessment)

Plato

- Lecture: Platonic Ethics ▪ Required Readings ▪ Lecture Notes ▪ PowerPoint Slides ▪ Group Discussion ▪ Online Consultation on the Proposed Essay Outline (Formative Assessment) ▪ Submit Short Essay (Summative Assessment)

Module 3 – The Reflection Process

- Lecture and Discussion – The Reflection Process and the Framework for Writing the Paper ▪ Lecture Notes ▪ PowerPoint Presentation ▪ Sample Reflection Papers

Module 4 – Moral Theories for the Reflection Paper

Aristotle

- Lecture: Aristotelian Ethics ▪ Required Readings ▪ Lecture Notes ▪ PowerPoint Presentation ▪ Email Consultation on the Proposed Paper Outline (Formative Assessment) ▪ Submit Reflection Paper (Summative Assessment)

Augustine

- Lecture: Augustinian Ethics ▪ Required Readings ▪ Lecture Notes ▪ PowerPoint Presentation ▪ Email Consultation on the Proposed Paper Outline (Formative Assessment) ▪ Submit Reflection Paper (Summative Assessment)

Module 5 – Moral Case Analysis

- Lecture and Discussion – The Framework for the Moral Case Analysis ▪ Outline for the Paper ▪ Sample Case Narratives ▪ Lecture Notes ▪ PowerPoint Presentation ▪ Sample Analysis Papers

Module 6 – Moral Theories for the Analysis Paper

Thomas Aquinas

- Lecture: Aristotelian Ethics ▪ Required Readings ▪ Lecture Notes ▪ PowerPoint Presentation ▪ Group Discussion ▪ Online Consultation on the Proposed Paper Outline (Formative Assessment) ▪ Submit Analysis Paper (Summative Assessment) ▪ Analysis Paper Oral Defense (Summative Assessment)

Immanuel Kant

▪ Lecture: Kantian Ethics ▪ Required Readings ▪ Lecture Notes ▪ PowerPoint Presentation ▪ Group Discussion ▪ Online Consultation on the Proposed Paper Outline (Formative Assessment) ▪ Submit Analysis Paper (Summative Assessment) ▪ Analysis Paper Oral Defense (Summative Assessment)

H. REQUIRED READINGS

All the required readings and lecture notes are uploaded to the Canvas platform. They may be downloaded and printed for easier reading and reference.

Confucius:

- Dubs, Homer H. "Confucius: His Life and Teaching." *Philosophy* 26, no. 96 (January 1951): 30-36.
- Ivanhoe, Philip J. "Kongzi ('Confucius')." In *Confucian Moral Self-Cultivation*, 1-14. Indianapolis: Hackett Publishing Company, Inc., 2000.
- Warytko, Sandra A. "Confucius and Kant: The Ethics of Respect." *Philosophy East & West* 32, no. 3 (July 1982): 237-55.
- Yu, Jiyuan. "Virtue: Confucius and Aristotle." *Philosophy East & West* 48, no. 2 (April 1998): 323-41.

Plato:

- Annas, Julia. "Transforming Your Life: Virtue and Happiness." In *Platonic Ethics, Old and New*, 31-51. London: Cornell University Press, 1999.
- Meyer, Susan S. "Plato and the Pursuit of Excellence." In *Ancient Ethics: A Critical Introduction*, 6-49. New York: Routledge, 2008.
- Plato. "Knowledge and Virtue," (*The Republic*). In *Great Traditions in Ethics*, edited by Theodore Denise et al., 6-22. Belmont: Thomson Wadsworth, 1999.

Aristotle:

- Aristotle. "Moral Character," (*Nicomachean Ethics*). In *Great Traditions in Ethics*, 29-47.
- Darwall, Stephen. "Aristotle." In *Philosophical Ethics*, 191-215. Oxford: Westview Press, 1998.
- Meyer, Susan. "Aristotle and the Pursuit of Happiness." In *Ancient Ethics: A Critical Introduction*, 50-89.

Augustine:

- Augustine. "The Love of God," (*City of God*). In *Great Traditions in Ethics*, 84-103.
- Kent, Bonnie. "Augustine's Ethics." In *The Cambridge Companion to Augustine*, edited by Eleonore Stump and Norman Kretzmann, 205-29. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2005.
- Naugle, David K. "Saint Augustine's Concept of Disordered Love and Its Contemporary Application." Southwest Commission on Religious Studies Theology and Philosophy of Religion Group (March 12, 1993).

Thomas Aquinas:

- Aquinas, Thomas. "Morality and the Natural Law," (*Summa Contra Gentiles* and *Summa Theologica*). In *Great Traditions in Ethics*, 106-23.
- Gallagher, David M. "The Will and Its Acts." In *The Ethics of Aquinas*, edited by Stephen J. Pope, 69-85. Washington, DC: Georgetown University Press, 2002.
- Kossel, Clifford G. "Natural Law and Human Law." In *The Ethics of Aquinas*, 169-82.
- Webster, Daniel. "Good and Evil in Human Acts." In *The Ethics of Aquinas*, 90-101.

Immanuel Kant:

- Darwall, Stephen. "Kant." In *Philosophical Ethics*, 139-73.
- Höffe, Otfried. "The Critique of Practical Reason." In *Immanuel Kant*, translated by Marshall Farrier, 139-165. Albany: State University of New York Press, 1994.
- Kant, Immanuel. "Duty and Reason," (*Fundamental Principles of the Metaphysics of Morals*). In *Great Traditions in Ethics*, 178-195.,
- MacKinnon, Barbara. "Kant's Moral Theory." In *Ethics: Theory and Contemporary Issues* (Concise Edition), 44-53. Boston: Wadsworth CENGAGE Learning, 2011.

I. SUGGESTED READINGS

- Holmes, Robert L. "The Nature of Ethics." In *Basic Moral Philosophy*, 1-11. California: Thomson Wadsworth 2007.
- Rachels, James. "What Is Morality?" In *The Elements of Moral Philosophy*, 1-13. Singapore: McGraw-Hill, 2010.

J. CLASSROOM POLICIES

1. *Promptness and Attendance* – The policies on promptness and attendance shall be strictly observed. The privilege of unlimited absences for honor students is not granted in this course. (*Undergraduate Student Handbook 2024 Edition, Volume I, "Section III, 5.1: Attendance Regulations," p. 24*)
2. *Submission of Requirements* – Punctuality in the submission of requirements and the oral examination shall be the rule. Late submission of papers will incur a deduction of points as stated above in "F. Assessment Tasks – Grading System – Submission Dates."
3. *Academic Integrity* – The proper acknowledgement of the sources and the accurate presentation of ideas and data used in the essays and papers are a must. Plagiarism and fabrication are absolutely verboten. Please refer to "The Student Guide to the Code of Academic Integrity of the Loyola Schools," *Undergraduate Student Handbook 2024 Edition, Volume II, pp. 16-25*.

All course assessment tasks should be submitted with a Cover Sheet certifying that the essay or paper complies with the principles and policies of the Student Guide to the Code of Academic Integrity of the Loyola Schools, Ateneo de Manila University, and that all the sources, including online applications, are duly cited and acknowledged in the Footnotes and References, respectively.

4. *Generative Artificial Intelligence* – The submission of any course assessment task that is wholly or mostly generated via artificial intelligence tools is strictly prohibited and will be considered as a form of academic dishonesty.

The first offense will automatically earn an F in the assessment task concerned. The second and succeeding offenses, in addition to the F mark in the assessment tasks, will be considered a major violation and reported to the Discipline Committee for the appropriate sanction.

The use of such tools is allowed only for editing or checking the grammar and mechanics of the paper. Proper citation of the tools used should appear in the Reference or Bibliography section of the paper.

Please take note that, as prescribed by the Guidelines on the Responsible Use of Generative Artificial Intelligence (GenAI) in Higher Education (II, A.5, p. 5), the submission should also "declare the use of GenAI in any work, through a statement such as 'This work [*Specify: paper, artwork, or other output*] used GenAI for the following components: [*Choose from the*

following] brainstorming, outlining, sentence generation, study design, editing, or [describe other uses not found in this list]. The following GenAI technologies were used [provide a list of GenAI technologies used].’ Alternatively, if GenAI was not used, one can declare, ‘This did not use GenAI in any aspect of the work.’”

It is best to bear in mind the following, before commencing any courses assessment task: “[The]...prose generated by Artificial Intelligence... is... bland and vague...missing a humanistic core...passion, pain, longings, and a life of deeply felt personal experiences. It does not spring from imagination, bursts of insight, anxiety and joy that underlie any profound work of human creativity.” **David Brooks, “In the Age of A.I., Major in Being Human,” *The New York Times* (2 Feb 2023)**

5. *Classroom Decorum* – The classroom is a venue for learning; hence, any behavior that prevents or disrupts the process of learning is unacceptable. Please refer to the Code of Decorum and Administrative Rules on Sexual Harassment, Other Forms of Sexual Misconduct, and Inappropriate Behavior – <https://www.ateneo.edu/central/policies/code-of-decorum>.
6. *Gender Policy* – Ateneo de Manila University does not discriminate on the basis of sex, gender, marital or parental status, sexual orientation, or gender identity or expression. Let us all be guided by the Loyola School Gender Policy which can be accessed through this website: <http://www.ateneo.edu/ls/ls-gender-policy>.

K. CONSULTATION SCHEDULES

The onsite and online consultations on the course assessment tasks are specified above in “E. Course Timetable” and “F. Assessment Tasks – Grading System – Submission Dates.” Requests for consultations on other matters related to the course are welcome. The regular consultation schedules are Monday and Thursday – 3:00-5:00 p.m.

L. RUBRICS FOR MARKING THE PAPERS

Rubrics for Marking the Essay							
Criteria	Ratings						Points
	Needs Improvement		Meets Standard		Exceeds Expectation		
	1.0	2.0	2.5	3.0	3.5	4.0	
(25%) RELEVANCE OF THE ANSWER	The essay did not answer the question, or the answer is not complete.		The answer is brief, provides insufficient details, and contains unrelated issues.		The essay is coherent and contains sufficient details.		
	.25	.50	.625	.75	.875	1.00	
(20%) COMPLETENESS OF THE ANSWER	The relevant aspects are not fully addressed by the essay.		The basic details of the question are tackled but some are not answered.		The essay deals with the full range of issues raised by the question.		
	.20	.40	.50	.60	.70	.80	
(20%) ENGAGEMENT WITH RELEVANT SOURCES	The essay does not show familiarity with readings pertinent to the question.		The essay engages with some of the readings related to the question.		The essay makes use of the readings that are relevant to the question.		
	.20	.40	.50	.60	.70	.80	
(25%) ORGANIZATION AND ARGUMENT	The answer is not argued clearly, and the essay is not organized soundly.		The essay presents a good argument but the logic and presentation need improvement.		The argument is clearly developed and supported with good reasoning.		
	.25	.50	.625	.75	.875	1.00	
(10%) GRAMMAR AND MECHANICS	The essay is difficult to understand due to problems in grammar and construction.		The grammar and construction are generally good with minimal errors.		The writing style is free of errors in grammar and it is easy and engaging to follow.		
	.10	.20	.25	.30	.35	.40	
Total Points and Letter Mark:							

Rubrics for Marking the Reflection Paper							
Criteria	Ratings						Points
	Below Expectation		Meets Expectation		Above Expectation		
	1.0	2.0	2.5	3.0	3.5	4.0	
<p>(20%)</p> <p>UNDERSTANDING AND EXPLANATION</p> <p><i>The concept or principle which is the starting point of the reflection is correctly interpreted and expressed.</i></p>	.20	.40	.50	.60	.70	.80	
<p>(70%)</p> <p>CONTENT AND STRUCTURE</p> <p>The paper follows the prescribed framework and the various moments of the process are proportionately elaborated:</p> <p><i>The personal experience highlights the significance of the moral theory and the narrative is succinct but adequate.</i></p>	.15	.30	.375	.45	.525	.60	
<p><i>The universal insights are original, show deep engagement with the process, and are extensively developed.</i></p>	.40	.80	1.00	1.20	1.40	1.60	
<p><i>The reflection contains a moral response in the form of a clear resolve to action that is pertinent to the significance moment.</i></p>	.15	.30	.375	.45	.525	.60	
<p>(10%)</p> <p>STYLE AND FORMAT</p> <p>The writing is excellent, the grammar perfect, and the presentation complies with the requirement.</p>	.10	.20	.25	.30	.35	.40	
Total Points and Letter Mark:							

Rubrics for Marking the Analysis Paper							
Criteria	Ratings						Points
	Inadequate		Satisfactory		Excellent		
	1.0	2.0	2.5	3.0	3.5	4.0	
(35%) UNDERSTANDING AND APPLICATION	The applicable moral principles are not used, and some elements of the case are not tackled.		Some moral principles are used, but their application is not completely accurate.		The moral principles used are adequate, relevant, and are applied correctly to the moral case.		
	.35	.70	.875	1.05	1.225	1.40	
(40%) FORMULATION OF THE ARGUMENT	The argument of the paper is limited and problematic, and the paper deals with only one question.		The two questions are addressed but the analysis and arguments for both are not adequate.		The argument of the paper is valid and sound, and both questions are sufficiently answered.		
	.40	.80	1.00	1.20	1.40	1.60	
(15%) ORIGINALITY OF THE ARGUMENT	The paper made little use of the sources and based its argument on common knowledge.		The paper offers the standard arguments based on the basic texts, but with no further research.		The paper offers a wider view showing extensive reading of the sources and further research.		
	.15	.30	.375	.45	.525	.60	
(10%) FORMAT AND MECHANICS	The writing style is inferior and contains defects in grammar, format, and other writing mechanics.		The writing style is generally devoid of major grammatical errors but can be further improved.		The writing style has perfect grammar, and follows the prescribed format for the paper.		
	.10	.20	.25	.30	.35	.40	
Total Points and Letter Mark:							

Rubrics for Marking the Paper Defense							
Criteria	Ratings						Points
	Below Expectation		Meets Expectation		Above Expectation		
	1.0	2.0	2.5	3.0	3.5	4.0	
<p>(20%)</p> <p>EXPLANATION OF THE ANALYSIS</p> <p><i>The dyad clearly articulates and elaborates their analysis of the case.</i></p>	.20	.40	.50	.60	.70	.80	
<p>(40%)</p> <p>JUSTIFICATION OF THE ARGUMENTS</p> <p><i>The dyad is able to defend the correctness of the principles and reasoning used in their analysis.</i></p>	.40	.80	1.00	1.20	1.40	1.60	
<p>(20%)</p> <p>RESPONSE TO QUESTIONS AND CLARIFICATIONS</p> <p><i>The dyad is able to answer questions and clarifications and develop further insights.</i></p>	.20	.40	.50	.60	.70	.80	
<p>(20%)</p> <p>TEAMWORK AND COLLABORATION</p> <p><i>The dyad shows equal and thorough familiarity with their paper.</i></p>	.20	.40	.50	.60	.70	.80	
Total Points and Letter Mark:							