

Core Review Task Force
Proposed Core Learning Outcomes
Ethical Reasoning

Introduction: CLO rubrics provide a common set of definitions and expectations for Core learning across the Core and the University. They will be used as assessment scoring instruments for Core assessment.

Most of the rubrics are adapted from the [AAC&U VALUE Rubrics](#). VALUE rubrics are intended to assess learning across the entire undergraduate journey. The Capstone levels represent the performance expected of graduating seniors. It is NOT expected that students will perform at the Capstone level after their first or second year.

The Task Force recommends that Core subcommittees be charged with reviewing and adapting these rubrics to ensure they meet the needs of FSU's core curriculum.

Definition: Students will make reasoned and informed judgments about right and wrong in human conduct. Students will assess their own ethical values and the social context of problems, recognize ethical issues in a variety of settings, think about how different ethical perspectives might be applied to ethical dilemmas, and consider the ramifications of alternative actions.

Rationale: To be an educated person requires more than specialized knowledge and technical skills. It also means individuals can understand, evaluate, and act on their ethical responsibilities. Ethics refers to standards of behavior that tell us how human beings ought to act in our roles as citizens, workers, students, professionals, friends, family members, and so on. An FSU education should help shape students' ethical values, moral reasoning, and their readiness to accept personal and social responsibility.

Background: Ethical Reasoning is part of Ethics and Civic Engagement in the current Core. the recommendation to separate the two components stems from the UNC System policy change establishing a mandatory course covering the Foundations of American Democracy. A review of the CLO and of the courses that fulfill it convinced the Task Force that it would be easier to accommodate the requirement if the two CLOs were distinguished.

Ethical Reasoning Rubric

Criterion	Capstone 4	Milestones		Benchmark 1
		3	2	
Ethical Self-Awareness	Student discusses in detail/analyzes both core beliefs and the origins of the core beliefs and discussion has greater depth and clarity.	Student discusses in detail/analyzes both core beliefs and the origins of the core beliefs.	Student states both core beliefs and the origins of the core beliefs.	Student states either their core beliefs or articulates the origins of the core beliefs but not both.
Understanding Different Ethical Perspectives/Concepts	Student names the theory or theories, can present the gist of said theory or theories, and accurately explains the details of the theory or theories used.	Student can name the major theory or theories she/he uses, can present the gist of said theory or theories, and attempts to explain the details of the theory or theories used, but has some inaccuracies.	Student can name the major theory she/he uses and is only able to present the gist of the named theory.	Student only names the major theory she/he uses.
Ethical Issue Recognition	Student can recognize ethical issues when presented in a complex, multilayered (gray) context AND can recognize cross-relationships among the issues.	Student can recognize ethical issues when issues are presented in a complex, multilayered (gray) context OR can grasp cross-relationships among the issues.	Student can recognize basic and obvious ethical issues and grasp (incompletely) the complexities or interrelationships among the issues.	Student can recognize basic and obvious ethical issues but fails to grasp complexity or interrelationships.
Application of Ethical Perspectives/Concepts	Student can independently apply ethical perspectives/concepts to an ethical question, accurately, and is able to consider full implications of the application.	Student can independently apply ethical perspectives/concepts to an ethical question, accurately, but does not consider the specific implications of the application.	Student can apply ethical perspectives/concepts to an ethical question, independently (to a new example) and the application is inaccurate.	Student can apply ethical perspectives/concepts to an ethical question with support (using examples, in a class, in a group, or a fixed-choice setting) but is unable to apply ethical perspectives/concepts independently (to a new example.).
Evaluation of Different Ethical Perspectives/Concepts	Student states a position and can state the objections to, assumptions and implications of and can reasonably defend against the objections to, assumptions and implications of different ethical perspectives/ concepts, and the student's defense is adequate and effective.	Student states a position and can state the objections to, assumptions and implications of, and respond to the objections to, assumptions and implications of different ethical perspectives/ concepts, but the student's response is inadequate.	Student states a position and can state the objections to, assumptions and implications of different ethical perspectives/concepts but does not respond to them (and ultimately objections, assumptions, and implications are compartmentalized by student and do not affect student's position.)	Student states a position but cannot state the objections to and assumptions and limitations of the different perspectives/concepts.