

Ethical Decision-Making Model Scoring Guide	Points Possible	Points Received
<b>Ethical question clearly identified</b> 5 pts: Question that relates to an ethical dilemma clearly identified. 4 pts: Question suggests an ethical dilemma but is ambiguous, vague, or not clearly identified. 3 pts: Question does not clearly relate to an ethical dilemma or is inappropriate for topic. 0 pts: Question not identified.	5	
<b>Basic bioethical principles at stake identified and explained</b> 5 pts: Principles clearly identified and their logical relation to the ethical question is explained. 4 pts: Principles are identified, but their relationship to the question is illogical or not explained. 3 pts: Inappropriate principles are identified, and no explanation is provided. 0 pts: Principles are neither identified nor explained.	5	
<b>Stakeholders clearly identified</b> 5 pts: Major stakeholders clearly identified, and their claims, values, and assumptions are explored. 4 pts: Major stakeholders clearly identified, but without corresponding clarification of their position. 3 pts: Major stakeholders not clearly identified, or irrelevant stakeholders mentioned. 0 pts: Description of stakeholders is missing.	5	
<b>Sufficient factual information gathered</b> 10 pts: Factual information gathered reflects good use of the time and resources available to student. 8 pts: Factual information gathered reflects adequate use of the time and resources available to student. 6 pts: Factual information gathered reflects poor use of the time and resources available to student. 0 pts: Factual information is missing.	10	
<b>Additional (unknown) information necessary for decision-making identified</b> 10 pts: Additional information necessary for decision-making is thoroughly considered; clear explanation of what is lacking is provided. 8 pts: Additional information briefly considered, and explanation conveys what is lacking overall. 6 pts: An attempt to identify additional information is made, but explanation is unclear or not present. 0 pts: Additional information not considered.	10	
<b>Minimum of 3 alternative options generated</b> 5 pts: 3 alternative options described 4 pts: 2 alternative options described 3 pts: 1 option described 0 pts: Description of options is missing.	5	
<b>Option 1</b> 10 pts: Option thoroughly evaluated based on principles, consideration of perspectives, implications, concessions, and costs/benefits. 8 pts: Evaluation of option is adequate, but certain aspects lack depth. The discussion of principles, implications, concessions, and costs/benefits would benefit from further exploration and development. 6 pts: Evaluation of option is attempted, but important aspects may have been missed or are incorrectly interpreted. 0 pts: Option is not described.	10	
<b>Option 2</b> 10 pts: Option thoroughly evaluated based on principles, consideration of perspectives, implications, concessions, and costs/benefits. 8 pts: Evaluation of option is adequate, but certain aspects lack depth. The discussion of principles, implications, concessions, and costs/benefits would benefit from further exploration and development. 6 pts: Evaluation of option is attempted, but important aspects may have been missed or are incorrectly interpreted. 0 pts: Option is not described.	10	
<b>Option 3</b> 10 pts: Option thoroughly evaluated based on principles, consideration of perspectives, implications, concessions, and costs/benefits. 8 pts: Evaluation of option is adequate, but certain aspects lack depth. The discussion of principles, implications, concessions, and costs/benefits would benefit from further exploration and development. 6 pts: Evaluation of option is attempted, but important aspects may have been missed or are incorrectly interpreted. 0 pts: Option is not described.	10	
<b>Decision clearly identified</b> 5 pts: Final decision is readily identified. 4 pts: Final decision is identified, but may be unclear or vague 3 pts: Final decision is alluded to, but may be incomplete or fragmentary. 0 pts: Final decision is not identified.	5	
<b>Justification provided based on comparison of options and reference to ethical perspectives</b> 20 pts: Thorough reference made to the consideration of perspectives, facts, and principles involved. Clear articulation of the rationale behind the decision. Explanation is logical and presents at least 3 supporting examples, as well as thoughtful exploration of ethical perspectives. 18 pts: Reference made to the consideration of perspectives, facts, and principles involved. Articulation of the rationale behind the decision is mostly complete. Explanation is logical and presents at least 3 supporting examples, as well as discussion of ethical perspectives. 16 pts: Partial reference is made to the consideration of perspectives, facts, and principles involved, but key points may be missing. The rationale behind the decision may be incomplete. The explanation may not follow logically, may lack discussion of ethical perspectives, or have fewer than 3 supporting examples. 14 pts: The consideration of perspectives, facts, and principles involved is incomplete. The rationale behind the decision is not clearly explained. Evidence of a logical justification for the decision reached is scant or absent, ethical perspectives are not mentioned, or fewer than 2 supporting examples are present. 12 pts or less: The consideration of perspectives, facts, and principles involved is attempted. Evidence of a logical justification for the decision reached is scant or absent. Supporting examples, if provided, are insufficiently developed or do not relate to the decision made.	20	
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>100</b>	