**Case Study on Moral Status**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | **1 Unsatisfactory 0.00%** | **2 Less Than Satisfactory 65.00%** | **3 Satisfactory 75.00%** | **4 Good 85.00%** | **5 Excellent 100.00%** |
| **70.0 %Content** |  | | | | | |
| **25.0 %Determination of Moral Status** | Theory/Theories that determine the moral status of the fetus are incorrectly identified. | Theory/Theories are identified that determine the moral status of the fetus for at least a few of the people listed in the case study, but explanation is lacking. | Theory/Theories are identified that determine the moral status of the fetus for at least a few of the people listed in the case study. Some explanation is provided. | Theory/Theories are identified that determine the moral status of the fetus for all of the people listed in the case study, including adequate explanation. | Theory/Theories are identified that determine the moral status of the fetus for all of the people listed in the case study, including a detailed explanation. |  |
| **25.0 %Recommendation for Action** | Recommendation for action shows little to no relevance to the case study. | Recommendation for action is present, but lacks explanation. | Recommendation for action is present, with some explanation. | Recommendation for action is present, with explanation. | Recommendation for action is present, with detailed explanation that shows a deep understanding of the subject. |  |
| **20.0 %Personal Response to Case Study** | Personal response to the case study shows little to no relevance, and does not detail how the theory determines or influences the recommendation for action. | Personal response to case study includes if you agree or disagree but does not detail how the theory determines or influences the recommendation for action. | Personal response to case study includes if you agree or disagree and an explanation on how the theory determines or influences the recommendation for action. | Personal response to case study includes if you agree or disagree and a detailed explanation on how the theory determines or influences the recommendation for action. | Personal response to case study includes if you agree or disagree and a detailed explanation that shows a deep understanding of the subject including how the theory determines or influences the recommendation for action. |  |
| **20.0 %Organization and Effectiveness** |  | | | | | |
| **7.0 %Thesis Development and Purpose** | Paper lacks any discernible overall purpose or organizing claim. | Thesis and/or main claim are insufficiently developed and/or vague; purpose is not clear. | Thesis and/or main claim are apparent and appropriate to purpose. | Thesis and/or main claim are clear and forecast the development of the paper. It is descriptive and reflective of the arguments and appropriate to the purpose. | Thesis and/or main claim are comprehensive. The essence of the paper is contained within the thesis. Thesis statement makes the purpose of the paper clear. |  |
| **8.0 %Argument Logic and Construction** | Statement of purpose is not justified by the conclusion. The conclusion does not support the claim made. Argument is incoherent and uses noncredible sources. | Sufficient justification of claims is lacking. Argument lacks consistent unity. There are obvious flaws in the logic. Some sources have questionable credibility. | Argument is orderly, but may have a few inconsistencies. The argument presents minimal justification of claims. Argument logically, but not thoroughly, supports the purpose. Sources used are credible. Introduction and conclusion bracket the thesis. | Argument shows logical progression. Techniques of argumentation are evident. There is a smooth progression of claims from introduction to conclusion. Most sources are authoritative. | Clear and convincing argument presents a persuasive claim in a distinctive and compelling manner. All sources are authoritative. |  |
| **5.0 %Mechanics of Writing (includes spelling, punctuation, grammar, language use)** | Surface errors are pervasive enough that they impede communication of meaning. Inappropriate word choice and/or sentence construction are used. | Frequent and repetitive mechanical errors distract the reader. Inconsistencies in language choice (register) and/or word choice are present. Sentence structure is correct but not varied. | Some mechanical errors or typos are present, but are not overly distracting to the reader. Correct and varied sentence structure and audience-appropriate language are employed. | Prose is largely free of mechanical errors, although a few may be present. The writer uses a variety of effective sentence structures and figures of speech. | Writer is clearly in command of standard, written, academic English. |  |
| **10.0 %Format** |  | | | | | |
| **5.0 %Paper Format (use of appropriate style for the major and assignment)** | Template is not used appropriately, or documentation format is rarely followed correctly. | Appropriate template is used, but some elements are missing or mistaken. A lack of control with formatting is apparent. | Appropriate template is used. Formatting is correct, although some minor errors may be present. | Appropriate template is fully used. There are virtually no errors in formatting style. | All format elements are correct. |  |
| **5.0 %Documentation of Sources (citations, footnotes, references, bibliography, etc., as appropriate to assignment and style)** | Sources are not documented. | Documentation of sources is inconsistent or incorrect, as appropriate to assignment and style, with numerous formatting errors. | Sources are documented, as appropriate to assignment and style, although some formatting errors may be present. | Sources are documented, as appropriate to assignment and style, and format is mostly correct. | Sources are completely and correctly documented, as appropriate to assignment and style, and format is free of error. |  |
| **100 %Total Weightage** |  | | | | |  |