

Ethics Final Paper: Full-term project with four milestone assignments

You will choose from the list of ethics topics listed below and write an analytic paper. In your paper, you will assess ethical concerns and constraints of the situation as well as evaluate ethical options for resolving it using the Baird's *EG Conversations Starters Worksheet* (EthicsGame, 2019) linked in the course room) for your paper's framework. You must independently research your information on your topic. **All information must come from publicly available, credible sources** (this means nothing from Wikipedia, but you are expected to use trustworthy online and print news sources such as PBS.org (online) or *Washington Post* (print or online) as well as scholarly journals from the Manderino Library and reliable periodicals such as *Forbes* or *Harvard Business Review*). This paper ties together many of the themes you have encountered throughout the course. You will work with others in the class as you peer-review papers.

Choose ONE topic for your paper:

Which small part of one of the [five "courses" for feeding the world](#) while preventing global temperature rise (Searchinger, Waite, Hanson, & Ranganathan, 2018, December) so you want to focus on for your final project? Which sector interests you (e.g., processed foods, consumer education, agriculture, etc.)? Once you've chosen your sector, you'll narrow your choice further. For examples, the report recommends genetically modified foods and farmed fish. There are lots of ethical issues. For example, even if these foods are safe, are they equally nutritious? What are the long-term concerns about biodiversity? Have fun with this! It may change your habits for life!

This project has the following required components:

1. **Milestone 1:** Choose one of the above situations and tell why you've chosen it.
 - a. Independently research your situations throughout the term.
2. Create an annotated bibliography for your project
 - a. **Milestone 2:** Submit your annotated bibliography for a grade
3. Draft your final paper
 - a. **Milestone 3:** Peer review the final paper of a classmate
 - b. **Milestone 4:** Submit your revised and edited paper for a grade

This project directly assesses elements of the following program-level goals and objectives and course-level objectives (CLO)

UCC Syllabus Objectives	BUS745
Apply general ethical principles to particular cases or practices in business (UCC4)	CLO3: Apply a structured ethical decision-making process to problems across business disciplines in order to analyze complex situations and suggest responsible actions.

<p>Critically evaluate the morality of the American free-enterprise system (UCC4) Critically evaluate the comparative morality of various different types of economic systems (UCC5) Evaluate the ethical issues due to rapid changes in the business world, including information technology and environmental degradation (UCC9)</p>	<p>CLO5: Evaluate ethical considerations and potential solutions as U.S. business and businesses in other economic systems confront and respond to growing global problems associated with information technology and environmental degradation.</p>
--	--

Milestone 1: Select your area of focus and conduct initial research

Select your area of focus from Searchinger et al. (2018, December):

- Selection of topic ([see 5 options for feeding the world](#))
- Brief description of why you find ethical tension in the topic
- References for your initial findings.

After you make your choice, you may begin your research in earnest.

Independent Research

Throughout the term, you will be prompted to apply what you are learning to your final paper. While this is a large project, if you work a little each week, you will find that the project nearly completes itself. Make and commit to research excellence!

Milestone 2: Structure an annotated bibliography

For your final paper, you will need references in addition to company websites and readings assigned for the course. This milestone activity will help focus your attention toward useful, reliable materials. Annotated bibliographies help writers evaluate their sources and consolidate their ideas prior to drafting research papers. For each entry, provide a properly APA-formatted reference followed by a two-part annotation of 75-100 words or slightly more: **summarizing the source material and describing how the source is relevant to your topic.** In the course room, you will find examples and instructions.

Please read these instructions in their entirety before beginning this project and review the annotated bibliography tutorial in the course room.

This milestone assignment assesses elements of the following course-level objectives (CLO)

UCC Syllabus Objectives	BUS745
<p>Critically evaluate the morality of the American free-enterprise system (UCC4) Critically evaluate the comparative morality of various different types of economic systems (UCC5)</p>	<p>CLO5: Evaluate ethical considerations and potential solutions as U.S. business and businesses in other economic systems confront and respond to growing global problems associated with information technology and</p>

UCC Syllabus Objectives	BUS745
Evaluate the ethical issues due to rapid changes in the business world, including information technology and environmental degradation (UCC9)	environmental degradation.

Required Elements

For this assignment find and analyze **five** potential references, including at least

- *one* (1) scholarly/peer reviewed article that is retrieved from the *Manderino Library*,
- *one* (1) professional journal or magazine (either through Google Scholar or the Library),
- *one* (1) newspaper report (credible newspaper print or online), must be news, *not* op-ed or opinion and
- *one* (1) online news sources, and
- *one* (1) other source of your choosing that is appropriate for your paper (remember, *Wikipedia is not acceptable*)

This assignment will help you gather appropriate information for your paper as well as encourage you to put your references in proper APA format. You may **NOT** include materials assigned in the course. Each annotation will be graded on its relevance, the summative content, and adherence to meeting APA format. If you have questions after reviewing the tutorial in the course room, please work with the Writing Center or the Manderino Library librarians.

Your annotated bibliography will be scored against this rubric

Ethics Paper Annotated Bibliography Rubric

Element	Excellent 100%	Good 85%	Basic 75%	Rudimentary 65%	Unacceptable 0%
CLO5a Scholarly 5%	Scholarly/peer-reviewed source from Manderino Library that fully meets stated source criteria and is of excellent quality.	Scholarly/peer-reviewed source from Manderino Library that fully meets stated source criteria and is of good quality.	Scholarly/peer-reviewed source from Manderino Library that fully meets stated source criteria and is of adequate quality.	Scholarly/peer-reviewed source from Manderino Library that may not fully meet stated source criteria.	Source mistaken for a scholarly one or missing.
CLO5b Professional 5%	Professional journal or magazine that fully meets stated source criteria and is of excellent quality.	Professional journal or magazine which fully meets stated source criteria and is of good quality	Professional journal or magazine which fully meets stated source criteria and is of adequate quality.	Professional journal or magazine that may not fully meet stated source criteria.	Source mistaken for a professional one or missing.
CLO5c Newspaper 5%	Newspaper report that fully meets stated source criteria and is of excellent quality.	Newspaper report that fully meets stated source criteria and is of good quality.	Newspaper report that fully meets stated source criteria and is of adequate quality.	Newspaper report that may not fully meet stated source criteria (such as op-ed).	Source mistaken for a newspaper report (such as opinion) or missing.
CLO5d News	Other credible news source	Other credible news source	Other credible news source	Other credible news	Source mistaken for a

Element	Excellent 100%	Good 85%	Basic 75%	Rudimentary 65%	Unacceptable 0%
other 5%	that fully meets stated source criteria and is of excellent quality.	that fully meets stated source criteria and is of good quality.	that fully meets stated source criteria and is of adequate quality.	source that may not fully meet stated source criteria.	credible news source or missing.
PCLO5e Online other 5%	Other credible online source that fully meets stated source criteria and is of excellent quality.	Other credible online source that fully meets stated source criteria and is of good quality.	Other credible online source that fully meets stated source criteria and is of adequate quality.	Other credible online source that may not fully meet stated source criteria.	Source mistaken for a credible online source or missing.
Summary 25%	Succinctly and accurately summarizes.	Accurately summarizes.	Cursory summary.	Regurgitates article abstract.	No substantive summarization.
Relevance 15%	Describes how sources are appropriate to topic.	Describes how sources are related to topic.	Describes how most sources are related to the topic.	Many sources not appropriate to topic.	Relevance not demonstrated.
Mechanics 10%	About 75-100 words or slightly more or less each and written well.	About 75 words each and written well.	About 50 words each (or more than 150 words) and written competently.	Fewer than 50 words (or more than 150 words) and may not be written well	Far too short or too long. Written poorly.
APA style 25%	Proper APA style used.	APA properly used in most areas—all mistakes minor.	APA style inconsistent, but clear attempt made.	Non-APA style applied (e.g., MLA) and/or many APA errors	No style applied.

Milestone 3: Draft your paper and participate in peer review

Reviewing the written work of others is a common managerial function. Like any skill, the ability to review the work of others grows with practice. Peer review of articles provides practice for this often-dreaded managerial task. Your job is to provide helpful feedback on your peer’s draft. You should point to areas of strength as well as weakness. You are not expected to edit the document; rather, you are to provide comments based on the Peer Review Guide. To successfully review the draft of a peer, follow these steps:

1. Open the draft of the peer whom you have been assigned, and then download that person’s case paper. Read the case paper carefully so that you can make a judgment on the review and the extent to which it meets the criteria of the final case project.
2. Follow the rubric for the assignment (below). Use Word’s commenting and track changes features to place comments directly on the draft itself. Remember to copy/paste your completed Peer Review Guide as the final page of the reviewed document.
3. Save the reviewed document and post it the course room. Once your own paper has been reviewed and the instructor has provided feedback on the simulation performance, you can begin editing your paper for submission.

Note: You may work with the writing center on your paper and on your peer review. **Working with the Writing Center is OPTIONAL in this assignment.**

Ethics Peer Review Guide (Attach as part of your review)

Name of peer being reviewed:

Your name:

Other thoughtful comments:

Element See Project Rubric for Criteria	Overall Assessment (Excellent, Good, Basic, Poor, Unacceptable)	Thoughtful Comments to Encourage Better Writing Include strengths as well as weaknesses
Framework		
Summaries		
Analyses		
Diagnoses		
Learning		
Conclusions		
Additional sources		
Mechanics/ Citations		

Peer Reviewer Rubric

You will be scored against this rubric

Element	Excellent 100%	Good 85%	Basic 75%	Rudimentary 65%	Unacceptable 0%
Comments 75%	Thoughtful, respectful, insightful comments that include all elements of the review guide and gently encourage your peer to improve writing.	Respectful, insightful comments that include all elements of the review guide and gently encourage your peer to improve writing.	Respectful comments that include all elements of the review guide, but lack insight into gently encouraging better writing.	Respectful comments that include some elements of the review guide, but lack insight into gently encouraging better writing.	Unhelpful, not supportive, or not substantive.
On time 25%	Peer review is posted by midnight on the day specified.	Peer review is posted by 8am on the morning after the deadline.	Peer review is posted by noon on the morning after the deadline.	Draft submitted after noon on the morning after the deadline.	Draft excessively late or not submitted

Milestone 4: Revise and submit your Final Ethics Paper

You will chose from the list of “feeding the world” ethics topics listed on page 1 and write an analytic paper. In your paper, you will assess ethical concerns and constraints of the situation as well as evaluate ethical options for resolving it using the Baird’s *EG Conversations Starters Worksheet* (EthicsGame, 2019) linked in the course room) for your paper’s framework. You must independently research your information on your topic. **All information must come from publicly available, credible sources** (this means nothing from Wikipedia, but you are expected to use trustworthy online and print news sources such as PBS.org (online) or *Washington Post* (print or online) as well as scholarly journals from the Manderino Library and reliable periodicals such as *Forbes* or *Harvard Business Review*). This paper ties together many of the themes you have encountered throughout the course.

Late papers will not be accepted unless you obtain prior approval from the instructor.

Papers should use no larger than 1” margins, Times New Roman 12 font, be double-spaced, at least 10 pages long excluding title, contents, or reference pages (excellent papers likely will be longer), and be in Word-compatible format (Turnitin doesn’t accept .pages). **You must support your work with facts from credible source including scholarly and professional literature and news courses using a minimum of 12 references, at least 8 of which come from your independent research and 4 of which come from course materials.** The citations and references should follow the APA format. Late papers will not be accepted unless you obtain prior approval from the instructor.

The paper has 5 major components following the Baird Model.

Please use Baird's EG Conversation Starters Worksheet (EthicsGame, 2019).

Remember that your paper needs to have a title page and a reference page.

1. Frame the ethical issue
 - a. CLO5 Describe the context of the issue and how you are going to approach it. This includes your introduction and thesis statement. Remember that the thesis must presage your conclusions, so you will need to write or adjust your thesis statement at the end of your writing process.
 - b. CLO5 Present the facts of the situation (citations required) and the assumptions you are making. It's very important to distinguish between facts and assumptions.
 - c. CLO3 What values are revealed in your exploration of facts and assumptions? How do these values compete (Baird calls this "values in tension")?
2. Isolate ethical players and explain their perspectives
 - a. CLO3 Stakeholder analysis
 - i. Who are the stakeholders and what are their concerns? You will need to do research and cite your sources to identify issues beyond the general and obvious ones.
 - ii. Who is the decision maker? (This could be a legislative body or city council rather than an individual. There may also be several levels, but be realistic in your approach)
 - b. CLO3 What are the limits of ethical action (what is *possible* and what are the limits)? This will require research and you will need to use citations.
3. Analyze ethical options using Baird's Four Lenses. *Baird's Conversation Starters Worksheet* provides details on how to do this.
 - a. CLO3 Issues and best options through the responsibilities lens (deontology)
 - b. CLO3 Issues and best options through the relationship lens (justice theories)
 - c. CLO3 Issues and best options through the results lens (consequentialism)
 - d. CLO3 Issues and best options through the reputations lens (virtue ethics)
4. Determine ethical course of action
 - a. CLO5 Based on your analysis through Baird's Four Lenses, craft an ethical course of action and defend why you have chosen this course of action (why is it better than others? What are its limitations?)
 - b. CLO5 How does your course of action correct for bias? What objections might others have to this decision?
 - c. CLO5 What should be communicated to the decision maker? How does this differ from communications to other stakeholders?
5. Integrate and reflect
 - a. CLO5 Evaluate your decision. What are the likely results? What might be unintended consequences? What remains to be done? What concerns you? What have you learned that will help you make solid ethical decisions in the future?

The following scoring matrix details the expectations for the paper.

Ethics Paper Rubric

This rubric was created using the Association of American Colleges and Universities (AAC&U, 2009) Ethics and Critical Thinking VALUE Rubrics.

Retrieved from <https://www.aacu.org/value-rubrics>

Element	Excellent 100%	Good 85%	Basic 75%	Rudimentary 65%	Unacceptable 0%
Major/concentration (no points)	Management	Integrated Global Business	Business Communications	Other business or economics major	Non-business Major
Minor (no points)	Management	Integrated Global Business	Business Communications	Other business or economics major	Non-business Major
CLO5 Framework 5%	Presents well-developed and well-reasoned framework using the techniques of moral reasoning and argumentation. Thesis is appropriate to the context and tied to the conclusions	Presents reasoned framework; may not fully articulate the techniques of moral reasoning and argumentation. Thesis reasonable and consistent with conclusions.	Outlines framework; may not fully articulate moral reasoning and argumentation. May need more concrete approach. Thesis may not presage conclusions.	Fails to provide viable framework and/or may fail to incorporate thesis.	Superficial reasoning
CLO5 Context 5%	Context reflects nuanced interpretation. Ethical issues presented in a complex, multi-layered way AND interrelationships across issues presented.	Context adequately interpreted. Ethical issues presented in a multi-layered way AND interrelationships across issues acknowledged.	Basic and obvious ethical context outlined. Partial grasp of complexities and interrelationships	Basic and obvious ethical context outlined. Fails to grasp complexities and interrelationships	Superficial explanation
CLO3 Stakeholder analysis 5%	Stakeholders clearly and appropriately identified. Reflects nuanced interpretation. Presented in a complex, multi-layered way AND interrelationships presented.	Stakeholders appropriately identified. Reflects solid understanding presented in a multi-layered way AND interrelationships acknowledged.	Basic and obvious stakeholders outlined. Partial grasp of complexities and interrelationships.	Basic and obvious stakeholders outlined. Fails to grasp complexities. Decision maker may not be appropriate.	Superficial explanation
CLO3 Ethical limits 5%	Ethical limits reflect nuanced interpretation. Ethical issues presented in a complex, multi-layered way AND interrelationships across issues presented.	Ethical limits adequately interpreted. Ethical issues presented in a multi-layered way AND interrelationships across issues acknowledged.	Basic and obvious ethical limits outlined. Partial grasp of complexities and interrelationships	Basic and obvious ethical limits outlined. Fails to grasp complexities and interrelationships	Superficial explanation
CLO3 responsibilities lens (deontology) 10%	Clearly, accurately, and fully analyzes all aspects of the situation through appropriate ethical lens. Gives full, specific consideration of implications	Fully and accurately analyzes all aspects of the situation through appropriate ethical lens. Gives general	Basic ethical analysis of most aspects of the situation through appropriate ethical lens. May not fully consider	Partially or simplistically analyses. May contain substantive errors or misinterpret this ethical	Insufficiently describes or inaccurately analyzes.

Element	Excellent 100%	Good 85%	Basic 75%	Rudimentary 65%	Unacceptable 0%
	and limitations of ethical lens in this context.	consideration of implications and of ethical lens in this context.	implications.	lens in this context.	
CLO3 relationship lens (justice theories) 10%	Clearly, accurately, and fully analyzes all aspects of the situation through appropriate ethical lens. Gives full, specific consideration of implications and limitations of ethical lens in this context.	Fully and accurately analyzes all aspects of the situation through appropriate ethical lens. Gives general consideration of implications and of ethical lens in this context.	Basic ethical analysis of most aspects of the situation through appropriate ethical lens. May not fully consider implications.	Partially or simplistically analyzes. May contain substantive errors or misinterpret this ethical lens in this context.	Insufficiently describes or inaccurately analyzes.
CLO3 results lens (consequentialism) 10%	Clearly, accurately, and fully analyzes all aspects of the situation through appropriate ethical lens. Gives full, specific consideration of implications and limitations of ethical lens in this context.	Fully and accurately analyzes all aspects of the situation through appropriate ethical lens. Gives general consideration of implications and of ethical lens in this context.	Basic ethical analysis of most aspects of the situation through appropriate ethical lens. May not fully consider implications.	Partially or simplistically analyzes. May contain substantive errors or misinterpret this ethical lens in this context.	Insufficiently describes or inaccurately analyzes.
CLO3 reputations lens (virtue ethics) 10%	Clearly, accurately, and fully analyzes all aspects of the situation through appropriate ethical lens. Gives full, specific consideration of implications and limitations of ethical lens in this context.	Fully and accurately analyzes all aspects of the situation through appropriate ethical lens. Gives general consideration of implications and of ethical lens in this context.	Basic ethical analysis of most aspects of the situation through appropriate ethical lens. May not fully consider implications.	Partially or simplistically analyzes. May contain substantive errors or misinterpret this ethical lens in this context.	Insufficiently describes or inaccurately analyzes.
CLO5 Chosen action 5%	Identifies preferred course of action and accurately presents it within the context of all four ethical lenses. Clearly differentiates among ethical theories and how they are used in this solution.	Identifies preferred course of action and presents it within the context of all four ethical lenses. Differentiates somewhat among ethical theories and how they are used in this solution.	Basic discussion of preferred course of action. Attempts to explain how all four ethical lenses were used. May contain minor inaccuracies.	Basic discussion of preferred course of action. May not use all four lenses in explanation. May contain inaccuracies.	Insufficiently describes or inaccurately analyzes.

Element	Excellent 100%	Good 85%	Basic 75%	Rudimentary 65%	Unacceptable 0%
CLO5 Evaluating action 5%	States position and effectively defends it while conveying own assumptions and adequately acknowledging possible objections from other ethical viewpoints.	States position and adequately defends it while conveying own assumptions and outlining possible objections from other ethical viewpoints.	Basic statement of position. Incompletely identifies own assumptions or possible objections from other ethical viewpoints.	Position stated but doesn't identify own assumptions or possible objections from other ethical viewpoints.	Insufficiently evaluates
CLO5 Communicating action 5%	Viewpoint is clearly described to appropriate stakeholder. Displays firm grasp of audience in approach to communication.	Viewpoint is described to appropriate stakeholder. Displays understanding of audience in approach to communication.	Basic viewpoint presented to appropriate stakeholder. May not display solid understanding of audience in this approach to communication	Outlines viewpoint. Stakeholder may be misidentified or communication may not be suitable to audience.	Insufficiently communicated
CLO5 Integration 5%	Thoughtful commentary on own core beliefs and their origin. Clarifies how this project will influence future ethical decision making.	General commentary on own core beliefs and their origin. Discusses how this project will influence future ethical decision making.	Basic comments on own core beliefs and their origin. Mentions how this project will influence future ethical decision making.	Talks about either own core beliefs or mentions how this project will influence future ethical decision making.	Inadequately addresses integration of beliefs
Mechanics 10%	Grammatically correct, fluid and well-written without spelling or typographical errors, and language in keeping with educated usage	Grammatically correct and well-written with few, minor spelling or typographical errors, and language in keeping with educated usage	Written with few, minor grammar or spelling or typographical errors, and language in keeping with educated usage	Errors in grammar, spelling, or language use detract from the product.	Egregious errors in grammar, spelling, or language use. Work may be sloppy in the extreme.
Scholarship 5%	Thoroughly integrates and cites theory from course and supplementary materials. New materials incorporated seamlessly	Adequately integrates and cites theory from course and supplementary materials. New materials are incorporated	Missing substantial integration and citation of theory from course materials. Some new material added.	Little or no integration or citation of theory from course materials or from new materials	Not substantive, missing or unacceptable
APA 5%	APA format correctly applied to overall paper, citations, and references (very few errors—very minor).	APA format applied to overall paper, citations, and references (any errors are small and are not serious).	APA format incorrectly or not applied to overall paper, citations, and references (missing citations or missing references may cause further reduction in the	Some attempt at format other than APA, but full of errors	Citation and reference format not appropriate or missing.

Element	Excellent 100%	Good 85%	Basic 75%	Rudimentary 65%	Unacceptable 0%
			grade).		

References

Association of American Colleges and Universities (AAC&U). (2009). *VALUE rubrics*. Retrieved from <https://www.aacu.org/value-rubrics>

EthicsGame. (2019). *EG conversation starters worksheet*. Retrieved from <https://www.ethicsgame.com>

Searchinger, T., Waite, R., Hanson, C., & Ranganathan, J. (2018, December). *Creating a sustainable food future* [Synthesis report]. Retrieved from https://wrr-food.wri.org/sites/default/files/2019-07/creating-sustainable-food-future_2_5.pdf