	LSU Integrative Learning Core (ILC) **Proficiency: Ethical Reasoning**				
Proficiency Dimensions	**Core Assessment** (performance indicators are based on the rigor of the discipline)				**Graduating Assessment**
Description	Four levels of performance intended for 1000 and 2000 level courses approved as ILC courses. The 'meeting' level of performance is LSU benchmark for the ILC curriculum.				The capstone level of performance is LSU benchmark for graduating seniors.
	NOT APPROACHING 0	**APPROACHING 1**	**MEETING 2**	**EXCEEDING 3**	**CAPSTONE 4**
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.
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.
Ethical Issue Recognition					Student can recognize ethical issues when presented in a complex, multilayered (gray) context AND can recognize cross-relationships among the issues.
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.
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.

LSU Adapted – AAC&U Ethical Reasoning VALUE Rubric

Definition
Ethical Reasoning is reasoning about right and wrong human conduct. It requires students to be able to 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. Students' ethical self-identity evolves as they practice ethical decision-making skills and learn how to describe and analyze positions on ethical issues.

Framing Language
This rubric is intended to help faculty evaluate work samples and collections of work that demonstrate student learning about ethics. Although the goal of a liberal education should be to help students turn what they've learned in the classroom into action, pragmatically it would be difficult, if not impossible, to judge whether or not students would act ethically when faced with real ethical situations. What can be evaluated using a rubric is whether students have the intellectual tools to make ethical choices.

The rubric focuses on five elements: Ethical Self Awareness, Ethical Issue Recognition, Understanding Different Ethical Perspectives/Concepts, Application of Ethical Principles, and Evaluation of Different Ethical Perspectives/Concepts. Students' Ethical Self Identity evolves as they practice ethical decision-making skills and learn how to describe and analyze positions on ethical issues. Presumably, they will choose ethical actions when faced with ethical issues.

Glossary
Core Beliefs: Those fundamental principles that consciously or unconsciously influence one's ethical conduct and ethical thinking. Even when unacknowledged, core beliefs shape one's responses. Core beliefs can reflect one's environment, religion, culture or training. A person may or may not choose to act on their core beliefs.
Service-learning class: A course-based educational experience in which students participate in an organized service activity and reflect on the experience in such a way as to gain further understanding of course content, a broader appreciation of the discipline, and an enhanced sense of personal values and civic responsibility.
Ethical Perspectives/concepts: The different theoretical means through which ethical issues are analyzed, such as ethical theories (e.g., utilitarian, natural law, virtue) or ethical concepts (e.g., rights, justice, duty).
Complex, multi-layered (gray) context: The sub-parts or situational conditions of a scenario that bring two or more ethical dilemmas (issues) into the mix/problem/context/for student's identification.
Cross-relationships among the issues: Obvious or subtle connections between/among the sub-parts or situational conditions of the issues present in a scenario (e.g., relationship of production of corn as part of climate change issue).

Evaluators are encouraged to assign a zero to any work sample or collection of work that does not meet level 1 performance.

	Not Approaching 0	Approaching 1	Meeting 2 (CORE ASSESSMENT BENCHMARK)	Exceeding 3	Capstone 4 (GRADUATING ASSESSMENT BENCHMARK)
Ethical Self-Awareness	Does not meet level 1 achievement target of 'Approaching'.	Student states either their core beliefs or articulates the origins of the core beliefs but not both.	Student states both core beliefs and the origins of the core beliefs.	Student discusses in detail/analyzes both core beliefs and the origins of the core beliefs.	Student discusses in detail/analyzes both core beliefs and the origins of the core beliefs and discussion has greater depth and clarity.
Understanding Different Ethical Perspectives/Concepts	Does not meet level 1 achievement target of 'Approaching'.	Student only names the major theory she/he uses.	Student can name the major theory she/he uses, and is only able to present the gist of the named theory.	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 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.
Ethical Issue Recognition	Does not meet level 1 achievement target of 'Approaching'.	Student can recognize basic and obvious ethical issues but fails to grasp complexity or interrelationships.	Student can recognize basic and obvious ethical issues and grasp (incompletely) the complexities or interrelationships 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 ethical issues when presented in a complex, multilayered (gray) context AND can recognize cross-relationships among the issues.
Application of Ethical Perspectives/Concepts	Does not meet level 1 achievement target of 'Approaching'.	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.).	Student can apply ethical perspectives/concepts to an ethical question, independently (to a new example) and the application is inaccurate.	Student can independently apply ethical perspectives/concepts to an ethical question, accurately, but does not consider the specific implications of the application.	Student can independently apply ethical perspectives/concepts to an ethical question, accurately, and is able to consider full implications of the application.
Evaluation of Different Ethical Perspectives/Concepts	Does not meet level 1 achievement target of 'Approaching'.	Student states a position but cannot state the objections to and assumptions and limitations of the different perspectives/concepts.	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 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 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.

LSU Adapted – AAC&U Ethical Reasoning VALUE Rubric