

For your second Response Paper, choose one of the following cases listed near the end of the course textbook, *Engineering Ethics: Concepts and Cases*, 4th edition (pages 229–90). Critically analyze the case, determine the potential courses of action, and — most importantly — take a clear and decisive position with respect to what you would do if you were one of the lead characters involved in the case.

- Case 2: Big Dig Collapse
- Case 15: Highway Safety Improvements
- Case 25: Oil Spill?
- Case 27: Pinto
- Case 45: XYZ Hose Co.

As you analyze the case, identify the parties involved, their rights, their responsibilities, and the salient moral issues of the case. Identify the relevant factual issues, conceptual issues, social and legal constraints, and any additional information necessary for an accurate understanding of the case. Then formulate possible courses of action. Evaluate the strengths and weaknesses of these actions, indicating which course of action you would choose, and why.

View your paper as a “position paper.” Although it includes “exposition,” your task is to understand the context, to evaluate the evidence, and then to make a decision concerning the appropriate course of action, which you support through arguments and counter-arguments.

The opening paragraph of your paper should include a *thesis statement* that clearly articulates the position and the course of action you are proposing, along with an *outline* that guides the reader through your paper. Although a case analysis has a distinct narrative structure, the *topic sentence* of each paragraph should nevertheless be integrally related to your opening thesis statement and the structure of analysis outlined in your introduction. Provide clear *transitions* between each paragraph, which will help the reader walk through with you each step of your initial outline.

The goal of your analysis in a case study is to come to a definitive position as to what you would do if you were one of the parties involved in the case you are studying. Support your analysis and the choices you would have made with substantive argumentation and sound reasons, evaluating with discretion alternative courses of action. End your paper with a strong conclusion, recapitulating the evidence in support of the position you have taken.

Your paper must be at least three pages in length. The draft must also be a complete three pages in order to receive full credit. The text should be double-spaced, with one-inch margins. Include a carefully constructed cover page, with your name, the submission date, and a substantive title. Submit your draft along with the final version.

GRADING CRITERIA 22 POINTS

Clarity and Organization

- 3: Overall organization is clear, with thesis statement, outline, and appropriate transitions. Ideas are clear and paragraphs coherent, integrally related to the thesis statement and outline.
- 2: Attention to the principles of cohesion and coherence would strengthen the paper.
- 1: Lack of organizational structure interferes with the clarity of the paper.

Moral Analysis

- 3: Accurately identifies all affected parties, their rights and responsibilities, and identifies the key moral issues in the case.
- 2: Identifies some affected parties, rights, responsibilities, and moral values, but at points may miss some.
- 1: Fails at numerous points to identify affected parties, rights, and responsibilities; misunderstands the moral issues.

Contextual Analysis

- 3: Distinguishes relevant factual and conceptual issues, lists social and legal constraints, and identifies missing information.
- 2: Identifies the most important issues and constraints.
- 1: Misunderstands the context.

Actions

- 3: Creatively proposes several viable courses of action, with supporting argumentation.
- 2: Outlines one or more reasonable courses of action.
- 1: Inadequate application.

Evaluation

- 3: Thoroughly evaluates strengths and weaknesses of actions using appropriate criteria: teleological and deontological tests, related moral principles, line-drawing, analogies, and character qualities. Uses specific, concrete examples.
- 2: Evaluates actions substantively, but may miss major advantages or disadvantages.
- 1: Minimal evaluation.

Sentences and Diction

- 3: Graceful sentences with appropriate variety of structures. Words are chosen precisely. Writing is vigorous and engaging.
- 2: Occasionally awkward or vague. Active verbs are used, with few superfluous or poorly chosen words. Some pronouns without clear referents.
- 1: Several cumbersome and unclear sentences. Wordy, excessive nominalizations, weak verbs.

Mechanics and Grammar

- 3: No significant errors of spelling, grammar, punctuation, or usage.
- 2: Minor errors of mechanics and grammar.
- 1: Numerous errors in grammar and substandard usage.

Format:

- 1: Double-spaced, in 12 point type, with one-inch margins. Three pages minimum in length. Title page with name and submission date. Complete draft submitted on time. Draft included with final version.