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**Due Date:** Dec 02, 2015 23:59:59       **Max Points:** 235  
  
**Details:**

Your assignment due at the end of Module 5 was to design a code of ethics. While having a code of ethics is a good thing, it is useless unless it is brought to life in the organization. This assignment gives you the opportunity to devise a plan to implement a code of ethics in an organization.

**General Requirements:**

Use the following information to ensure successful completion of the assignment:

* This assignment uses a grading rubric. Instructors will be using the rubric to grade the assignment; therefore, students should review the rubric prior to beginning the assignment to become familiar with the assignment criteria and expectations for successful completion of the assignment.
* Prepare this assignment according to the APA guidelines found in the APA Style Guide, located in the Student Success Center. An abstract is not required.
* Locate your "Code of Ethics Design Paper" (submitted in Module 5). You will also need the assignment feedback provided by the instructor. Your implementation plan will be written for this code of ethics.

**Directions:**

Make revisions to your code of ethics, as appropriate, based on the feedback received from the instructor.

In a paper of 1,250-1,500 words, create and present an implementation plan for the code of ethics you designed for the "Code of Ethics Design Paper" assignment. Base your plan on the revised version of your code of ethics incorporating the feedback from the instructor. Your plan must include the following:

1. A description of how the code will be connected to other important documents such as the mission/vision statement and other organizational policy statements.
2. A research-supported strategy for launching the code and communicating its implementation to all stakeholders.
3. A research-supported strategy for enforcing the code.
4. A research-supported process for evaluating the code for effectiveness and making revisions to maintain applicability.
5. A discussion that invokes current research and explains why your implementation plan will succeed when many others have failed.
6. An appendix that presents your revised code of ethics from the Module 5 assignment. In keeping with APA style, this appendix is not included in the assignment word count.

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | **1 Unsatisfactory 0.00%** | **2 Less Than Satisfactory 73.00%** | **3 Satisfactory 82.00%** | **4 Good 91.00%** | **5 Excellent 100.00%** |
| **80.0 %Content** |  | | | | | |
| **10.0 %** **Revision of Original Paper** | Revisions were not made to the original paper. | Revisions were made to the original paper, but the revisions did not improve the quality of the paper. | Revisions were made to the original paper, and the revisions minutely improved the quality of the paper. However, not all of the original instructor feedback was addressed. | Revisions were made to the original paper, and the revisions improved the quality of the paper. All of the original instructor feedback was addressed at a cursory level. | Revisions were made to the original paper, and the revisions significantly improved the quality of the paper. All of the original instructor feedback was addressed in depth to create an insightful paper. |  |
| **10.0 %** **Connection to Key Documents** | The connection to key documents is not present. | The connection to key documents is present, but incomplete. | The connection to key documents is present and complete, but is cursory. | The connection to key documents is thorough and clearly presented. Connections are supported with moderate detail. | The connection to key documents is thorough and clearly presented. Connections are supported with rich detail. |  |
| **10.0 %** **Launch and Communication Strategy** | A launch and communication strategy is not present. | A launch and communication strategy is present, but incomplete. No research support is offered. | A launch and communication strategy is present, but the strategy is cursory. Research support is limited and from dated resources. | A launch and communication strategy is thorough and clearly presented. Research support is limited but from current resources. | A launch and communication strategy is thorough and clearly presented. The strategy is well defined and thoughtful. Research support is thorough and from current resources. |  |
| **10.0 %** **Enforcement Strategy** | An enforcement strategy is not present. | An enforcement strategy is present, but incomplete. No research support is offered. | An enforcement strategy is present and includes all components, but discussion is cursory. Research support is limited and from dated resources. | An enforcement strategy is thorough and clearly presented. Research support is limited but from current resources. | An enforcement strategy is thorough and clearly presented. The strategy is well defined and thoughtful. Research support is thorough and from current resources. |  |
| **15.0 %** **Evaluation Process** | An evaluation process is not present. | An evaluation process is present, but incomplete. No research support is offered. | An evaluation process is present and includes all components, but discussion is cursory. Research support is limited and from dated resources. | An evaluation process is thorough and clearly presented. Research support is limited but from current resources. | An evaluation process is thorough and clearly presented. The process is well defined and thoughtful. Research support is thorough and from current resources. |  |
| **15.0 %** **Discussion** | Discussion of why the implementation plan will succeed is not present. | Discussion of why the implementation plan will succeed is present, but incomplete. | Discussion of why the implementation plan will succeed is present and complete, but is cursory. Little or antiquated research is cited in support. | Discussion of why the implementation plan will succeed is thorough and clearly presented. Research is cited in support of the plan, but some sources are outdated. | Discussion of why the implementation plan will succeed is thorough, clear, and detailed. Adequate current research is cited in support of the plan. |  |
| **10.0 %** **Synthesis and Argument** | No synthesis of source information is evident. Statement of purpose is not followed to a justifiable conclusion. The conclusion does not support the claim made. Argument is incoherent and uses non-credible sources. | Synthesis of source information is attempted, but is not successful. Sufficient justification of claims is lacking. Argument lacks consistent unity. There are obvious flaws in the logic. Some sources have questionable credibility. | Synthesis of source information is present, but pedantic. 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. | Synthesis of source information is present and meaningful. Argument shows logical progressions. Techniques of argumentation are evident. There is a smooth progression of claims from introduction to conclusion. Most sources are authoritative. | Synthesis of source information is present and scholarly. Argument is clear and convincing presenting a persuasive claim in a distinctive and compelling manner. All sources are authoritative. |  |
| **15.0 %Organization and Effectiveness** |  | | | | | |
| **10.0 %** **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. They are 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. |  |
| **5.0 %** **Mechanics of Writing** | Mechanical 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), sentence structure, and/or word choice are present. | Some mechanical errors or typos are present, but are not overly distracting to the reader. Correct sentence structure and audience-appropriate language are used. | Prose is largely free of mechanical errors, although a few may be present. A variety of sentence structures and effective figures of speech are used. | Writer is clearly in command of standard, written, academic English. |  |
| **5.0 %Format** |  | | | | | |
| **5.0 %** **APA Format** | Required format is rarely followed correctly. No reference page is included. No in-text citations are used. | Required format elements are missing or incorrect. A lack of control with formatting is apparent. Reference page is present. However, in-text citations are inconsistently used. | Required format is generally correct. However, errors are present (e.g. font, cover page, margins, and in-text citations). Reference page is included and lists sources used in the paper. Sources are appropriately documented though some errors are present. | Required format is used, but minor errors are present (e.g. headings and direct quotes). Reference page is present and includes all cited sources. Documentation is appropriate and citation style is usually correct. | The document is correctly formatted. In-text citations and a reference page are complete and correct. The documentation of cited sources is free of error. |  |
| **100 %** **Total Weightage** |  | | | | |  |