

Teaching Dossier

Trystan S. Goetze

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Teaching Statement.....	2
Diversity Statement.....	3
Student Ratings of Instruction (Summary)	4
Harvard University	4
Embedded EthiCS Module for CS 153 Compilers (Face-To-Face Instruction)	4
Dalhousie University	5
PHIL 2490 & CSCI 3101 Social, Ethical and Professional Issues in Computer Science, Fall 2020 (sole instructor, online, asynchronous)	5
PHIL 2490 & CSCI 3101 Social, Ethical and Professional Issues in Computer Science, Winter 2020 (sole instructor, face-to-face).....	7
University of Sheffield.....	8
PHI 125 Matters of Life and Death (co-lecturer).....	8
Sample Syllabus: PHIL 2490 & CSCI 3101 Social, Ethical, and Professional Issues in Computer Science (online, asynchronous, taught Fall 2020)	9
Sample Course Outlines.....	24
Lower Division – Computing and Society in History	24
Lower Division – Imagining Artificial Intelligence and Robotics	28
Lower Division – Introduction to Moral Philosophy.....	32
Lower Division – Feminist Philosophy	35
Lower Division – Biomedical Ethics	37
Upper Division – Social Epistemology.....	40
Upper Division – Privacy: Fundamental Right or Outmoded Ideal?.....	43
Upper Division / Graduate Seminar – Epistemic Injustice	46
Professional Accreditation (Higher Education Academy).....	49

Additional information about my teaching, including a sample lecture,
is available on my website:

<http://www.trystangoetze.ca/teaching/>

Teaching Statement

My general aims as an instructor are to improve my students' abilities to engage critically yet charitably with philosophical arguments and views, to improve their writing skills, and to enable them to make meaningful connections between philosophy and their personal lives.

In order to facilitate high-level discussion of course material in my Winter 2020 computer ethics class, I employed a method called Team Based Learning (TBL). This approach enables students in large classes—even in traditional lecture halls with fixed seating—to gain the benefits of a seminar-style classroom.¹ In a TBL classroom, students are assigned to permanent teams on the basis of their key skills. In their teams, students collaborate on reading quizzes and complete application exercises on realistic case studies. For example, in a unit on the philosophy of privacy, one application exercise asked, “Would it be unethical for a university to require its students to use attendance-tracking apps?” In whole class discussion, students then defend their answers to each other. I facilitated these activities with the help of instructional technology, particularly the Top Hat classroom response app. In course evaluations, students overwhelmingly indicated that these activities were enjoyable and contributed to their understanding of the course material. One student remarked: “The team-based learning was unique and I had never experienced a method like that in a university course before. Being in a team helped my understanding of the course material because everyone could share their ideas and opinions.”

In Fall 2020, I taught computer ethics again, this time completely online due to COVID-19 restrictions. I developed a new reading list to eliminate the need for textbooks, incorporating more recent material on professional ethical failures in computer ethics (such as the Cambridge Analytica scandal, the Boeing 737 MAX disasters, and predictive policing). I also added work on racial and gender bias in computer systems, particularly artificial intelligence systems, from important contemporary researchers such as Ruha Benjamin and Safiya Noble. Students responded highly positively to the course; in course evaluations, one student wrote, “Despite the pandemic, I was able to have meaningful discussions with my group, and I felt that my time was respected with the way that the course handled attendance and assignments... Overall the entire course was a joy to take and has been one of the best structured courses I've taken both during online-only sessions and outside of them.” In an optional reflection exercise at the end of the course, multiple students commented that the online group activities had a positive impact on their understanding of the material and development of their writing skills. Students also noted that they were now much more aware of the ways in which technology is not value-neutral, and how artificial intelligence systems in particular can be biased, noting that they would remember this in their professional careers. This course was later featured on the Blog of the APA.²

I am constantly improving my pedagogical practice by trying new techniques. Something I am excited to try in a future course is to use tabletop roleplaying games, such as *Dungeons & Dragons*, as an instructional tool. Initial experiments by philosophers such as Rebecca Scott have shown that the imaginative free play of such games is an exciting way to challenge students to engage with ethical issues through interactive thought experiments.³ As an indie game designer myself, I am thinking about how to teach AI ethics tools through gamified roleplaying scenarios.

In sum, my teaching is engaging, multimodal, and effective in meeting pedagogical goals.

¹ L. Michaelson, A. Bauman-Knight, and D. Fink, *Team-Based Learning*, Sterling, VA: Stylus (2003); K. van Orman, “Teaching philosophy with team-based learning,” *AAPT Studies in Pedagogy* 1 (2015): 61–81.

² T. Goetze, “Syllabus Showcase: Social, Ethical, and Professional Issues in Computer Science,” Blog of the APA (18 Aug 2021), <https://blog.apaonline.org/2021/08/18/syllabus-showcase-social-ethical-and-professional-issues-in-computer-science-trystan-goetze/>

³ R. Scott, “Why I Use Dungeons & Dragons to Teach Ethics,” *Aesthetics for Birds*, 3 Aug 2020, <https://aestheticsforbirds.com/2020/08/03/why-i-use-dnd-to-teach-ethics/>

Diversity Statement

My research, service, and teaching reflect my commitment to diversity and inclusion, which have renewed importance to me since I came to identify as genderqueer.

When co-organizing the 2017 Departmental Conference of the Royal Institute of Philosophy, I closely followed the [BPA/SWIP-UK Good Practice Scheme](#) for improving the representation of women and other minoritized groups in philosophy. My collaborators and I employed a double-blind review of submissions, and, with the help of an assistant, we checked the blinded shortlist (in aggregate) for signs of demographic bias. We also imposed a set of policies designed to facilitate the participation of all in the Q&A sessions. Written feedback solicited from participants showed that we were successful in hosting an accessible event in which all felt comfortable participating, with particular praise for the chairing of Q&A sessions. I continue to follow and advocate for such best practices when organizing professional events.

As an international student at Sheffield, I quickly came to understand the importance of support for students from other countries. From 2015–17, I was co-chair of the Philosophy International Students' Society committee. My leadership led to an increase in the number and variety of social and cultural events for international postgraduates in the department, including pub nights, coffee mornings, field trips, and an annual welcome dinner. We also organized presentation workshops for students whose first language was not English; a first-year Ph.D. student from Mexico found this highly valuable in preparing her first talk at the research seminar. Altogether, the Society's activities created a strong support community for students far from home. As I would again be an international member of the department community, I would be pleased to work with students to adapt this model to your department.

Showing students early on that philosophy is a diverse discipline aids those from underrepresented groups to become confident in their abilities and comfortable identifying with philosophy as a pursuit. Accordingly, I consciously choose selections from philosophers belonging to minoritized groups, including historically overlooked figures. For example, when I taught computer ethics at Dalhousie University, I included recent material on bias in computer systems, such as work by Helen Nissenbaum and Batya Friedman on how computer systems can be biased, Safiya Noble's recent study of racist and sexist biases that exist in Google Search, and Ruha Benjamin's concept of the "New Jim Code." In recognition of the need for reconciliation and decolonization in philosophy, I have set aside three classes for discussing First Nations ethical systems in my introduction to moral philosophy course outline. The readings currently listed in that unit are tentative; the actual schedule would be developed in consultation with local knowledge keepers. My hope is that at least one of the sessions would be led by a local elder.

When I switched to teaching online during the pandemic, meeting the accessibility needs of all my students during an extraordinarily difficult semester was top-of-mind for me. To avoid privacy issues and concerns about the reliability of the technology, I did not use any online proctoring for quizzes – and saw no evidence of cheating. I made no synchronous sessions mandatory, allowed students to determine the timing of these sessions to accommodate time zones (some students were tuning in from India and China), and uploaded recordings and slides for all lectures. Participation in synchronous sessions did not require the use of a webcam or microphone, to recognize accessibility needs and divides in access to the needed technology. I was also generous in offering accommodations for individual assignments, and adjusted the schedule of assignments in consultation with the students to reduce the feeling of overwork.

In sum, my past, present, and planned professional activities demonstrate a consistent commitment to diversity in all aspects of my work as a philosopher.

Student Ratings of Instruction (Summary)

The following summarizes the results of student evaluations of my courses and teaching as co- or sole instructor. Complete datasets and comments are available on request.

Harvard University

EMBEDDED ETHICS MODULE FOR CS 153 COMPILERS (FACE-TO-FACE INSTRUCTION)

Student comments are unedited and complete.

1. What was one concept from the class that you found particularly helpful for thinking about the ethical issues we discussed (if any)?

- Movement of open software
- I like the discussion of Free vs Open Source vs Proprietary
- Navigating copyright licenses
- The difference between different sorts of software usage licenses
- I like the discussion of Free vs Open Source vs Proprietary

2. What was one concept from the class that you found particularly confusing (if any)?

- Na
- Still not sure whether included libraries (of code when linked) compel the compiled product to use those same licenses.

3. My module instructor helped me grow in my understanding of the ethical issue we discussed.

1. Strongly disagree: 0%
2. Moderately disagree: 0%
3. Slightly disagree: 0%
4. Neither agree nor disagree: 0%
5. Slightly agree: 27%
6. Moderately agree: 55%
7. Strongly agree: 18%

Mean: 6 / 7

4. What was one strength of your module instructor?

- Great speaker, inclusive, warm
- I think they taught at a good pace and made the concepts clear.
- Really great in terms of relevance, and the case was intriguing!
- very clear and practical, the IP cheatsheet was super helpful
- Strong communication skills and was empathetic

5. What was one thing your module instructor could have done better?

- n/a

6. Any other thoughts or feedback?

- I found the discussion of different types of licensing schemes (like golang) to be very interesting and wish this could have been talked about more.
- One of the better ethiCS modules I've attended. Rivalled only by 2019 CS61 unicode lecture.

Dalhousie University

PHIL 2490 & CSCI 3101 SOCIAL, ETHICAL AND PROFESSIONAL ISSUES IN COMPUTER SCIENCE, FALL 2020 (SOLE INSTRUCTOR, ONLINE, ASYNCHRONOUS)

Question (5-point scale)	Instructor Mean	Department Mean (Computer Science)	Department Mean (Philosophy)
The instructor conducted the class / clinical in such a way that I was stimulated to learn.	4.51	3.95	3.99
The instructor organized the class well.	4.60	4.11	4.28
The instructor communicated clearly during the class.	4.67	4.20	4.25
The instructor showed enthusiasm for the subject matter of the class.	4.62	4.29	4.44
The instructor used fair evaluation methods to determine grades.	4.47	4.17	4.02
The instructor provided constructive feedback (considering the class size).	4.32	4.07	4.06
The instructor showed genuine concern for my learning.	4.53	4.11	4.12
Overall, the instructor was an effective teacher.	4.58	4.10	4.19
<i>Overall averages:</i>	4.54	4.13	4.17

Selection of substantive student comments (slightly edited for clarity, all edits noted with square brackets; a complete, unedited set of comments is available on request):

1. What are one to three specific things about the course, or the instructor's approach, that especially helped to support your learning?
 - I appreciated the general delivery of the course, which was not only very accessible (webcam/microphone usage was not forced or required, time zone differences were taken into account, notes were posted in PowerPoints alongside the lecture videos, etc.) and the instructor was approachable and easy to contact when there were questions about the assignment material. The essay instructions were always very clear and easy to understand, students were generally given a choice of topics to write about rather than just one topic, and the topics were always current and interesting (for instance, there was a choice to write about the Boeing Scandal). Lectures were always easy to hear, and allowed that students could either take their own written notes by hand or just follow along with the pre-provided lecture slides.

- Trystan was a very engaging professor making all of his videos actually worthwhile to watch. He provided so many resources for students from extra reading to writing strategies, and was also very accommodating when it came to students who were overwhelmed with deadlines.
- The entire course was incredibly well structured and there were very few surprises in terms of course work. Despite the pandemic, I was able to have meaningful discussions with my group, and I felt that my time was respected with the way that the course handled attendance and assignments. This isn't to say that the course was rigid to a fault, either. Early on there was a major schedule shift for group work due dates that was incredibly necessary to accommodate group meeting times. This was implemented quickly and with little issue. Overall the entire course was a joy to take and has been one of the best structured courses I've taken both during online-only sessions and outside of them.

2. What are one to three specific things about the course, or the instructor's approach, that could be changed to better support your learning?

- I think if he can have synchron[ous] lectures, it will help a lot.
- I found everything in this class helpful. The only thing that I would change is the amount of group work every two weeks. I did not always have group members that participated so sometimes it was a bit much, but they were helpful for learning.
- Smaller tutorial like sessions [should be added] to go over class contents and ensure understanding.
- Give more feedback on the assignments. On the essay assignments, only the rubric was used for feedback. It would be helpful if the markers also made comments about the essay.

3. Are there distinctive qualities of the instructor's teaching that you would like to highlight that have helped improve your learning experience in this course?

- He is very responsible. Every time I reach out to him for essay suggestions, he reviews my essays and writes lots of inspiring questions for me to think of. My writing improved a lot.
- He seemed like he enjoyed his job. This is such an important trait for an instructor to have, and it showed in his teachings and knowledge of the subject matter. He said "we love reading your essays" which is the first time I've heard a professor say that. It really meant a lot to me because most professors make jokes about how much they hate grading work.
- I really like how you choose to reflect on the course while you were walking outside. It really was quite different and refreshing means of delivering your reflection to students in the course.
- Every lecture was a joy to listen to. The instructor spoke clearly and engagingly and made every unit's series of lectures a joy to watch. This being said, it must also be noted that the structure of the course into bi-weekly units that were easy to digest made learning and participating easier than any other course I've taken.

**PHIL 2490 & CSCI 3101 SOCIAL, ETHICAL AND PROFESSIONAL ISSUES IN
COMPUTER SCIENCE, WINTER 2020 (SOLE INSTRUCTOR, FACE-TO-FACE)**

Question (5-point scale)	Instructor Mean	Department Mean (Computer Science)	Department Mean (Philosophy)
The instructor conducted the class / clinical in such a way that I was stimulated to learn.	4.20	4.14	3.92
The instructor organized the class well.	4.08	4.03	4.22
The instructor communicated clearly during the class.	4.28	4.07	4.30
The instructor showed enthusiasm for the subject matter of the class.	4.33	4.32	4.70
The instructor used fair evaluation methods to determine grades.	4.16	4.12	4.29
The instructor provided constructive feedback (considering the class size).	4.04	4.02	4.18
The instructor showed genuine concern for my learning.	4.20	4.00	4.30
The team exercises helped me engage with and understand the course material.	4.04	N/A	N/A
Overall, the instructor was an effective teacher.	4.32	4.02	4.36
<i>Overall averages:</i>	4.20	4.07	4.31

Selection of substantive student comments (slightly edited for clarity, all edits noted with square brackets; a complete, unedited set of comments is available on request):

1. What did your instructor do that helped your learning in this course or clinical setting?

- I really liked the team-based approach taken for ethics. I was very hesitant at first because I thought I might get put in a weaker group, but everything turned out okay. The lectures were well-prepared and presented. In light of the COVID-19 situation, I feel that the actions taken were very fair and well-justified.
- The team-based learning was unique and I had never experienced a method like that in a university course before. Being in a team helped my understanding of the course material because everyone could share their ideas and opinions. He also had informative slides and gave good details.
- I thought Dr. Goetze did a tremendous job considering it was his first teaching opportunity. He always came prepared and you could tell he put in a lot of work in his presentations and tophat activities. He is very tech savvy and knows his stuff!

2. Do you have any suggestions for what the instructor could have done differently to further assist you in your learning?

- While I did enjoy the team activities and thought it helped people engage with one another and the material, I may suggest making it worth a bit more so that people are held

accountable to their share of work. The questions and analysis questions can be a lot of work at times which I feel should maybe have some more weight behind them. Other than that, I think it is fair to have the essays and exam worth the most!

- My only complaint is that some of the readings (usually the first of each unit) seemed quite lengthy, with certain parts of them feeling useless when it came to the in-class activities. Other than that, the variety of things to read was great.

3. Additional comments:

- He was very supportive when all this COVID-19 things came up. I think he showed real concern and made good choices to help us accommodate for it.

University of Sheffield

PHI 125 MATTERS OF LIFE AND DEATH (CO-LECTURER)

Note: These questions were solicited by me for training purposes and have no comparison data.

Question (5-point scale)	Mean
The material was clearly presented in the lectures.	4.7
The material was presented in an organized way in the lectures.	4.6
The instructor delivered the lectures well (eye contact, vocal tone, enthusiasm).	4.7
The material was interesting and useful to me.	4.8
The instructor managed classroom time effectively.	4.7
The instructor encouraged student participation.	4.5
The instructor created an environment that was conducive to learning.	4.7
The instructor respected me and my opinions.	4.7
Overall rating of the instructor.	4.7

Selection of substantive student comments (complete comments available upon request):

- Engaging, humorous, and all together a fantastic lecturer. I look forward to interacting with you again in the future, should the opportunity arise!
- Trystan was a fantastic lecturer, I was beyond impressed by his performance. He was funny, enthusiastic and made incredibly dense and difficult content accessible, clear and interesting. I wish him all the best.
- I was extremely impressed by the quality of Trystan's lectures, particularly with the way he encouraged discussion.

**Sample Syllabus: PHIL 2490 & CSCI 3101 Social, Ethical, and Professional Issues in
Computer Science (online, asynchronous, taught Fall 2020)**

CLASS MEETINGS

TERM: Fall 2020

LOCATION: Cyberspace

TIME ZONE: Atlantic (UTC-3:00 before 1 Nov, UTC-4:00 after 1 Nov).

MEETINGS: Asynchronous lectures, online discussions, synchronous weekly streams with the instructor (Fridays, time determined by class poll).

FORMAT: Lecture, online discussion, and individual reading/writing.

LEARNING TECHNOLOGY: All course materials will be hosted on **Brightspace**. The weekly streams will be conducted in **Collaborate Ultra**. See below for information about system requirements.

INSTRUCTOR

Dr. Trystan Goetze (he/they/she)

Banting Postdoctoral Fellow Scholar in Philosophy and Assistant Professor of Philosophy & Computer Science

Office: Working remotely

Email: trystan.goetze@dal.ca

Office Hours: Weekly stream (via Collaborate Ultra), email, or audio/video/chat by appointment

TEACHING ASSISTANTS

[Two TAs were assigned to this course. I have redacted their personal information for their privacy.]

COURSE DESCRIPTION

Computers enable people to do things that our present laws and policies were not formulated to cover (hacking, sharing files on the internet, and companies sharing data). In such cases, people need to be able to decide for themselves the best course of action, and defend such decisions. This course aims at developing the ethical reasoning skills and sensitivities that computer professionals will need to make good decisions and to justify them. The course includes a general introduction to ethical theories and their use in making and justifying decisions. We then consider various issues and case studies, illustrating the kinds of problems that can arise from the use and misuse of computers and technology: the responsibilities of computing professionals; ethics on the internet (hacking, computer crime, netiquette); privacy and information; intellectual property; social and political issues (digital divide, computers and work, the internet as a democratic technology).

Prerequisites: No previous knowledge of computing or of philosophy is assumed. Some familiarity with computers and information technology, philosophical ethics, or argumentative writing would be an advantage.

Exclusions: COMP 3090.03

LEARNING OUTCOMES

By the end of this course, students will:

- In terms of course content:
 - Be able to identify and analyze ethical issues in computer ethics.
 - Have expanded their knowledge of various ethical issues and perspectives on them in computer ethics.
 - Be able to defend and critique specific views and arguments on ethical issues in computer ethics.
 - Understand the importance of professional codes of ethics in the computing and information technology professions, and how to apply them to real-life cases.
 - Understand some of the major theories in philosophical ethics and how to use them in making ethical arguments.
- In terms of transferable skills:
 - Have improved their formal writing skills.
 - Have improved their ability to read and reflect critically on texts in a variety of media.
 - Have improved their ability to work effectively as part of team tasked with solving concrete problems.
 - Have increased their familiarity with business collaboration software.

ASSESSMENT

Your work for this course comprises the following assignments. Because this course fulfills a writing requirement in computer science, and because it is the norm for coursework in philosophy, the majority of your grade depends on written work. **There will be no midterm or final exams.**

ASSIGNMENT	WEIGHT	NOTES
Quizzes	20% (2% × 10)	Quizzes based on weekly readings. Due Fridays.
Discussion Notes	15% (3% × 5)	Short writing done in teams. Due first Friday of each unit after Unit 0.
Discussion Replies	5% (1% × 5)	Brief replies to discussion notes. Due second Tuesday of each unit after Unit 0.
Post-Discussion Reflections	5% (1% × 5)	Survey to fill out post-discussion. Due second Wednesday of each unit after Unit 0.
Peer & Self Evaluations	5% (0% + 5%)	Formative evaluation due Week 6. Summative evaluation due Week 12.
Essays	50% (25% × 2)	Three essays will be assigned; only your best two count. Due Weeks 5, 9, and 13.
Additional Assignments	0% or bonus	See below.

Brief descriptions of these assignments follow. Marking rubrics and full instructions will be

available on Brightspace. For information about late or missed assignments, see the Course Policies section below.

Reading Quizzes (2% × 10 = 20%)

Every week, there is a quiz based on the assigned readings, which is available to complete throughout the week. Quizzes have 10 questions each; you have 20 minutes to complete them. They are open-book and unproctored, but you are expected to take them without assistance from others. Your score will be released automatically the next day. There are 12 quizzes total, but only your best 10 will count towards your final grade. (If you like, consider 2 quizzes of your choice to be optional.) Graded automatically on a points-based scale. Your score will be released immediately; answers will be visible the following week.

Discussion Notes (3% × 5 = 15%)

Each major unit has an activity for you and your team to complete together. These will present an ethical issue related to the present unit based on a real-life example, and ask you to apply course concepts to that scenario in a 350-word blog post. Discussion note questions are released on the first Monday of each unit, and are due by 23:59 on the first Friday of the unit. The professor may highlight some of the best team exercises on the weekly livestreams. Graded using a rubric.

Discussion Replies (1% × 5 = 5%)

After submitting your team's discussion note, you will have a few days to read and think about the posts made by several other teams. Your team must produce a reply of at least 100 words to one other team's discussion note and post it to the discussion board by 23:59 on the second Tuesday of each unit. These replies should briefly raise an objection, complication, counter-argument, alternative perspective, or further development to that presented in the discussion note your team chooses. At your option, you may engage in further discussion. Graded Pass/Fail.

Post-Discussion Reflections (1% × 5 = 5%)

Following the submission of your team's discussion reply you will fill out a reflection survey by 23:59 on the second Wednesday of each unit. The first part of the survey will ask about the answer your team chose, your own personal view, and whether your view changed as the result of your discussion. The answers to these questions will be aggregated and discussed at the weekly livestreams. The rest of the survey will ask you to reflect on how well your team worked together and your own contributions to the project. Graded Pass/Fail.

Peer & Self Evaluations (0% + 5%)

Once in Week 6 and again in Week 12, you are required to evaluate your and your teammates' contributions to the Discussion Notes and Replies. These will take the form of peer and self assessment rubrics and reflection questions. Your evaluations of your peers will be anonymized and aggregated before being returned to them. Part of your grade on these evaluations will be based on your level of engagement with the exercise. The midterm peer evaluation is formative; a component of the final peer evaluation will be how well you responded to the areas for

improvement identified by your peers in the midterm evaluation. Graded on a rubric by students; professor reserves the right to make adjustments.

Essays (25% × 2 = 50%)

In response to prompts provided several weeks in advance, you will be assigned three 1,000 word essays applying ethical reflection to a problem relating to cybertechnology. Essay 1 (due Week 5) is about applying the ACM Code. Essay 2 (due Week 9) is about making arguments with the ethical theories. Essay 3 (due Week 13) combines both of these approaches. Graded on rubrics with common elements. **Only your best two out of three essays will count towards your final grade.** (If you like, you may consider one essay of your choice to be optional.)

Bonus Assignments

Several other activities will be assigned over the course of the semester. Completing them is optional but strongly encouraged – doing so will earn you bonus marks!

- *Introduction Message (+1%)*. In the first week of the course, you are asked to post a brief message to the general discussion boards introducing yourself to the class. If possible, please produce a short video recording.
- *Team Contract (+1% × 3)*. You and your team are strongly encouraged to discuss your expectations of one another in Week 1. At your option, you may formalize these expectations in a Team Contract. This is an optional bonus activity, which gives you a structure to set your expectations and accountability mechanisms. There will be two reviews of the team contract – once in Week 3, and once in Week 7 – where you will have the opportunity to reflect on how things are going and adjust your expectations as needed.
- *Bonus Discussion (+1% × 2)*. Unit 6 has no required discussion activities, but you may post a discussion note about the ethics of machine learning for bonus marks. You can also earn bonus marks for making a thoughtful reply to another student’s post in this unit.
- *Bonus Reflection (+1%)*. After the final week of classes, you may submit an optional reflection activity about how the course has influenced your thinking and how you will use what you have learned in the future.

COURSE TIMETABLE

The following table lists lecture topics, required readings, activities with deadlines, and the amount of progress towards completing the course your submitted work represents. Full details will be posted on Brightspace. It is your responsibility to check this timetable regularly for due dates.

NOTE (29/09/20): In response to student concerns about workload, the deadlines for Discussion Replies and Post-Discussion Reflections have been moved to provide greater flexibility.

NOTE (01/12/20): Deadlines for the End of Term Peer & Self Evaluations and Essay 3 have changed to **18 Dec**.

Unit	Academic Week	Lecture Topics	Readings	Assignments & Due Dates
(0) Introduction	Week 1 (8–13 Sep)	0.0. Introduction to the course 0.1. What is computer ethics? 0.2. Policy vacuums and conceptual muddles 0.3. Socio-technical systems S.0. Using the course website S.1. Plagiarism & academic honesty S.2. Teams & team contracts	• Syllabus • Tavani • Huff	• Introduction message (Fri 11 Sep) • Quiz 0 (Fri 11 Sep) • Team Contract (Sun 13 Sep)
(1) Professional Ethics in Computer Science	Week 2 (14–20 Sep)	1.1. Professions & professional ethics 1.2. Professional ethical failures 1.3. The ACM Code and other ethical codes 1.4. Applying ethical codes S.3. Writing argumentative essays	• New York Times • Cadwalladr & Graham-Harrison • ACM Code • Using the ACM Code	• Quiz 1A (Fri 18 Sep) • Discussion Note 1 (Fri 18 Sep)
	Week 3 (21–27 Sep)	1.5. Professional responsibilities 1.6. Whistle-blowing 1.7. Red Teams	• Gotterbarn • Johnson et al. • Bok • Wood & Duggan	• Discussion Reply 1 (Tues 22 Sep) • Post-Discussion Reflection 1 (Fri 25 Sep) • Quiz 1B (Fri 25 Sep) • Team contract review 1 (Sun 27 Sep)
(2) Philosophical Ethics	Week 4 (28 Sep–4 Oct)	2.1. Why philosophical ethics? 2.2. Resistance to ethical thinking: relativism, egoism, legalism, relativism 2.3. Utilitarianism 2.4 Deontology	• Weston • Abumere • Kranak	• Quiz 2A (Fri 2 Oct) • Discussion Note 2 (Fri 2 Oct)
	Week 5 (5–11 Oct)	2.5. Virtues & vices 2.6. Moral rights 2.7. Foundations, frameworks, lenses	• Giles • Whitbeck & Goetze • Sherwin	• Discussion Reply 2 (Fri 9 Oct) • Quiz 2B (Fri 9 Oct) • Essay 1 (Fri 9 Oct)
(3) Digital Intellectual Property	Week 6 (12–18 Oct)	3.1. What is intellectual property (IP)? 3.2. Philosophical justifications of IP 3.3. Philosophical criticism of IP 3.4. IP and software	• Posner • Chartier • Robinson • Johnson & Miller	• Post-Discussion Reflection 2 (Tue 13 Oct) • Quiz 3A (Fri 16 Oct) • Discussion Note 3 (Fri 16 Oct) • Midterm Peer & Self Evaluation (Sun 18 Oct)
	Week 7 (19–25 Oct)	3.5. Free & open source software 3.6. Piracy & DRM 3.7. Digital IP in Canada	• Stallman • National Research Council • Scassa	• Discussion Reply 3 (Fri 23 Oct) • Quiz 3B (Fri 23 Oct) • Team contract review 2 (Sun 25 Oct)
(4) Privacy & Security	Week 8 (26 Oct–1 Nov)	4.1. What is privacy? 4.2. Value of privacy 4.3. Privacy & democracy 4.4. Privacy law: a brief history	• DeCew • Reiman	• Post-Discussion Reflection 3 (Mon 26 Oct) • Quiz 4A (Fri 30 Oct) • Discussion Note 4 (Fri 30 Oct)
	Week 9 (2–8 Nov)	4.5. Privacy law today: GDPR, PIPEDA 4.6. The ethics of hacking 4.7. Corporate and government data collection	• Wolford • Privacy Commissioner of Canada • Spafford • Garfinkel • Di Cicco	• Discussion Reply 4 (Fri 6 Nov) • Quiz 4B (Fri 6 Nov) • Essay 2 (Fri 6 Nov)
BREAK	9–15 Nov	Fall study break—no course activities.		

(5) Computers and Society	Week 10 (16–22 Nov)	5.1. Digital divides 5.2. Stereotypes, bias, discrimination 5.3. Bias in computer systems 5.4. Algorithms of oppression	• J. Brown • Berghoef • Friedman & Nissenbaum • Noble • Hutson	• Post-Discussion Reflection 4 (Mon 16 Nov) • Quiz 5A (Fri 20 Nov) • Discussion Note 5 (Fri 20 Nov)
	Week 11 (23–29 Nov)	5.5. Computers and the economy 5.6. Digital technologies and social class 5.7. Informing ourselves to death	• Townsend • Carnoy • Postman	• Discussion Reply 5 (Fri 27 Nov) • Quiz 5B (Fri 27 Nov)
(6) Ethics of Machine Learning	Week 12 (30 Nov – 6 Dec)	6.1. What is machine learning? 6.2. Sci-fi issues: robot rights, robot revolutions 6.3. AI as moral decision makers 6.4. AI as social decision makers	• Clark • A. Brown • Benjamin • Kalluri • Coeckelbergh	• Post-Discussion Reflection 5 (Mon 30 Nov) • Quiz 6 (Fri 4 Dec) • Bonus discussion note (Fri 4 Dec)
(7) Reflecting	Double Monday & Exam Period (7–13 Dec)	7.0. Instructor’s reflections on the course	• No readings	• Bonus discussion reply (Tues 8 Dec) • Bonus reflection exercise (Fri 11 Dec) • Essay 3 (Fri 18 Dec) • End-of-Term Peer & Self Evaluation (Fri 18 Dec)

Other Important Dates

- **7 Sep:** Labour Day – University closed.
- **8 Sep:** First day of classes.
- **18 Sep:** Fees due for fall term, last day to register, last day to add fall term courses, last day to drop courses with a full refund.
- **2 Oct:** Last day to change fall term courses from audit to credit and vice versa, last day to drop fall term courses without a grade of “W.”
- **12 Oct:** Thanksgiving Day – University closed.
- **2 Nov:** Last day to drop fall courses with a grade of “W.”
- **11 Nov:** Remembrance Day – University closed.
- **8 Dec:** Last day of classes (Monday schedule).
- **10–20 Dec:** Fall exam period.

COURSE MATERIAL

The course material will be delivered through a combination of readings, pre-recorded lectures, and livestreams with the instructor. Students are expected to review all three of these components, though synchronous participation in the livestreams is not required.

Readings

Philosophy involves a lot of careful close reading of texts, and critical reflection upon the arguments and values expressed therein. In this course, there are multiple readings to prepare each week; on average, this amounts to **about 33 pages per week**, or **about 1–2 hours of reading** (possibly longer for non-native speakers of English). You should also spend some additional time reviewing and taking notes from these readings after viewing their associated lectures and as you write your assignments.

All readings will be provided on Brightspace; there is no required textbook. The readings vary from academic research articles to professional articles from computing periodicals to popular magazine pieces. Most lectures have a specific pre-reading associated with them. These readings are required and form the basis of the weekly quizzes. They will also inform your discussion notes and essay assignments. Readings will become available in Brightspace one week before their associated lectures. Supplemental readings will also be provided; these are optional but strongly recommended for further learning about the week's topics.

Students interested in further reading are encouraged to consult the following textbooks as a starting point:

- Deborah G. Johnson and Keith W. Miller, *Computer Ethics*, 4th ed., Prentice Hall (2009).
- Herman Tavani, *Ethics and Technology: Controversies, Questions, and Strategies for Ethical Computing*, 5th ed., Wiley (2015).
- M. David Ermann and Michele S. Shauf, eds., *Computers, Ethics, and Society*, 3rd ed., Oxford University Press (2003).
- Luciano Floridi, ed., *The Cambridge Handbook of Information and Computer Ethics*, Cambridge University Press (2010).

None of these books is required for this course.

Lectures

Each major unit has **7 lectures** (Units 0 and 6 have only 4 lectures each). Each lecture runs approximately **10–30 minutes in length**. The format of these lectures is pre-recorded videos, available on Brightspace via Panopto. Supplemental lectures on writing skills, teamwork skills, providing constructive feedback, and academic integrity will also be available. Lectures will become available on Brightspace the Monday of the week with which they are associated in the course timetable.

Livestreams

Each Friday, at a time to be arranged with the class, the instructor will host a **30-minute synchronous livestream** via Collaborate Ultra. During the livestreams, the instructor will answer students' questions (submitted live or before the stream), discuss assignment instructions, highlight recent computer ethics stories in the news, offer study and writing tips, and spotlight some particularly good submissions to the discussion notes and replies. Students have the opportunity to customize the content the instructor will prepare for these streams by submitting questions through optional surveys available each Wednesday. Attending these streams is not mandatory, but is strongly recommended. They will be recorded and posted to Brightspace the following week.

Learning Technology and Minimum System Requirements

This course will make extensive use of **Brightspace** and **Collaborate Ultra**. Use of these technologies requires a computer or mobile device with an internet connection (preferably high-speed broadband or better) and a modern web browser (preferably Firefox or Chrome). You can

find system requirements and other information about these technologies here:

https://www.dal.ca/academics/online_learning/getting-started-.html

Additionally, it is recommended that students choose a preferred messaging platform – such as Discord, WhatsApp, or Signal – to use when communicating with their teammates and peers. It is the student’s responsibility to read, understand, and decide whether to agree to each service’s terms of use and privacy policy.

When connecting to online resources from outside of Canada, students are responsible for ensuring that they are aware of and observing any applicable laws of the country they are connecting from.

While it is recommended that students have a microphone and webcam for communicating with their instructor, TAs, and peers, these devices are not required to take this course or to participate in any synchronous activities.

Not having a stable internet connection or a system with the minimum requirements may impair your ability to engage in course activities. Please contact the instructor as soon as possible if this situation applies to you.

The course material is provided online for your personal education purposes only. Copying or distributing course material outside of the course website may be a violation of copyright law. If you have questions regarding copyright, contact the Copyright Office: copyright.office@dal.ca

Writing Support at the University Writing Centre

Learning to write well contributes to the quality of critical thought, good marks, completion of degrees, and, later, success in the workplace. Now is the time to improve your writing skills. You can visit the Writing Centre online **for assistance with your assignments**. Staff and tutors help you to understand writing expectations and disciplinary writing conventions. Staff with graduate-level experience in philosophical writing are available to assist you.

To book an appointment email writingcentre@dal.ca. The Writing Centre is completely online this fall.

In addition, the Centre offers **monthly seminars**. This year the online seminars focus on understanding academic integrity and learning to integrate source material into your writing assignments. Email Dr. Adam Auch for more information.

The Writing Centre, also, provides an online learning tool called the **Academic Integrity Module (AIM)**. Self-register at https://www.dal.ca/campus_life/academic-support/writing-and-study-skills/academic-integrity-module.html. *New this year online*: after you have completed the AIM, arrange **a follow-up session** to discuss the scenarios more fully. Write to Janice Eddington (Janice.eddington@dal.ca) to arrange the session.

Visit the Writing Centre’s **Resource Guide** at <http://dal.ca.libguides.com/writingcentre> for online guidance.

COURSE POLICIES

The following policies govern this course. It is your responsibility to read, understand, and follow them; the instructor will do the same. In case of conflict with Department, Faculty, or University Regulations, the Regulations supersede the policies in this syllabus.

University Academic Honour Statement

Academic integrity is a commitment to the values of learning in an academic environment. These values include honesty, trust, fairness, responsibility, and respect (International Center for Academic Integrity, *The Fundamental Values of Academic Integrity*, 2nd ed.). All members of the Dalhousie community must acknowledge that academic integrity is fundamental to the value and credibility of academic work and inquiry. We must seek to uphold academic integrity through our actions and behaviours in all our learning environments, our research, and our service.

Culture of Respect in Computer Science

We believe inclusiveness is fundamental to education. We stand for equality. Disrespectful behaviour – like misogyny – in our classrooms, on our campus and in our community is unacceptable. If you have witnessed inappropriate behaviour, are not sure what is acceptable, are quite sure you heard inappropriate comments but are unsure of what to do, or just need someone to talk to, you may contact Christian Blouin (Professor and Associate Dean, Academic, Computer Science) cblouin@cs.dal.ca, or Margie Publicover (Faculty of Computer Science Navigator) margie@cs.dal.ca. For more information about Culture of Respect in Computer Science: <https://www.dal.ca/faculty/computerscience/about/respect.html>

Peer Course Representative

The Faculty of Computer Science appoints a student representative for each course. The course representative is a point of contact to facilitate and provide more timely feedback mechanisms to instructors and to the Faculty of Computer Science. Additionally, course representatives can assist peers in navigating to the most appropriate support mechanism on campus. You can think of the course representative as “the middle person”; a neutral point of contact for students to use when they don’t feel comfortable addressing an issue with the professor directly.

Contacting the Instructor & Teaching Assistants

The instructor’s primary way of contacting you with messages about the course will be via announcements on Brightspace. You should check the course homepage frequently. Unless it is urgent, these messages will not normally be cross-posted to the class email list. It is recommended that you configure your Brightspace notifications to push course announcements to your email.

To contact the instructor or a TA, please send them an email to the address(es) listed on the first page of this syllabus. Messages with “PHIL 2490” or “CSCI 3101” in the subject line will receive a reply within 2 business days. Please send correspondence about the course only from your Dalhousie email address, to the instructor’s or TAs’ Dalhousie email addresses. Do not contact the instructor or TAs on their phones, at their personal emails, or on social media platforms (unless you are instructed otherwise), and do not use your personal email for messages about the course.

Virtual Office Hours

The instructor and TAs are available for meetings of 10–30 minutes by audio or video call for discussion of course material, deliverables, study skills, writing skills, or general academic inquiries. Send an email to request an appointment.

Every Friday, there will be an optional synchronous livestream with the instructor (see above). You will have the opportunity to submit questions about the material in advance.

Requesting Extensions

Please refer to the Late and Missed Evaluations policy, below, for information about requests for extensions on assigned work. Failure to follow that policy will result in an automatic rejection of your extension request.

Grade Appeals

If you feel that the grade you received on an evaluation was unfair, you may contact the grader to discuss your concerns. If you find the grader's explanation of your grade unsatisfactory, you may contact the instructor to request a re-assessment. The instructor will discuss your concerns with the grader and determine whether any adjustments are warranted. **Do not abuse this privilege.** Appeal only if you are certain you have been treated unfairly and can defend your claim with good reasons. (In practice, I have found that most re-assessments produce the same grade or lower.)

Teamwork No-Shows

Not contributing to team assignments and expecting to get the grade from your teammates' work is unacceptable freeloading and a breach of academic honour and integrity. In the event that members of your teams did not contribute *at all* to specific assignments (or all semester), inform the instructor. Provide some evidence of their non-participation, such as the transcript for your group chat. The instructor will review the evidence and adjust no-show teammates' grades accordingly.

Late and Missed Evaluations

The following policies will govern how extensions and accommodations for late or missed work are handled in this course. They are based on the university regulation "Missed or Late Academic Requirements due to Student Absence," which you should review and understand:

[https://cdn.dal.ca/content/dam/dalhousie/pdf/dept/university_secretariat/policy-repository/Student%20Absence%20Regulation%20\(May%202018\)%20\(3\).pdf](https://cdn.dal.ca/content/dam/dalhousie/pdf/dept/university_secretariat/policy-repository/Student%20Absence%20Regulation%20(May%202018)%20(3).pdf)

In the absence of extenuating circumstances, the following policies apply for late submission of coursework:

- Late submissions of **reading quizzes** will not be accepted. Missed quizzes will receive a grade of zero.
- Late or missed **discussion notes**, **discussion replies**, or **post-discussion reflections** will receive a grade of zero.
- Late or missed **peer and self evaluations** will result in a cumulative –25% penalty (once for missing the formative midterm evaluations, once for missing the end-of-term evaluations) to your grade on the end-of-term peer and self evaluations.
- Late submissions of **essay assignments** will receive a cumulative penalty of –10% to the base grade for each time the clock strikes midnight after the 23:59 deadline, to a

maximum of –30%. After 72 hours, your grade reverts to zero and no late submission will be accepted.

Short-term Absences (first two). If illness or other extenuating circumstances (such as family care duties, personal emergencies, or legal obligations) result in a short-term (three days or shorter) inability to engage with the course activities, you may notify the instructor by email before any deadlines, then complete a **Student Declaration of Absence (SDA) Form** and submit it via the drop box on Brightspace within three days of the end of the absence. This form takes the place of a sick note, and does not require a signature from a medical professional or other authority, nor are you required to divulge confidential information about the nature of your absence. You are responsible for informing your group members of your absence. The form can be downloaded from the following link, or from the Syllabus, Supplemental Lectures, Handouts, and Forms module on the course Brightspace site:

<https://cdn.dal.ca/content/dam/dalhousie/pdf/campuslife/Health%20and%20wellness/FINAL%20Student%20Declaration%20of%20Absence%20Form.pdf>

Upon being notified of your absence, the instructor may suggest an extension or other accommodation, if appropriate. The instructor is not required to offer an extension. If an extension is granted, a second extension will not be granted on the same assignment. Retroactive extensions – i.e. extensions requested *after* the due date – will not be granted without a letter from your Academic Advisor or Program Coordinator supporting the retroactive extension.

The following regulations govern the use of SDA forms:

- You must notify the instructor of the absence before the deadlines of work you will miss.
- You must submit an SDA form no later than three days after the last day of the absence.
- The form may only be used for short-term absences (three days or shorter).
- You may use this form a maximum of two times for this course.
- Submitting the form does not guarantee that you will receive an extension, exemption, or alternative assessment – this is the instructor’s sole discretion.
- A record of this form will be kept on file and will fall under Freedom of Information and Protection of Privacy (FOIOP) regulations.
- Knowingly providing false information or identification on an SDA is an academic offence (misrepresentation), subject to university discipline (per University Regulations and Section 7 of Dalhousie’s Code of Student Conduct).

Third Short-term Absence. You must notify the instructor before any deadlines you will miss, then meet with your Academic Advisor or Program Coordinator to discuss your situation before the instructor will consider making further alternative arrangements. A letter from your Advisor or Coordinator with the Advisor’s or Coordinator’s recommendations will be required before accommodations can be made.

Long-term Absence (first). For an absence longer than three days, you must notify the instructor no later than five days after the last day of the absence. If you will miss any deadlines, again, you must inform the instructor before the work is due. If the absence was caused by a physical or mental health condition, you must supply documentation signed by a primary health care professional. Documentation should indicate the dates and duration of the condition (confidential health information of the exact condition is *not* required), when possible should describe its impact on your ability to fulfill academic requirements, and include any other information the

primary care health professional considers relevant and appropriate. For other kinds of extenuating circumstances resulting in a long-term absence, another kind of official documentation providing similar information is required. The instructor will use this information to determine whether to offer an extension, exemption, or alternative assessment. Again, no special arrangements are guaranteed.

Second Long-term Absence. You must meet with your Advisor or Coordinator to discuss your situation before the instructor will consider making further alternative arrangements. A letter from your Advisor or Coordinator regarding this discussion and the Advisor's or Coordinator's recommendations will be requested.

Accessibility & Accommodations

The following statements are taken from the university's Student Accommodation Policy and the Student Accessibility Centre's guidelines and protocols, which you should review and understand in full:

https://cdn.dal.ca/content/dam/dalhousie/pdf/dept/university_secretariat/policy-repository/StudentAccomPolicy_rev%20Apr%202019.pdf

<https://cdn.dal.ca/content/dam/dalhousie/pdf/campuslife/student-services/academicsupport/Accessibility/SAC%20Guidelines%20and%20Protocols%20document.pdf>

Students are encouraged to seek accommodation where they believe that they are experiencing a barrier to participation in a University activity, due to a characteristic protected under human rights legislation, which may be reduced or eliminated through accommodation. All requests for accommodation shall be made by the student to the Student Accessibility Centre in accordance with the Procedures and with all Guidelines and Protocols published by the Centre.

Accommodation requests shall be made prior to the University activity in question. There shall be no "after-the-fact" accommodation except in rare circumstances where significant psychological or mental health issues arise coincident with the activity in question. All documentation relating to a request for accommodation, including supporting documentation, shall be treated as strictly confidential, and shall not be disclosed to other persons without the consent of the student requesting the accommodation, except to the extent that such disclosure is necessary for the effective implementation of the accommodation decision or appeal of that decision.

The following could be implemented as part of the student's accessibility plan:

- i. Additional time and quiet space to write quizzes, tests, exams
- ii. Alternate exam formats
- iii. Alternate modes of course delivery or evaluation
- iv. Provision of a note taker or interpreter
- v. Special equipment in classrooms
- vi. Adaptive technology

The Student Accessibility Centre requires a minimum of seven days to fulfill student requests.

Plagiarism & Academic Integrity

Plagiarism is representing the work of others as your own, whether or not you intend to do it. This includes but isn't limited to submitting an assignment written by someone other than you (whether or not you paid them for it) or copying a work in whole or in part and submitting it as if

you wrote it (whether or not the copied text is protected by copyright). I take these and related breaches of academic conduct (such as cheating) extremely seriously. Why? (1) Plagiarism and cheating are types of theft, dishonesty, and fraud – that is to say, they’re unethical. (2) Committing such an offence defeats the whole reason you are here, namely, to learn. (3) Doing so is disrespectful to me, as your teacher, to your peers, who are putting in the effort to succeed honestly, and to the university itself, as an institution of higher learning.

If your circumstances ever reach a point where you are tempted to cheat, or if you simply don’t understand how to follow the rules, I urge you to contact me, a TA, your Academic Advisor, or the appropriate support services (listed in SECTION B, below). Let us help you out! We want you to succeed honestly. Don’t jeopardize your grade or your degree!

Plagiarism Checking. By default, your essays will be submitted to the Urkund plagiarism detection tool to compare them with a database of previously created work. At the instructor’s option, your discussion notes and replies may also be sent for processing by Urkund. Reports generated by Urkund will be used by the instructor to identify possible instances of plagiarism or other forms of academic dishonesty. In accordance with the University Policy on Student Submission of Assignments and Use of Originality Checking Software, you may inform the instructor, no later than the Add/Drop date (in Fall 2020, 18 Sep), if you prefer not to have your assignments processed by Urkund, so that the instructor and TAs can prepare alternative means of scrutinizing your work for plagiarism. You should read and understand Urkund’s terms of service, particularly their privacy policy, before submitting your assignments. For more information, visit their website: <https://www.unkund.com/>

Disciplinary Procedures. It is your responsibility as a student to read, understand, and follow the university’s regulations governing academic integrity. In addition to the resources listed below in SECTION B, the “Examples of Plagiarism” handout posted to the course web page in Brightspace, and the supplemental lecture “S.1. Plagiarism and Academic Honesty,” it is your responsibility to familiarize yourself with the following guidelines and procedures:

Academic Integrity: https://www.dal.ca/dept/university_secretariat/academic-integrity.html

Plagiarism and Cheating: https://www.dal.ca/dept/university_secretariat/academic-integrity/plagiarism-cheating.html

Other Cheating: https://www.dal.ca/dept/university_secretariat/academic-integrity/plagiarism-cheating/other-cheating.html

Discipline Process and Penalties: https://www.dal.ca/dept/university_secretariat/academic-integrity/plagiarism-cheating/discipline-process.html

Final Grades

Your final grade will be calculated as a score out of 100, and converted to a letter grade using the following table, adapted from the Dalhousie Grade Scale and Definitions:

https://www.dal.ca/campus_life/academic-support/grades-and-student-records/grade-scale-and-definitions.html

A+	A	A–	B+	B	B–	C+	C	C–	D	F
90–100	85–89	80–84	77–79	73–76	70–72	65–69	60–64	55–59	50–54	0–49

Please note that the Faculty of Computer Science requires students with a first major in computer science or applied computer science to achieve a final grade of C or better in required computer science courses.

SECTION B: UNIVERSITY POLICIES, STATEMENTS, GUIDELINES, AND RESOURCES FOR SUPPORT

This course is governed by the academic rules and regulations set forth in the University Calendar and the Senate:

<https://academiccalendar.dal.ca/Catalog/ViewCatalog.aspx?pageid=viewcatalog&catalogid=105&chapterid=6323&loadusercredits=False>

University Statements

Academic Integrity. At Dalhousie University, we are guided in all of our work by the values of academic integrity: honesty, trust, fairness, responsibility and respect (The Center for Academic Integrity, Duke University, 1999). As a student, you are required to demonstrate these values in all of the work you do. The University provides policies and procedures that every member of the university community is required to follow to ensure academic integrity. Read more: http://www.dal.ca/dept/university_secretariat/academic-integrity.html

Accessibility. The Advising and Access Services Centre is Dalhousie's centre of expertise for student accessibility and accommodation. The advising team works with students who request accommodation as a result of: a disability, religious obligation, or any barrier related to any other characteristic protected under Human Rights legislation (NS, NB, PEI, NFLD). Read more: https://www.dal.ca/campus_life/academic-support/accessibility.html

Student Code of Conduct. Everyone at Dalhousie is expected to treat others with dignity and respect. The Code of Student Conduct allows Dalhousie to take disciplinary action if students don't follow this community expectation. When appropriate, violations of the code can be resolved in a reasonable and informal manner—perhaps through a restorative justice process. If an informal resolution can't be reached, or would be inappropriate, procedures exist for formal dispute resolution. Read more: https://www.dal.ca/campus_life/safety-respect/student-rights-and-responsibilities/student-life-policies/code-of-student-conduct.html

Diversity and Inclusion – Culture of Respect. Every person at Dalhousie has a right to be respected and safe. We believe inclusiveness is fundamental to education. We stand for equality. Dalhousie is strengthened in our diversity. We are a respectful and inclusive community. We are committed to being a place where everyone feels welcome and supported, which is why our Strategic Direction prioritizes fostering a culture of diversity and inclusiveness (Strategic Priority 5.2). Read more: <http://www.dal.ca/cultureofrespect.html>

Recognition of Mi'kmaq Territory. Dalhousie University would like to acknowledge that the University is on Traditional Mi'kmaq Territory. The Elders in Residence program provides students with access to First Nations elders for guidance, counsel and support. Contact the program at elders@dal.ca.

University Policies and Programs

E-Learning website. <http://www.dal.ca/dept/elearning.html>

Important Dates in the Academic Year (including add/drop dates).

http://www.dal.ca/academics/important_dates.html

University Grading Practices: Statement of Principles and Procedures.

https://www.dal.ca/dept/university_secretariat/policies/academic/grading-practices-policy.html

Scent-Free Program. <http://www.dal.ca/dept/safety/programs-services/occupational-safety/scent-free.html>

Learning and Support Resources

General Academic Support – Advising. Halifax: https://www.dal.ca/campus_life/academic-support/advising.html • Truro: <https://www.dal.ca/about-dal/agricultural-campus/student-success-centre/academic-support.html>

Fair Dealing Guidelines. <https://libraries.dal.ca/services/copyright-office/guidelines/fair-dealing-guidelines.html>

Dalhousie University Library. <http://libraries.dal.ca>

Indigenous Students. https://www.dal.ca/campus_life/communities/indigenous.html

Black Students. https://www.dal.ca/campus_life/communities/black-student-advising.html

International Students. https://www.dal.ca/campus_life/international-centre.html

Student Health Services. https://www.dal.ca/campus_life/health-and-wellness.html

Counselling. https://www.dal.ca/campus_life/health-and-wellness/frequently-asked-questions-august-2017.html

Copyright Office. <https://libraries.dal.ca/services/copyright-office.html>

Dalhousie Student Advocacy Services. <http://dsu.ca/dsas>

Dalhousie Ombudsperson. https://www.dal.ca/campus_life/safety-respect/student-rights-and-responsibilities/where-to-get-help/ombudsperson.html

Writing Centre. https://www.dal.ca/campus_life/academic-support/writing-and-study-skills.html

Faculty or Departmental Advising Support: Studying for Success.
http://www.dal.ca/campus_life/academic-support/study-skills-and-tutoring.html

Sample Course Outlines

LOWER DIVISION – COMPUTING AND SOCIETY IN HISTORY

This course is about the history of computing as it relates to society. We will be interested in different explanations of how computing developments came about, what social factors influenced these developments, and how computing developments have influenced society. This is not a technical course: there will be only minimal discussion of the mathematics, engineering, and programming that underly computing technologies. Rather, we will be interested in the sociological, ethical, historical, economic, political, and philosophical questions that are raised by computing and information technologies and their predecessors. CSCI 1800 takes a long view of this history, opting for breadth rather than depth, and covers major developments from antiquity to the early 21st century.

Writing Instruction

This is a writing course: >50% of the final grade is derived from individual written work. The course is included as part of the Computer Science curriculum in part to teach students how to communicate their ideas in formal written English. Some writing instruction will be included as part of the course schedule. Students are encouraged to book supplemental writing instruction with the Writing Centre; students with a first language other than English are particularly urged to attend these sessions. Each relevant Writing Centre workshop earns a bonus +0.5 points out of 100 to the student's final grade, including those on the course schedule.

To give students a great deal of writing practice, this course includes a set of blog post and peer review assignments. These allow students to practice summarizing a point from a reading, articulating their own position with supporting evidence, formulating objections, and replying to criticism. These scaffolded, low-stakes, repeated assignments allow students to practice the specific tasks involved in essay-writing, while also learning from their peers.

Course Schedule

We will spend three class sessions on each unit. Each class session, apart from the writing workshops, will have a lecture followed by discussion in small groups and as a class. The writing workshops will be facilitated by Writing Centre staff.

Unit	Topic	Readings	Due Dates
Prelude	Introduction to the Course	Syllabus	
1. Socio-technical Systems	Technological Determinism	Merritt Roe Smith, 'Technological Determinism in American Culture' in <i>Does Technology Drive History?</i> eds. Merritt Roe Smith and Leo Marx	
	Sociotechnical Systems	Thomas J. Misa, 'Retrieving Sociotechnical Change from Technological Determinism', in <i>Does Technology Drive History?</i>	
Interlude	Writing Workshop 1	(To be decided by the Writing Centre)	

2. The Algorithm	Ancient Mathematics: Babylon and Euclid	Donald E. Knuth, ‘Ancient Babylonian Algorithms’	BlogPost_1
	Hindu-Arabic Numerals and al-Khwārizmī	John Crossley and Alan S. Henry, ‘Thus Spake al-Khwārizmī’	BlogReview_1
	The Turing Machine	Jack Copeland, ‘Computable Numbers: A Guide’, in <i>The Essential Turing</i> , ed. Jack Copeland (selections)	BlogReply_1
Interlude	Writing Workshop 2	(To be decided by the Writing Centre)	
3. Calculating Machines	Abacuses and Ancient Computing	Shu-T’ien Li, ‘Origin and Development of the Chinese Abacus’	BlogPost_2
	The Antikythera Mechanism	Alexander Jones, <i>A Portable Cosmos</i> (selections)	BlogReview_2
	Lovelace and Babbage’s Analytical Engine	John Fuegi and Jo Francis, ‘Lovelace & Babbage and the Creation of the 1843 “Notes”’	BlogReply_2
Interlude	Writing Workshop 3	(To be decided by the Writing Centre)	
4. Computers	Human Computers	Margot Lee Shetterly, <i>Hidden Figures</i> (selections)	BlogPost_3
	Personal Computers	Robert Pool, ‘A History of the Personal Computer’, in <i>Computers, Ethics, and Society</i> , 3rd ed., eds. David Ermann and Michele Shauf	BlogReview_3
	Disruptive Technology	Clayton M. Christensen, ‘How Can Great Firms Fail? Insights from the Hard Disk Drive Industry’, in <i>The Innovator’s Dilemma</i>	BlogReply_3
5. The Internet and the Web	ARPANET	Katie Hafner and Matthew Lyon, <i>Where Wizards Stay Up Late: The Origins of the Internet</i> (selections)	
	The Dot Com Bubble	Matthew Crane, ‘Financial markets and online advertising: reevaluating the dotcom investment bubble’	BlogPost_4
	Web 2.0	Maria Bakardjieva and Georgia Gaden, ‘Web 2.0 Technologies of the Self’	BlogReview_4
Interlude	Writing Workshop 4	(To be decided by the Writing Centre)	BlogReply_4

6. Mobile Devices	From <i>Star Trek</i> to the Cellular Phone	Joshua Cuneo, “‘Hello, Computer’”: The Interplay of <i>Star Trek</i> and Modern Computing’, in <i>Science Fiction and Computing: Essays on Interlinked Domains</i> , eds. David Ferro and Eric Swedin	BlogPost_5
	‘Mobile Culture’ and Learning Environments	Ronen Hammer <i>et al.</i> , ‘Mobile Culture in College Lectures: Instructors’ and Students’ Perspectives’	BlogReview_5
	The Internet of Things	Adam Henschke, ‘Privacy, the Internet of Things, and State Surveillance: Handling Personal Information within an Inhuman System’	BlogReply_5
Students’ Choice	Topic to be determined by class vote	TBD	
Postlude	Reflections and Review		TermPaper
Exam Period			FinalExam

Schedule of Assessments

Listing of assignments for credit.

Blog - Posts ([5 * 4%] = 20%)

Write a blog post of approximately 200 words in response to a prompt based on each unit’s material. The prompt will ask a question that is open to historical or normative interpretation, and you should use something in the course material to provide evidence for your answer to the prompt. There will be an optional sixth blog post which you can complete for a chance at replacing your worst grade with a better one, or in case you missed a blog post due to absence.

Blog - Peer Reviews ([2 * 5 * 1%] = 10%)

Each unit, you will be assigned two blog posts written by other students to anonymously review. Your review should consist of:

- A single recommendation that would improve the quality of the writing.
- A single critical comment on the summary of the issue to be discussed.
- A single objection to the argument.

If you complete the optional sixth blog post, there will be an optional sixth peer review exercise for a chance at replacing your worst grade with a better one, or in case you missed a peer review due to absence. The peer review process will be facilitated with PeerScholar.

Blog - Reply ([5 * 1%] = 5%)

Write a brief response to the peer reviews you have received. Pick the best criticisms of your writing, use of materials, and argumentation, and write a brief reply. If you complete the optional sixth blog post and sixth peer review, there will be an optional sixth reply assignment for a chance at replacing your worst grade with a better one, or in case you missed a reply due to absence.

Term Paper (35%)

Write an essay of 750–1,000 words in response to a prompt that will require reflection on more than one unit of material. The essay should provide an argument in favour of a historical interpretation or normative claim, defend your argument with evidence, and

Final Exam (30%)

Formal final exam to be scheduled for in-person writing. Composed of comprehensive multiple choice and short answer questions, and an essay question based on Unit 6.

Bonus: Writing Centre Workshops

For each Writing Centre Workshop you complete, **including the four workshops held in-class**, you will earn a bonus 0.5/100 towards your final grade.

LOWER DIVISION – IMAGINING ARTIFICIAL INTELLIGENCE AND ROBOTICS

Though the term ‘artificial intelligence’ was first coined in 1956, human beings have dreamt of creating intelligent machines for centuries. In this course, we will uncover the rich history of both artificial intelligence and robotics. We will begin with the automata of ancient Greece and work our way through the Islamic golden age toward the modern era of artificial intelligence research. This historical picture will be complemented by an examination of current advances in AI and robotics in a number of different fields, including policing, high-frequency trading, art, agriculture, law, and advertising. Along the way, we will also pay close attention to the philosophical, social, and ethical implications posed by these technological developments and their applications to nearly every aspect of modern life.

Course Schedule

The course meets synchronously (online or in person) twice a week for 80 minute sessions.

Week	Topic	Reading	Due Dates & Quizzes
1	Prelude	• Syllabus	
	Frameworks & Concepts: Robots and AI as sociotechnical systems	• Ibo van de Poel, ‘Embedding Values in Artificial Intelligence (AI) Systems’	iRAT_0
2	Frameworks & Concepts: What do we mean by ‘intelligence’?	• Mary Midgley, <i>What is Philosophy For?</i> (selections)	
	Frameworks & Concepts: Making your own AI	• Video: Stefania Kaczmarczyk, <u>Building Bots with Watson Conversation</u>	
3	Interlude: Meeting your teams	• Handout: Working in teams • Handout: Chatbot assignment brief	TeamContract
	Robots in Myth and Early Science Fiction: Greek, Jewish, and Chinese Myths and Legends	• Adrienne Mayor, <i>Gods and Robots</i> , (selections on Talos and Galatea) • David Wisniewski, <i>Golem</i> • Joseph Needham Ronan, <i>The Shorter Science and Civilisation in China: Volume 1</i> , ed. Colin A. Ronan (selections on Yen Shih the artificer)	iRAT_1 tRAT_1
4	Robots in Myth and Early Science Fiction: Terrifying Robots and Artificial Life	• Mary Shelley, <i>Frankenstein</i> (selections) • Karel Čapek, <i>R.U.R.</i> (selections) • Michael Szollosy, ‘Freud, Frankenstein, and Our Fear of Robots’	
	Robots in Myth and Early Science Fiction: Helpful Robots	• Isaac Asimov, <i>I, Robot</i> (selections) • Roger Clarke, ‘Asimov’s Laws of Robotics: Implications for Information Technology’	

5	Early Inventions: Automata in the ancient, medieval, and early modern world	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Heron of Alexandria, <i>On Automaton-Making</i>, trans. Susan Murphy (selections) • Gunalan Nadarajan, ‘Islamic Automation: A reading of al-Jazari’s <i>The Book of Knowledge of Ingenious Mechanical Devices</i>’, in <i>MediaArtHistories</i>, ed. Oliver Grau 	iRAT_2 tRAT_2
	Early Inventions: Deception and natural magic	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Edgar Allan Poe, ‘Maezel’s Chess-Player’ • Noel Sharkey and Amanda Sharkey, ‘Artificial Intelligence and Natural Magic’ 	
6	Early Inventions: Automation and Unemployment in the 1930s and 1960s	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Gregory Woirol, <i>The Technological Unemployment and Structural Unemployment Debates</i> (selections) • Rick Wartzman, <i>The End of Loyalty: The Rise and Fall of Good Jobs in America</i> (selections) 	
	Interlude: Chatbot Workshop		Essay_1
7	Machine Learning: What are machine learning and deep learning?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Pedro Domingos, <i>The Master Algorithm</i> (selections) 	iRAT_3 tRAT_3
	Machine Learning: Natural Language Processing / Understanding	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Joseph Weizenbaum, ‘ELIZA—A Computer Program For the Study of Natural Language Communication Between Man And Machine’ • Lauren F. Klein, ‘The Image of Absence: Archival Silence, Data Visualization, and James Hemings’ 	
8	Machine Learning: Computer Vision	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Nuria Rodríguez-Ortega, ‘Image Processing and Computer Vision in the Field of Art History,’ in <i>Routledge Companion to Digital Humanities and Art History</i>, ed. Kathryn Brown • Joy Buolmewini and Timnit Gebru, ‘Gender Shades: Intersectional Accuracy Disparities in Commercial Gender Classification’ 	
	Cultural Receptions: Indigenous AI	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Jason Edward Lewis, ed., <i>Indigenous Protocol and Artificial Intelligence Workshops Position Paper</i> (selections) 	iRAT_4 tRAT_4
9	Cultural Receptions: Hope for the singularity	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Ray Kurzweil, <i>When Computers Exceed Human Intelligence: The Age of Spiritual Machines</i> (selections) • Susan B. Levin, ‘Antiquity’s Missive to Transhumanism’ 	

	Cultural Receptions: Robotic children	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Carlo Collodi, <i>The Adventures of Pinocchio</i> (selections) • Frederick Schodt, ‘Interface Between Man and Robot’, in <i>The Astro Boy Essays</i> • Brian Aldiss, <i>Supertoys last all summer long</i> (selections) 	
10	Interlude: Chatbot Beta Testing		Chatbot_Beta
	Becoming Human: The Turing Test and other criteria of general intelligence	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Alan Turing, ‘Computing Machinery and Intelligence’, in <i>The Essential Turing</i>, ed. Jack Copeland 	iRAT_5 tRAT_5
11	Becoming Human: Robot rights	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Philip K. Dick, <i>Do androids dream of electric sheep?</i> (selections) • Belinda Bennett and Angela Daly, ‘Recognising rights for robots: Can we? Will we? Should we?’ 	
	Becoming Human: Digital resurrection and mind preservation	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Massimo Pigliucci, ‘Mind Uploading: A Philosophical Counter-Analysis’, in <i>Intelligence Unbound</i>, eds. Russell Blackford & Damien Broderick • ‘Be Right Back’, <i>Black Mirror</i> 	
12	Chatbot Showcase		Chatbot_Final
	Postlude: Topic to be determined by the class		
Exams			Essay_2

Schedule of Assessments

A breakdown of planned assignments for the course.

Essays (25% + 30% = 55%)

In response to a selection of prompts distributed 4 weeks in advance of the due dates, you will write two essays of approximately 1,000 words drawing on the course materials. Your best essay will be worth 30%; the other will be worth 25%. **Essay_1** is due in Week 6; **Essay_2** is due two weeks after lectures end.

Team Contract (0%)

When you first meet your teams, you will be required to draw up a ‘team contract’ that sets expectations for your collaboration.

Readiness Assurance Tests ([2% * 5] + [1% * 5] = 15%)

This course employs a teaching method called Team-Based Learning (TBL). One component of TBL is that students are required to complete readings ahead of class, so they are prepared for their in-class team activities. To ensure that students complete the readings ahead of time, each unit opens with a “Readiness Assurance Test,” or RAT, a 5-question quiz based on the main points of the pre-reading. You will take each RAT twice: individually (iRATs), and in your team (tRATs). Each iRAT (including iRAT_0) is worth 2% of your course grade; the worst score of your six iRATs will be dropped. Each tRAT is worth 1% of your course grade. These tests are to encourage you to keep up with the readings, to build rapport with your teammates, and to prepare you for the formative in-class activities where we will discuss and apply what we have read for

that session.

Chatbot group project (30%)

You and your team will work together throughout the semester to produce an AI-powered chatbot using IBM's Watson Assistant. This project requires no coding experience and uses only free services. Your team will work to identify a potential service where a chatbot may be useful; define its intents, entities, and dialog trees; test a prototype (or 'beta') in Week 10; and present your design to the class in Week 12. A portion of your grade on this assignment will be based on a peer evaluation exercise that makes use of your TeamContract *[Note to search committees: this is an early concept for the assignment, since Watson Assistant is fairly easy to access and use. Given time to develop the assignment, I would like to open it up to other easy-to-use AI tools, such as those collected here: <https://docubase.mit.edu/lab/case-studies/ai-platforms-for-interactive-storytellers/>].*

LOWER DIVISION – INTRODUCTION TO MORAL PHILOSOPHY

Which action would be good or bad? What does it mean to be a good person? What is the nature of evil? What do I owe to my fellow human beings and to other living things? How can we make our society more just? These are some of the questions that moral philosophy – or ethics – is concerned with. In this course, we’ll examine these and other philosophical questions by engaging with historical and contemporary texts. Students will learn about eight major traditions in moral philosophy: consequentialism, deontology, virtue and vice ethics, human rights, care ethics, existentialism, sentimentalism, and the ethical systems of the First Nations of Turtle Island (North America). [Note to search committees: The First Nations component of this course will be co-developed with local indigenous knowledge keepers. The content under that unit should be considered a placeholder.]

Course Schedule

Week	Topic	Reading	Due Dates
1	Introduction to philosophical ethics	Syllabus	
	Consequentialism – The Mills’s Utilitarianism	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • John Stuart Mill, <i>Utilitarianism</i>, Ch. 1–2. • Optional: Dale E. Miller, “Harriet Taylor Mill,” <i>Stanford Encyclopedia of Philosophy</i> 	iRAT_0 tRAT_0
2	Consequentialism – Acts and Rules	Richard Brandt, “Actual Rule Utilitarianism”	
	Consequentialism – Consequences for Animals	Tyler M. John and Jeff Sebo, “Consequentialism and Nonhuman Animals,” in <i>The Oxford Handbook of Consequentialism</i>	Discussion_0
3	Deontology – Kant	Immanuel Kant, <i>Groundwork of the Metaphysics of Morals</i> , section 1	iRAT_1 tRAT_1
	Deontology – Kant, continued	Immanuel Kant, <i>Groundwork of the Metaphysics of Morals</i> , section 2	
4	Deontology – Lying within the moral law	Christine Korsgaard, “The Right to Lie: Kant on Dealing with Evil”	Discussion_1
	Virtues and Vices – Aristotle	Aristotle, <i>Nicomachean Ethics</i> , books I–III	iRAT_2 tRAT_2
5	Virtues and Vices – Virtue under oppression	Lisa Tessman, <i>Burdened Virtues</i> , introduction and ch. 1	
	Virtues and Vices – Can virtue ethics help with moral dilemmas?	Rosalind Hursthouse, “Virtue Theory and Abortion”	Discussion_2
6	Sentimentalism – Hume	David Hume, <i>A Treatise of Human Nature</i> , Book III, Part I, ch. 1–2	iRAT_3 tRAT_3
	Sentimentalism – Emotivism	Alfred Jules Ayer, <i>Language, Truth, and Logic</i> , selections	
7	Interlude – Is moral philosophy misguided?	Susan Wolf, “Moral Saints”	Midterm Paper
	Indigenous Ethics – Hopi ethics	Maria Glowacka, “The Metaphorical Dimensions of Hopi Ethics”	

8	Indigenous Ethics – Contributions to the American experiment	Donald A. Grinde, Jr., and Bruce E. Johansen, <i>Exemplar of Liberty: Native America and the Evolution of Democracy</i> , selections	Discussion_3
	Indigenous Ethics – Special guest: a local elder	TBD	
9	Human Rights – Wollstonecraft	Mary Wollstonecraft, <i>A Vindication of the Rights of Woman</i> , ch. 1–2	iRAT_4 tRAT_4
	Human Rights – Locke	John Locke, <i>Second Treatise of Government</i> , selections	
10	Human Rights – Disability	Inga Bostad and Halvor Hanisch, “Freedom and Disability Rights: Dependence, Independence, and Interdependence”	Discussion_4
	Existentialism – Nietzsche	Friedrich Nietzsche, <i>Genealogy of Morality</i> , part 1	iRAT_5 tRAT_5
11	Existentialism – de Beauvoir	Simone de Beauvoir, <i>The Ethics of Ambiguity</i> , selections	
	Care Ethics – Gilligan	Carol Gilligan, <i>In a Different Voice: Psychological Theory and Moral Development</i> , selections	
12	Care Ethics – Noddings	Nel Noddings, <i>Caring: A Relational Approach to Ethics and Moral Education</i>	Discussion_5
	Review & Open Discussion		Peer & Self Evaluations
Exams	Formal written exam: short answer and essay questions		

Schedule of Assessments

A breakdown of planned assignments for the course.

Team-Based Learning (25%)

This course employs a method called Team-Based Learning (TBL). Students are assigned to permanent teams of about 4–5 people throughout the semester. These teams complete a series of assignments together in class, including contributing to whole-class discussion. Teams will be *ad hoc* in Weeks 1–2 to accommodate the add/drop period. Permanent teams will be finalized by Week 3.

*Readiness Assurance Tests (1% * 5 + 1% * 5 = 10%).* These are reading quizzes with 5 multiple choice questions each. Their purpose is to encourage students to complete the assigned readings *before* the class sessions that depend on that background. RATs cover *all* of the assigned readings for a unit; shorter units will be combined with others. There are two components to each RAT: an individual RAT, or iRAT, which students complete individually; and a team RAT, or tRAT, which students complete in their teams. Each iRAT and tRAT is worth 1% towards the final grade. The first RATs (iRAT_0 and tRAT_0) are to familiarize students with the format, and do not count towards the final grade.

*Discussion Assignments (2% * 5 = 10%).* These are short answer assignments. Students will be given a discussion question to work on in-class. Over the course of the unit, each team will build the outline of an essay in response to the question. The whole class will discuss the teams’ answers. These must be submitted at the end of the final class of a unit.

Peer & Self Evaluations (5%). At the end of the course, students will evaluate their teammates' contributions to their discussions, as well as their own, and provide constructive feedback. A formative Peer & Self Evaluation is due as an additional attachment to the Midterm paper.

Midterm Paper (35%)

A midterm paper of approximately 1,500 words is due by the beginning of Week 7. Students will be given a choice between several essay questions to answer.

Exam (40%)

There will be a formal written exam for this course. It is comprehensive, covering the entirety of the course readings, lectures, and discussions, but weighted slightly in favour of the latter half. It will consist of short answer questions and an essay question. Students may bring only approved materials. The exam will be 2 hours in length, but the questions will be designed such that it should be possible to complete the exam in about 90 minutes.

LOWER DIVISION – FEMINIST PHILOSOPHY

Feminism is a political and activist movement aimed at ending sexism, misogyny, and injustices faced by women. Feminism is also a rich intellectual tradition dating back centuries, which uses various facets of women’s experience to challenge or critique oppressive social and intellectual frameworks, imagine alternatives, and uncover insights in more abstract domains. Some ethical, epistemological, political, or metaphysical issues are distinctively, if not uniquely, raised in the feminist tradition. Feminist scholarship also considers the many different perspectives that intersect with those of women, including those of black, indigenous, and other people of colour; people with disabilities; and queer and trans folks. This course surveys a number of important topics and writers in feminist philosophy, beginning with historical and timeless issues for feminists, such as how to theorize oppression, misogyny, reproductive rights, and women’s work. The course then considers several theoretical approaches, such as Black feminism, intersectionality, and postcolonial feminism. The final sessions of the course consider recent ways in which feminist philosophy and feminist theory have critiqued the tech industry.

Course Schedule

Week	Topic	Reading	Due Dates
1	Introduction: Feminism & Feminist Philosophy	Syllabus	
	Oppression	Marilyn Frye, “Oppression,” <i>The Politics of Reality</i> .	
2	Misogyny	Kate Manne, <i>Down Girl</i> , selections	
	The Suffrage Movement	Glenda Norquay (ed.), <i>Voices and Votes</i> , selections	Journal_1
3	Women’s Education	Anna Julia Cooper, <i>A Voice from the South</i> , “The Higher Education of Woman”	
	Reproductive Rights	Susan Sherwin, “Abortion Through a Feminist Ethics Lens”	
4	Women in the Workplace	Mary Johnstone-Louis, “Corporate Social Responsibility and Women’s Entrepreneurship: Towards a More Adequate Theory of ‘Work’”	
	Care Work	Eva Feder Kittay, <i>Love’s Labor</i> , selections	Journal_2
5	Sex Work	Julia O’Connell Davidson, “The Rights and Wrongs of Prostitution”	
	Pornography	Rae Langton, “Speech Acts and Unspeakable Acts”	
6	Intersectionality	Kimberlé Crenshaw, “Mapping the Margins: Intersectionality, Identity Politics and Violence against Women of Color”	
	Feminist Metaphysics	María Lugones, “Playfulness, ‘World’-Travelling, and Loving Perception”	Journal_3

7	Feminist Epistemology	Donna Haraway, "Situated Knowledges: The Science Question in Feminism and the Privilege of Partial Perspective"	
	Black Feminist Epistemology	Patricia Hill Collins, <i>Black Feminist Thought</i> , selections	
8	Feminist Anger	Myisha Cherry, <i>The Case for Rage</i> , selections	
	Allyship	Veronica Ivy, "Allies Behaving Badly: Gaslighting as Epistemic Injustice"	Midterm_Paper
9	Indigenous Matriarchy as Feminism	Jihan Gearon, "Indigenous Feminism is Our Culture"	
	Missing and Murdered Indigenous Women and Girls	Sherene Razack, "Gendering Disposability"	
10	Postcolonial Feminism	Elena Ruíz, "Postcolonial and Decolonial Feminisms"	
	Feminism and Disability	Alison Kafer, "Feminist Queer Crip"	Journal_4
11	Trans Feminism	Talia Mae Bettcher, "Evil Deceivers and Make-Believers: On Transphobic Violence and the Politics of Illusion"	
	Queer Feminism	Eve Kosofsky Sedgwick, "Queer and Now"	
12	Data Feminism	Catherine D'Ignazio and Lauren Klein, <i>Data Feminism</i> , selections	
	Technological Racism	Ruha Benjamin, <i>Race after Technology</i> , selections	Journal_5
Exams	Term_Paper		

Schedule of Assessments

A breakdown of planned assignments for the course.

Online Discussion (10%)

This course will use a gamified discussion platform (ideally YellowDig, but MS Teams can be hacked to make this work if need be). Students will earn points by contributing to the discussion platform; to receive full marks, students must earn enough points to reach a weekly quota. Contributions may include: questions about course material, questions about assignments, sharing additional sources or news articles, sharing relevant insights or personal experiences, or commenting on other students' posts.

Reading Journal (5% * 5 = 25%)

Every two weeks (except Week 8), students will submit a short reflection piece on the most recent set of readings. These short, informal essays will be about 300 words long.

Midterm Paper (25%)

A formal philosophical essay, about 800 words. Due Week 8.

Term Paper (40%)

A formal philosophical essay, about 1,500 words. Due two weeks after classes end.

LOWER DIVISION – BIOMEDICAL ETHICS

Medicine is a field fraught with ethical dilemmas. This course introduces students to a selection of these issues, such as: the history of biomedical ethics, including the Hippocratic Oath; modern professional ethics in medicine and biomedical research; the ethics of death, killing, and saving lives, including abortion, physician assisted death, and advance directives; issues raised by medical technologies, including access to treatment, vaccine hesitancy, medical surveillance, and human enhancement; social issues and medicine, including race, LGBTQ, disability, and epistemic injustice; and pandemic ethics. The course also provides an introduction to ethical principles used in medical practice and professional associations. The aim is to provide future medical professionals and savvy healthcare service users a set of tools for thinking about and debating contentious issues in medicine and medical research.

Course Schedule

Unit	Topic	Reading	Due Dates
Intro	Introduction	Syllabus	
0 Ethical Principles	The Hippocratic Oath	Michael North (trans.). The Hippocratic Oath. https://www.nlm.nih.gov/hmd/greek/greek_oath.html	iRAT_0 tRAT_0
	Values in Health Care	Canadian Medical Association, Charter of Shared Values.	
	Principles of Bioethics	Tom L. Beauchamp and James F. Childress, Respect for Autonomy; Beneficence; Non-Maleficence [selections]. In <i>Principles of Biomedical Ethics</i> , 5th ed.	Discussion_0
1 Professional Ethics	Professional Ethics in Medicine	Canadian Medical Association Code of Ethics and Professionalism, https://policybase.cma.ca/documents/policypdf/PD19-03.pdf	iRAT_1 tRAT_1
	Hospital Ethics Committees	Robert M. Veatch, “Hospital Ethics Committees: Is There a Role?”	
	Biomedical Research Ethics	The National Commission for the Protection of Human Subjects of Biomedical and Behavioral Research, <i>The Belmont Report</i> .	
	Professional Responsibility	Benjamin Davies and Joshua Parker. “No Blame No Gain? From a No Blame Culture to a Responsibility Culture in Medicine.”	
	Medical Paternalism	Daniel Groll. “Medical Paternalism.”	Discussion_1
2 Death, Killing, and Letting Die	Is it Bad to Die?	Thomas Nagel, “Death,” in <i>Mortal Questions</i> .	iRAT_2 tRAT_2
	Medical Assistance in Dying	James Rachels. “Active and Passive Euthanasia.”	
	Abortion	Judith Jarvis Thomson. “A Defence of Abortion.”	
	Advance Directives	Jim Stone. “Advance Directives, Autonomy, and Unintended Death.”	

	Resource Allocation and Saving Lives	Richard Yetter Chappell. “Against ‘Saving Lives’: Equal Concern and Differential Impact.”	Discussion_2
3 Medical Technologies and Treatments	Vaccination	Jason L. Schwartz and Arthur L. Caplan. “Vaccination refusal: ethics, individual rights, and the common good.”	iRAT_3 tRAT_3
	Drug Development	David B. Resnik. “Developing Drugs for the Developing World: An Economic, Legal, Moral, and Political Dilemma.”	
	Health Surveillance	Alan Rubel. “Justifying Public Health Surveillance: Basic Interests, Unreasonable Exercise, and Privacy.”	
	Human Enhancement	Alberto Giubilini and Sagar Sanyal. “The Ethics of Human Enhancement.”	Discussion_3
	Listening to Patients	Havi Carel and Ian James Kidd. “Epistemic injustice in healthcare: a philosophical analysis.”	iRAT_4 tRAT_4
4 Social Context	Disabilities	Elizabeth Barnes. “Disability, Minority, and Difference.”	
	Queer Bioethics	Cristina Richie. “Lessons from Queer Bioethics: A Response to Timothy F. Murphy.”	
	Gender Affirmation	Samuel Dubin et al. “Medically assisted gender affirmation: when children and parents disagree.”	Term_Paper
	Race and Medicine	Laura Specker Sullivan. “Trust, Risk, and Race in American Medicine.”	
	Pandemics	Joint Centre for Bioethics Pandemic Ethics Working Group. “The Duty to Care in a Pandemic.”	Discussion_4
Exams	Peer_Assessment, Final_Exam		

Schedule of Assessments

A breakdown of planned assignments for the course.

Team-Based Learning (25%)

This course employs a method called Team-Based Learning (TBL). Students are assigned to permanent teams of about 4–5 people throughout the semester. These teams complete a series of assignments together in class, including contributing to whole-class discussion. Teams will be *ad hoc* in Weeks 1–2 to accommodate the add/drop period. Permanent teams will be finalized by Week 3.

*Readiness Assurance Tests (2% * 4 + 1% * 4 = 12%).* These are reading quizzes with 5 multiple choice questions each. Their purpose is to encourage students to complete the assigned readings *before* the class sessions that depend on that background. RATs cover *all* of the assigned readings for a unit; shorter units will be combined with others. There are two components to each RAT: an individual RAT, or iRAT, which students complete individually; and a team RAT, or tRAT, which students complete in their teams. Each iRAT and tRAT is worth 1% towards the final grade. The first RATs (iRAT_0 and tRAT_0) are to familiarize students with the format, and do not count towards the final grade.

*Discussion Assignments (1.5% * 4 = 6%).* These are short answer assignments. Students will be given a discussion question to work on in-class. Over the course of the unit, each team will build the outline of an essay in response to the question. The whole class will discuss the teams' answers. These must be submitted at the end of the final class of a unit.

Peer & Self Evaluations (7%). At the end of the course, students will evaluate their teammates' contributions to their discussions, as well as their own, and provide constructive feedback. A formative Peer & Self Evaluation is due as an additional attachment to the Midterm paper.

Term Paper (35%)

A midterm paper of approximately 1,000 words is due by the end of Week 11. Students will be given a choice between several essay questions to answer.

Exam (40%)

There will be a formal written exam for this course. It is comprehensive, covering the entirety of the course readings, lectures, and discussions. It will consist of short answer questions and an essay question. Students may bring only approved materials. The exam will be 2 hours in length, but the questions will be designed such that it should be possible to complete the exam in about 90 minutes.

UPPER DIVISION – SOCIAL EPISTEMOLOGY

Classically, in the Western tradition, epistemology has been dominated by questions about the nature of knowledge, skepticism, scientific objectivity, justification, and similar. While important, these questions tend to be discussed in the abstract, paying little attention to the actual contexts in which people go about acquiring, testing, and sharing their beliefs. In other words, the classical project in the theory of knowledge has tended to overlook the experiences of actual *knowers*.

In recent decades, this approach to epistemology has been challenged from several angles. Postmodernists raise suspicions about supposedly apolitical knowledge claims. Feminists and other liberatory theorists ask about the epistemological significance of the knower's social identity. In a tradition stemming from Aristotle's ethics, virtue and vice theorists investigate the traits of the knower that are most and least conducive to epistemic goods. Work in social ontology raises questions about whether groups are the kind of entity that can have beliefs and knowledge. Social psychology exposes the presence of bias in our epistemic practices. The possibility of epistemic harms and distinctively epistemic injustices arise especially where marginalized and dominant social groups interact. The role of trust in acquiring beliefs exposes our limitations and vulnerabilities as inquirers. Ignorance and prejudice can masquerade as knowledge in socially unjust conditions. Finally, there has been some work applying epistemological tools to understand real world phenomena, such as conspiracy theories and fake news. This course surveys each of these topics.

Course Schedule

Week	Topic	Reading	Due Dates
1	Introduction	Syllabus	
	Power and Postmodernism	Michel Foucault, <i>The History of Sexuality, Vol. 1</i> , pp. 92–131.	
2	Feminist Epistemology	Elizabeth Anderson, "Feminist Epistemology: An Interpretation and a Defense"	
	Feminist Philosophy of Science	Helen Longino, "Values and Objectivity," in <i>Science as Social Knowledge</i>	
3	Virtue Reliabilism	Ernest Sosa, "The Raft and the Pyramid"	
	Virtue Reliabilism	John Greco, "Agent Reliabilism"	
4	Virtue Responsibilism	Linda Zagzebski, <i>Virtues of the Mind</i> , sections 2.7 and 4.1	
	Virtue Responsibilism	James Montmarquet, "Epistemic Virtue and Doxastic Responsibility"	
5	Epistemic Vices	Heather Battaly, "Varieties of Epistemic Vice," in <i>The Ethics of Belief</i> , eds. J. Matheson and R. Vitz.	
	Epistemic Vices	Quassim Cassam, "Vice Epistemology"	Midterm Paper
6	Group Beliefs and Knowledge	Margaret Gilbert, "Collective Epistemology"	

	Group Beliefs and Knowledge	Raimo Tuomela, "Group Knowledge Analyzed"	
7	Social Psychology and Philosophy of Implicit Bias	Alex Madva, "Virtue, Social Knowledge, and Implicit Bias," in <i>Implicit Bias and Philosophy, Vol. 1</i> , eds. M. Brownstein and J. Saul	
	Social Psychology and Philosophy of Implicit Bias	Jules Holroyd and Joseph Sweetman, "The Heterogeneity of Implicit Bias," in <i>Implicit Bias and Philosophy, Vol. 1</i>	
8	Epistemic Injustice	Miranda Fricker, "Testimonial Injustice," in <i>Epistemic Injustice: Power and the Ethics of Knowing</i>	
	Epistemic Injustice	Emmalon Davis, "On Epistemic Appropriation"	
9	Trust	Paul Faulkner, "Norms of Trust," in <i>Social Epistemology</i> , eds. A. Haddock, A. Millar, and D. Pritchard	
	Trust	Judith Baker, "Trust and Rationality"	
10	Ignorance	Charles Mills, "White Ignorance," in <i>Race and Epistemologies of Ignorance</i> , eds. S. Sullivan and N. Tuana	
	Ignorance	José Medina, "Active Ignorance, Epistemic Others, and Epistemic Friction," in <i>The Epistemology of Resistance</i>	
11	Conspiracy Theories	Charles Pigden, "Conspiracy Theories and Conventional Wisdom"	
	Conspiracy Theories	Susan Feldman, "Counterfactual Conspiracy Theories"	
12	Fake News	Regina Rini, "Fake News and Partisan Epistemology"	
	Poster Session		Poster
Exams			Term Paper

Schedule of Assessments

A breakdown of planned assignments for the course.

Midterm Paper (30%)

An essay of approximately 2,000 words. Prompts will be supplied, but students may write on another topic with the instructor's approval.

Poster Project (25%)

Individually or in groups of 3–4 (depends on enrolment), produce a research poster on a topic drawing from the course readings. Posters will be showcased in the final class session. Each

student must evaluate two other posters; these peer evaluations will be combined with the instructor's evaluations to produce the grade.

Term Paper (45%)

An essay of approximately 3,000 words on a topic drawing from the course material. Prompts will be supplied, but students are encouraged to propose a topic to the instructor.

UPPER DIVISION – PRIVACY: FUNDAMENTAL RIGHT OR OUTMODED IDEAL?

In the mid-twentieth century, the right to privacy had become enshrined as one of the fundamental human rights, and was recognized as a key component of democracy. But, as one of the original architects of the Internet, Vint Cerf, observed in 2013, from a historical perspective ‘privacy may actually be an anomaly’. Indeed, privacy rights do not appear in any of the philosophical or political texts of the Enlightenment, which are credited with expounding the very idea of human rights for the first time. It is not until the late nineteenth century, when new technologies – photography and cheap printing – enabled new forms of intrusion on private life, that legal scholars and philosophers began to discuss the possibility of a ‘right to be let alone’. A century and a half later, new developments in computing and information technology are poised to return us to a pre-privacy world, but on a global scale.

In this course, we will explore historical and contemporary writings on privacy. We will trace the evolution of thinking about privacy from the pre-modern era to the information revolution. We will discuss philosophical accounts of what privacy is, and why it has value. Of interest to us will be the historical question of whether privacy is a recent invention, or a reconceptualization of older ideas. A recurring theme will be how changes in technology have prompted changes in how we think about privacy, whether we think it is worth protecting, and whether it was merely an historical anomaly.

Course Schedule

Week	Topic	Reading	Due Dates
1	Introduction	Syllabus	
	Early history: confessionals and barriers	Irven Resnick, ‘Learning from the Confessional in the Later Thirteenth Century: Contributions to Human Sexuality, Daily Life, and a Science of Nature’	
2	The Panopticon	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Jeremy Bentham, <i>The Works of Jeremy Bentham, Published under the Superintendence of his Executor, John Bowring</i> (selections) • Michel Foucault, <i>Discipline and Punish</i> (selections) 	
	Photography and the Right to Be Let Alone	Samuel Warren & Louis Brandeis, ‘The Right to Privacy’	
3	Privacy as Information Control	Alan Westin, <i>Privacy and Freedom</i> (selections)	
	Privacy as Information Control	William Parent, ‘Privacy, Morality, and the Law’	
4	Privacy as Access Control	Ruth Gavison, ‘Privacy and the Limits of the Law’	
	Privacy as Contextual Integrity	Helen Nissenbaum, ‘Privacy as Contextual Integrity’	
5	Privacy as Power	Carissa Véliz, <i>Privacy is Power</i> (selections)	
	Privacy, Dignity, and Autonomy	Edward Bloustein, ‘Privacy as an Aspect of Human Dignity’	

6	Privacy and Intimacy	Charles Fried, 'Privacy', in <i>An Anatomy of Values</i>	MidtermPaper
	The Right to Forget	Anita Allen, 'The Electronic Data Give-Away'	
7	Privacy and Democracy	Jeffrey Reiman, 'Driving to the Panopticon'	
	Electronic Databanks	Simson Garfinkel, <i>Database Nation</i> (selections)	
8	Privacy and <i>Roe v. Wade</i>	Jean Cohen, 'Redescribing Privacy: Identity, Difference, and the Abortion Controversy'	
	Feminist Critiques of Privacy	Catharine MacKinnon, <i>Toward a Feminist Theory of the State</i> (selections)	
9	Feminist Defences of Privacy	Anita Allen, <i>Uneasy Access: Privacy for Women in a Free Society</i> (selections)	
	Government Surveillance	Kenneth Einar Himma, 'Why Security Trumps Privacy', in <i>Privacy, Security and Accountability: Ethics, Law and Policy</i> , ed. Adam Moore	
10	Surveillance Capitalism	Shoshana Zuboff, <i>The Age of Surveillance Capitalism</i> (selections)	
	Terms of Service	Irene Pollach, 'A Typology of Communicative Strategies in Online Privacy Policies: Ethics, Power, and Informed Consent'	
11	Social Media	Zhen Troy Chen and Ming Cheung, 'Privacy perception and protection on Chinese social media: a case study of WeChat'	
	Electronic Health Records	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Mark Rothstein, 'Is Deidentification Sufficient to Protect Health Privacy in Research?' • Sharona Hoffman, 'Electronic Health Records and Research: Privacy Versus Scientific Priorities' 	
12	Discussion: Is Privacy Dead?	Review previous readings and your own research	GroupProject
	Group Projects	No reading	
Exams			TermPaper

Schedule of Assessments

A breakdown of planned assignments for the course.

Group Project (30%)

In a group of three or four, produce a case study of a privacy violation. It could be a data breach, case of identity theft, surveillance, snooping, etc. Your presentation must use the theoretical

material we studied to analyze technological and normative features of the case, and offer some critical commentary. A component of the grade on this assignment will be associated with a peer evaluation exercise.

Midterm Paper (30%)

A philosophical essay of about 1,500 words on the nature of privacy. May be theoretical or applied. Prompts will be supplied, but students may propose their own topics of interest.

Term Paper (40%)

A philosophical essay of about 2,000 words that substantially engages with the course material. May be theoretical or applied. Prompts will be supplied, but students may propose their own topics of interest.

UPPER DIVISION / GRADUATE SEMINAR – EPISTEMIC INJUSTICE

Have you ever been doubted not because of what you said, but because of who you are? Have you ever had a difficult time explaining something that is important to you, but for which your conversation partners have lacked the required background to understand what you were saying? Have you been frustrated by the ignorance some people have of basic facts about your culture? Have you noticed that some communities lack access to important epistemic resources, such as reliable news media, public libraries, or educational opportunities?

‘Epistemic injustice’ refers to instances or patterns that unfairly discount, ignore, reject, distort, or impair the subject’s ability to acquire or contribute to knowledge and understanding. It is a kind of distinctively epistemic wrong, and not just an epistemically-tinged ethical or political wrong. Experiences of epistemic injustice, particularly having one’s testimony or one’s conception of one’s experience ignored or rejected, have been noted by writers from marginalized social groups for many years, but it is only recently that philosophical attention has been turned to the issue. The last decade has seen a proliferation of research analysing, applying, and extending accounts of various kinds of epistemic injustice, and proposing ways to confront these and other epistemic wrongs. This seminar canvasses the central texts and live areas of debate in this field, including: silencing and smothering testimony, testimonial injustice, virtuous listening, hermeneutical injustice, active ignorance, distributive epistemic injustice, epistemic oppression, epistemic justice and democracy, and applications of epistemic injustice to specific settings and cases.

Course Schedule

Week	Topic	Reading	Due Dates
1	Introduction	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Syllabus • Tyler Ford, ‘My life without gender’, <i>The Guardian</i>, 7 Aug 2015, https://www.theguardian.com/world/2015/aug/07/my-life-without-gender-strangers-are-desperate-to-know-what-genitalia-i-have • Reni Eddo-Lodge, ‘Why I’m no longer talking to white people about race’, 22 Feb 2014, http://renieddolodge.co.uk/?p=842 • Gretchen Kelly, ‘The thing all women do that you don’t know about’, <i>Huffpost</i>, 23 Nov 2015, https://www.huffingtonpost.com/gretchen-kelly/the-thing-all-women-do-you-dont-know-about_b_8630416.html 	
2	Epistemic Wrongs	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Alessandra Tanesini, ‘“Calm Down, Dear”: Intellectual Arrogance, Silencing, and Ignorance’ • Patricia Hill Collins, ‘Black Feminist Epistemology’, in <i>Black Feminist Thought: Knowledge, Consciousness, and the Politics of Empowerment</i> • Kristie Dotson, ‘Tracking Epistemic Violence, Tracking Practices of Silencing’ 	
3	Testimonial Injustice	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Miranda Fricker, <i>Epistemic Injustice: Power and the Ethics of Knowing</i>, ch. 1–3 	

4	Testimonial Injustice	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Miranda Fricker, <i>Epistemic Injustice</i>, ch. 4–6 	
5	Testimonial Injustice	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Paul Faulkner, ‘A Virtue Theory of Testimony’ • Jeremy Wanderer, ‘Addressing Testimonial Injustice: Being Ignored and Being Rejected’ • Emmalon Davis, ‘Typecasts, Tokens, and Spokespersons: A Case for Credibility Excess as Testimonial Injustice’ 	
6	Hermeneutical Injustice	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Miranda Fricker, <i>Epistemic Injustice</i>, ch. 7 • José Medina, ‘Imposed Silences and Shared Hermeneutical Responsibilities’, in <i>The Epistemology of Resistance</i> • Miranda Fricker, ‘Epistemic injustice and the preservation of ignorance’, in <i>The epistemic dimensions of ignorance</i>, eds. Rik Peels and Martijn Blaauw 	
7	Active Ignorance	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Gaile Pohlhaus, Jr., ‘Relational Knowing and Epistemic Injustice: Toward a Theory of Willful Hermeneutical Ignorance’ • José Medina, ‘Resistance as Epistemic Vice and as Epistemic Virtue’, in <i>The Epistemology of Resistance</i> • Charles Mills, ‘White Ignorance’, in <i>Race and Epistemologies of Ignorance</i>, eds. S. Sullivan and N. Tuana. 	
8	Epistemic Justice and Democracy	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Amandine Catala, ‘Democracy, Trust, and Epistemic Justice’ • Susan Dieleman, ‘Epistemic Justice and Democratic Legitimacy’ • Miranda Fricker, ‘Epistemic Justice as a Condition of Political Freedom?’ 	
9	Epistemic Oppression	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Kristie Dotson, ‘Conceptualizing Epistemic Oppression’ • Nora Berenstain, ‘Epistemic Exploitation’ • Alison Bailey, ‘On Anger, Silence, and Epistemic Injustice’, in <i>Harms and Wrongs in Epistemic Practice</i>, eds. Simon Barker, Charlie Crerar, and Trystan Goetze 	
10	Epistemic Injustice Applied	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Katharine Jenkins, ‘Rape Myths and Domestic Abuse Myths as Hermeneutical Injustices’ • Ian James Kidd and Havi Carel, ‘Epistemic Injustice and Illness’ • Ben Kotzee, ‘Education and Epistemic Injustice’, in <i>Routledge Handbook of Epistemic Injustice</i>, eds. I. J. Kidd, J. Medina, G. Pohlhaus 	
11	Structural Barriers to Epistemic Justice	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Benjamin Sherman, ‘There’s No (Testimonial) Justice: Why Pursuit of a Virtue is Not the Solution to Epistemic Injustice’ • Elizabeth Anderson, ‘Epistemic Injustice as a Virtue of Social Institutions’ 	

		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Veronica Ivy, 'Allies Behaving Badly: Gaslighting as Epistemic Injustice', in <i>Routledge Handbook of Epistemic Injustice</i> 	
12	Epistemic Injustice Grab Bag	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • David Coady, 'Two Concepts of Epistemic Injustice' • Faik Kurtulmus and Gürol Irzik, 'Justice in the Distribution of Knowledge' • Heidi Grasswick, 'Understanding Epistemic Trust Injustices and Their Harms', in <i>Harms and Wrongs in Epistemic Practice</i> 	
Exams			Term Paper

Schedule of Assessments

Assigned work for this course.

Weekly Discussion Questions (10%)

Post three to five questions about the assigned reading before each class to help structure our discussion.

Weekly Reading Journal (15%)

After class, write about 300 words in response to the reading and post it online. You may earn up to 5 bonus points towards your course grade by writing a substantive reply to another student's post.

Seminar Presentation (25%)

Lead part of one session of the seminar with a 30 minute presentation, then moderate the following 30 minutes of discussion. The presentation must summarize the main points of one of the assigned readings, raise some critical points for discussion, and connect the reading to either another philosophical article you have found in your independent research or to a detailed case study from real life or fiction. Sign up for a seminar slot by the end of Week 2.

Research Paper (50%)

Write an essay of 5,000 words (7,000 words for graduate students). It must make reference to and substantively engage with some of the mandatory readings. You are asked to send me a paper proposal, comprising an outline and provisional list of references, no later than Week 12, which we will discuss in a one-on-one tutorial. Due two weeks after lectures end.

Professional Accreditation (Higher Education Academy)



Certificate

This is to certify that

Trystan Goetze

has achieved the status of

Associate Fellow

of The Higher Education Academy

in recognition of attainment against the

UK Professional Standards Framework for
teaching and learning support in higher education.

Recognition reference:

PR110152

Date of recognition

25/07/2016

Professor Stephanie Marshall

Chief Executive

The Higher Education Academy

Professor Rama Thirunamachandran

Chairman of the Board of Directors

The Higher Education Academy Board

The Higher Education Academy is a company limited by guarantee registered in England and Wales no. 04931031.
Registered as a charity in England and Wales no. 1101607. Registered as a charity in Scotland no. SC043946.

The Higher Education Academy and its logo are registered trademarks and should not be used without our permission.