CS 153 – Post-Module Assignment

In the style of a blog post (250–300 words), write an answer to **one** of the following prompts:

Option 1: Should the government levy a tax on proprietary software, and distribute the funds to support free and open-source software? Why or why not?

Option 2: Does the purpose of a piece of software (e.g. medical, accounting, software development) matter when considering whether to release it under a free or open-source license? Why or why not?

Sources

Refer to the following reading in your answer (this is the same text as the PDF on Canvas):

<u>The GNU Manifesto, by Richard Stallman</u>

You may also use sources that you find in your own research.

The following are some suggested starting places for finding additional sources:

- <u>Free Software Foundation | Philosophy</u>
- CNet article on how businesses decide between open- and closed-source
- Tech Republic article on Google's open-source but closed-development language, Go

Citations

Cite your sources in the Chicago Author-Date style, in-line and in a bibliography. The bibliography does not count toward the word limit. Instructions for this citation style are here:

Purdue Online Writing Lab - Chicago

Due Dates

Your assignment is due by **11:59 PM on Monday, October 25**. Submit it on Canvas in the text entry block (i.e., write your answer so that it is suitable to be pasted as plain text).

You will receive two anonymized assignments written by your peers to grade using the rubric on the next page. Your grading is due by **11:59 PM on Monday, November 8**.

The teaching team will review these peer grades prior to release; the course head reserves the right to make any adjustments deemed necessary for fairness and accuracy.

After grading: Post your assignment (optional)

Please do not post your assignment anywhere until <u>after</u> grades have been released. This is to preserve anonymity in the grading process.

Thereafter, you are welcome, but not required, to share your writing on the Ed discussion forum for CS 153, and to reply to one another's thoughts. Dr. Goetze or Prof. Chong may also reply.

Grading (out of 12 points total)

When grading, use the following rubric.

	2/2	1.5/2	1/2	0.5/2	0/2
Quality of Answer	Gives a specific and original answer to the question	Gives a specific answer to the question	Gives multiple answers to the question	Unclear exactly what answer to the question is being given	Does not answer the question
	4/4	3/4	2/4	1/4	0/4
Quality of Arguments	Arguments are persuasive and mutually reinforcing	Arguments are mostly persuasive but could use additional details	Arguments are somewhat unpersuasive or underdeveloped, vulnerable to obvious objections	Arguments are unpersuasive, undeveloped, or contradictory	Arguments are nonsensical or contradictory
	4/4	3/4	2/4	1/4	0/4
Quality of Writing	Writing is clear, grammatical	Writing is mostly clear, a few minor grammatical errors	Writing is at times unclear, several major grammatical errors	Writing is mostly unclear, riddled with grammatical errors	Writing is difficult or impossible to understand
	2/2	1.5/2	1/2	0.5/2	0/2
Citations	In-line and bibliographic citations are present and correct to style, required reading and additional sources are used highly effectively	In-line and bibliographic citations are present are correct to style, required reading is used effectively	Some citations are missing or not to style, required reading is used somewhat ineffectively	Multiple citations are missing and/or incomplete, required reading is not used	Citations are absent, required reading is not used

Comments

In addition to the above rubric, you are encouraged to provide constructive feedback by answering the following questions:

- What did the writer of this piece do *particularly well*?
- What is one specific area where the writer could improve their *argument*?
- What is one specific area where the writer could improve the quality of their writing?

Additional office hours (by appointment)

Email Dr. Goetze to ask questions or to schedule an appointment: tgoetze@fas.harvard.edu