CornellEngineering

Bovay Program in the History and Ethics of Professional Engineering

ENGRG 3605 // LEC 001 // FALL 2025

Ethics of Computing and Artificial Intelligence Technologies

Catalogue Course Description

Computing is ubiquitous in modern life, and essential to professional work in engineering and many other disciplines. However, computing technologies, especially artificial intelligence, raise distinctive normative issues. This course surveys a variety of social, ethical, and political issues that arise in connection with computing technologies, including artificial intelligence, from a philosophical perspective. Specific topics may include: hacking, privacy, intellectual property, forms of deception and manipulation enabled by computing technologies, social injustices that are reinforced by algorithmic systems, machine ethics, and science fiction issues such as robot rights or existential risks posed by superintelligent computer systems. Content delivery will be through a mix of lectures, readings, and in-class discussion.

Class No.: 8562 **Credit Hours**: 3.0 **Grade Options**: Letter grades or S/U

Cross-listed and/or held with: PHIL 2473 (class No. 18494), STS 3605 (class No. 20757)

Prerequisites: For engineering students: Completion of at least one first-year writing seminar

Permission note: For engineering students: Limited to sophomores, juniors, and seniors

Major requirements: This course fulfills a liberal studies requirement for engineering majors (categories: ETM-AS, SSC-AS, KCM-AG, SBA-AG). The course may also fulfill an ethics requirement for other programs of study; consult with your academic advisor.

Minor requirements: This course can fulfill either an elective or the "Foundations of AI: Ethics, Governance & Policy" requirement for the Bowers CIS AI Minor.

Meeting times: Tuesdays & Thursdays 1:25–2:40 PM **Meeting Location** [redacted]

Course website: https://canvas.cornell.edu/courses/80884

Instructor

Dr. Trystan S. Goetze (they/them/theirs), Sue G. and Harry E. Bovay, Jr., '36 Assistant Teaching Professor and Director of the History and Ethics of Professional Engineering, Senior Lecturer (by courtesy) in the Sage School of Philosophy.

Email: [redacted] **Phone**: [redacted] **Office**: [redacted]

Web: https://ethics.engineering.cornell.edu/ • https://www.trystangoetze.ca/

Appointments

Drop-in Office Hours (no appointment required): Fridays, 1:00–2:30 PM

In-person appointments [redacted]

Online appointments [redacted]

[redacted] to request a meeting if none of the options above works for you.

Course Objectives

After completing this course, students will be able to:

- Identify and explain ethical issues raised by computing technologies, including but not limited to the following themes: human autonomy, deception, privacy, property, human relationships, existential risks, and sustainability.

- Critique, articulate, and justify specific ethical opinions and computing design choices deriving therefrom.
- Develop a commitment to professional responsibility in computing and/or develop an evolving personal conception of practical wisdom vis–à-vis computing technologies.

Course Schedule

The following schedule is subject to revision in light of inclement weather, instructor illness, or emergencies. Changes to the schedule will be announced on Canvas first.

The readings are annotated with a number in [ ] square brackets. The number corresponds to the reading's number in the Bibliography of Readings, below. Where [C] appears, the reading will instead be posted to Canvas.

Dates highlighted in **green** are devoted to preparing for a specific assignment. Dates highlighted in **orange** will be spent on an in-class assignment. Dates highlighted in **navy blue** are scheduled breaks. The date highlighted in **red** is the final exam.

Unit	Date	Topic	Reading	Due Dates
0. Prelude	Aug 26	Welcome to the Course		
1. Computer Ethics	Aug 28	Technomoral Values	Rugnetta [C]	
	Sep 2	Professional Ethics in Computing	ACM Code [1] Johnson [2]	
	Sep 4	Sustainable Computing	Betz et al. [3]	
	Sep 9	**Manifesto Workshop**		
	Sep 11	Policy Vacuums and Conceptual Muddles	Moor [4]	Quiz 1 [F 9/12]
2. AI Ethics	Sep 16	The AI Mirror	Vallor [5]	
	Sep 18	AI Safety & Machine Ethics	D'Alessandro & Kirk-Giannini [6]	Manifesto 1 [F 9/19]
	Sep 23	Algorithmic Bias	Noble [7]	
	Sep 25	Algorithms and Autonomy	Rubel, Castro, and Pham [8]	
	Sep 30	**Letter to a Representative**		
3. Manipulative Technologies	Oct 2	Deceptive Patterns	Brignull [9]	
	Oct 7	Gamification	Nguyen [10]	

	Oct 9	Bullshit	Hicks, Humphries, and Slater [11]	Quiz 2 [F 10/10]
Fall Break (Oct 13–14)				
	Oct 16	**Manifesto Workshop**		
4. Privacy On- and Offline	Oct 21	Data, Privacy, and Persons	Garfinkel [12]	
	Oct 23	Surveillance and Democracy	Reiman [13]	Quiz 3 [F 10/24]
	Oct 28	Privacy and Race in America	Allen [14]	
5. Digital Property	Oct 30	Digital Media Piracy	Meissner [C]	Manifesto 2 [F 10/31]
	Nov 4	Free and Open-Source Software	Stallman [16]	
	Nov 6	Cultural Property and Indigenous Data Sovereignty	Carroll et al. [17]	
	Nov 11	**Essay**		
6. Computerized Relationships	Nov 13	App-Mediated Sex and Love	McKeever [18]	Quiz 4 [F 11/14]
	Nov 18	AI, Creativity, and Human Connection	Brainard [C]	
	Nov 20	Chatbots, Death, and Grieving	Kurzweil & Story [19]	Quiz 5 [F 11/21]
7. Interlude: Science Fiction Issues	Nov 25	Science Fiction Screening & Discussion (in-person attendance optional)		
Thanksgiving Break (Nov 26–28)				
8. Postlude	Dec 2	**Debate Preparation**		Quiz 6 [F 12/5]
	Dec 4	**Debate Day**		Manifesto 3 [M 12/8]
	TBA	**Final Exam**		Final Exam [TBA]

Other Key Dates

Last day to add Fall '25 courses: Sep 8.

Last day to drop without a "W" or to change final grade options: Oct 20.

Last day to drop with a "W": Dec 8.

Study Days: Dec 9 to Dec 11.

Final Exam Period: Dec 12 to Dec 20.

See the Registrar's list of key academic dates for more.

Course Materials

The course uses a custom coursepack, which is available through CAMP. Additional readings will be distributed via Canvas. Most of the readings are also available online or through the library. Contact the instructor if you have difficulty obtaining the readings.

You will not be required to purchase any other materials, but you are encouraged to obtain a set of index cards for taking notes on the readings (see Reading Note cards, below).

Bibliography of Readings

[C] M. Rugnetta, "Writing is Death," *Never Post*, 28 Aug 2024, <https://www.neverpo.st/xoxo-fest-live/>, 29:45–46:45.

[1] ACM, "ACM Code of Ethics and Professional Conduct," Association for Computing Machinery. Accessed: July 15, 2022. [Online]. Available: https://ethics.acm.org/

[2] D. G. Johnson, "Professional Ethics in Computing," in *Computer Ethics: Analysing Information Technology*, 4th ed., Upper Saddle River, NJ: Pearson, 2008, pp. 162–193.

[3] S. Betz *et al.*, "Sustainability Debt: A Metaphor to Support Sustainability Design Decisions," in *RE4SuSy 2015*, Ottawa, ON: CEUR Workshop Proceedings, Aug. 2015, pp. 55–63. [Online]. Available: https://ceur-ws.org/Vol-1416/Session2Paper4.pdf

[4] J. H. Moor, "What is Computer Ethics?," *Metaphilosophy*, vol. 16, no. 4, pp. 266–275, 1985.

[5] S. Vallor, "The AI Mirror," in *The AI Mirror: How to Reclaim Our Humanity in an Age of Machine Thinking*, Oxford University Press, 2024, pp. 15–36. doi: 10.1093/oso/9780197759066.003.0002.

[6] W. D'Alessandro and C. D. Kirk-Giannini, "Artificial Intelligence: Approaches to Safety," *Philos. Compass*, forthcoming.

[7] S. U. Noble, "Missed Connections: What Search Engines Say About Women," *Bitch*, no. 54, pp. 36–41, 2012.

[8] A. Rubel, C. Castro, and A. Pham, *Algorithms and Autonomy: The Ethics of Automated Decision Systems*. Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press, 2021.

[9] H. Brignull, *Deceptive Patterns: Exposing the Tricks Tech Companies Use to Control You*. Eastbourne, UK: Testimonium Ltd, 2023. Accessed: June 16, 2025. [Online]. Available: https://www.deceptive.design/book/contents/get-started

[10] C. T. Nguyen, "How Twitter Gamifies Communication," in *Applied Epistemology*, J. Lackey, Ed., Oxford and New York: Oxford University Press, 2021, pp. 410–436. [Online]. Available: https://doi.org/10.1093/oso/9780198833659.003.0017

[11] M. T. Hicks, J. Humphries, and J. Slater, "ChatGPT is bullshit," *Ethics Inf. Technol.*, vol. 26, no. 2, p. 38, June 2024, doi: 10.1007/s10676-024-09775-5.

[12] S. Garfinkel, "Privacy in a Database Nation," in *Computers, Ethics, and Society*, 3rd ed., M. D. Ermann and M. S. Shauf, Eds., New York and Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2003, pp. 137–152.
[13] J. H. Reiman, "Driving to the Panopticon: A Philosophical Exploration of the Risks to Privacy Posed by the Highway Technology of the Future," *Comput. High Technol. Law J.*, vol. 11, no. 1, pp. 27–44, 1995.
[14] A. L. Allen, "Dismantling the 'Black Opticon': Privacy, Race Equity, and Online Data-Protection Reform Forum Collection: Envisioning Equitable Online Governance," *Yale Law J. Forum*, vol. 131, pp. 907–959, 2022 2021.
[C] Meissner, N. "Forced pirates and the ethics of digital film." *Journal of Information Communication and Ethics in Society*, vol. 9, no. 3, Aug. 2011, doi: 10.1108/14779961111167667. [Replaced the Breakey article as of Oct 27.]
[16] R. Stallman, "The GNU Manifesto." Accessed: Feb. 25, 2024. [Online]. Available: https://www.gnu.org/gnu/manifesto.html
[17] S. R. Carroll *et al.*, "The CARE Principles for Indigenous Data Governance," *Data Sci. J.*, vol. 19, no. 43, pp. 1–12, Nov. 2020, doi: 10.5334/dsj-2020-043.
[18] N. McKeever, "Online Dating and Love Robots: How Technology May Undermine Valuable Features of Romantic Love," in *Philosophy of Love in the Past, Present, and Future*, A. Grahle, N. McKeever, and J. Saunders, Eds., New York, NY: Routledge, 2022, pp. 240–256.
[C] L. Brainard, "Step Away from the Chatbot: a Letter to a Student about AI and Creativity," in *Living Debates in Aesthetics*, ed. Sarah Worth, forthcoming.
[19] A. Kurzweil, D. Story, and C. A. McKean, "Are chatbots of the dead a brilliant idea or a terrible one? | Aeon Essays," Aeon. Accessed: June 13, 2025. [Online]. Available: https://aeon.co/essays/are-chatbots-of-the-dead-a-brilliant-idea-or-a-terrible-one

Assessment

Your final grade will be weighted across the following assessments:

- Technomoral Manifesto: 20%
    - First Draft: 10%*
    - Second Draft: 10%*
    - Final Draft: 10%
- In-class Assignments: 30%
    - Letter to a Representative: 10%
    - Essay: 15%
    - Debate: 5%
- Homework: 5%

    - Practice Quizzes: 2.5%
    - Reading Notes: 2.5%
- Participation: 10%
- Final Exam: 35%

Technomoral Manifesto (10% + 10% = 20%)

A technomoral manifesto is a short personal statement that articulates your core values as a computing professional and/or as a wise user of computing technologies, and how you plan to align your actions with these values. This exercise is intended to be part of a life-long practice of ethical reflection.

You will revise and expand your manifesto twice, in light of new material we have studied and any personal reflections in the meantime: one revision will occur midway through the course, the other at the end of the course.

Your technomoral manifesto is one of the permitted aids for the in-class assignments and the final exam.

Important Dates

- In-class Writing Workshop: Tuesday Sep 9.
- First Draft (10%)*: Due Friday, Sep 19.
- In-class Revision Workshop: Thursday, Oct 16.
- Second Draft (10%)*: Due ~~Friday, Oct 17.~~ Friday, Oct 31. (Changed as of 10/9.)
- Final Draft (10%): Due Monday, Dec 8.

* The best grade between the two drafts counts for 10% of your grade. (Added as of 10/9.)

In-Class Assignments (10% + 15% + 5% = 30%)

There are three in-class assignments. (You can think of these as prelims, if that's helpful.)

The first will be a writing assignment. The format will be a letter to an elected representative explaining your views on an AI ethics issue.

The second will be another writing assignment. The format will be an argumentative essay defending a specific opinion on a computer ethics issue connected to units 3, 4, and 5.

The third will be a debate. You will be assigned a group arguing for or against a specific view on a computer ethics topic. Class on December 2 will be a preparation session for the debate on December 4.

In-Class Assignment Dates

Letter to a Representative (10%): Sept 30.

Essay (15%): Nov 11.

Debate (5%): Dec 4.

Homework (5%)

There are two recurring homework assignments. The **Reading Note Cards** are due at the end of most class sessions. The **Practice Quizzes** are due periodically throughout the semester, always following the end of a unit of instruction.

Reading Note Cards (2.5%)

You are expected to read each assigned text ***before*** the relevant class session. See the course schedule on the syllabus or on the modules page.

As you read, capture your thoughts on a 3" x 5" index card (front and back). You can obtain these from the instructor or purchase your own. Some combination of the following would make for good notes on any of the readings:

- Definitions of technical terms
- A summary of the author's main claims
- Outlines of arguments the author makes in favor of their claims
- Quotations that encapsulate any of the above
- Your reflections on what you're reading, such as:
    - Do you agree or disagree with the claims and arguments being made? Why?
    - How does the text connect with your personal or professional life?
    - How does the text connect to other material in the course?
    - What else does the text make you think about?

Bring your note card to class. Throughout the lectures and discussions, take time to note anything else you wish to include on your note card. At the end of every class, there will be five minutes set aside for finalizing your note card for the day.

Hand in your note card at the end of class. You are encouraged to take a picture of both sides of the card to use as a study reference at home.

Your note cards will be returned to you for using during the in-class assignments and the final exam.

You can skip up to four note cards without penalty.

Practice Quizzes (2.5%)

Each of the six units has an associated quiz. These comprise several short answer questions on key details from the readings and lectures for the unit. Examples of correct solutions will be available for the week after the quiz is due.

Quizzes are graded complete/incomplete only; answers that are "incorrect" will not count against you. The threshold for "complete" will be "all of these answers look like an honest attempt to engage with the question." For feedback beyond comparing your answers to the example solutions, visit the instructor at office hours.

Quizzes due dates are all Fridays at 5:00 PM. Quiz submissions will be accepted late until the Sunday immediately following the due date.

You can skip one quiz without penalty.

List of Quizzes and Due Dates

- Sep 12: Quiz 1
- Oct 10 (changed as of 10/2): Quiz 2
- Oct 24: Quiz 3
- Nov 7: Quiz 4
- Nov 21: Quiz 5
- Dec 5: Quiz 6

Participation (10%)

One of the best ways to practice ethical reasoning is through conversation. Your unique perspective and contributions will help your peers get more clear on both the course material and their own values and opinions. At the same time, having to articulate your thoughts and commit to them verbally will help you to clarify your ethical values and opinions as well.

As such, **regular attendance and participation in classroom activities are expected of all students**, even if you are taking the course on the S/U option.

Your attendance grade must be earned for each class session, aside from those where there is an in-class assignment. Each class session is worth up to 5 participation points, which are earned as follows:

- Attend class: 3.5 pts
- Hand in a completed worksheet: 1 pt
- Contribute to class discussion: 0.5 pts

Contributions to discussion include: asking a question, responding to a question from the instructor, reporting back on your group's breakout discussion, and more.

Your participation grade will be calculated according to the the following rules:

$$Participation\,Grade = \frac{P_t}{C * 5}$$

where P_t is the total participation points you have earned and C is the total number of classes you are expected to attend.

$$C = 24 - E$$

where E is the number of excused absences.

$$E = 4 + A$$

where A is any additional absences approved by the instructor. See the Course Policies for information on how to request an absence.

Final Examination (35%)

The final exam will be scheduled by the University Registrar during the formal exam period.

The exam will have two parts. The first section will comprise short answer questions drawn from the quizzes. The second will be an open-ended essay question spanning several course themes. Your Note Cards and Manifesto (see above) are the only permitted aids.

More information about the final exam will be distributed in November.

Course Policies

The following policies supplement the policies of the university, schools, departments, and programs. If you're not sure how to interpret a specific policy, please contact the instructor.

Contacting the Instructor

If you need to reach me about matters pertaining to the course, please use my email: [redacted] Note that I do not check or respond to work emails on weekends or university holidays.

Please call my office phone for urgent matters only [redacted]

My regular office hours are Fridays, 1:00–2:30 PM, except when classes are not in session. You can drop in during this time without an appointment to discuss any matter related to the course or your academics more generally.

You can also schedule a time to meet with me outside of my regular office hours in several ways:

- [redacted]

- [redacted]
- If none of the times available through the above options work for you, please [redacted] find a time that is mutually convenient.

Late Work, Extensions, and Excused Absences

These policies may be superseded by SDS-approved disability accommodations, where applicable. See the Accessibility policies, below.

Late Work

Submissions for the first and second draft of the **Technomoral Manifesto** will be accepted without penalty until 11:59 PM on the Sunday following the due date. Submissions of the final draft of the Technomoral Manifesto will be accepted without penalty until 11:59 PM 12/11 (i.e., the end of the Study Days). After the end of these grace periods, the maximum grade that can be earned on a late submission is 75% (C).

If you miss an **In-Class Assignment** or the **Final Exam**, you must write to the instructor to explain the absence within 48 hours of the end of class. Where extenuating circumstances exist, the instructor will work with you on an alternative assessment. Otherwise, the grade for that assignment reverts to zero.

Submissions of **Practice Quizzes** will continue to be accepted until 11:59 PM on the Sunday following the due date. Thereafter, late submissions may be allowed with extenuating circumstances, provided that the instructor has not yet posted suggested solutions. (*Clarified as of 10/16.*)

Late submissions of **Participation** worksheets is not possible.

Late submissions of **Note Cards** will be allowed for the duration of Unit 1. Thereafter, late submissions will be accepted only in the event of an excused absence.

Extensions

I understand that there are many circumstances where it becomes difficult to complete your assigned work on time. If there are extenuating circumstances necessitating an extension on an assignment, please write to me within 48 hours of the due date to propose an alternative deadline. Submitting a request does not guarantee an extension.

Excused Absences

At the start of term, you have 4 excused absences. If you need more due to circumstances beyond your control, please write to me to explain your request. Specific details and documentation are not required, but it does help me to understand the nature of the request if you say in the abstract what's going on. Examples of legitimate reasons for an excused absence include but are not limited to:

- Religious holidays which are not University Holidays
- Illness (physical or mental)
- Disability flare-ups
- Legal obligations
- Family emergencies
- Tournament participation
- Conference attendance

Academic Integrity

Each student in this course is expected to be familiar with and to abide by the Cornell University Code of Academic Integrity. Any work submitted by a student in this course for academic credit must be the student's own work.

If you are unsure about what constitutes a violation of the Code, or about any other issue related to academic integrity, please ask the instructor.

This course is participating in **Accepting Responsibility** (AR), which is a pilot supplement to the Code. For details about the AR process and how it works with the Code, see the AR website.

For additional guidance, please consult the following sources:

- Provost's Guide to Academic Integrity at Cornell
- Library Guide to Academic Integrity
- College of Arts & Sciences guide for avoiding plagiarism
- Information on Academic Integrity hearings

Turnitin

Students agree that by taking this course, all required papers may be subject to submission for textual similarity review to Turnitin.com for the detection of plagiarism. All submitted papers will be included as source documents in the Turnitin.com reference database solely for the purpose of detecting plagiarism of such papers. Use of the Turnitin.com service is subject to the terms of service, privacy, and usage policies posted on the Turnitin.com site. If you object to Turnitin's policies, you must contact the instructor before the Add/Drop date to request an alternative.

Generative AI

My opinion on generative AI is that it has both some potential to be a useful tool in learning and massive potential to undermine learning—but it depends on the context, and much is still unknown. I'm also not a cop: I do not want to spend my time trying to catch and prosecute inappropriate uses of generative AI. With that said, here are my recommendations around the use of generative AI in completing work in this course.

1. Violations of Academic Integrity. There are some instances where I would consider doing so a violation of academic intergrity, and if I feel confident that generative AI has been used in these ways I will initiate an academic integrity case. These disallowed uses include the following:

- Submitting content produced by genAI as your own work with no changes.
- Submitting work that has been produced by genAI and then edited or paraphrased by you, regardless of the extent of the edits.

I will admit, there is no effective and reliable way to catch these instances of the use of genAI, unless a student makes a stupid mistake like leaving the prompt in the submission. (Yes, this does happen!) So while I reserve the right to initiate a preliminary hearing over violations of this policy, I will also note that this policy is intended more as a warning that violating it will undermine your learning and in any case is scoundrelly behavior.

2. Allowed, but Discouraged. There are other instances where my opinion, based on research and experience, is that using generative AI would be an ineffective way to assist your learning, but would not be an academic integrity violation. These uses include the following:

- Asking an LLM to summarize a text for you, instead of reading it yourself.
- Asking an LLM to provide ideas for a writing assignment, instead of doing research yourself.
- Asking an LLM to help you brainstorm potential arguments to make in an essay, instead of thinking about it yourself.
- Asking an LLM to create an outline for an essay, instead of putting your own thoughts in order.
- Asking an LLM to improve the style and grammar of your writing, instead of proofreading your own work.
- Using an LLM as a study aid, for example, to ask for definitions of concepts or to generate study questions on course topics.

If you use genAI in any of these ways, I ask that you include a brief description of how you used the application, and link to a transcript of the relevant interactions.

Each of these uses of genAI either substitutes a language model's outputs for your own thinking or replaces an opportunity to connect with peers and teachers. In my opinion, this is problematic. Going through the process of thinking for yourself is part of what I'm explicitly asking you to practice in this course, and talking through these ideas with human beings is part of what is valuable about the college experience. I don't think you will learn as much or as well if you use genAI in these ways. However, I am open to being convinced otherwise, and if you have a workflow that you find helpful to your thinking in these ways, then you may proceed. I simply ask that you try doing it yourself, because I do think that will better represent your own thoughts, which I am more interested in reading. After all, if I wanted to know what an LLM would say about this or that, I would ask it instead!

3. Breach of Trust. Finally, there are some instances of generative AI use that I would consider a breach of trust but not an academic integrity concern, which I politely ask you not to do:

- Uploading any of my course materials or any of the readings to any cloud-based genAI service. This breaches the creators' copyright. The only exception to this is Cornell's Enterprise Microsoft CoPilot, which has data protection guarantees.

- Uploading any sensitive information about your peers to any cloud-based genAI service, including grades and submitted assignments, without their permission. This violates their privacy.

Acceptable Collaboration

Collaboration means multiple people contributing substantively to work submitted by an individual student as their own. For example, a friend proofreading your written work for spelling and grammar is allowed, but asking a friend to make suggestions for how you can improve an argument in a written assignment is not. How collaboration is treated as a matter of academic integrity depends on the learning goals of the assignment. Below is a summary.

Collaboration on the **Technomoral Manifesto** is not allowed except in the context of the in-class workshops. (*Clarification added 10/16.*)

Collaboration on the **Letter to a Representative** and the **Essay** is not allowed and a breach of academic integrity.

Collaboration on the **Debate** is required.

Collaboration in classroom **Participation** is encouraged.

Collaboration on **Practice Quizzes** is discouraged, but not a breach of academic integrity.

Collaboration on **Reading Notes** is encouraged.

Accessibility

Your access in this course is important to me. If you identify an accessibility need for yourself, please consult with Student Disability Services (SDS) on your next steps as soon as possible. In general, I will only act on accessibility requests that come via SDS.

Please request your accommodation letter early in the semester, or as soon as you become registered with SDS, so that we have adequate time to arrange your approved academic accommodations. Changes to your approved accommodations at the last minute before an assessment is due or a test is scheduled may not be possible to enact.

- Once SDS approves your accommodation letter, it will be emailed to both you and me. Please follow up with me to discuss the necessary logistics of your accommodations.

- This course is participating in the **Alternative Testing Program** (ATP). This means that if you are approved for accommodations for the tests, instead of writing them in-class you will write them in a space managed by SDS. For information and support, visit the ATP website or email sds-testing@cornell.edu.

- If you experience any access barriers in this course, such as with printed content, graphics, online materials, or any communication barriers, reach out to me or SDS right away.

- If you need an immediate accommodation, please speak with me after class or send an email message to me and SDS at sds_cu@cornell.edu.

You never need to disclose the nature of your disability to me, only your needed accommodations.

If you have or think you may have a disability, please contact Student Disability Services for a confidential discussion: sds_cu@cornell.edu, 607-254-4545, https://sds.cornell.edu/.

Academic Disruptions and Considerations

Emergent and often unexpected disruptions to learning can be difficult for students to process while maintaining their academic focus. These temporary disruptions may include acute illness (common cold and the flu), family emergency, death in the family, personal crisis, and concern for unsettling world events. Students who do not qualify for mandated accommodations for these disruptions and who need short-term academic flexibility can request assistance from the advising office for their college, school, department, or program.

For engineering students: Academic Considerations is the process in which Engineering Advising immediately responds and assists students who are experiencing a short-term extenuating circumstance and academic disruption. The Academic Considerations process involves an advisor in Engineering Advising sending out a general notification to a student's instructors on the students behalf notifying them that the student is experiencing an extenuating circumstance and to consider offering flexibility if appropriate. This general

notification serves as a pathway for students to connect with their instructors to find possible flexible academic options.

To request an academic consideration, contact Engineering Advising at adv_engineering@cornell.edu or 607-255-7414. Or, contact your professional academic advisor in Engineering Advising directly to discuss.

For students in other colleges: Similar procedures exist in other programs of study. If you are not a student in the College of Engineering and believe you need a short-term academic consideration due to a disruption, please consult the advising office in your college, school, department, or program to determine the appropriate process.

Grading Practices

This course uses letter grades as defined by the Cornell Grading System. Students may change grading options between letter grades and S/U until the 57th calendar day of term. Students interested in the S/U option are responsible for ensuring that this choice will not interfere with any academic requirements towards which they wish to have this course counted. Students should consult their academic advisor and familiarize themselves with the rules in the Engineering Undergraduate Handbook, or the appropriate handbook for their major, minor, college, or school, when considering the S/U option.

All assessments will be accompanied by an explanation of how your grade is determined, typically using a rubric.

Your final grade will be calculated as a score out of 100, and converted to a letter or S/U grade using the following table:

A+	A	A–	B+	B	B–	C+	C	C–	D+	D	D–	F
97–100	93–96	90–92	87–89	83–86	80–82	77–79	73–76	70–72	67–69	63–66	60–62	0–59
S (pass)									**U (fail)**			

The instructor reserves the right to adjust final grades using a normal distribution (often called “grading on a curve” or “curving”) if they believe that doing so would more accurately reflect student achievement. This decision, if made, will be explained in writing.

Please be advised that your estimated grade in Canvas is not always an accurate prediction.

Sources of Support

Cornell University and its facult and staff care about our students and want you all to succeed. The following services are available to you if you require support.

Academic Support

In addition to contacting the instructor, the following academic support services are available to Cornell students.

Writing Skills

Students requiring additional guidance with writing assignments are encouraged to consult the following resources:

- The instructor, via [redacted] or appointment (see Contacting the Instructor, above)
- The Cornell Writing Centers
- Library resources

Student Disability Services

SDS should be your first point of contact when it comes to disability and accommodation matters. (See Accessibility in the Course Policies.)

Cornell Libraries

The library can offer help with research, studying, understanding academic integrity, and more.

Learning Strategies Center

The Learning Strategies Center offers peer-led study skills workshops by request. Peer facilitators provide workshops on calendaring and time management, preparing for prelims and finals, reading, taking notes, growth mindset, Zoom fatigue, and self-care. Students will learn how to work more efficiently (smarter, not harder!), get more sleep, manage procrastination and distractions, and work without pulling all nighters. Please contact LSC for more information.

Cornell Health

Cornell Health is the healthcare provider for undergraduate students. Their website has advice and support on topics including mental health, stress, seasonal illness, neurodiversity, suicide prevention, and more.

Cornell Health also operates a 24/7 help line at (607) 255-5155.

Student Support & Advocacy Services

Student Support and Advocacy Services, offered by Student and Campus Life, provide guidance to students facing challenging life events and crisis situations, including:

- Academic difficulty due to physical or mental health issues
- Extenuating life circumstances impacting academic performance and/or overall functioning

- Seeking assistance finding or getting connected to support services on campus and/or in the local community
- To report a concern about the well-being or safety of themselves, another student, or the broader community
- Trouble fitting in or adjusting to college
- Food insecurity or unstable housing
- Financial Distress
- To talk through a life stressor
- Relationship challenges
- Not sure where else to go

Centers for Equity, Empowerment, and Student Belonging

The Centers for Student Equity, Empowerment, and Belonging (The Centers) is part of the Office of the Dean of Students within Student and Campus Life. The Centers enhance equity, empowerment, and belonging to support students through advocacy and the transformational learning that takes place outside of the classroom. The Centers work together to support student equity, empowerment, and belonging. This is defined as:

- Equity ensures that students are provided the resources needed to access the same opportunities.
- Empowerment promotes the skills, knowledge, and confidence necessary to take control of one's life.
- Belonging cultivates an inclusive community, welcomes individuality, celebrates identity, appreciates contribution, inspires connection, and supports equity.

This is accomplished through identity-based programs, resources and community spaces. Each area focuses on identity exploration and celebration, involvement opportunities, leadership development, support, and allyship. The Centers encourage students to explore and embrace the depth of their multiple identities to foster a more profound understanding of themselves and others.

The Centers are led by a dynamic leadership team and consist of the following areas:

Asian & Asian American Center

The Asian & Asian American Center (A3C) acknowledges and celebrates the rich diversity that Asian, Pacific Islander, and Desi American (APIDA) students bring to Cornell and actively fosters a supportive and inclusive campus community.

Black Student Empowerment

Black Student Empowerment leads initiatives to support Black identified students and other underserved student populations, advises student organizations, implement intercultural and intersectional longitudinal co-curricular programs.

First-Generation and Low-Income Student Support

First-Generation & Low-Income (FGLI) student support promotes identity exploration, community, advocacy and empowerment for all students who identify with the first-generation and/or low-income student experience.

Gender Equity Resource Center

The Gender Equity Resource Center fosters a vibrant and supportive campus community for woman-identified and gender diverse people so that they can bring their full and authentic selves to every part of their lives.

Latinx Student Empowerment

Latinx Student Empowerment leads strategic planning and collaborative partnerships across campus to improve the Latinx/e student experience at Cornell University. This area cultivates student-centered initiatives that foster identity development, leadership skills, and a strong sense of belonging.

LGBT Resource Center

The LGBT Resource Center is the hub of LGBTQ+ student life and resources at Cornell. They provide advocacy, outreach, education, support, and community to LGBTQ+ students of all identities, backgrounds, and experiences.

Office of Spirituality and Meaning-Making

OSMM supports all Cornell students of all religious identities, ethical backgrounds, and worldviews in discovering what they deeply believe, finding places of spiritual belonging, and growing into the people they feel called to become.

Undocumented/DACA Student Support

Undocumented & DACA Student Support serves as a resource to undocumented, DACAmented students, students from mixed-status familiar, and their allies. This is done through facilitating referrals, advising, and collaborating widely with campus partners to host presentations and undocu-ally trainings.

Confidential Support

The university offers a number of confidential resources for individuals who are looking for support, or an opportunity to consider next steps, who need care or who may be unsure about whether to report incidents to the university or police. Conversations with the university's "confidential resources" are kept strictly confidential and, except in rare circumstances, will not be shared (including to faculty, coaches, parents, etc.) without explicit permission.

- Cornell Health (medical and mental health providers, students only: (607) 255-5155)
- Cornell Victim Advocacy Program (for students, staff, and faculty: (607) 255-1212, victimadvocate@cornell.edu)
- The professional staff of the Gender Equity Resource Center: (607) 255-1406, GenEq@cornell.edu
- The professional staff of the LGBT Resource Center: (607) 254-4987, lgbtrc@cornell.edu
- The University Ombuds: (607) 255-4321, ombuds@cornell.edu
- The director of the Office of Spirituality and Meaning Making and the pastoral counselors of Cornell United Religious Work (CURW): (607) 255-4214 / (607) 255-6002)
- The Advocacy Center of Tompkins County 24/7 hotline: (607) 277-5000