

QUEST 1: IDS 2935
ETHICS AND THE PUBLIC SPHERE
SPRING 2019

INSTRUCTORS

| | |
|---|--|
| Dr. Jaime Ahlberg (Philosophy) Office Hours: TBD (and by appointment) Office Location: 332 Griffin-Floyd Hall Phone: 352-273-1814 e-mail: jlahlberg@ufl.edu | Dr. Anna Peterson (Religion) Office Hours: TBD Office Location: 105 Anderson Hall Phone: 352-273-2936 e-mail: annap@ufl.edu |
|---|--|

COURSE DETAILS

Time: T4, R4-5

Location: TUR 2353

Quest 1 Theme: Justice and Power

General Education: Humanities, Writing (2,000 words)

(Note that a minimum grade of 'C' is required for General Education credit)

Course Cost: Students must purchase a \$10 ticket to see *Mercy Killers* at UF's Phillips Center for the Performing Arts Thursday, March 21 at 7:30pm. Tickets have been reserved for the class, so please mention that you are a student in this course when you purchase your ticket. A small fund is available to cover tickets for students with genuine financial hardship; if purchasing a ticket will be a hardship for you, you must discuss and make arrangements with an instructor by 18 February.

Class resources, announcements, updates, and assignments will be made available through the class Canvas site (www.elearning.ufl.edu).

COURSE DESCRIPTION

Contemporary public discourse is teeming with issues of urgent moral concern. From the #metoo campaign and associated conversations about sexual violence to the presence of right wing extremists on campus, and the growing imperatives to respond to economic inequality, we are faced with complex challenges that have ethical problems at their core. It is not always easy, however, to think through these challenges in a responsible and productive way. So, how is one to begin?

This interdisciplinary Quest 1 course explores the how the methods and traditions in the humanities provide resources for approaching publicly relevant ethical issues. The topics we will address include freedom of speech, economic inequality, and sex and gender justice. Philosophical and legal arguments, laws, papal encyclicals, pastoral letters, historical analyses,

and news articles will be incorporated into our course readings. The crucial skills we will emphasize throughout the class include identifying the moral dimensions of legal, political, and economic problems; critically evaluating traditions and perspectives; appreciating the diversity of perspectives on these controversial issues; thinking beyond one's own interests; and approaching disagreement with open-mindedness and a willingness to be rationally persuaded. The class is thus for students from any major who want to explore public moral challenges in rigorous, creative ways. Assignments will include short writings on the ethical topics listed above, and a capstone project in which students address an ethical, public issue of importance to them.

QUEST 1 AND GEN ED DESCRIPTIONS AND STUDENT LEARNING OUTCOMES

QUEST 1 DESCRIPTION: Quest 1 courses are multidisciplinary explorations of truly challenging questions about the human condition that are not easy to answer, but also not easy to ignore: What makes life worth living? What makes a society a fair one? How do we manage conflicts? Who are we in relation to other people or to the natural world? To grapple with the kinds of open-ended and complex intellectual challenges they will face as critical, creative, and self-reflective adults navigating a complex and interconnected world, Quest 1 students use the humanities approaches present in the course to mine texts for evidence, create arguments, and articulate ideas.

QUEST 1 SLOs:

- Identify, describe, and explain the history, theories, and methodologies used to examine essential questions about the human condition within and across the arts and humanities disciplines incorporated into the course (Content).
- Analyze and evaluate essential questions about the human condition using established practices appropriate for the arts and humanities disciplines incorporated into the course (Critical Thinking).
- Connect course content with critical reflection on their intellectual, personal, and professional development at UF and beyond (Critical Thinking).
- Develop and present clear and effective responses to essential questions in oral and written forms as appropriate to the relevant humanities disciplines incorporated into the course (Communication).

HUMANITIES DESCRIPTION: Humanities courses provide instruction in the history, key themes, principles, terminology, and theory or methodologies used within a humanities discipline or the humanities in general. Students will learn to identify and to analyze the key elements, biases and influences that shape thought. These courses emphasize clear and effective analysis and approach issues and problems from multiple perspectives.

HUMANITIES SLOs:

- Identify, describe, and explain the history, underlying theory and methodologies used in the course (Content).
- Identify and analyze key elements, biases and influences that shape thought within the subject area. Approach issues and problems within the discipline from multiple perspectives (Critical Thinking).
- Communicate knowledge, thoughts and reasoning clearly and effectively (Communication).

WRITING DESCRIPTION: The Writing Requirement (WR) ensures students both maintain their fluency in writing and use writing as a tool to facilitate learning. The writing course grade assigned by the instructor has two components: the writing component and a course grade. **To receive writing credit a student must satisfactorily complete all the assigned written work and receive a minimum grade of C (2.0) for the course.** It is possible to not meet the writing requirement and still earn a minimum grade of C in a class, so students should review their degree audit after receiving their grade to verify receipt of credit for the writing component.

WRITING EVALUATION:

- This course carries 2000 words that count towards the UF Writing Requirement. You must turn in all written work counting towards the 2000 words in order to receive credit for those words.
- The instructor will evaluate and provide feedback on the student's written work with respect to content, organization and coherence, argument and support (when appropriate), style, clarity, grammar, punctuation, and other mechanics, using a published writing rubric (see syllabus pages 12-14).
- More specific rubrics and guidelines for individual assignments may be provided during the course of the semester.

COURSE OBJECTIVES AND GOALS

STUDENT LEARNING OUTCOMES:

Reflecting the curricular structures of Quest 1 and these Gen Ed designations, after taking Ethics and the Public Sphere students will be able to:

1. Identify, describe, and explain how the resources available in the humanities can help with becoming a more informed and engaged citizen. (**Content SLOs for Gen Ed Humanities and Q1**)
2. Identify and analyze the histories of and relations among different theoretical frameworks in humanistic traditions of thought (**Critical Thinking SLOs for Gen Ed Humanities and Q1**)
3. Identify, analyze and evaluate moral themes in public discourse (**Critical Thinking SLO for Gen Ed Humanities**)
4. Analyze and evaluate the particular, public ethical issues that we discuss in the course (including free speech, economic inequality, sexual violence) (**Critical Thinking SLO for Gen Ed Humanities**)
5. Analyze, evaluate, and critically reflect on connections between course content and their intellectual, personal, and professional development at UF and beyond (**Critical Thinking SLO for Q1**)
6. Develop and present clear and effective responses to essential questions about important public ethical issues in oral and written forms appropriate to the relevant humanities disciplines incorporated into the course (**Communication SLO for Gen Ed Humanities and Q1**).

TO SEE HOW ASSIGNED WORK ADVANCES EACH SLO, GO TO PAGES 9-11.

TEXTS AND MATERIALS

Required books for class are available at the UF Bookstore. Shorter assigned readings will be available through the class Canvas page. Students are required to bring hard copy of the day's assigned reading to class every day; failure to do so may result in loss of participation points.

Required

Books

1. Anthony Weston, *A Practical Companion to Ethics*, 4th edition, (New York: Oxford University Press, 2011)
2. Sigal Ben-Porath, *Free Speech on Campus* (Philadelphia, PA: University of Pennsylvania Press, 2017)
3. Barbara Ehrenreich, *Nickel and Dimed: On (Not) Getting By in America* (New York: Picador, 2001)

Field Trip

This class includes a field trip to see the play *Mercy Killers* (with Michael Milligan) at the Philips Center for the Performing Arts on Thursday, 21 March at 7:30 pm. Student tickets cost \$10; **YOU MUST PURCHASE YOUR OWN TICKET FOR THIS PERFORMANCE** at the box office: <https://performingarts.ufl.edu/tickets/>. Tickets have been reserved for the class, so please mention that you are a student in this course when you purchase your ticket. A small fund is available to cover tickets for students with genuine financial hardship; if purchasing a ticket will be a hardship for you, you must discuss and make arrangements with an instructor by 18 February.

Recommended

1. A terrific guide to general writing rules is Strunk and White's *The Elements of Style*. The first edition is available online for free: <http://www.bartleby.com/141/>

GRADE DISTRIBUTION AND GRADING POLICIES

- | | |
|--|----------------|
| 1. Participation | 10% |
| 2. 3 Short Papers (1000-1200 words each) | 60% (20% each) |
| 3. Capstone Project | 30% |

Grading Scale

This course will employ the following grading scale:

| | | |
|----|------|--------|
| A | 4.0 | 94-100 |
| A- | 3.67 | 90-93 |
| B+ | 3.33 | 87-89 |
| B | 3.0 | 84-86 |
| B- | 2.67 | 80-83 |

| | | |
|----|------|-------|
| C+ | 2.33 | 77-79 |
| C | 2.0 | 74-76 |
| C- | 1.67 | 70-73 |
| D+ | 1.33 | 67-69 |
| D | 1.0 | 64-66 |
| D- | 0.67 | 60-63 |
| E | 0.0 | 0-59 |

More information on UF's grading policies is available [here](#).

COURSE POLICIES AND STUDENT RESOURCES

Attendance Policy

Students are expected to attend class regularly and to arrive on time. Unexcused absences from more than four classes will negatively affect your participation grade. For each unexcused absence beyond fourth, you will lose 10% of your participation grade (e.g. a 100% will become a 90%).

Requirements for class attendance and make-up exams, assignments, and other work are consistent with university policies specified at:

<https://catalog.ufl.edu/ugrad/current/regulations/info/attendance.aspx>.

Academic Honesty

UF students are bound by The Honor Pledge, which states, "We, the members of the University of Florida community, pledge to hold ourselves and our peers to the highest standards of honor and integrity by abiding by the Honor Code. On all work submitted for credit by students at the University of Florida, the following pledge is either required or implied: "On my honor, I have neither given nor received unauthorized aid in doing this assignment." The Honor Code (<http://www.dso.ufl.edu/sccr/process/student-conduct-honor-code/>) specifies a number of behaviors that are in violation of this code and the possible sanctions. Furthermore, you are obligated to report any condition that facilitates academic misconduct to appropriate personnel. If you have any questions or concerns, please consult with the instructor.

Plagiarism on any assignment will automatically result in a grade of "E" for the course.

Plagiarism is defined in the University of Florida's Student Honor Code as follows: "A student shall not represent as the student's own work all or any portion of the work of another.

Plagiarism includes (but is not limited to): a. Quoting oral or written materials, whether published or unpublished, without proper attribution. b. Submitting a document or assignment which in whole or in part is identical or substantially identical to a document or assignment not authored by the student." Students found guilty of academic misconduct will be prosecuted in accordance with the procedures specified in the UF honesty policy.

Making Up Work

Work is due as specified in the syllabus. Late work is subject to a 1/3 grade penalty for each 24 hour period it is late (e.g., a paper that would've earned an A if turned in in class on Monday

becomes an A- if received Tuesday, a B+ if received Wednesday, etc, with the weekend counting as two days). To be excused from submitting work at the assigned time, you must give 24 hours advance notice and/or meet the UF standards for an excused absence.

Students Requiring Accommodations

Students with disabilities requesting accommodations should first register with the Disability Resource Center (352-392-8565, www.dso.ufl.edu/drc/) by providing appropriate documentation. Once registered, students will receive an accommodation letter which must be presented to the instructor when requesting accommodation. Students with disabilities should follow this procedure as early as possible in the semester.

Course Evaluation

Students are expected to provide feedback on the quality of instruction in this course by completing UF's standard [online evaluations](#) (summary results will be available to students [here](#)) as well as a course-specific evaluation that focuses on course content and the experience of the Quest curriculum. Class time will be allocated for the completion of both evaluations.

Class Demeanor

Students are expected to arrive to class on time, stay the full class period, and behave in a manner that is respectful to the instructor and to fellow students. Electronic devices should be turned off and placed in closed bags. Opinions held by other students should be respected in discussion, and conversations that do not contribute to the discussion should be kept to a minimum.

Materials and Supplies Fees

There are no additional fees for this course.

Counseling and Wellness Center

Contact information for the Counseling and Wellness Center:
<http://www.counseling.ufl.edu/cwc/Default.aspx>, 392-1575; and the University Police Department: 392-1111 or 9-1-1 for emergencies.

Writing Studio

The writing studio is committed to helping University of Florida students meet their academic and professional goals by becoming better writers. Visit the writing studio online at <http://writing.ufl.edu/writing-studio/> or in 302 Tigert Hall for one-on-one consultations and workshops.

GRADED WORK AND ASSIGNMENTS

(YOU MUST COMPLETE ALL THE ASSIGNED WORK IN ORDER TO PASS THE CLASS)

Participation and Attendance

You must come to class on time and prepared. This means keeping current on the reading assignments and being aware of the course schedule and activities, as presented in this syllabus, discussed in class, and announced on the course website. It also means bringing the day's

reading to class with you. Consistent high-quality class participation—in large and small groups—is expected. “High-quality” in this case means:

- informed (i.e., shows evidence of having done assigned work),
- thoughtful (i.e., shows evidence of having understood and considered issues raised in readings and other discussions), and
- considerate (e.g., takes the perspectives of others into account).

If you have personal issues that prohibit you from joining freely in class discussion, e.g., shyness, language barriers, etc., see the instructors as soon as possible to discuss alternative modes of participation.

Unexcused absences from more than four classes will negatively affect your participation grade. For each unexcused absence beyond the fourth, you will lose 10% of your participation grade (e.g. a 100% will become a 90%).

Requirements for class attendance and make-up exams, assignments, and other work are consistent with university policies specified at:

<https://catalog.ufl.edu/ugrad/current/regulations/info/attendance.aspx>.

Advances SLOs: 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6

Short Papers

Over the course of the semester students will be asked to write three original papers (1000-1200 words each), which will combine to satisfy a 2000 word General Education requirement. For each paper, students will be asked to find their own news story on the topic at hand (free speech, sex/gender, and economic inequality), and offer an ethical analysis of their own. Each paper must include a full copy of the news source upon which the ethical analysis is based. Please see the attached rubric for the assessment method and the course schedule for due dates.

All papers must be typed, double-spaced with one-inch margins, 12 pt Times New Roman. You must include a word-count at the top of your first page. Please also include your name, the date you hand in the assignment, and title your essays. If it is difficult for you to choose a title, consider that a clue that you may need to focus your essay more.

Each paper is to be uploaded onto the course’s e-learning site in Canvas. You can log in and find the course web page here: elearning.ufl.edu. The papers will be graded electronically, and returned to you electronically. We will consider allowing you to turn in a paper late without penalty only if you have a valid and documented reason for doing so. If you turn in a paper without a valid or documented reason, 1/3 of a letter grade will be deducted for each day it is late (including weekend days!).

It is not truly possible to separate the quality of ideas from the quality of the language through which they are expressed, but we attempt to do so by using a grading rubric for papers. The rubric clearly identifies how we assign point values to each of four levels of achievement (Excellent, Good, Needs Improvement, Unacceptable), according to what level you have reached with respect to each of six areas: the appropriateness of the news article chosen, the presence and

clarity of a thesis, the explanation of the issue, the evaluation of the issue, writing mechanics, and writing coherence. Please see the rubric for short papers included at the end of the syllabus for elaboration of these requirements.

Advances SLOs: 3, 4, 6

Capstone Project

The capstone project asks students to identify a public issue of ethical relevance that we have not studied in class, as well as to explore how to understand and address the issue. We encourage students to engage the three central themes of this course in thinking about their ethical issue, including: how to learn about the issue responsibly (information literacy); how to reflect on the issue well (thinking ethically); and how to address the issue in real life (acting ethically). We do not expect students to ‘solve’ the issue, but rather to explore how to address the issue in these three ways. The short paper assignments, in addition to readings and discussion, should prepare you to succeed in this assignment. The grade for the capstone project will be based on 100 points and will involve two parts: a poster presentation and a reflection paper.

Part 1: Poster presentation (80/100 points: 35 for individual presentation and 45 for poster)

Posters may be completed individually, or in groups of up to 3 people who are working on the same ethical issue. The final two classes will be reserved for student poster presentations, during which each group/individual will have time to present their findings. Every student will be responsible for presenting to the class, even if the work on the poster was done collaboratively. The work of presenting should be divided evenly between group members, if applicable. Please see the Capstone Rubric included at the end of this syllabus for a breakdown of requirements and assessment.

Advances SLOs: 1, 2, 3, 6

Part 2: Reflection paper (20/100 points for individual paper)

Each student must write a 750-100 word reflection paper on their experience identifying, evaluating, and considering engagement opportunities on the topic they chose. Students will also be asked to reflect on the ways in which the themes of this course are relevant to their own intellectual, personal, and professional development at UF and beyond. These papers will be more informal than your three short essays, but they must be clearly written, thoughtful, and reveal an understanding of the main themes of the course. Please see the Capstone Rubric included at the end of this syllabus for a description of requirements and assessment.

Advances SLOs: 1, 5

COURSE SCHEDULE

NOTE: COURSE CONTENT IS TENTATIVE AND SUBJECT TO CHANGE
ASSIGNMENT DEADLINES INDICATED IN **BOLD**

| Week | Topic | Readings and Assignments |
|-----------------------|---|---|
| 1 Jan 8 Jan 10 | Introduction to Practical Ethics | 1. Weston, selections |
| 2 Jan 15 Jan 17 | Introduction to Practical Ethics | 1. Weston, selections |
| 3 Jan 22 Jan 24 | Issue: Free Speech and Ethics in the Public Sphere Theme: Information Literacy | <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Bill of Rights: The First Amendment 2. <i>National Socialist Party v. Skokie</i> (1977) 3. <i>Brandenburg v. Ohio</i> (1969) 4. Graeme Wood, "His Kampf" <i>The Atlantic</i> 5. Presentation by April Hines, Librarian, College of Journalism and Communications <p>Recommended:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Eric Kelderman, "Inside the Free Speech Case that Caught Jeff Session's Eye" (<i>The Chronicle of Higher Ed</i>, September 29, 2017) https://www.chronicle.com/article/Inside-the-Free-Speech-Case/241333 2. Anna Peterson, "I Teach Ethics at the University where Richard Spencer Spoke" (<i>The Conversation</i>, October 19, 2017) http://theconversation.com/i-teach-ethics-at-the-university-where-richard-spencer-spoke-86025 |
| 4 Jan 29 Jan 31 | Issue: Free Speech and Ethics in the Public Sphere | <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Richard Delgado, "Words that Wound: A Tort Action for Racial Insults, Epithets, and Name-Calling" 2. Joel Feinberg, "The Offense Principle" 3. Vanessa Williams, "In Debate Over National Anthem, Black Wealth Becomes a Target" (<i>The Washington Post</i>, October 31, 2017) https://www.washingtonpost.com/national/in-debate-over-national-anthem-black-wealth-becomes-a-target/2017/10/30/b63934d2-a55c-11e7-8cfe-d5b912fab99_story.html?utm_term=.544e2b1fe617 4. John Branch, "'National Anthem Protests Sidelined by Ambiguity'" (<i>The New York Times</i>, January 1, 2018) https://www.nytimes.com/2018/01/01/sports/nfl-national-anthem-protests.html |

| | | |
|------------------------|--|---|
| 5 Feb 5 Feb 7 | Issue: Free Speech and Ethics in the Public Sphere | <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Sigal Ben-Porath, <i>Free Speech on Campus</i> Feb 5: Preface and Chs. 1 and 2 (pp.1- 46) 2. Ben-Porath continued Feb 7: Chs. 3, 4, and Conclusion (pp.47-116) |
| 6 Feb 12 Feb 14 | Issue: Economics and Ethics in the Public Sphere | <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Copeland, <i>Economic Justice</i> selections 2. US Catholic Bishops, <i>Economic Justice for All</i> (1985), selections 3. John Paul II, <i>Centesimus Annus</i> (1991), selections 4. Benedict XVI, <i>Caritas in Veritate</i> (2009), selections 5. Francis I, "Message for First World Day of the Poor" (2017) <p style="text-align: center;">Paper # 1 on Free Speech Due via upload to Canvas by 11:59pm Friday, Feb. 15</p> |
| 7 Feb 19 Feb 21 | Issue: Economics and Ethics in the Public Sphere | <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Margaret Drabble, ch. 1 of <i>The Witch of Exmoor</i> 2. David Leonhardt, "Our Broken Economy, in One Simple Chart" (<i>New York Times</i>, August 7, 2017) https://www.nytimes.com/interactive/2017/08/07/opinion/leonhardt-income-inequality.html 3. Begin reading Ehrenreich, selections |
| 8 Feb 26 Feb 28 | Issue: Economics and Ethics in the Public Sphere | <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Ehrenreich, selections |
| 9 Mar 5 Mar 7 | | <p style="text-align: center;">Spring Break, No Classes</p> <p style="text-align: center;">(Please be reading Ehrenreich for next week)</p> |
| 10 Mar 12 Mar 14 | Issue: Economics and Ethics in the Public Sphere | <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Finish discussion of Ehrenreich, selections <p style="text-align: center;">Paper # 2 on Economics Due via upload to Canvas by 11:59pm Friday, Mar 15</p> |
| 11 Mar 19 Mar 21 | Theme: Thinking Ethically | <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Famous Dilemmas, selections available on Canvas 2. Anthony Weston, "Values Clash" 3. Anthony Weston, "Creative Problem-Solving" <p>Field Trip to see <i>Mercy Killers</i> at UF's Phillips Center for Performing Arts. Thursday, March 21, 7:30pm.</p> |
| 12 Mar 26 Mar 28 | Issue: Sex, Gender, and Ethics in the Public Sphere | <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Claudia Card, "Rape Terrorism" 2. Explore US Sexual Assault Statistics, RAINN https://www.rainn.org/statistics 3. <i>This American Life</i>, "Once More, with Feeling" (Act One) https://www.thisamericanlife.org/radio-archives/episode/603/once-more-with-feeling?act=0 |

| | | |
|------------------------|---|---|
| 13 Apr 2 Apr 4 | Issue: Sex, Gender, and Ethics in the Public Sphere Theme: Acting Ethically | <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Nadja Sayej, “Chuck Close: How to deal with an artist accused of sexual harassment” (<i>The Guardian</i>, February 15, 2018) https://www.theguardian.com/artanddesign/2018/feb/15/chuck-close-art-sexual-harassment-pafa 2. Robin Pogrebin and Jennifer Schussler, “Chuck Close is Accused of Harrassment. Should his Artwork Carry an Asterisk?” https://www.nytimes.com/2018/01/28/arts/design/chuck-close-exhibit-harassment-accusations.html 3. Presentation by Eric Segal, Director of Education and Curator of Academic Programs, Samuel P. Harn Museum of Art 4. Presentation by Elaine Giles, Assistant Director, UF’s Brown Center for Leadership & Service |
| 14 Apr 9 Apr 11 | Issue: Sex, Gender, and Ethics in the Public Sphere | <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Michelle Anderson, “Negotiating Sex” 2. April 4, 2011 Dear Colleague Letter clarifying University obligations re campus sexual assault under Title IX 3. “Trump Administration Scraps Obama’s Campus Sexual Assault Rules” (<i>The Independent</i> September 22, 2017) https://www.independent.co.uk/news/world/americas/us-politics/trump-campus-sexual-assault-rules-scrapped-betsy-devos-title-ix-a7961811.html 4. Harry Shepherd Smith, “Have We Gone Too Far with Going Too Far?” (<i>Inter:Mission</i> October 30, 2016) http://intermissionbristol.co.uk/opinion/2016/10/30/7f33erdaz09sggy3ho9zlkuf1ma54c 2. Caitlin Flanagan, “Mutually Nonconsensual Sex” (<i>The Atlantic</i>, June 1, 2018) https://www.theatlantic.com/politics/archive/2018/06/title-ix-is-too-easy-to-abuse/561650/ <p style="text-align: center;">Paper # 3 on Sex and Gender Due via upload to canvas By 11:59pm on Friday, April 11</p> |
| 15 Apr 16 Apr 18 | | <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Catch-up and wrap-up 2. Student Poster Presentations begin in class, Apr 18 |
| 16 Apr 23 | | <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Course evaluations 2. Student Poster Presentations continued in class, Apr 23 <p style="text-align: center;">Capstone Reflection Papers due uploaded onto Canvas by 11:59pm on Wednesday, April 24</p> |

Short Paper Rubric

| | Excellent | Good | Needs Improvement | Unacceptable | |
|---------------------|--|---|---|---|----------|
| News Article | <p>An appropriate article is chosen:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The article is included with the paper • Its content is ethical in nature • It is about an issue of contemporary public concern (last 6 mo.) • It is of 'digestible' size (substantive enough to write about, not too long that it cannot be reasonably addressed) <p>5 points</p> | <p>An appropriate article is chosen:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The article is included with the paper • Its content is ethical in nature • It is about an issue of contemporary public concern (last 6 mo.) <p>However:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • It may not offer enough substance to argue about • It may be too large or unwieldy for the purposes of argumentation <p>4 points</p> | <p>The article is included with the paper, however:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The topic is not clearly ethical • It is not about an issue of contemporary public concern (last 6 mo.) <p>1- 3 points</p> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The article is not submitted with the paper. • The article is not ethical in nature, and is not about an issue of contemporary public concern (last 6 mo.) <p>0 points</p> | 5 points |
| Thesis | <p>A clear statement of the main conclusion of the paper.</p> <p>5 points</p> | <p>The thesis is obvious, but there is no single clear statement of it.</p> <p>4 points</p> | <p>The thesis is present, but must be uncovered or reconstructed from the text of the paper.</p> <p>1- 3 points</p> | <p>There is no thesis.</p> <p>0 points</p> | 5 points |
| Exposition | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The paper contains accurate and precise summarization, description and/or paraphrasing of the issue being discussed • Key concepts and theories are accurately and completely explained | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The summarization, description and/or paraphrasing of the issue is fairly accurate and precise. • Key concepts and theories are explained. | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The summarization, description and/or paraphrasing of the issue is fairly accurate, but not precise. • Key concepts and theories are not explained. | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The summarization, description and/or paraphrasing of the issue is inaccurate. • Key concepts and theories may be identified but are not explained. | |

| | | | | | |
|---------------------------|---|---|--|--|-----------|
| | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● When appropriate, good, clear examples are used to illuminate concepts and issues and/or support arguments. ● The paper uses appropriate textual support. <p>32-35 points</p> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Examples are clear, but may not be well chosen. ● The paper has textual support, but other passages may have been better choices. <p>29-31 points</p> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Examples are not clear, and may not be well chosen or appropriate. ● The textual support is inappropriate. <p>26-28 points</p> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Examples are not clear, are inappropriate, and/or do not illuminate concepts and issues. ● No textual support. <p>0-25 points</p> | 35 points |
| Evaluation | <p>The paper presents an original argument regarding a position on an issue of ethical import. This argument is supported by:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● checking for support in the argument ● checking for the argument's internal consistency ● considering objections to one's own argument. This involves presenting 1 or more plausible and appropriate objections, and responding to them thoroughly. <p>32-35 points</p> | <p>The paper presents an original argument regarding a position on an issue of ethical import. This argument is supported by:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● checking for support in the argument ● checking for the argument's internal consistency ● considering objections to one's own argument, though the objections may be ill chosen and/or not thoroughly responded to. <p>29-31 points</p> | <p>The paper presents an original argument but describes and/or considers its plausibility in a weak or superficial way. It does not check for the support offered in the argument or the argument's internal consistency. It does not defend the central argument against plausible objections.</p> <p>26-28 points</p> | <p>The paper does not present an original argument about the issues in question, or, it fails to offer support through rational argument.</p> <p>0-25 points</p> | 35 points |
| Writing: Mechanics | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● All sentences are complete and grammatical. | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● All sentences are complete and grammatical. | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● A few sentences are incomplete and/or ungrammatical. | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Many sentences are incomplete and/or ungrammatical. | |

| | | | | | |
|--|--|---|---|--|-----------|
| | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Paper has been spell-checked and proofread, and has no errors, and no rhetorical questions or slang. | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Paper has been spell-checked and proofread, and has very few errors, and no rhetorical questions or slang. | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Paper has several spelling errors, rhetorical questions and/or uses of slang. | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Paper has many spelling errors, rhetorical questions and/or uses of slang. | 10 points |
| | 9-10 points | 7-8 points | 5-6 point | 0-4 points | |
| Writing: Flow and Coherence | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● All words are chosen for their precise meanings and are used consistently. ● All of the content of the paper is relevant to the main line of argument; no extraneous material. ● Ideas are developed in a natural order. Premises fit together naturally and it is easy to identify the main line of argument and to understand what is being said. ● All new or unusual terms are well-defined. ● Information (names, facts, etc.) is accurate. | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Most words are chosen for their precise meanings. ● Most of the content of the paper is relevant to the main line of argument; extraneous material is at a minimum. ● Ideas are mostly developed in a natural order. It is not hard to understand what is being said. ● Most new or unusual terms are well-defined. ● Information (names, facts, etc.) is accurate. | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Words are not chosen for their precise meanings. ● May be substantial extraneous material. ● Ideas are not always developed in a natural order. It is sometimes difficult to identify the line of argument or to understand what is being said. ● New or unusual terms are not well-defined. ● Information (names, facts, etc.) is mostly accurate. | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Words are not chosen for their precise meanings. ● Substantial extraneous material. ● Ideas are not developed in a natural order. Premises do not fit together naturally and it is difficult to identify the line of argument or to understand what is being said. ● New or unusual terms are not defined. ● Information (names, facts, etc.) is inaccurate. | 10 points |
| | 9-10 points | 7-8 points | 5-6 points | 0-4 points | |

Total Points Possible: 100

Each Short Paper will be worth 20% of your final grade

Capstone Project Rubric

| | Excellent | Good | Needs Improvement | Unacceptable | |
|---|--|---|---|--|-----------|
| Poster: Subject Matter and Content | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● The news item is ethical in nature ● The news item is about an issue of contemporary public concern (last 6 mo.) ● The poster clearly addresses: sources, ethical reflection, ethical action. It provides consideration of all three. ● Sources used are substantive and appropriate. Information is accurate. ● It is of ‘digestible’ size (substantive enough to write about, not too long that it cannot be reasonably addressed) <p>23-25 points</p> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● The news item is ethical in nature ● The news item is about an issue of contemporary public concern (last 6 mo.) ● The poster clearly addresses: sources, ethical reflection, ethical action. ● Sources used are appropriate. Information is accurate. <p>However:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● It may not offer enough ethical substance ● It may be too large or unwieldy of a topic for the purposes of a poster presentation <p>20-22 points</p> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● The news item is not clearly ethical ● It is not about an issue of contemporary public concern (last 6 mo.) ● The poster does not clearly address all of the following, or does so only in a cursory way: sources, ethical reflection, ethical action. ● Sources are not appropriate, may include slight inaccuracies. <p>17-19 points</p> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● The news item is not ethical in nature, and is not about an issue of contemporary public concern (last 6 mo.) ● The poster does not address its sources, ethical reflection, and ethical action. ● Sources are not appropriate. Inaccurate information presented. <p>0-16 points</p> | 25 points |
| Poster: Visual Presentation | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● The poster is neat, clean, well- organized and presented in a clear and creative way. The poster is easy to follow. | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● The poster is mostly neat and clean. Information is organized in a logical manner and shows some degree of creativity. The overall presentation is interesting. | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Poster is somewhat difficult to follow; ideas are not clearly organized or neatly presented. The presentation of information lacks creativity, or does not hold viewer’s interest. | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Poster is difficult to follow. Ideas and information are not clearly or logically presented. Presentation of information lacks creativity, and does not hold viewer’s interest. | 15 points |

| | | | | | |
|---|---|---|--|---|-----------|
| | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Presentation is colorful and creative. | | | | |
| | 14-15 points | 12-13 points | 10-11 points | 0-9 points | |
| Poster: Writing Mechanics | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● No spelling, grammar, or punctuation errors in the text. Text is in the student's own words. | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● A few (2-3) errors in spelling, grammar or punctuation. Most text is in student's own words. | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Some grammar or punctuation errors. Several instances where the text is not in student's own words. | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Several spelling, grammar or punctuation errors. Text is copied or not included. | 5 points |
| | 5 points | 4 points | 3 points | 0-2 points | |
| Poster Presentation: Individual Student's Contribution | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● The presentation contains accurate and precise summarization, description and/or paraphrasing ● Presentation is succinct and clear ● Key concepts and theories are accurately and completely explained ● When appropriate, good, clear examples are used ● Appropriate use of sources ● Response to questions demonstrates substantive knowledge of subject matter and project | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Summarization, description and/or paraphrasing in the presentation is fairly accurate and precise. ● Presentation is relatively succinct and clear ● Key concepts and theories are explained. ● Examples are clear, but may not be well chosen. ● Appropriate use of sources ● Response to questions demonstrates knowledge of subject matter and project. Student is able to have a brief conversation about what has been presented. | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● The summarization, description and/or paraphrasing is fairly accurate, but not precise. ● Presentation is not always clear and easy to follow. Not succinct. ● Key concepts and theories are not explained. ● Examples are not clear, and may not be well chosen or appropriate. ● Sources are not properly used to support the presentation ● Responses to questions reveals that the student does not understand the subject matter or project enough to converse about them in a clear or effective manner | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● The summarization, description and/or paraphrasing of the issue is inaccurate. ● Presentation cannot be followed ● Key concepts and theories may be identified but are not explained. ● Examples are not clear, are inappropriate, and/or do not illuminate concepts and issues. ● Student does not use sources, or uses them improperly. ● Responses to questions reveals that the student does not understand the subject matter or project. | 35 points |

| | 32-35 points | 29-31 points | 26-28 points | 0-25 points | |
|--|---|--|--|--|-----------|
| Individual Student's Reflection Paper | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Paper includes consideration of how the poster project has brought together the themes of the course: information literacy, ethical reflection, and ethical action. ● Paper is clearly and well written. (See rubric for short papers on writing mechanics and coherence criteria) ● Paper is thoughtful. | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Paper includes consideration of how the poster project has brought together the themes of the course: information literacy, ethical reflection, and ethical action. ● Paper is clearly written. ● Paper is thoughtful. | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Paper includes consideration of how the poster project has brought together the themes of the course: information literacy, ethical reflection, and ethical action. ● Paper is not clearly written. ● The paper does not engage in genuine reflection. | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Paper fails to address how the poster project has brought together the themes of the course. ● The paper is poorly written. ● The paper is superficial and/or does not involve genuine reflection. | 20 points |
| | 9-10 points | 7-8 points | 6 points | 0-5 points | |

Total Points Possible: 100 (worth 30% of final grade). Point Breakdown:

Poster: 45

Individual Student Presentation: 35

Individual Reflection Paper: 20 points

