



**QUEST 1: IDS 2935
ETHICS IN THE PUBLIC SPHERE
SUMMER 2021**

INSTRUCTOR

Prof. Anna Peterson
105 Anderson Hall
Tel. 352-273-2936
Email: annap@ufl.edu
Office hours: TBD

COURSE DETAILS

Time: M-F 2-3:15.

Please note: On Mondays and Wednesdays the whole class will meet for lectures. On Tuesdays and Thursdays there will be discussion sections led by TAs. On Fridays the class will meet asynchronously.

Location: TBD

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

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

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

COURSE DESCRIPTION

This class asks how we can engage constructively in public discussions on complex and contentious problems. We explore examples that include the #metoo movement and associated conversations about sexual violence, the presence of right wing extremists on campus, systemic

racism in policing and other institutions, and the growing imperatives to respond to economic inequality. Public discussions about these issues are often so polarized that constructive discussions, let alone solutions, seem hard to find. In order to address these challenges in a responsible and productive way, we need reliable sources of information, strategies for rigorous ethical reflection, and knowledge about effective ways to respond.

Our readings will include scholarly works in philosophical and religious ethics as well as legal arguments, papal encyclicals, pastoral letters, historical analyses, and news articles. 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 appropriate 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 the ethical dimensions of a public issue of importance to them. The class is discussion based and includes a variety of interactive projects and activities.

TEXTS AND MATERIALS

Required books for class are available at the UF Bookstore. Shorter assigned readings will be available through the class Canvas page. Please bring the day's assigned reading to class every day (print or electronic), since we will often be referring to specific passages.

REQUIRED BOOKS

1. Anthony Weston, *A Practical Companion to Ethics*, 4th edition, (New York: Oxford University Press, 2011)
2. Barbara Ehrenreich, *Nickel and Dimed: On (Not) Getting By in America* (New York: Picador, 2001)

Recommended books:

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/>
2. An excellent guide to writing in ethics, religion, philosophy, and related fields is Anthony Weston's *A Rulebook for Arguments* (Hackett, 2018).

SUMMARY OF ASSIGNMENTS AND GRADE DISTRIBUTION

Details about each assignment are available below

- | | |
|--|----------------|
| 1. Participation | 10% |
| 2. Two short papers (1000-1200 words each) | 60% (30% each) |
| 3. Capstone project: poster | 10% |
| 4. Capstone project: reflection paper | 10% |
| 5. Reflection paper on public event | 10% |

COURSE POLICIES AND STUDENT RESOURCES

Attendance Policy

Students are expected to attend class regularly and to arrive on time. Absences will be excused in situations beyond the student's control (illness, family emergency, etc.). Please let me know as soon as possible if you must miss class. 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, and (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 planned, other than possible costs for producing a poster for the final research fair. Poster costs will be shared among group members and should be under \$5/person.

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)

1. Participation (10% of final grade)

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 instructor as soon as possible to discuss alternative modes of participation.

Your participation grade will be based on unannounced reading quizzes, which may be held during lectures or discussion sections.

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>.

2. Two short papers (30% of grade each; 60% total)

Due July 11 and July 25

Over the course of the semester students will be asked to write *two* original papers (1000-1200 words each). These analytical essays meet the Quest requirement as well as the 2000 word General Education requirement. For each paper, students will be asked to find their own news story and write an ethical analysis. The first paper (due July 11) will address free speech, and the second (due July 25) will address economic and gender justice. 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. I will also provide a detailed assignment sheet on Canvas.

General instructions for short papers

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.

4. Capstone Project (20% of grade)

Poster presentation due Aug. 3 (10%) (Group Project)

Reflection paper due Aug. 7 (10%)

The capstone project asks students to identify a public issue of ethical relevance. Students should 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 and presentation (10% of grade)

You will break into groups of up to four people (from your discussion section) to produce a poster about the ethical dimensions of a contemporary public issue, to be chosen in consultation with the instructor. Every student will be responsible for presenting to the class, and the work of presenting should be divided evenly between group members. Please see the Capstone Rubric included at the end of this syllabus for a breakdown of requirements and assessment. Groups must submit an outline explaining the contributions of each individual member. Posters will be presented in discussion sections the last week of class. Poster are due in class (discussion sections) on Aug. 3 and will be presented in discussion sections on Aug. 3 and 5.

Part 2: Reflection on final project (10% of grade)

Each student must write a short (1-2 page) reflection paper on their final research project. This paper will also discuss 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 two analytical 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. The papers are due by midnight on Aug 7.

5. Reflection paper on public event (10%)

Due one week after the event you attend; final deadline for all reflections is August 7

An important component of Quest classes is engagement with the world beyond campus. In this class, students are encouraged to connect readings and discussions to larger issues facing local communities and US society as a whole. One way to make those connections is by attending an event off campus that addresses some of the issues we address. The event could be a lecture, meeting, demonstration, art exhibit, or play, among other options. I will give you a list of public events during the Summer B semester, but you may also suggest an event that is not on the list. After attending the event and taking notes, you will write a short reflection paper (1-2 page) connecting the event to our guiding question and some of the specific issues and theories we have discussed.

COURSE SCHEDULE

NOTE: COURSE CONTENT IS SUBJECT TO CHANGE

Date	Readings and Assignments
	<p>MODULE 1: ETHICAL REFLECTION</p> <p>This module will introduce students to ethics as a discipline and to major models and themes in ethical theory, both philosophical and religious. Students will also engage in experiential activities to understand and practice civil dialogue about ethical issues.</p>

June 28	Lecture: Introduction to the class
June 29	Discussion sections: Read: Weston, <i>Practical Companion</i> , Ch. 1 and 2 Activity: Tales from the Trenches
June 30	Lecture: Ethical Theories Read: Weston, <i>Practical Companion to Ethics</i> , Ch. 3 and 4
July 1	Discussion sections: Read: Weston, <i>Practical Companion</i> , Ch. 5 and 6 Activity: Hatful of Quotes on ethical theories
July 2	Asynchronous learning Listen: Steven Petrow, “Three Ways to Practice Civility” https://www.ted.com/talks/steven_petrow_3_ways_to_practice_civility
	MODULE 2: FREE SPEECH AND HATE SPEECH In this module, students will learn philosophical and legal definitions of free speech and hate speech. They will also learn about the major ethical approaches to these issues, including various philosophical and legal theories.
July 5	Holiday; no class
July 6	Discussion sections: The Constitution and free speech Read: 1. Bill of Rights: The First Amendment https://billofrightsinstitute.org/founding-documents/bill-of-rights/ 2. <i>National Socialist Party v. Skokie</i> (1977) https://www.oyez.org/cases/1976/76-1786 3. <i>Brandenburg v. Ohio</i> (1969) https://www.oyez.org/cases/1968/492 Activity: modular debate about hate speech laws
July 7	Lecture: Balancing Free Speech and Hate Speech Read: Richard Delgado and Jean Stefancic, “Hateful Speech, Loving Communities: Why Our Notion of ‘A Just Balance’ Changes So Slowly.” <i>California Law Review</i> . 82, No. 4 (Jul.,1994), pp. 851-869
July 8	Discussion sections: Mill’s Free Speech Extremism

	<p>Read:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. John Stuart Mill, <i>On Liberty</i>, Ch. 3 https://www.gutenberg.org/files/34901/34901-h/34901-h.htm 2. Jason Stanley, “What John Stuart Mill Got Wrong about Freedom of Speech” http://bostonreview.net/politics-philosophy-religion/jason-stanley-what-mill-got-wrong-about-freedom-of-speech 3. Clifford Orwin, “What would John Stuart Mill Think about Today’s Campus Free Speech Debates?” https://www.theglobeandmail.com/opinion/what-would-john-stuart-mill-think-about-todays-campus-free-speechdebates/article38005374/
July 9	<p>Asynchronous learning:</p> <p>Watch: Video documentary on Richard Spencer, in Graeme Wood, “His Kampf” <i>The Atlantic</i> https://www.theatlantic.com/magazine/archive/2017/06/his-kampf/524505/</p> <p>Listen: The Hate Debate https://www.wnycstudios.org/podcasts/radiolabmoreperfect/episodes/hate-debate</p>
July 11	First short paper due by midnight on Sunday, July 11
	<p>MODULE 3: SEXUAL VIOLENCE AND GENDER JUSTICE</p> <p>In this module, students will be introduced to the ethical issues raised by sexual violence and related issues. They will learn about definitions of key terms such as sexism, sexual harassment, and sex trafficking, and about important philosophical approaches to these problems.</p>
July 12	<p>Lecture: What is sexism?</p> <p>Read:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Michelle Anderson, “Negotiating Sex” (Villanova University School of Law, Working Paper, Aug. 2005) 2. Laura Bates, “Everyday Sexism” (podcast) https://www.ted.com/talks/laura_bates_everyday_sexism
July 13	<p>Discussion sections: Sex trafficking</p> <p>Read: Annie George, U Vindhya, and Sawmya Ray, “Sex Trafficking and Sex Work: Definitions, Debates and Dynamics — A Review of Literature.” <i>Economic and Political Weekly</i> 45, No. 17 (April 24-30, 2010), pp. 64-73</p>

July 14	<p>Lecture: Sexual violence</p> <p>Read:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Elizabeth Arveda Kisling, “Street harassment: the language of sexual terrorism.” <i>Discourse & Society</i> 2, No. 4 (1991): 451-460 2. Claudia Card, “Rape Terrorism.” <i>The Unnatural Lottery</i>, Ch. 5. <p>Listen: Inés Hercovich, “Why Women Stay Silent after Sexual Assault” https://www.ted.com/talks/ines_hercovich_why_women_stay_silent_after_sexual_assault</p>
July 15	<p>Discussion sections: Sexual Consent</p> <p>Read:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Hallie Liberto, “Intention and Sexual Consent.” <i>Philosophical Explorations</i>, 20: sup 2 (2017), 127-141 2. Clementine Ford, “Why ‘Asking First’ Doesn’t Excuse Louis CK’s Behaviour.” <i>Sydney Morning Herald</i> (Nov. 13, 2017). https://www.smh.com.au/lifestyle/why-women-dont-leave-when-men-like-louis-ck-commit-lewd-acts-20171112-gzjdr.html <p>Listen: <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</p> <p>Classroom activity: Ethics café on consent</p>
July 16	<p>Asynchronous learning: sexual violence on campus</p> <p>Read:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. April 4, 2011 Dear Colleague Letter clarifying University obligations re campus sexual assault under Title IX 2. “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 3. “UF releases results of 2019 sexual assault and misconduct survey.” https://news.ufl.edu/2019/10/campus-climate-results/
	<p style="text-align: center;">MODULE 4: ECONOMIC JUSTICE</p> <p>In this module, students will learn about different philosophical and religious understandings of economic justice. We will also explore practical dimensions of this issue and the challenges of public discussions.</p>

July 19	<p>Lecture: Defining Economic Justice</p> <p>Read:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Warren Copeland, <i>Economic Justice</i>, Ch. 1 2. Jeffrey Sachs, <i>Building the New American Economy: Smart, Fair, and Sustainable</i> (Columbia Univ. Press, 2017), Ch. 5: Facing up to Income Inequality 3. US Catholic Bishops, “Economic Justice for All a Decade Later” (1995)
July 20	<p>Discussion sections: <i>Nickel and Dimed</i></p> <p>Read: Ehrenreich, <i>Nickel and Dimed</i>, Introduction and Section 1</p>
July 21	<p>Lecture: <i>Nickel and Dimed</i></p> <p>Read: Ehrenreich, <i>Nickel and Dimed</i>, Section 2</p>
July 22	<p>Discussion section: <i>Nickel and Dimed</i></p> <p>Read: <i>Nickel and Dimed</i>, Section 3 and Evaluation:</p> <p>Classroom activity: Wealth inequality game</p>
July 23	<p>Asynchronous learning: what does the wealth gap mean?</p> <p>Read: Pedro Nicolai da Costa, “America’s Humungous Wealth Gap is Widening Further.” <i>Forbes</i> (May 29, 2019). https://www.forbes.com/sites/pedrodacosta/2019/05/29/americas-humungous-wealth-gap-is-widening-further/#33b2bd5742ee</p> <p>Listen: Paul Piff, “Does money make you mean?” https://www.ted.com/talks/paul_piff_does_money_make_you_mean</p>
July 25	Second short paper due by midnight
	<p>MODULE 5: RACIAL JUSTICE</p> <p>In this module, we will learn about some of the ethical perspectives and issues that are important in contemporary discussions about racial justice. In order to understand the practical implications of ethical discussions, we will look at case studies including racial profiling and reparations.</p>
July 26	Lecture: Race and ethics in the public sphere

	<p>Read: Susannah Heschel, "The Slippery Yet Tenacious Nature of Racism: New Developments in Critical Race Theory and Their Implications for the Study of Religion and Ethics." <i>Journal of the Society of Christian Ethics</i>, Volume 35, Number 1 (Spring/Summer 2015), pp. 3-27</p>
July 27	<p>Discussion sections: Racial profiling</p> <p>Read: Paul Bou-Habib, "Racial Profiling and Background Injustice," <i>The Journal of Ethics</i>, Vol. 15, No.1-2 (March/June 2011), pp.33-46</p>
July 28	<p>Lecture: Martin Luther King Jr and BLM</p> <p>Jermaine M. McDonald, "Ferguson and Baltimore according to Dr. King: How Competing Interpretations of King's Legacy Frame the Public Discourse on Black Lives Matter." <i>Journal of the Society of Christian Ethics</i>, Volume 36, Number 2, Fall/Winter 2016, pp. 141-158 (Article)</p>
July 29	<p>Discussion sections: Reparations:</p> <p>1. Patricia Cohen, "What Reparations for Slavery might look like in 2019," <i>The New York Times</i> (May 23, 2019). https://www.nytimes.com/2019/05/23/business/economy/reparations-slavery.html</p> <p>2. Sheila Flemming-Hunter, "Conversations About Reparations for Blacks in America: A 21st Century Model in Civic Responsibility And Engagement." <i>Phylon</i> 53, No. 2 (Winter 2016), pp. 100-125</p>
July 30	<p>Asynchronous learning:</p> <p>Watch: Malcolm X, "The Ballot or the Bullet" https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=8zLQLUpNGsc</p>
	<p>MODULE 6: PARTISANSHIP AND CIVIL DISCOURSE</p> <p>In the final module, students will learn about the partisanship and civil discourse in contemporary US society. They will use these themes to reflect on the specific issues we have discussed in the previous modules and also on their own final projects, which we will present and discuss in class this week.</p>
Aug. 2	<p>Lecture: Partisanship and civil discourse</p> <p>Read: Partisan Prejudice in the US and civil discourse</p>

	https://www.theatlantic.com/politics/archive/2019/03/us-counties-vary-their-degree-partisan-prejudice/583072/
Aug 3	Discussion sections: Poster presentations
Aug 4	Ethics café
Aug 5	Discussion sections: Poster presentations
Aug 6	Asynchronous learning Finish reflection papers (due by midnight Aug 7)

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 at
<https://catalog.ufl.edu/UGRD/academic-regulations/grades-grading-policies/>.

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 • When appropriate, good, clear examples are used to illuminate concepts and issues and/or support arguments. 	<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. • Examples are clear, but may not be well chosen. 	<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. • Examples are not clear, and may not be well chosen or appropriate. • The textual support is inappropriate. 	<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. • Examples are not clear, are inappropriate, and/or do not illuminate concepts and issues. • No textual support. 	35 points

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The paper uses appropriate textual support. 32-35 points	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The paper has textual support, but other passages may have been better choices. 29-31 points	26-28 points	0-25 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. 32-35 points	<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. 29-31 points	<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> 26-28 points	<p>The paper does not present an original argument about the issues in question, or, it fails to offer support through rational argument.</p> 0-25 points	35 points
Writing: Mechanics	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • All sentences are complete and grammatical. • Paper has been spell-checked and proofread, and has no errors, and no rhetorical questions or slang. 9-10 points	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • All sentences are complete and grammatical. • Paper has been spell-checked and proofread, and has very few errors, and no rhetorical questions or slang. 7-8 points	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A few sentences are incomplete and/or ungrammatical. • Paper has several spelling errors, rhetorical questions and/or uses of slang. 5-6 point	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Many sentences are incomplete and/or ungrammatical. • Paper has many spelling errors, rhetorical questions and/or uses of slang. 0-4 points	10 points
Writing: Flow and Coherence	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • All words are chosen for their precise meanings and are used consistently. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Most words are chosen for their precise meanings. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Words are not chosen for their precise meanings. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Words are not chosen for their precise meanings. 	

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● 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. <p>9-10 points</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● 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. <p>7-8 points</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● 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. <p>5-6 points</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● 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. <p>0-4 points</p>	10 points
--	---	--	---	--	-----------

Total Points Possible: 100

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

Research Report Rubric

	Excellent	Good	Needs Improvement	Unacceptable	
Research	<p>Researcher uses primary sources that are appropriate and unique</p> <p>Researcher has conducted wide-ranging research to identify correct sources</p> <p>Researcher cites the sources properly</p> <p>27-30 points</p>	<p>Researcher uses primary sources that are appropriate</p> <p>Researcher has conducted some research to identify correct sources</p> <p>Researcher cites sources properly</p> <p>However</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> the research may not be as extensive as possible sources may be common and easily found <p>24-26 points</p>	<p>Researcher has conducted some research, but it may be limited or cursory</p> <p>Materials identified may not all be completely relevant or appropriate</p> <p>Research citations are not consistently correct</p> <p>20-23 points</p>	<p>Researcher has not conducted adequate (or any) original research</p> <p>Materials are not relevant or appropriate</p> <p>Research is not cited correctly</p> <p>19 points or below</p>	30 points
Exposition of the issue	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The paper contains accurate and precise summarization, description and/or paraphrasing of the issue being discussed Relevant ethical concepts and theories are accurately and completely explained The paper uses appropriate textual support. <p>23-25 points</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The summarization, description and/or paraphrasing of the issue is fairly accurate and precise. Relevant ethical concepts and theories are explained. The paper has textual support, but other passages may have been better choices. <p>21-22 points</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The summarization, description and/or paraphrasing of the issue is fairly accurate, but not precise. Key ethical concepts and theories are not explained. Textual support is inappropriate. <p>15-16 points</p>	<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. No textual support. <p>14 points or below</p>	25 points
Presentation and analysis of the research	<p>The research is presented clearly and the relevance to the issue is evident</p> <p>Research is carefully and insightfully analyzed in relation to ethical theories, themes, and arguments that are important to the issue</p> <p>23-25 points</p>	<p>Research is presented clearly and is mostly relevant to the issue</p> <p>Research is analyzed in relation to ethical theories, themes, and arguments that are important to the issue</p> <p>21-22 points</p>	<p>Research presentation is not always clear and relevance to the issue is not made evident</p> <p>15-16 points</p>	<p>The paper does not present relevant research</p>	25 points

Writing: Mechanics	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● All sentences are complete and grammatical. ● Paper has been spell-checked and proofread, and has no errors, and no rhetorical questions or slang. <p>9-10 points</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● All sentences are complete and grammatical. ● Paper has been spell-checked and proofread, and has very few errors, and no rhetorical questions or slang. <p>7-8 points</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● A few sentences are incomplete and/or ungrammatical. ● Paper has several spelling errors, rhetorical questions and/or uses of slang. <p>5-6 point</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Many sentences are incomplete and/or ungrammatical. ● Paper has many spelling errors, rhetorical questions and/or uses of slang. <p>0-4 points</p>	10 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. <p>9-10 points</p>	<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. <p>7-8 points</p>	<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. <p>5-6 points</p>	<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. <p>0-4 points</p>	10 points

Total Points Possible: 100

The research report 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. ● Presentation is colorful and creative. <p>14-15 points</p>	<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. <p>12-13 points</p>	<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. <p>10-11 points</p>	<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. <p>0-9 points</p>	15 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. <p>5 points</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● A few (2-3) errors in spelling, grammar or punctuation. Most text is in student's own words. <p>4 points</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Some grammar or punctuation errors. Several instances where the text is not in student's own words. <p>3 points</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Several spelling, grammar or punctuation errors. Text is copied or not included. <p>0-2 points</p>	5 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 <p>32-35 points</p>	<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. <p>29-31 points</p>	<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 <p>26-28 points</p>	<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. <p>0-25 points</p>	35 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 	<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. 	<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. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Paper fails to address how the poster project has brought together the themes of the course. 	

	reflection, and ethical action. ● Paper is clearly and well written. (See rubric for short papers on writing mechanics and coherence criteria) ● Paper is thoughtful.	● Paper is clearly written. ● Paper is thoughtful. 7-8 points	● Paper is not clearly written. ● The paper does not engage in genuine reflection. 6 points	● The paper is poorly written. ● The paper is superficial and/or does not involve genuine reflection. 0-5 points	20 points
	9-10 points				

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

Poster: 45

Individual Student Presentation: 35

Individual Reflection Paper: 20 points

I. 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**).