



**QUEST 1: IDS 2935
ETHICS IN THE PUBLIC SPHERE (HONORS)
SPRING 2020**

INSTRUCTOR

Prof. Anna Peterson

105 Anderson Hall

Tel. 352-273-2936

Email: annap@ufl.edu

Office hours: Tuesdays and Thursdays, 1:45-2:45, and by appointment

COURSE DETAILS

Time: Tuesdays 10:40-11:30 and Thursdays 10:40-12:35

Location: Turl 2333 (Tues) and Weimer 1070 (Thurs)

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

From the #metoo movement 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. 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.

This interdisciplinary Quest 1 course addresses these needs by introducing students to ways that the humanities provide resources for understanding, analyzing, and addressing the ethical dimensions of important public issues. We will address contentious public issues including hate speech, economic inequality, and gender justice. 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.

HONORS OBJECTIVES

As an honors section, this class will expect students to understand and integrate diverse disciplinary perspectives, to consider the social implications of what we are studying, to engage in collaborative learning, and to grow in intellectual confidence and capacity for independent work. Throughout the semester, readings, assignments, and activities in and outside the classroom will encourage students to develop intellectual confidence and creativity, the ability to understand and engage diverse perspectives, and the capacity to identify, analyze, and address complex problems.

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 READINGS

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)

All other required readings are available online or on Canvas, and are specified in the schedule below.

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

SUMMARY OF ASSIGNMENTS AND GRADE DISTRIBUTION

Details about each assignment are available below

- | | |
|---|----------------|
| 1. Participation | 10% |
| 2. Three short papers (1000-1200 words each) | 60% (20% each) |
| 3. Capstone project (poster and reflection paper) | 25% |
| 4. Ethics Café reflection paper | 5% |

COURSE POLICIES AND STUDENT RESOURCES

Attendance Policy

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

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 would 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 and Attendance (10% of final grade)

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

Your participation grade will be based on:

- Attendance. Unexcused absences from more than three classes will negatively affect your participation grade. For each unexcused absence beyond the third, you will lose 10% of your participation grade (e.g. a 100% will become a 90%).
- Engagement
- Unannounced reading quizzes

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. First two short papers: News analysis (20% of grade each; 40% total)

Due: Feb. 8 and March 15

Over the course of the semester students will be asked to write *two* 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 and write an ethical analysis. The first paper (due Feb. 8) will address free speech, and the second (due March 15) will address sexual violence 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 and the course schedule for due dates. I will also provide a detailed assignment sheet on Canvas.

4. Third short paper: Economic justice research report and ethical analysis (20% of grade)

Due: April 8

Students will conduct research about economic justice in the Gainesville area. Students will select or be assigned specific issues to research, in groups or individually. Possible topics include the relations between economic justice and public education, environmental problems, housing, policing, gender, race, and UF relations to the larger community. Some of this research will contribute to a public ethics café to be held April 15 in downtown Gainesville. I will

provide a detailed assignment sheet on Canvas with information about the format and rubric for the report, which is due on April 8.

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.

5. Capstone Project (25% of grade)

Poster presentation April 16 (15%)

Reflection paper due April 27 (10%)

The capstone project asks students to identify a public issue of ethical relevance. We encourage students to choose issues that include attention to gender, which will be the overarching theme of our final research symposium, as part of UF's celebration of 100 years of women's suffrage. Students might explore the gendered dimensions of free speech or economic justice or of another issue, such as environmental justice, immigration, health care reform, etc.; or they might focus on gender/sexuality more directly. 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 (15% of grade)

You will break into groups of up to 4 people to produce a poster about the ethical dimensions of a contemporary public issue, to be chosen in consultation with the instructor. The posters will be presented during the miniconference/research symposium during the final full week of classes.

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 on April 16 in the Reitz Union.

Part 2: Reflection paper (10% of grade)

Each student must write a short (1-2 page) 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. The papers are due by midnight on Sunday, April 26.

7. Experiential Learning and Outside Events

During the spring semester, there will be a number of outside events that are related to the class. Both Quest and the Honors program emphasize the value of such events, which help you connect our readings and discussions to larger issues facing local communities and US society as a whole. You must attend at least one ethics café and write a short essay based on that experience (details below). If you attend any other events, you may write reflection papers for extra credit. You can find details about these and other events at <https://public-ethics.humanities.ufl.edu/events/>

Ethics Café Requirement (5% of grade):

You must attend at least one of the student ethics cafes and write a short (1-2 page) reflection paper analyzing the way issues raised in those conversations are linked to issues we have discussed in class. During the semester there will be three student ethics cafes.

February 4, 3-4:30 pm, Smathers 100: Free Speech on Campus

March 17, 3-4:30 pm, Smathers 100: Gender Violence

April 7, 3-4:30 pm, Smathers 100: Reparations

Other Outside Events

Feb. 11 or 12, Panel on Sex Trafficking; details TBD

March 11, 7-8:30 pm, Panel Discussion on Immigration Reform, at the Thomas Center in downtown Gainesville

April 1, 7-8:30 pm, Panel Discussion on Climate Change, at the Thomas Center in downtown Gainesville

April 15, 7-8:30 pm, Public Ethics Café on economic justice in Gainesville, at the Thomas Center in downtown Gainesville

COURSE SCHEDULE

NOTE: COURSE CONTENT IS SUBJECT TO CHANGE

ASSIGNMENT DEADLINES AND EVENTS INDICATED IN **BOLD**

Week	Topic	Readings and Assignments
1 Jan 7 Jan 9	Introduction to Practical Ethics	<p>Tuesday: Introduction to the class</p> <p>Thurs: 1. Weston, <i>Practical Companion to Ethics</i>, Ch. 1 and 2 2. Steven Petrow, “Three Ways to Practice Civility” https://www.ted.com/talks/steven_petrow_3_ways_to_practice_civility</p>
2 Jan 14 Jan 16	Introduction to Practical Ethics	<p>Tues: Weston, <i>Practical Companion to Ethics</i>, Ch. 3 and 4</p> <p>Thurs.: Weston, <i>Practical Companion to Ethics</i>, Ch. 5 and 6</p> <p>Classroom activity: Hatful of Quotes on ethical theories</p>
3 Jan 21 Jan 23	<p>Issue: Free Speech and Ethics in the Public Sphere</p> <p>Theme: Information Literacy</p>	<p>Tuesday: 1. EJ Dickenson, “How I accidentally Started a Wikipedia Hoax...” https://www.dailydot.com/unclick/amelia-bedelia-wikipedia-hoax/ 2. Caitlin Dewey, “How a 13-year old’s one-line blog post became a worldwide meme” https://www.washingtonpost.com/news/the-intersect/wp/2015/02/19/how-a-13-year-olds-one-line-blog-post-became-a-worldwide-meme/?noredirect=on&utm_term=.7dd39b5f9111 3. Presentation by April Hines, Journalism and Media Librarian, Smathers Libraries</p> <p>Thursday: 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</p>

		<p>4. 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</p> <p>Classroom activities: 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>Modular debate about hate speech</p>
4 Jan 29 Jan 30	Issue: Free Speech and Ethics in the Public Sphere	<p>Tuesday: 1. John Stuart Mill, <i>On Liberty</i>, Ch. 3 https://www.gutenberg.org/files/34901/34901-h/34901-h.htm</p> <p>Thursday: 1. 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 2. 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/</p>
5 Feb 4 Feb 6	Issue: Free Speech and Ethics in the Public Sphere	<p>Feb. 4: Ethics Café on Free Speech</p> <p>Tuesday: 1. Sigal Ben-Porath, <i>Free Speech on Campus</i>, Preface and Ch. 1 and 2 (pp.1- 46)</p> <p>Thursday: 1. Ben-Porath, Ch. 3, 4, and Conclusion (pp.47-116)</p> <p>Paper # 1 on Free Speech Due via upload to Canvas by 11:59pm Sunday, Feb. 9</p>
6 Feb 11 Feb 13	Issue: Sexual violence and Ethics in the Public Sphere	<p>Panel on Gender and Sex Trafficking: Feb 11 or 12</p> <p>Tuesday: 1. Annie George, U Vindhya, and Sawmya Ray, “Sex Trafficking and Sex Work: Definitions, Debates and Dynamics — A Review</p>

		<p>of Literature.” <i>Economic and Political Weekly</i> 45, No. 17 (April 24-30, 2010), pp. 64-73</p> <p>2. Diana Tietjens Meyers, “Feminism and Sex Trafficking: Rethinking Some Aspects of Autonomy and Paternalism.” <i>Ethical Theory and Moral Practice</i> 17, No. 3 (June 2014), pp. 427-441</p> <p>Classroom activity: Prepare questions for the panel on sex trafficking</p> <p>Thursday:</p> <p>1. Kaethe Hoffer, “A Response to Sex Trafficking Chicago Style: Follow the Sisters, Speak Out.” <i>University of Pennsylvania Law Review</i> 158, No. 6 (May 2010), pp. 1831-1848</p> <p>2. Kamala Kempadoo, “Women of Color and the Global Sex Trade: Global Feminist Perspectives.” <i>Meridians: feminism, race, transnationalism</i> 1, No. 2 (Spring 2001), pp. 28-51</p>
7 Feb 18 Feb 20	Issue: Sexual violence and Ethics in the Public Sphere	<p>Tuesday</p> <p>1. Claudia Card, <i>The Unnatural Lottery</i>, Ch. 5 “Rape Terrorism”</p> <p>2. Ines Hercovich, “Why Women Stay Silent after Sexual Assault” (podcast) https://www.ted.com/talks/ines_hercovich_why_women_stay_silent_after_sexual_assault</p> <p>Thursday:</p> <p>1. Michelle Anderson, “Negotiating Sex”(Villanova University School of Law, Working Paper, Aug. 2005)</p> <p>2. Laura Bates, “Everyday Sexism” (podcast) https://www.ted.com/talks/laura_bates_everyday_sexism</p> <p>Classroom activity: explore US Sexual Assault Statistics, RAINN https://www.rainn.org/statistics (Bring laptops to class!)</p>
8 Feb 25 Feb 27	Issue: Sexual violence and ethics in the public sphere	<p>Tuesday:</p> <p>1. Hallie Liberto, “Intention and Sexual Consent.” <i>Philosophical Explorations</i>, 20: sup 2 (2017), 127-141</p> <p>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-gzjidr.html</p> <p>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</p>

		<p>Thursday:</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>Classroom activity: Modular Debate on sexual harassment and consent</p>
9		Spring Break, No Classes
10 Mar 10 Mar 12	Issue: Sexual violence and Ethics in the Public Sphere	<p>Paper # 2 on Sexual violence due via upload to Canvas by 11:59pm Sunday, March 8</p> <p>March 11: Public Ethics Panel on Immigration Reform at the Thomas Center, 7-8:30 pm</p> <p>Tuesday:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Warren Copeland, <i>Economic Justice</i>, Ch. 1 2. US Catholic Bishops, <i>Economic Justice for All</i> (1985), selections <p>Class activity: Prepare questions for the panel on immigration</p> <p>Thursday:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. US Catholic Bishops, “Economic Justice for All a Decade Later” 2. Francis I, “Message for First World Day of the Poor” (2017) <p>Classroom Activity: Hatful of Quotes on Economic Justice Poster Groups Assigned</p>
11 Mar 17 Mar 19	Issue: Economics and Ethics in the Public Sphere	<p>March 17: Ethics Café on Gender Violence</p> <p>Tuesday:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Ehrenreich, <i>Nickel and Dimed</i>, Introduction and Ch. 1 <p>Thursday:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Ehrenreich, <i>Nickel and Dimed</i>, Ch. 2-3 2. Paul Piff, “Does money make you mean?” (Podcast) https://www.ted.com/talks/paul_piff_does_money_make_you_mean

<p>12 Mar 24 Mar 26</p>	<p>Issue: Economics and Ethics in the Public Sphere</p>	<p>Tuesday: 1. Ehrenreich, <i>Nickel and Dimed</i>, Evaluation</p> <p>Thursday: 1. Margaret Drabble, <i>The Witch of Exmoor</i>, Ch. 1 Guest Lecture: Dr Jaime Ahlberg Classroom activity: Original position game</p>
<p>13 Mar 31 Apr 2</p>	<p>Issue: Economics and Ethics in the Public</p>	<p>April 1, Public Ethics Panel on Climate Change at the Thomas Center, 7-8:30 pm</p> <p>Tuesday: 1. Jeffrey Sachs, <i>Building the New American Economy: Smart, Fair, and Sustainable</i> (Columbia Univ. Press, 2017), Ch. 5: Facing up to Income Inequality</p> <p>Classroom activity: Prepare questions for the public ethics panel on climate change</p> <p>Thursday: 1. 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>Classroom activity: Wealth inequality game</p>
<p>14 Apr 7 Apr 9</p>	<p>Issue: Economics and Ethics in the Public Sphere - Reparations</p>	<p>April 7, 4-5:30: Ethics Café on Reparations</p> <p>Research report on economic justice in Gainesville must be uploaded onto Canvas by 11:59 pm on Wed., April 8</p> <p>Tuesday: 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 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> <p>Thursday: Classroom activities: 1. Present reports on income/wealth inequality in Gainesville 2. Prepare questions for the public ethics café on economic justice</p>

<p>15 Apr 14 Apr 16</p>		<p>April 15, Public Ethics Café on economic justice in Gainesville at the Thomas Center, 7-8:30 pm</p> <p>Tuesday: Partisan Prejudice in the US and civil discourse https://www.theatlantic.com/politics/archive/2019/03/us-counties-vary-their-degree-partisan-prejudice/583072/</p> <p>Thursday: Research symposium in Reitz Union (room and (hours TBD)</p> <p>Our class will meet during the regular time (10:40-12:35) at the Reitz Union. In addition, at least one member of each group must be available to bring the poster and set it up a half hour before the fair begins, and another member must be available to take it down when the fair ends. Please bring posters to class on Tuesday 4/21.</p>
<p>Apr 21</p>		<p>Tuesday: Discussion and presentation of posters in class</p> <p>Capstone Reflection Papers must be uploaded onto Canvas by 11:59pm on Sunday, April 26</p>

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. <p>32-35 points</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The paper has textual support, but other passages may have been better choices. <p>29-31 points</p>	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. <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. 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. 	<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>	<p>10 points</p>
--	---	--	---	--	------------------

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

<p>Writing: Mechanics</p>	<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>	<p>10 points</p>
<p>Writing: Flow and Coherence</p>	<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>	<p>10 points</p>

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>	<p>5 points</p>
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>	<p>35 points</p>
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 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. 	

	<p>reflection, and ethical action.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Paper is clearly and well written. (See rubric for short papers on writing mechanics and coherence criteria) ● Paper is thoughtful. <p>9-10 points</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Paper is clearly written. ● Paper is thoughtful. <p>7-8 points</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Paper is not clearly written. ● The paper does not engage in genuine reflection. <p>6 points</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● The paper is poorly written. ● The paper is superficial and/or does not involve genuine reflection. <p>0-5 points</p>	20 points
--	--	---	---	--	-----------

Total Points Possible: 100 (worth 30% of final grade). Point Breakdown:
 Poster: 45
 Individual Student Presentation: 35
 Individual Reflection Paper: 20 points