

Cover Sheet: Request 12936

IDS2935: UFQuest1, Justice and Power: Ethics and the Public Sphere

Info

| | |
|------------------------|--|
| Process | Course New/Close/Modify Ugrad Gen Ed |
| Status | Pending at PV - General Education Committee (GEC) |
| Submitter | Jaime Ahlberg jahlberg@ufl.edu |
| Created | 8/14/2018 4:53:38 PM |
| Updated | 9/29/2018 10:55:30 PM |
| Description of request | IDS2935 is the course "shell" through which the first offerings in the new UF Quest curriculum will be offered. I am asking that the Gen Ed committee temporarily approve a section of IDS2935 titled UFQuest 1, Justice and Power: Ethics and the Public Sphere as an offering that fills the Humanities, and Writing—2000 words Gen Ed requirements. This temporary approval will last from Spring term, 2019, through fall term 2019. |

Actions

| Step | Status | Group | User | Comment | Updated |
|---|----------|---|-----------------|---------|-----------|
| Department | Approved | CLAS - Philosophy 011615000 | John Palmer | | 8/14/2018 |
| Ahlberg and Peterson- Ethics and the Public Sphere cover letter.doc | | | | | 8/14/2018 |
| College | Approved | CLAS - College of Liberal Arts and Sciences | Joseph Spillane | | 9/10/2018 |
| Ahlberg and Peterson- Religion Department Consent Letter.pdf | | | | | 8/15/2018 |
| General Education Committee | Pending | PV - General Education Committee (GEC) | | | 9/10/2018 |
| No document changes | | | | | |
| Office of the Registrar | | | | | |
| No document changes | | | | | |
| Catalog | | | | | |
| No document changes | | | | | |
| College Notified | | | | | |
| No document changes | | | | | |

Course|Gen_Ed|New-Close-Modify for request 12936

Info

Request: IDS2935: UFQuest1, Justice and Power: Ethics and the Public Sphere

Description of request: IDS2935 is the course "shell" through which the first offerings in the new UF Quest

curriculum will be offered. I am asking that the Gen Ed committee temporarily approve a section of IDS2935 titled UFQuest 1, Justice and Power: Ethics and the Public Sphere as an

offering that fills the Humanities, and Writing—2000 words Gen Ed requirements. This temporary approval will last from Spring term, 2019, through fall term 2019.

Submitter: Jaime Ahlberg jlahlberg@ufl.edu

Created: 8/14/2018 4:44:23 PM

Form version: 1

Responses

Course Prefix and Number

Response:
IDS2935

Enter the three letter prefix, four-digit course number, and lab code (if applicable), as the course appears in the Academic Catalog (or as it has been approved by SCNS, if the course is not yet listed in the catalog). If the course has been approved by the UCC but is still pending at SCNS, enter the proposed course prefix and level, but substitute XXX for the course number; e.g., POS2XXX.

Course Title

Enter the title of the course as it appears in the Academic Catalog (or as it has been approved by SCNS, if the course is not yet listed in the catalog, or as it was approved by the UCC, if the course has not yet been approved by SCNS).

Response:
UFQ1 Justice and Power: Ethics and the Public Sphere

Delivery Method

Please indicate the delivery methods for this course (check all that apply). Please note that content and learning outcome assessment must be consistent regardless of delivery method.

Response:
Classroom

Request Type

Response:
Change GE/WR designation (selecting this option will open additional form fields below)

Effective Term

Enter the term (semester and year) that the course would first be taught with the requested change(s).

Response:
Spring

Effective Year

Response:
2019

Credit Hours

Select the number of credits awarded to the student upon successful completion. Note that variable credit courses are not eligible for GE or WR certification.

Response:
3

Prerequisites

Response:
n/a

Current GE Classification(s)

Indicate all of the currently-approved general education designations for this course.

Response:
None

Current Writing Requirement Classification

Indicate the currently-approved WR designation of this course.

Response:
None

Requesting Temporary or Permanent Approval

Please select what type of General Education Approval you desire for this course. Selecting 'Permanent', will request a permanent General Education designation. You may also select a temporary General Education assignment for 1, 2, or 3 semesters.

Response:
3 semseters

Requested GE Classification

Indicate the requested general education subject area designation(s) requested for this course. If the course currently has a GE designation and the request includes maintaining that designation, include it here.

Response:
H

Requested Writing Requirement Classification

Indicate the requested WR designation requested for this course. If the course currently has a WR designation and the request includes maintaining that designation, include it here.

Response:

E2

Description of other writing skills feedback

Response:

Beyond corrections, feedback will presented on the quality of thought and presentation in the essay.

August 10, 2018

Dear committee members:

Along with this letter please find attached our syllabus for “Ethics and the Public Sphere,” a class we propose for the spring 2019 Trial of Quest 1. Quest 1 is the new arts and humanities curriculum that will replace IUF1000 “What is the Good Life?” as an introduction to methods, themes, and perspectives in the humanities for first year students. Quest 1 class will thus fulfill the Gen Ed Humanities requirement. The goal of Quest courses is not to provide standard introductory or survey classes but instead to engage students in explorations of critical questions about the core questions of the humanities, organized into five multidisciplinary themes. Quest 1 classes also include several special features, including an experiential component, enhanced student-faculty interaction, attention to metacognitive thinking about the humanities, and student reflection about the connections between issues raised in the class and their own intellectual, professional, and personal lives.

Our class is a somewhat unusual case, because it is supported by a team-teaching award from the Center for the Humanities in the Public Sphere and the honors program. Because the theme is so well suited for the Quest 1 program, we asked the directors of the CHPS and the Honors program if they would agree to our participation in the Spring 2019 trial. They fully support our participation in the trial. While the class benefits from being team-taught, this is not necessary for future versions.

Our course, Ethics and the Public Sphere, is housed in the Quest theme “Justice and Power.” The class approaches this theme by raising crucial questions about the moral dimensions of divisive public issues in contemporary U.S. The course focuses on challenging and complex contemporary issues, including hate speech/free speech, sexual harassment, economic disparities, and education access and reform. In all of these issues, as well as in more general discussions of ethics as a scholarly discipline, we ask students to engage daunting problems that hinge on the expression, distribution, and meaning of justice and power in contemporary society.

Our overarching objective is to teach students to use resources and perspectives from the humanities to think through these challenges in responsible and productive ways, as well as how to explore opportunities for action. In the process, we will raise a number of broad questions, including: What is the place of ethics in the public sphere, in relation to both individual and social action? How can students and citizens learn to identify, analyze, and assess the moral dimensions of contemporary political problems? How are moral claims expressed in law, policy, and public institutions? And perhaps most important, how can the scholarly discipline of ethics help us think about how to act morally, to become good people, and to create morally sound institutions, policies, and practices?

We approach this class from a perspective that is both multidisciplinary, because it addresses many different academic topics and fields, and interdisciplinary, because it interweaves different disciplinary perspectives. We are both ethicists, trained in different disciplines (Philosophy and Religion) but interested in the same questions about the nature of ethical thinking and the relationship between ethical action and justice in the public sphere.

The class's interdisciplinary character is reflected in our engagement with multiple disciplines, including religion, philosophy, law, journalism, economics, women's studies, environmental studies, and education. Students will be assigned readings from these disciplines in various formats, including scholarly articles and books, legal decisions, laws, papal encyclicals, pastoral letters, historical analyses, and news articles. In teaching these different documents, we will focus not only on their content but also on the distinctive kinds of reading and analysis that they require. To help us think through these issues, we will draw on the expertise of a number of guest lecturers, including April Hines from UF libraries (to speak about information literacy), Eric Segal from the Harn Museum of Art (to speak about a recent ethical issue in curating an exhibit), and Elaine Giles from the Brown Center for Leadership and Service (to speak about ethical service).

The skills we will emphasize throughout the course reflect our interdisciplinary approach to themes and practices that are unique to the humanities, including 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. These are all meta-cognitive skills which will teach students how to analyze and

address moral conflicts in critical and constructive ways. These skills will serve students well throughout their college careers as well as in their lives as professionals and citizens.

To pursue these goals, course discussions, assignments, and readings will encourage students to engage public issues in thoughtful, rigorous, and evidence-based ways. We will also explore the relevance of the humanities for real life problems that we all face as individuals, scholars, and citizens. At the center of our exploration will be learning how to “do ethics.” This is a multi-part process that includes learning about scholarly methods and sources to understand the moral dimensions of controversial public issues, understanding how to find, evaluate, and use relevant information, and thinking about effective ways to address these problems.

To pursue these goals, we employ both content and format that will teach students not just to learn what ethical analysis is but to practice it: identifying the moral issues at stake and evaluating them with the help of diverse sources and methods. We will provide support for students’ efforts by introducing ethics through engaging and accessible readings that do not presuppose prior specialized training and that highlight distinctive modes of analysis as well as practical challenges.

As an introduction to the humanities for first year students, our course emphasizes close, critical reading of diverse sources, comparative analysis, and creative problem solving. The readings, class sessions, and writing assignments are designed to help students learn how to integrate moral concepts and theories into contextualized arguments. The metacognitive skills that students will learn throughout the class will improve their ability to succeed in upper division courses and beyond. In particular, students will learn strategies for breaking out of common dilemmas and the dualistic ways of thinking that are prevalent in public discourse. We will practice these strategies in reflective exercises in class discussions and individual writing projects, which will be oriented toward incorporating ethical thinking skills into their own responses to controversial issues and divergent opinions. The class will be suitable for students from any major who want to explore contemporary moral challenges in rigorous, creative ways.

The instructors will engage students’ and the learning process in multiple ways, including feedback on writing assignments and discussions. The course will be relatively small (30 students) in order to facilitate student participation and active discussions. We have already arranged for the class to have a field trip to see the play

“Mercy Killers” at the Philips Center and have a class visit by the playwright and actor. In addition, the students will complete a capstone assignment in which they engage a selected public issue in creative and constructive ways and write a reflection paper connecting the activity with their personal, public, and professional lives.

Thank you for your review of our proposal. Please let us know if you have any questions or require additional information.

Sincerely,

Anna Peterson
Professor of Religion

Jaime Ahlberg
Assistant Professor of Philosophy

August 15, 2018

General Education Committee
University of Florida

Dear Colleagues:

Professors Jaime Ahlberg (Philosophy) and Anna Peterson (Religion) have proposed a course for the Quest 1 trial, titled Ethics and the Public Sphere. They are requesting Gen Ed approval through UF's online submission the H Gen Ed designation and the 2000 word Writing Requirement for this course. The approval portal allows only one chair approval, which John Palmer, chair of Philosophy, has submitted. As chair of the Religion Department, I am writing separately to express my approval for the Gen Ed requests for this class.

Thank you for your consideration. Please let me know if you need further information.

Sincerely,



James R. Mueller
Associate Professor and Interim Chair

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

INSTRUCTORS

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

COURSE DETAILS

Time: TR, TBD

Location: TBD

Quest 1 Theme: Justice and Power

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

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

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

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

COURSE DESCRIPTION

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

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

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

QUEST 1 AND GEN ED DESCRIPTIONS AND STUDENT LEARNING OUTCOMES

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

QUEST 1 SLOs:

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

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

HUMANITIES SLOs:

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

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

WRITING EVALUATION:

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

COURSE OBJECTIVES AND GOALS

STUDENT LEARNING OUTCOMES:

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

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

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

TEXTS AND MATERIALS

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

Required

Books

1. Mary Midgely, *Can't We Make Moral Judgments?* (New York, NY: St. Martin's Press, 1993)
2. Sigal Ben-Porath, *Free Speech on Campus* (Philadelphia, PA: University of Pennsylvania Press, 2017)
3. Richard Reeves, *Dream Hoarders* (Washington DC: The Brookings Institution, 2017)

Field Trip

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

Recommended

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

GRADE DISTRIBUTION AND GRADING POLICIES

All assignments are worth 100 points each for the purposes of grading, but are weighted differently in calculating the final grade. In calculating the final grade, the assignments are weighted as follows:

- | | |
|---|----------------|
| 1. Attendance (100 points) | 10% |
| 2. 3 Short Papers (1000-1200 words each; 100 points each) | 60% (20% each) |
| 3. Capstone Project (100 points) | 30% |

Grading Scale

This course will employ the following grading scale:

| Letter Grade | 4 pt. scale | Percentage/Points |
|--------------|-------------|-------------------|
| A | 4.0 | 94-100 |
| A- | 3.67 | 90-93 |
| B+ | 3.33 | 87-89 |
| B | 3.0 | 84-86 |
| B- | 2.67 | 80-83 |
| C+ | 2.33 | 77-79 |
| C | 2.0 | 74-76 |
| C- | 1.67 | 70-73 |
| D+ | 1.33 | 67-69 |
| D | 1.0 | 64-66 |
| D- | 0.67 | 60-63 |
| E | 0.0 | 0-59 |

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

COURSE POLICIES AND STUDENT RESOURCES

Attendance Policy

Students are expected to attend class regularly and to arrive on time. Attendance is worth 100 points, and the attendance grade is 10% of the final course grade.

Unexcused absences from more than four classes will negatively affect your attendance grade. For each unexcused absence beyond the fourth, you will lose 10 points from your attendance grade. For example, 100 points will become 90 points upon a fifth unexcused absence; 90 points would become 80 points upon a sixth unexcused absence; and so on.

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

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

Academic Honesty

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

obligated to report any condition that facilitates academic misconduct to appropriate personnel. If you have any questions or concerns, please consult with the instructor.

Plagiarism on any assignment will automatically result in a grade of "E" for the course. Plagiarism is defined in the University of Florida's Student Honor Code as follows: "A student shall not represent as the student's own work all or any portion of the work of another. Plagiarism includes (but is not limited to): a. Quoting oral or written materials, whether published or unpublished, without proper attribution. b. Submitting a document or assignment which in whole or in part is identical or substantially identical to a document or assignment not authored by the student." Students found guilty of academic misconduct will be prosecuted in accordance with the procedures specified in the UF honesty policy.

Making Up Work

Work is due as specified in the syllabus. Work will be due by the next class period for a student with a valid, excused absence.

If a student does not submit work on time and lacks a documented, excusing reason, work can still be submitted for credit. In such cases, late work is subject to a 4 point deduction for each 24 hours period it is late (including weekend days). For example, a short paper that would have earned 100 points but is submitted one day late, and without a documented and excusing reason, would earn 96 points.

Requirements for class attendance and make-up exams, assignments, and other work in this course are consistent with university policies that can be found at: <https://catalog.ufl.edu/ugrad/current/regulations/info/attendance.aspx>

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 and Participation

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. Students must also come to class 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.

Consistent high-quality class participation—in large and small groups—will improve the class experience and outcomes for everyone. “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 students have personal issues that prohibit them from joining freely in class discussion, e.g., shyness, language barriers, etc., they should see the instructors as soon as possible to discuss alternative modes of participation.

Electronic devices should be turned off and placed in closed bags. Opinions held by other students should be respected in discussion, and conversations that do not contribute to the discussion should be kept to a minimum.

Materials and Supplies Fees

There are no additional fees for this course.

Counseling and Wellness Center

Contact information for the Counseling and Wellness Center:

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

Writing Studio

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

GRADED WORK AND ASSIGNMENTS

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

Attendance

While participation is not directly graded, this course does require attendance. One cannot engage in high quality class participation if one is not in class. Unexcused absences from more than four classes will negatively affect the attendance grade. Attendance is worth 100 points, and is 10% of the final course grade. For each unexcused absence beyond the fourth, you will lose 10 points from your attendance grade. For example, 100 points will become 90 points upon a fifth unexcused absence; 90 points would become 80 points upon a sixth unexcused absence; and so on.

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

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

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

Short Papers

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

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

Each paper is to be uploaded onto the course's e-learning site in Canvas. You can log in and find the course web page here: elearning.ufl.edu. The papers will be graded electronically, and returned to you electronically. We will consider allowing you to turn in a paper late without penalty only if you have a valid and documented reason for doing so. If you turn in a paper without a valid or documented reason, 4 points will be deducted for each day it is late (including weekend days!). For example, an essay that earns 100 points but is submitted 1 day late without a valid and documented excuse would earn 96 points.

It is not truly possible to separate the quality of ideas from the quality of the language through which they are expressed, but we attempt to do so by using a grading rubric for papers. The rubric clearly identifies how we assign point values to each of four levels of achievement (Excellent, Good, Needs Improvement, Unacceptable), according to what level you have reached with respect to each of six areas: the appropriateness of the news article chosen, the presence and clarity of a thesis, the explanation of the issue, the evaluation of the issue, writing mechanics, and writing coherence. Please see the rubric for short papers included at the end of the syllabus for elaboration of these requirements.

Advances SLOs: 3, 4, 6

Capstone Project

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

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

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

Advances SLOs: 1, 2, 3, 6

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

Each student must write a 750-1000 word reflection paper on their experience identifying, evaluating, and considering engagement opportunities on the topic they chose. Students will also be asked to reflect on the ways in which the themes of this course are relevant to their own intellectual, personal, and professional development at UF and beyond. These papers will be more informal than your three short essays, but they must be clearly written, thoughtful, and reveal an understanding of the main themes of the course. Please see the Capstone Rubric included at the end of this syllabus for a description of requirements and assessment.

Advances SLOs: 1, 5

COURSE SCHEDULE

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

| Week | Topic | Readings and Assignments |
|-----------------------|--|--|
| 1 Jan 8 Jan 10 | Introduction to Practical Ethics | 1. Mary Midgley, <i>Can't We Make Moral Judgements?</i> Chs. 1-5 (pp. 1-40) |
| 2 Jan 15 Jan 17 | Introduction to Practical Ethics | 1. Midgley continued, selected chapters (Jan 15:6-8) 2. Midgley continued, selected chapters (Jan 17: 16-18) |
| 3 Jan 22 Jan 24 | Issue: Free Speech and Ethics in the Public Sphere | 1. Bill of Rights: The First Amendment 2. <i>National Socialist Party v. Skokie</i> (1977) 3. <i>Brandenburg v. Ohio</i> (1969) 4. Graeme Wood, "His Kampf" <i>The Atlantic</i> |

| | | |
|-----------------------|--|--|
| | Theme: Information Literacy | <p>5. Presentation by April Hines, Librarian, College of Journalism and Communications</p> <p>Recommended:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Eric Kelderman, "Inside the Free Speech Case that Caught Jeff Session's Eye" (<i>The Chronicle of Higher Ed</i>, September 29, 2017) https://www.chronicle.com/article/Inside-the-Free-Speech-Case/241333 2. Anna Peterson, "I Teach Ethics at the University where Richard Spencer Spoke" (<i>The Conversation</i>, October 19, 2017) http://theconversation.com/i-teach-ethics-at-the-university-where-richard-spencer-spoke-86025 |
| 4 Jan 29 Jan 31 | Issue: Free Speech and Ethics in the Public Sphere | <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Richard Delgado, "Words that Wound: A Tort Action for Racial Insults, Epithets, and Name-Calling" 2. Joel Feinberg, "The Offense Principle" 3. Vanessa Williams, "In Debate Over National Anthem, Black Wealth Becomes a Target" (<i>The Washington Post</i>, October 31, 2017) https://www.washingtonpost.com/national/in-debate-over-national-anthem-black-wealth-becomes-a-target/2017/10/30/b63934d2-a55c-11e7-8cfe-d5b912fab99_story.html?utm_term=.544e2b1fe617 4. John Branch, "'National Anthem Protests Sidelined by Ambiguity'" (<i>The New York Times</i>, January 1, 2018) https://www.nytimes.com/2018/01/01/sports/nfl-national-anthem-protests.html |
| 5 Feb 5 Feb 7 | Issue: Free Speech and Ethics in the Public Sphere | <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Sigal Ben-Porath, <i>Free Speech on Campus</i> Feb 5: Preface and Chs. 1 and 2 (pp.1- 46) 2. Ben-Porath continued Feb 7: Chs. 3, 4, and Conclusion (pp.47-116) |
| 6 Feb 12 Feb 14 | Issue: Economics and Ethics in the Public Sphere | <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Copeland, <i>Economic Justice</i> selections 2. US Catholic Bishops, <i>Economic Justice for All</i> (1985), selections 3. John Paul II, <i>Centesimus Annus</i> (1991), selections 4. Benedict XVI, <i>Caritas in Veritate</i> (2009), selections 5. Francis I, "Message for First World Day of the Poor" (2017) <p style="text-align: center;">Paper # 1 on Free Speech Due via upload to Canvas by 11:59pm Friday, Feb. 15</p> |
| 7 Feb 19 Feb 21 | Issue: Economics and Ethics | <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Margaret Drabble, ch. 1 of <i>The Witch of Exmoor</i> 2. David Leonhardt, "Our Broken Economy, in One Simple Chart" (<i>New York Times</i>, August 7, 2017) |

| | | |
|------------------------|---|---|
| | in the Public Sphere | https://www.nytimes.com/interactive/2017/08/07/opinion/leonhardt-income-inequality.html 3. Begin reading Richard Reeves, <i>Dream Hoarders</i> Ch. 1 (pp.1-16) |
| 8 Feb 26 Feb 28 | Issue: Economics and Ethics in the Public Sphere | 4. Reeves, <i>Dream Hoarders</i> Chs. 2-5 (pp.17-94) |
| 9 Mar 5 Mar 7 | | Spring Break, No Classes (Please be reading Reeves's <i>Dream Hoarders</i> for next week) |
| 10 Mar 12 Mar 14 | Issue: Economics and Ethics in the Public Sphere | 1. Finish discussion of Reeves, <i>Dream Hoarders</i> , Chs. 6-8 (pp.95-156) 2. Barbara Ehrenreich, <i>Nickled and Dimed: On (Not) Getting by in America</i> (1996), selections Paper # 2 on Economics Due via upload to Canvas by 11:59pm Friday, Mar 15 |
| 11 Mar 19 Mar 21 | Theme: Thinking Ethically | 1. Famous Dilemmas, selections available on Canvas 2. Anthony Weston, "Values Clash" 3. Anthony Weston, "Creative Problem-Solving" Field Trip to see <i>Mercy Killers</i> at UF's Phillips Center for Performing Arts. Thursday, March 21, 7:30pm. |
| 12 Mar 26 Mar 28 | Issue: Sex, Gender, and Ethics in the Public Sphere | 1. Claudia Card, "Rape Terrorism" 2. Explore US Sexual Assault Statistics, RAINN https://www.rainn.org/statistics 3. <i>This American Life</i> , "Once More, with Feeling" (Act One) https://www.thisamericanlife.org/radio-archives/episode/603/once-more-with-feeling?act=0 |
| 13 Apr 2 Apr 4 | Issue: Sex, Gender, and Ethics in the Public Sphere Theme: Acting Ethically | 1. Nadja Sayej, "Chuck Close: How to deal with an artist accused of sexual harassment" (<i>The Guardian</i> , February 15, 2018) https://www.theguardian.com/artanddesign/2018/feb/15/chuck-close-art-sexual-harassment-pafa 2. Robin Pogrebin and Jennifer Schussler, "Chuck Close is Accused of Harrassment. Should his Artwork Carry an Asterisk?" https://www.nytimes.com/2018/01/28/arts/design/chuck-close-exhibit-harassment-accusations.html 3. Presentation by Eric Segal, Director of Education and Curator of Academic Programs, Samuel P. Harn Museum of Art 4. Presentation by Elaine Giles, Assistant Director, UF's Brown Center for Leadership & Service |
| 14 | Issue: | 1. Michelle Anderson, "Negotiating Sex" |

| | | |
|---------------------------------|---|--|
| <p>Apr 9 Apr 11</p> | <p>Sex, Gender, and Ethics in the Public Sphere</p> | <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 2. April 4, 2011 Dear Colleague Letter clarifying University obligations re campus sexual assault under Title IX 3. “Trump Administration Scraps Obama’s Campus Sexual Assault Rules” (<i>The Independent</i> September 22, 2017) https://www.independent.co.uk/news/world/americas/us-politics/trump-campus-sexual-assault-rules-scrapped-betsy-devos-title-ix-a7961811.html 4. Harry Shepherd Smith, “Have We Gone Too Far with Going Too Far?” (<i>Inter:Mission</i> October 30, 2016) http://intermissionbristol.co.uk/opinion/2016/10/30/7f33erdaz09sgy3ho9zlkuf1ma54c 5. Caitlin Flanagan, “Mutually Nonconsensual Sex” (<i>The Atlantic</i>, June 1, 2018) https://www.theatlantic.com/politics/archive/2018/06/title-ix-is-too-easy-to-abuse/561650/ <p style="text-align: center;">Paper # 3 on Sex and Gender Due via upload to canvas By 11:59pm on Friday, April 11</p> |
| <p>15 Apr 16 Apr 18</p> | | <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Catch-up and wrap-up 2. Student Poster Presentations begin in class, Apr 18 |
| <p>16 Apr 23</p> | | <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Course evaluations 2. Student Poster Presentations continued in class, Apr 23 <p style="text-align: center;">Capstone Reflection Papers due uploaded onto Canvas by 11:59pm on Wednesday, April 24</p> |

Short Paper Rubric

| | Excellent | Good | Needs Improvement | Unacceptable | |
|---------------------|--|---|---|---|----------|
| News Article | <p>An appropriate article is chosen:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● The article is included with the paper ● Its content is ethical in nature ● It is about an issue of contemporary public concern (last 6 mo.) ● It is of 'digestible' size (substantive enough to write about, not too long that it cannot be reasonably addressed) ● The source of the article is a reliable news source. Examples of reliable sources include: <i>The New York Times</i>, <i>The Washington Post</i>, <i>BBC News</i>, <i>Deutsche Welle</i>, <i>The Gainesville Sun</i> <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 ● The source of the article is a reliable news source. <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.) ● The reliability of the news source is in question. <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.) ● The reliability of the news source is in question. <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 |

| | | | | | |
|--------------------------|--|---|---|--|------------------|
| <p>Exposition</p> | <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. ● The paper uses appropriate textual support. <p>32-35 points</p> | <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. ● The paper has textual support, but other passages may have been better choices. <p>29-31 points</p> | <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. <p>26-28 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. ● Examples are not clear, are inappropriate, and/or do not illuminate concepts and issues. ● No textual support. <p>0-25 points</p> | <p>35 points</p> |
| <p>Evaluation</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. This involves presenting 1 or more plausible and | <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 | <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>The paper does not present an original argument about the issues in question, or, it fails to offer support through rational argument.</p> | <p>35 points</p> |

| | | | | | |
|------------------------------------|--|---|---|--|-----------|
| | appropriate objections, and responding to them thoroughly. 32-35 points | chosen and/or not thoroughly responded to. 29-31 points | 26-28 points | 0-25 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. 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. • All of the content of the paper is relevant to the main line of argument; no extraneous material. • Ideas are developed in a natural order. Premises fit together naturally and it is easy to identify the main line of argument and to understand what is being said. • All new or unusual terms are well-defined. • Information (names, facts, etc.) is accurate. | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Most words are chosen for their precise meanings. • Most of the content of the paper is relevant to the main line of argument; extraneous material is at a minimum. • Ideas are mostly developed in a natural order. It is not hard to understand what is being said. • Most new or unusual terms are well-defined. • Information (names, facts, etc.) is accurate. | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Words are not chosen for their precise meanings. • May be substantial extraneous material. • Ideas are not always developed in a natural order. It is sometimes difficult to identify the line of argument or to understand what is being said. • New or unusual terms are not well-defined. • Information (names, facts, etc.) is mostly accurate. | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Words are not chosen for their precise meanings. • Substantial extraneous material. • Ideas are not developed in a natural order. Premises do not fit together naturally and it is difficult to identify the line of argument or to understand what is being said. • New or unusual terms are not defined. • Information (names, facts, etc.) is inaccurate. | 10 points |

| | | | | | |
|--|-------------|------------|------------|------------|--|
| | 9-10 points | 7-8 points | 5-6 points | 0-4 points | |
|--|-------------|------------|------------|------------|--|

Total Points Possible: 100

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

Capstone Project Rubric

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

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

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

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

Poster: 45

Individual Student Presentation: 35

Individual Reflection Paper: 20 points