

**Philosophy 202**  
**Introduction to Ethics**

Morton Hall 122  
MW 12:45-2:05

Professor: Nicholaos Jones  
Office: Morton Hall 332B  
Office Phone: 256.824.2338  
Office Hours: MW 11:45-12:45, TR 1:15-2:15, by appointment  
Email: nick[dot]jones[at]uah[dot]edu  
Web: www.uah.edu/njones/phl202.html  
Angel: angel.uah.edu (podcasts *only*)  
Call #: 90748

**Course Description**

This course has two components. One concerns an examination of theories of right and wrong action, for which we will explore the moral importance of virtues, consequences, dignity, and natural laws. The second component looks at some interesting and important issues in applied ethics. These issues are mixed in with the discussion of ethical theories, to keep things interesting and to provide an opportunity for applying each theory.

There are no prerequisites.

**Course Aims**

- to help the student develop into a person who is intellectually active, critical, and curious, capable of resisting blind concessions to authority and peer pressure
- to help the student make connections between ideas and everyday life, understanding ideas as meaningful to real-world actions rather than mere ineffectual and irrelevant abstractions
- to foster in the student a sense of toleration as not only a "live and let live" attitude but also, and more importantly, a product of genuinely understanding others
- to help the student develop analytic and imaginative skills to make good sense of facts from other disciplines, as a bulwark against unscrupulous manipulation of those facts
- to cultivate in the student flexibility and openness to disagreement, as a counterpoise to provincialism and moral obtuseness

**Course Texts**

- Jones, *A Practical Introduction to Ethical Theory* (e-book, available at UAH Bookstore)
- various articles (available on course website and Angel)

Use of the Texts: The readings should be used as a preparation for lecture, as a supplemental aid in understanding the material covered in lecture, and as a stimulus for class discussion. Each lecture presumes everyone's familiarity with the relevant reading.

## Lecture, Reading, and Assessment Schedule (*Tentative*)

08/17	Desire and Reason	
08/22	Desire and Reason	Read Chapter 1
08/24	Nature and Religion	Read Chapter 2
<b>08/29</b>	<b>Quiz #1 / Virtue</b>	
08/31	Virtue	Read Chapter 3.1-4
09/05	<b>No Class - Labor Day</b>	
09/07	Virtue	Read Chapter 3.5-6
09/12	Common Sense	Read Chapter 4.1-3
09/14	Common Sense	Read Chapter 4.4
<b>09/19</b>	<b>Quiz #2 / Group Workshop</b>	
09/21	Famine Relief	
09/26	Consequences	Read Chapter 5.1-3
<b>09/28</b>	<b>Essay #1 Due / Consequences</b>	
10/03	Consequences	Read Chapter 5.4-6
<b>10/05</b>	<b>Quiz #3 / Realism</b>	Read Chapter 7.1-4
10/10	Dignity	Read Chapter 6.1-3
10/12	Dignity	Read Chapter 6.4-5
<b>10/17</b>	<b>Quiz #4 / Disagreement</b>	
10/19	Disagreement	Read Chapter 7.5-6
10/24	Group Presentations 1&2	
10/26	Group Presentations 3&4	
10/31	Group Presentations 5&6	
11/02	Group Presentations 7&8	
11/07	Natural Law	Read Chapter 9.1-4
<b>11/09</b>	<b>Essay #2 Due / Natural Law</b>	
11/14	Natural Law	Read Chapter 9.4-7
11/16	Rationality	Read Chapter 9
<b>11/21</b>	<b>Journals Due / Codes of Ethics</b>	Read Chapter 8
11/23	<b>No Class - Thanksgiving Break</b>	
<b>11/28</b>	<b>Quiz #5 / Course Evaluations</b>	
<b>12/05</b>	<b>Essay #3 due.</b>	Submit hard copy to Morton Hall 332 by 3:00pm.

## Assessment

There are **five in-class quizzes**, each worth 5% of the final grade.

There is **one expository essay**, worth 20% of the final grade.

There is **one evaluative essay**, worth 20% of the final grade.

There is **one adjudicatory essay**, worth 20% of the final grade.

There is **one group presentation**, worth 10% of the final grade.

There is **one journal**, worth 5% of the final grade.

*Option 1: Presentation Journal*

*Option 2: Service Learning Journal (+ 10 hours minimum service)*

Details on the group presentation, journal, and essays are appended to the end of this syllabus.

Assessments and final grades are assigned according to the following measure:

>90% = A      80-89% = B      70-79% = C      60-69% = D      <60% = F or NC (as appropriate)

- Only dire circumstances merit an incomplete.
- Cheating is unacceptable. You shouldn't cheat. Don't cheat. Seriously.
- *Retain a copy of all graded work*, in order to resolve grade disputes.
- The instructor is not responsible for "lost" material.

The instructor reserves the right to augment the final grades of students who demonstrate superior class performance, and to lower the grades of students who demonstrate a dereliction of their work or contribute to a classroom environment that is not conducive to learning. Final grades may be adjusted **+/- 3 points** based upon participation and attendance, according to the instructor's judgment.

## Student Expectations

Abide by the UAH Code of Student Conduct.

### *In Class*

Attend class regularly. Without doing this, success in the course is unlikely.

Arrive at class in a timely fashion: lateness is disruptive.

Ask questions and share thoughts, especially if something is not understood.

Participate courteously in class discussions.

Treat other people's questions as opportunities for learning rather than distractions from lecture.

### *Outside of Class*

Keep up with the material.

Carefully read the selections assigned for each class, and formulate questions to ask in lecture.

Seek help from the instructor (or other students) as often as needed.

Devote, on average, about nine hours of work per week to this class.

## Academic Honesty

UAH is committed to the fundamental values of preserving academic honesty as defined in the *Student Handbook*. The instructor reserves the right to impose academic sanctions, in lieu of or in addition to those imposed by the Vice President for Student Affairs, upon any student who commits any form of academic misconduct during the course. Students have the right to discuss such sanctions with the instructor before they are imposed, and to protest sanctions to the Vice President for Student Affairs.

At the instructor's discretion, plagiarism and other academic misconduct will be reported promptly to the Vice President for Student Affairs as being in violation of the UAH Code of Student Conduct, Chapter 7, Article III, Part C, Section 1.

- Plagiarism is defined as "the act of appropriating the literary composition of another, or parts or passages of his writings, or the ideas or language of the same, and passing them off as the product's of one's own mind" --Black's Law Dictionary, 5th edition.
- Students should refer to page 93 of the *Student Handbook* to review the definition and examples of academic misconduct. Students should contact the instructor without delay to discuss questions regarding academic misconduct.
- The instructor reserves the right to utilize electronic means to help prevent and identify plagiarism, including the use of Turnitin.com. Students agree that by taking this course, all assignments are subject to submission for textual similarity review to Turnitin.com. Assignments submitted to Turnitin.com will be included as source documents in their restricted access database solely for the purpose of detecting plagiarism in such documents. The terms that apply to the University's use of the Turnitin.com service, as well as additional information about the company, are described at <[www.uah.edu/library/turnitin](http://www.uah.edu/library/turnitin)>.

No student may submit, in fulfillment of requirements for this course, any work submitted, presented, or used by the student in any other course, without the prior consent of the instructor.

## Miscellany

Philosophy is not easy. You must make a serious effort to understand and articulate the material. Technology can help here. Barring technical problems, I endeavor to make available all course lectures on Angel. You should not use this as a substitute for attending class. Instead, use it as an opportunity to take less detailed notes and to focus your main efforts on discussing ideas during class time. You can hear the lecture again, using the audio recording of the lecture, on your own time, where you can take more thoughtful notes.

This course is not primarily about mastering a fixed body of knowledge (although there is some of that going on). Let your mind wander over what you find interesting outside of the classroom. Also, don't be shy about discussing ideas with others, especially people not in the class. The best way to understand something is to explain it to someone else.

If at any time you would like to discuss the issues covered in this course or philosophy in general, feel free to visit during office hours or to arrange a meeting.

If at any time you are having problems with the subject matter or the manner of its presentation, do not

hesitate to bring this to my attention (in person, via email or anonymous note, etc). It is your responsibility to bring any course-related concerns to my attention.

Any student who feels that accommodations based on the impact of a disability are required should contact me privately to discuss specific needs. Please also contact the Disability Support Services at 113 University Center (256.824.6203); they coordinate reasonable accommodations for students with documented disabilities.

Any student who feels that their life is overwhelming or unmanageable is encouraged to contact the Counseling Center at 136 Madison Hall (256.824.6203) for free and confidential appointments. It is normal to use counseling services: no problems are too big or too small.

I encourage a free and tolerant atmosphere in class. I encourage and expect questions and challenges at appropriate times during class. I welcome visits to my office. *I am here to help you learn.*

I reserve all federal and state copyrights over my lectures and course materials.

I reserve the right to alter any or all portions of this syllabus, at my sole discretion, at any time.

### **UAlert Emergency Notification System**

UAHuntsville has implemented the *UAlert* emergency notification system. *UAlert* allows you to receive time-sensitive emergency messages in the form of e-mail, voice mail, and text messages. Everyone who has a UAHuntsville e-mail address will receive emergency alerts to their campus e-mail address. In order to also receive text and voice message alerts, you are asked to provide up-to-date phone contact information. Participation in *UAlert* text and voice messaging is optional, but enrollment is strongly encouraged. *You can't be reached through UAlert unless you participate.* The information you supply is considered confidential and will not be shared or used for purposes other than emergency notification. To review your *UAlert* account, add or update phone and alternate e-mail addresses, and set the priority for your contact methods, please visit the *UAlert* web site: <<http://ualert.uah.edu>>.

## Introduction to Ethics: Group Presentation

Toward the beginning of the semester, you will have the opportunity to assign yourself to a presentation group. (If you do not do this in a timely fashion, the instructor will assign you to a group.)

Each group has a presentation article. This article discusses contemporary issues related to how people ought to behave, what people's obligations are, and so on. The first task for your group is to select an interesting ethical issue, about which there is reasonable disagreement, raised by your group's article. The second task for your group is to develop a presentation for the class in which you discuss this issue.

- Your presentation should be more than a book report. View your article as a springboard for discussing an ethical issue. There is no need to outline the article or present every detail.
- Be pessimistic: assume that few members of the audience have read your article. Use examples to make your ethical issue vivid, and pick examples to which your peers can relate.

Your presentation should last no longer than 30 minutes and should include five elements:

- 1- an explanation of an ethical issue the article raises, including illustrations drawn from real life and a discussion of why the issue is relevant or interesting;
- 2- an explanation of why there is reasonable disagreement about the issue, including a discussion of arguments in support of at least two competing stances on the issue (see Chapter 4 for help);
- 3- an application to the issue of *two* of the following ethical theories: Virtue Ethics, Utilitarianism, Deontology; Natural Law Theory
- 4- a sincere attempt to engage the audience in discussion of their ideas or other participation;
- 5- a Group Presentation Evaluation Form (see next page) submitted no more than one class meeting after your presentation.

During the first part of the semester, the instructor will present an issue in a way that models how your group presentation might proceed. *Each group is welcome and invited to consult with me prior to their presentation, for suggestions, tips, etc.* Assessment of each presentation considers:

- 1: Introduction
  - Did the group choose an issue that is interesting from a moral point of view?
  - Did the group choose an issue about which there is reasonable disagreement?
  - How well did the group convey the issue's importance or relevance?
  - How well did the group illustrate the issue, and its importance, with real life examples?
- 2: Explanation
  - How well did the group show that there is reasonable disagreement about the issue?
  - Did the group attempt to apply two theories to their chosen issue?
  - How well did the group apply each theory?
- 3: Interaction
  - Did the group make a sincere effort to engage the audience in discussion or other participation?
  - Was the group able to solicit input and answer questions from the audience?
- 4: Delivery
  - How organized is the presentation? Is it easy to follow? Is there redundant information?
  - Do presenters appear to be comfortable with the material? Do they read from notes? Are they easy to hear? Do they help each other when appropriate?
- 5: Cooperation (see Group Presentation Evaluation Form)

**Introduction to Ethics: Group Presentation Grading Rubric**

**Computation of Instructor Score**

*Introduction*

Interesting issue?	Yes (+0)	No (-1)	
Reasonable disagreement?	Yes (+0)	No (-3)	
Convey importance/relevance?	Poor (+0)	Good (+1)	Very Good (+2) Excellent (+3)
Illustrations?	Poor (+0)	Good (+1)	Very Good (+2) Excellent (+3)

*Explanation*

Show disagreement?	Poor (+0)	Good (+1)	Very Good (+2) Excellent (+3)
Theory application 1?	Poor (+0)	Good (+1)	Very Good (+2) Excellent (+3)
Theory application 2?	Poor (+0)	Good (+1)	Very Good (+2) Excellent (+3)
Two application <i>attempts</i> ?	Yes (+0)	No (-4)	

*Interaction*

Effort?	Poor (+0)	Good (+1)	Very Good (+2) Excellent (+3)
---------	-----------	-----------	-------------------------------

*Delivery*

Organization?	Poor (+0)	Good (+1)	Very Good (+2) Excellent (+3)
Style?	Poor (+0)	Good (+1)	Very Good (+2) Excellent (+3)

*Evaluation Form*

Submitted on/before date?	Yes (+0)	No (-4)	
---------------------------	----------	---------	--

**Computation of Contribution Score**

Contribution Score = [(Sum of Effort Scores) / (Number of Group Members submitting Effort Scores)]\*

\*rounded to the nearest highest whole number

**Computation of Raw Score**

Raw Score = Instructor Score + Contribution Score

**Computation of Actual Score**

<b>Raw</b>	<0 or 0	1-2	3-4	5-7	8-10	11-14	15-18	19-22	23-24	25-26	27
<b>Actual</b>	0	40	60	65	70	75	80	85	90	95	100

**Introduction to Ethics: Group Presentation Evaluation Form**

NAME: \_\_\_\_\_

Group #: \_\_\_\_\_

Please submit this form, with a completed Section 1, to the instructor *on or before* the day of your presentation. Failure to do so will result in partial loss of credit for the assignment. If you cannot print this form, submit a handwritten equivalent.

**Section 1: To be completed by student**

Please list the names of your *other* group members (not *you*) and rank their effort in contributing to the preparation and delivery of your group's presentation on a scale of 1 to 3:

1 = horrible effort      2 = moderate effort      3 = excellent effort

name: \_\_\_\_\_ effort = \_\_\_\_\_

name: \_\_\_\_\_ effort = \_\_\_\_\_

name: \_\_\_\_\_ effort = \_\_\_\_\_

name: \_\_\_\_\_ effort = \_\_\_\_\_

name: \_\_\_\_\_ effort = \_\_\_\_\_

**Section 2: To be completed by instructor**

Contribution Score: \_\_\_\_\_

Instructor Score: \_\_\_\_\_

Raw Score: \_\_\_\_\_

Actual Score: \_\_\_\_\_

---

Contribution Score is computed by adding together the effort scores given to you by your fellow group members, dividing this sum by the number of group members submitting a score for you, and rounding to the nearest highest whole number.

Consult the Group Presentation Grading Rubric for information about Instructor Score.

Raw Score = Contribution Score + Instructor Score.

Consult the Group Presentation Grading Rubric for information about Actual Score.

## Introduction to Ethics: Journal

You must submit a journal--a collection of written reports that show some degree of self-reflection and engagement with the course material.

Type your entries and begin each one with the date. Your entries probably will differ in length. As in a traditional paper, grammar, spelling, and mechanics are important components.

Your grade does not depend upon the *length* of your journal. Take as many or as few pages as you need in order to complete each element of the assignment. There is no page requirement. This means that there is no need for fluff. Your grade is a function of the quality and clarity of your entries as well as the degree to which you are excellent in completing each element of the assignment.

You have two options for the kind of journal you submit:

### **Option 1: Presentation Journal**

If you choose this option, you must submit journal entries on *three different group presentations*, not to include *your* group's presentation.

*Autumn/Spring Semester:* Each presentation for which you write a journal entry must be *from a different class meeting*. (For example, if you are Group 1, you may not submit a journal entry on Group 1's presentation. Nor may you submit journal entries for *both* Group 3 and Group 4, although you may submit an entry for one of those presentations.)

*Summer Semester:* Since there are only two days of group presentation, *at least two* of the presentations you discuss must be *from a different class meeting*. You may do an entry on one presentation, other than your own, given on the same day as your presentation.

Each journal entry should contain five elements:

- 1- a brief description of the presentation topic and its relevance (or irrelevance) to real life;
- 2- a description of your initial attitudes about the topic, and an explanation of why you have those attitudes;
- 3- a comparison of those initial attitudes with your attitudes after reflecting on the presentation and class discussion, including a discussion and explanation of why your attitudes have changed or, if they have not, why they remain the same;
- 4- a statement of your considered opinion on the topic, and a fact-to-value argument (see Chapter 4) that supports your considered opinion (including general connection and supporting instances);
- 5- a description of one ethical theory's verdict on the topic, and an explanation of whether you find that verdict to be plausible.

Use the tools you learn in Chapters 4 and 7. Keeping a journal is most helpful if you make the entries promptly after each presentation.

If you choose to write a presentation journal, you do not need to write a service learning journal.

## Option 2: Service Learning Journal

If you choose this option, in addition to writing a journal (see details below) you also must:

- submit a completed **Service Learning Agreement** as soon as possible
- complete at least **10 hours of community service** by the end of the semester
- submit a completed **Service Learning Project Report** with your journal

(Find the Service Learning Agreement and Service Learning Project Report on the next two pages.)

You may not count community service you have done prior to the semester.

The journal is a place to record your reflections on what you experience in your community work. You should allow your community work and other course work to inform one another. For example, you might discuss an ethical issue with which you saw someone struggling during your service, or discuss whether your volunteering is mere charity or, instead, a moral obligation. You might use interactions with those whom you are serving as data to correct common factual misunderstandings people use when assessing the moral qualities of those in need of assistance. You might discuss the suffering or misfortune of those whom you are helping, whether anyone unjustly benefits from their situation, and how one might change their situation.

The journal you submit should contain five elements:

- 1- a brief description of your service activity;
- 2- a description of your initial attitudes toward the people you are helping, and an explanation of why you have those attitudes;
- 3- a discussion of what difference you think your service made to the community;
- 4- a comparison of these first impressions with your attitudes at the end of your service, including a discussion of how, if at all, your attitudes changed as well as an explanation for this change (if there is one);
- 5- a discussion in which you connect your service to your course work (see above for suggestions).

Keeping a journal is most helpful if you make entries throughout the service. I suggest at least doing one entry after your first day of service and another entry after your last day.

If you choose to write a service learning journal and do community service, you do not need to write a presentation journal.

THE UNIVERSITY OF ALABAMA IN HUNTSVILLE

SERVICE LEARNING AGREEMENT



**STUDENT INFORMATION**

Student Name: \_\_\_\_\_  
Address: \_\_\_\_\_  
Phone Number: \_\_\_\_\_  
Course Name: \_\_\_\_\_  
Course Instructor: Nicholaos Jones, Ph.D. Phone: (256) 824.2338. Email: nick.jones@uah.edu

**AGENCY INFORMATION**

Community Organization Name: \_\_\_\_\_  
Address: \_\_\_\_\_  
Supervisor's Name: \_\_\_\_\_  
Phone Number: \_\_\_\_\_

**SERVICE LEARNING ASSIGNMENT/DUTIES**

Project Description:

\_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_

Number of Hours to Be Completed:

Dates and Times of Expected

Service: \_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_

---

***Agency Supervisor's Signature and Title***

I agree to accept the above-named student and to provide supervision of this student.

---

***Student's Signature***

I agree to the terms set forth above and to perform my duties to the best of my ability.



**SERVICE LEARNING PROJECT REPORT**

**To the student:** This form is to be completed by your supervisor at the site at which you fulfill your service. It is your responsibility to submit it with your Service Learning Journal.

**To the supervisor:** Thank you for hosting a UAHuntsville student at your organization. Please call the instructor, Dr. Nicholas Jones (256.824.2338), if you would like to discuss this student's service.

Name of Student: \_\_\_\_\_

Name of Agency: \_\_\_\_\_

Number of Work Hours Provided: \_\_\_\_\_

Description of Specific Service(s) Performed:

Please rate the service(s) provided:

1. How willing was the student to receive directions from your staff?

VERY GOOD      FAIR      POOR

2. At what level of personal initiative and self-sufficiency did the student provide the service?

VERY GOOD      FAIR      POOR

3. What attitude did the student convey?

VERY GOOD      FAIR      POOR

4. What was the quality of work provided by the student?

VERY GOOD      FAIR      POOR

5. Please provide additional comments, feedback, or reactions:

Signature and contact information (phone/email) of person completing this form:

Signature: \_\_\_\_\_

Info: \_\_\_\_\_

## Introduction to Ethics: Expository, Evaluative, and Adjudicatory Essays

### *Rationale for the Assignments*

Our ethical discourse is in disarray. There is fundamental disagreement between conservatives and liberals, pro-lifers and pro-choicers, hawks and doves, and so on. There exists a wide variety of opinion on the ethical permissibility or desirability of abortion, euthanasia, capital punishment, health care reform, public welfare, and so on. People, after all, differ widely with respect to their personal background and experiences, their family values, and their cultural history. The prospects for resolving these debates through careful, impartial, rational discussion are bleak. Appeals to emotion, tradition, political power, and legal minutiae rule the day.

There are two standard responses to this situation. The first is intellectual apathy, a flat refusal to stake a claim about controversial issues or to assess opinions that differ from one's own. The second is intellectual obtuseness, an inability to understand how sensible people could sincerely, and with good motives, assent to opinions that differ from one's own. Neither of these responses takes seriously the idea that, even though justifying some moral opinions as correct and others as mistaken is difficult, those opinions make a difference in the real world and, in many cases, significantly affect the lives of many people. Moral disagreement is not something we should ignore; nor is it something we should take lightly.

Engaging in a serious moral dialogue with other people requires humility and flexibility, the willingness to interpret competing opinions in a charitable way and to probe beyond the perfunctory platitudes propagating through the public sphere. The point of these assignments is to challenge you to practice doing these things by applying what we've been learning about ethics. The assignments ask you to think like a philosopher, to move beyond the catch-phrases and one-liners in order to examine the reasons and values that fuel people's opinions.

These assignments build upon each other. The second is a continuation of the first, and the third is a continuation of the second. This means that you have the opportunity to improve your writing and reasoning skills, by taking into account the evaluation of prior essays. There is a grading rubric for each assignment; consult this rubric in order to discern how to improve your second and third essays.

### **Paper #1: Expository Essay**

Select an issue, *any* issue, about which there is reasonable disagreement. You might choose a "hot button" issue, like abortion, assisted suicide, immigration, or off-shore drilling. You might choose a "warmer" issue, such as the permissibility of using Tasers on civilians who do not comply with law enforcement, eating meat, or drinking bottled water. You might even choose an issue from your personal life.

Whatever. Just make sure it is an issue about which there is *reasonable* disagreement: there are at least two opposing stances a person might take on the issue, and there are reasonable things one might say in trying to justify each stance. (A useful way to identify an issue is to formulate a question to which disputing parties give different answers (such as "yes" or "no"). The test for whether the disagreement is reasonable is to ascertain whether, for each answer, our common sense morality offers any values or reasons that support or justify the answer.)

Recommendation 1: If you're having trouble selecting a topic, write about the issue from your group presentation.

Your assignment is to write an expository essay in which you report the reasons that fuel disagreement about your selected issue. Expository essays typically have two main parts.

There is an **introduction**, in which the author states the issue to be discussed in the paper. A *good* introduction manages to capture the issue in a single, clear, concise statement (either declarative or interrogative) and illustrates some circumstances for which a stance on the issue is important. A *bad* introduction, in contrast, captures the issue with a phrase or slogan and laboriously sketches the structure of the essay.

Recommendation 2: Ignore what you were told about introductions in high school. That advice makes introductions *boring*.

There is an **explanation** of why there is reasonable disagreement about the issue, in which the author states the main competing stances toward the issue, presents some of the key values and reasons that support those stances, and offers examples to illustrate why those values and reasons are reasonable. A *good* explanation is one that reports the views of others in a way that proponents of those views would find to be fair and sympathetic, presenting the strongest possible case for each stance. A *bad* explanation is one that reports the views of others in a biased manner, or that offers only the most superficial of reasons as the support for a particular stance, or that explains the rationale for a stance in a way that can be conclusively dismissed in a few sentences. Good explanations require authors to imaginatively place themselves in the shoes of other people, to search out the strengths of those people's stances and construe the justifications for those stances in the best possible light.

Recommendation 3: If you have trouble imagining how a sane and intelligent person could have a particular opinion about some issue, talk to some people who have that opinion. Also, consult Chapter 4.2, on understanding fact-to-value arguments.

Your assignment is to write an expository essay with the following components: an introduction; a clear statement of two competing stances about that issue; for each stance, an explanation of two arguments that support the stance (for a total of four arguments). These arguments should be ones that advocates of the stance would consider reasonable, and they should not be enthymematic (see Chapter 4).

## **Paper #2: Evaluative Essay**

Your assignment is to revise your expository essay and add an evaluation. Evaluating a dispute involves discussing the comparative strength of each stance's supporting arguments. This involves, first, criticizing arguments by either disputing factual claims or adducing exceptions to general connections that appear in those arguments; and, second, evaluating which arguments seem to be strongest in light of the preceding criticisms.

Recommendation 4: If you have trouble imagining how a sane and intelligent person could object to an argument, talk to people who deny the correctness of the

stance for which that argument provides support. Also, consult Chapter 7.6, on responding to persistent moral disagreements with an appeal to reasonableness.

Your assignment is to write an evaluative essay with the following components: a revised introduction; a revised exposition; one criticism for *each* argument that appears in the exposition (for a total of *four* criticisms); an argument for why one of the stances is more reasonable than its competitor (see Chapter 7.6).

If you dispute a factual claim that appears in an argument, be sure to provide a citation to a respectable research publication that supports your criticism, to explain the content of that research, and to explain how that research shows the factual claim to be false. If you dispute a connection that appears in an argument, be sure to provide examples that support your criticism.

### **Paper #3: Adjudicatory Essay**

Your assignment is to revise your evaluative essay and add an adjudication, in which you act as a third party to the dispute over your selected issue, evaluating the strengths and weaknesses of the competing stances and defending a resolution to the dispute that avoids as many weaknesses as possible while embodying as many strengths as possible. An adjudicatory essay is not merely an expository essay, reporting the views of others. Nor is it an editorial, reporting your personal opinions on an issue. An adjudicatory essay combines exposition and editorial with *engagement*, an attempt to fairly assess the merits of competing views and to imagine the values and reasons that motivate sane and intelligent people to disagree.

In addition to having an introduction, exposition, and evaluation, an adjudicatory essay contains a **resolution** of the dispute, in which the author defends a particular stance on the issue. The resolution only rarely amounts to a judgment that one of the stances is entirely and wholly correct. More often, the resolution involves a stance that carefully and creatively interweaves many complementary insights from the dispute and many of the author's insights. A *good* resolution does three things: (1) it states the author's stance in a single, clear, concise statement; (2) it presents the key values and reasons that support the stance; and (3) it explains why the stance is more plausible than its competitors. This last part is the trickiest, requiring the author to not only tout the virtues of the resolution stance but also explain why that stance does not succumb to the weaknesses of its competitors. A *bad* resolution either omits one of the three essential components of a good resolution *or*, while including all of those components, offers reasons against competing stances that are either blatantly unfair or unresponsive to the concerns that motivate those stances.

Recommendation 5: Be open-minded. Don't think of ethical disputes as multiple choice questions. If you are not satisfied by any proposed stances, develop a new one that tries to better integrate the values motivating other stances.

Your assignment is to write an adjudicatory essay with the following components: a revised introduction; a revised exposition; a revised section in which you criticize arguments from your exposition; a statement of your stance about the ethical issue; an argument for why your stance is more reasonable than one competing stance that appears in your exposition (see Chapter 10.4).

**Introduction to Ethics: Grading Rubric for Essays**

<b>Grammar (10 pts)</b>	<b>Comments</b>
<b>10.0: A+</b> <b>9.0: A</b>	The paper has little to no grammatical mistakes (no spelling errors, fragments, excessively long sentences, obscurity, etc).
<b>8.0: B</b>	The paper contains a few minor grammatical errors (an occasional misspelled word or misplaced comma, etc).
<b>7.0: C</b>	The paper has a few significant, or minor but recurring, grammatical errors.
<b>6.0: D</b>	The paper has many significant, recurring grammatical errors.
<b>5.0: F</b>	The paper is a grammatical disaster.

<b>Style (20 pts)</b>	<b>Comments</b>
<b>20.0: A+</b> <b>19.0: A</b> <b>18.0: A-</b>	The paper is clearly written (avoids unfamiliar or complicated words when familiar or simpler ones will do, avoids ambiguous terms, gives illustrative examples, etc). It avoids rhetorical questions, uses paragraphs in an intelligent way, and provides signposts to the reader. There are proper citations. Each sentence is necessary to support or explain some other sentence.
<b>17.0: B</b> <b>16.0: B</b>	The paper shares many features of an "A" paper, but there are some awkwardly phrased sentences or other minor stylistic deficiencies. The paper might benefit from more explanation in key places.
<b>15.0: C</b> <b>14.0: C</b>	The paper has a large number of awkwardly phrased sentences, bad transitions, or unhelpful citations. The author's meaning is difficult to discern because of awkward writing.
<b>13.0: D</b> <b>12.0: D</b>	The paper is the same as a "C" paper, except that it has a "C" paper's deficiencies to a greater degree.
<b>11.0: F</b> <b>10.0: F</b>	The paper is a stylistic disaster.

<b>Introduction (10 pts)</b>	<b>Comments</b>
<b>10.0: A+</b> <b>9.0: A</b>	The paper introduces the issue in a single, clear, concise statement and illustrates some circumstances for which a stance on the issue is important. The illustrations are vivid, realistic, and relevant to everyday concerns. There are no platitudes or rhetorical questions.
<b>8.0: B</b>	The statement of the issue is clear and concise, but the illustrations of the issue are slightly less than ideal. There are no platitudes or rhetorical questions.
<b>7.0: C</b>	The statement of the issue is obscure, and the illustrations are less than ideal. There are some platitudes or rhetorical questions.
<b>6.0: D</b>	The statement of the issue is obscure, and the illustrations are significantly less than ideal. The main substance consists of platitudes or rhetorical questions.
<b>5.0: F</b>	The statement of the issue is obscure or absent. There is no illustration of circumstances for which a stance on the issue is important.

<b>Exposition (60 pts)</b>	<b>Comments</b>
60.0: A+ 57.0: A 54.0: A-	There is a clear, concise statement of two competing stances toward the issue. For each stance, there are two fact-to-value arguments that support that stance. The generalized connection for each argument is stated clearly and correctly, and there are examples given that support each connection. Those examples are plausible. Each argument for a stance is one that is fair and sympathetic to advocates of the stance, presenting that stance in the best possible light.
53.0: B+ 51.0: B 48.0: B-	There is a clear, concise statement of two competing stances toward the issue. For each stance, there are two fact-to-value arguments that support that stance. The generalized connection for each argument is stated clearly and correctly, and there are examples given that support each connection. However, either the examples are implausible, or the arguments do not present advocates of the stance in the best possible light.
47.0: C+ 45.0: C 42.0: C-	There is a clear, concise statement of two competing stances toward the issue. For each stance, there are two fact-to-value arguments that support that stance. However, the connections for the arguments are obscure, unsupported, or incorrect, or the stances themselves are presented in a biased manner. There is a failure to understand how advocates of competing stances could be reasonable.
41.0: D 39.0: D 36.0	There is a clear, concise statement of two competing stances toward the issue. However, there are not two fact-to-value arguments given in support of each stance.
35.0: F 30.0: F	The discussion of the competing stances is obscure, and the discussion of supporting arguments for the stances is either absent or prejudicial.

<b>Evaluation (20 pts)</b>	<b>Comments</b>
20.0: A+ 19.0: A 18.0: A-	There are four total criticisms, one for each of the two arguments given to support two stances. The criticisms are <i>very</i> thoughtful and engaging. There is helpful citation to research pertaining to the truth of factual claims. When a generalized connection is criticized, the examples given are realistic and relevant.
17.0: B 16.0: B	The paper is the same as an "A" paper, except that the citation is less than ideal, the criticisms are somewhat thoughtful and engaging, or the examples are less than realistic or somewhat irrelevant.
15.0: C 14.0: C	The paper is the same as a "B" paper, except that the criticisms are obscure or contentious, or there only three criticisms given.
13.0: D 12.0: D	The paper is the same as a "C" paper, except that there are no relevant citations, the criticisms are given as flat assertions rather than supported with appropriate reasons (citation of research or illustration by example), or there are only one or two criticisms.
11.0: F 10.0: F	There is an utter failure to complete any part of the assignment.

Adjudication (10 pts)	Comments
<b>10.0: A+</b> <b>9.0: A</b>	The thesis is original, creative, and feasible. Reasons for believing the thesis are made clear, as is the way in which those reasons support the thesis. The author is sensitive to the ways in which those who disagree might criticize these reasons and makes an outstanding effort to take those criticisms seriously and respond to them.
<b>8.0: B</b>	The thesis is original and feasible. Reasons for believing the thesis are made clear, as is the way in which those reasons support the thesis. The author is sensitive to the ways in which those who disagree might criticize these reasons and makes a good-faith effort to take those criticisms seriously and respond to them.
<b>7.0: C</b>	The thesis is feasible. Reasons for believing the thesis are made clear, as is the way in which those reasons support the thesis. However, the author is not sensitive to the ways in which those who disagree might criticize those reasons, or is sensitive but does not take those criticisms seriously.
<b>6.0: D</b>	There is a thesis, but the reasons for believing the thesis are obscure.
<b>5.0: F</b>	There is no thesis, or there is one but it is supported by a list of assertions with no clear connection to the thesis. There is a failure to engage with opposing stances in a thoughtful way.

#### **Expository Essay Assessment**

Grammar: \_\_\_\_\_ / 10  
 Style: \_\_\_\_\_ / 20  
 Introduction: \_\_\_\_\_ / 10  
 Exposition: \_\_\_\_\_ / 60  
**Total: \_\_\_\_\_ / 100**

#### **Evaluative Essay Assessment**

Grammar: \_\_\_\_\_ / 10  
 Style: \_\_\_\_\_ / 20  
 Introduction: \_\_\_\_\_ / 10  
 Exposition: \_\_\_\_\_ / 60  
 Evaluation: \_\_\_\_\_ / 20 x 5  
**Total: \_\_\_\_\_ / 200**

#### **Adjudicatory Essay Assessment**

Grammar: \_\_\_\_\_ / 10  
 Style: \_\_\_\_\_ / 20  
 Introduction: \_\_\_\_\_ / 10  
 Exposition: \_\_\_\_\_ / 60  
 Evaluation: \_\_\_\_\_ / 20 x 5  
 Adjudication: \_\_\_\_\_ / 10 x 10  
**Total: \_\_\_\_\_ / 300**

## Introduction to Ethics: Supplemental Comments on Essay Assessment

Your grade does not depend upon the *length* of your paper. Take as many or as few pages as you need in order to complete all elements of the assignment. There is no page requirement. This means that there is no need for fluff.

As a student, write for your parents (or someone else with no prior exposure to philosophy.) If your parents could not understand what you've written, try again. If a person from high school, looking only at your notes from class, could have written your paper, then try again. I will give comments on rough drafts (preferably submitted by email). But drafts are not required. I also will meet with you to discuss your ideas. This is not required, either. But it is likely to increase the quality of your paper.

If you are in doubt about how to format the paper, use your favorite method from high school or college. If you use outside sources, be sure to cite them in a consistent manner, and in a way that would allow a reasonable person to locate the source. If you are unsure, show someone else your citation and see whether they could find the source. Standard elements of a responsible reference include: source name; source title; source location; year of publication or access.

It is okay to use the first person singular.

There is no need for a separate conclusion, in which you summarize the content of your paper. That's boring and, given the probable length of your paper, redundant.

### *Polite Requests*

Please staple or otherwise bind together the pages of your essay (but please do not use the rip-and-fold binding method). This helps me to keep all of the papers organized and facilitates transporting the papers between office and home.

Please submit a hard-copy of your essay, double-spaced, and use a readable font. Times New Roman 12 point is a nice one. So is Calibri 11 point. All of this helps me to avoid straining my eyes. (The hard-copy also helps me to keep track of submissions: sometimes technology doesn't cooperate and I can't get to a printer that works in a timely manner.)

Please do not use a separate cover page or submit your essay in a folder. Put your name at the very top of the first page. Put a title below that, with center justification. Then insert one or two blank lines and begin your essay. This helps to prevent unnecessary use of our natural resources and reduce waste. For the same reason, please do not use a separate page for references. Enter one or two blank spaces after your last sentence and then insert your references (if any).

### *Emphatic Suggestions*

If you have questions about the term paper, ask *before* the paper is due. Do not wait until the last minute to begin work on your papers. Since you have advance notice about when each essay is due and what each essay should be, I am not prone to be sympathetic to hearing that you were unable to do a good job because of your obligations in other courses, at home, or at work.