

Teaching Portfolio

Fall 2020

Michelle M. Dyke
Assistant Professor & Faculty Fellow
New York University
Center for Bioethics
michelle.dyke@nyu.edu
www.michellemdyke.net

Contents

Teaching Experience and Qualifications

Courses Taught.....	2
Additional Training & Experience.....	3
Statement of Pedagogical Objectives and Practices.....	4-5

Previous Syllabi, NYU Dept. of Philosophy

Topics in Metaphysics & Epistemology: Moral Epistemology and the Debate Over Moral Realism.....	6-11
Central Problems in Philosophy.....	12-15
Philosophy of Mind.....	16-18
History of Modern Philosophy.....	19-22

Previous Syllabi, NYU Center for Bioethics

Advanced Introduction to Bioethics.....	23-29
Advanced Introduction to Public Health Ethics.....	30-40
Topics in Bioethics: Controversies & Politics.....	41-49
Ethics & Identity: Disability, Gender, and Race.....	50-57

Additional Sample Syllabi

Seminar: Collective Responsibility and the Ethics of Group Agency.....	58-60
Seminar: Moral & Epistemic Normativity.....	61-63

Evidence of Teaching Effectiveness

Course Evaluation Results from NYU Students (summary table on p. 64).....	64-end
--	--------

Teaching Letter of Recommendation

from Professor Don Garrett, NYU Dept. of Philosophy.....see page 65
(to be sent separately)

Teaching Experience and Qualifications

I have several years of experience teaching as the sole or primary course instructor at New York University, in addition to experience as a teaching assistant. I have taught material in Ethics, Metaethics, Bioethics, Epistemology, Philosophy of Mind and Metaphysics, as well as the History of Philosophy. I have experience teaching courses aimed at philosophy majors and Bioethics MA students as well as a general undergraduate audience with no prior instruction in philosophy. Syllabi for all of my current and past courses are included as part of this portfolio, along with results from my student course evaluations.

I have also included sample syllabi for a seminar in Ethics (titled “Is There Anything We Ought to Do? Collective Responsibility and the Ethics of Group Agency”) and a seminar in metaethics/meta-normative theory (“Moral and Epistemic Normativity”).

Courses Taught

As Sole or Primary Instructor, Graduate (MA) Seminar (NYU Center for Bioethics)

- Advanced Introduction to Bioethics (Fall 2019 & Fall 2020^{***})
- Advanced Introduction to Public Health Ethics (Summer 2020^{**})
- Topics in Bioethics: Controversies and Politics (Spring 2020^{*})

As Sole Instructor, Undergraduate Seminar (NYU Center for Bioethics)

- Ethics & Identity: Disability, Gender, and Race (Spring 2020^{*})

As Primary Instructor, Undergraduate Lecture Course (NYU Dept. of Philosophy)

- Central Problems in Philosophy (Fall 2018)

As Sole Instructor, Undergraduate Seminar (NYU Dept. of Philosophy)

- Topics in Metaphysics & Epistemology: Moral Epistemology and the Debate Over Moral Realism (Spring 2019)
- Central Problems in Philosophy (Summer 2018)
- Philosophy of Mind (Summer 2017)
- History of Modern Philosophy (x3: Summers 2015, 2016 & 2017)

As Teaching Assistant, Undergraduate Lecture (NYU Dept. of Philosophy)

- History of Modern Philosophy (for Anja Jauernig, Spring 2016)
- History of Ancient Philosophy (for Jessica Moss, Fall 2015)
- History of Modern Philosophy (for Kristin Primus, Spring 2015)
- Existentialism & Phenomenology (for John Richardson, Fall 2014)

As Teaching Assistant, Undergraduate Lecture (NYU College of Arts & Science Core Curriculum)

- Texts & Ideas: Attachment, Loss, and the Passage of Time (for Sharon Street, Spring 2018)

*Switched to online instruction halfway through the term

**Offered entirely online (live/“synchronous instruction”) over Zoom

***Offered in a hybrid format, with some students attending in person and others attending live over Zoom
All others were offered in a traditional format on campus.

Additional Training & Experience

MA Thesis Advising

As a faculty member at the Center for Bioethics, I am responsible for the academic advising of a share of our MA students in Bioethics. Advising includes supervision of the writing and defense of an MA thesis (15,000 words). The thesis incorporates analysis of ethical issues with discussion of the student's work or volunteer experience in a required practicum component of the program.

Experience Supervising Teaching Assistants

As part of teaching the introductory lecture course "Central Problems in Philosophy" in fall 2018, I was responsible for supervising two graduate student teaching assistants. At NYU, the duties of a teaching assistant include leading a weekly discussion section intended to supplement the lecture, grading the students' assignments, and holding open office hours for student meetings.

I have also worked with a course assistant for the "Advanced Introduction to Bioethics" that is required for all incoming MA students in Bioethics. The course assistant's responsibilities include facilitating smaller-group discussion during class, providing feedback on a selection of short assignments throughout the term, and (in 2020) assisting with hybrid-format teaching of both in-person and virtual students.

Teacher Training Completed

- Workshop: Improving Student Writing, New York University Center for the Advancement of Teaching, October 5, 2018
- Workshop: Teaching Large Lectures, NYU Center for the Advancement of Teaching, November 29, 2018

Public Outreach and Volunteer Teaching at the High School Level

I am dedicated to doing my part to make academia a more diverse and inclusive place. I believe that one of the most promising ways to achieve this goal is to reach groups of underrepresented students before they make decisions regarding their university plans and to make clear by example that the pursuit of advanced degrees is an attractive option for them.

During my time at NYU, I have been involved as a volunteer in the teaching of elective and extracurricular programs in Philosophy for high school students in New York City public schools. In the fall of 2018, and again in 2019, I led small-group discussions of issues in Applied Ethics at NYC's High School for Environmental Studies as part of a team of four visiting volunteers from NYU. In spring 2019, I participated in the team-teaching of an elective course in Philosophy for students at East Side Community High School as part of the "Corrupt the Youth" program directed by Briana Toole.¹ Each year, I also volunteer as a judge for New York City's High School Ethics Bowl.² My hope has been to get high school students excited about the study of Philosophy, as well as to help normalize the idea of an academic career path in any discipline.

¹ <https://corrupttheyouth.weebly.com/about.html>

² <https://highschoolethicsbowl.com>

Statement of Pedagogical Objectives and Practices

At all levels, my philosophy courses seek to help students strengthen three important skills: the ability to critically evaluate complex arguments, the ability to articulate and defend original viewpoints, and the ability to express those ideas clearly and professionally in writing. By making the development of these skills a priority in each of my courses, I hope to ensure that all of my students, whatever their academic or career goals, will benefit from taking each course.

My assignments and class activities are designed to enable students to learn by doing in a way that builds incrementally on their existing skills.

For beginning students, I have found that an effective way of promoting the development of their writing skills is through a series of short writing assignments (<5 pages) of a similar style. For more advanced students writing term papers (>10 pages), I give students the option of either building from a midterm paper or pursuing a new topic. I “scaffold” the assignment by introducing small increases in the requirements for the final assignment in comparison to the midterm, such as citation of additional material from the student’s own research and consideration of an additional pair of objections & replies. In my written feedback on papers, I make an effort to include for every student a handful of relatively minor and specific improvements that they can prioritize in completing their next assignment in order to most efficiently strengthen their writing. For this reason, I do not “blind” all writing assignments for grading; I have found that students find my feedback most helpful when it addresses specific ways in which their own writing has developed over the course of the term. Where possible, for introductory students, I also include more objective assessments as part of the overall course grade, such as multiple-choice quizzes for reading comprehension of assigned authors’ views and arguments.

For seminars that treat one topic in depth throughout the term, I assign a series of 2-page “mini-papers” in addition to the final paper that provide an incentive for students to keep up with the readings and to begin thinking early about a prospective term paper topic. My past students have commented in their evaluations that these assignments, which are graded mostly for participation credit but with plenty of written comments, have been especially effective in helping them to stay engaged with the material and to receive consistent feedback in a way that is constructive without unnecessary pressure.

During class, I seek to promote active participation and engagement of a kind that will lead to deeper understanding and long-term memory of the course material. For example, I will break up a typical lecture format by occasionally dividing students into pairs and allowing them a few minutes (about 3-5) to discuss short passages from our readings with each other in order to identify and debate crucial steps in the relevant arguments. Once the students are finished talking through the passage with their partners, I call on students to share their conclusions with the larger group. (For more advanced students, this can also be done with more open-ended questions.) This exercise promotes a higher degree of engagement with the course texts than a lecture alone. It also helps the more reserved students in the group to become more comfortable speaking and asking questions in class, since it is far easier to start by sharing an opinion with one other student than to immediately volunteer one’s perspective in front of the entire class.

I often structure undergraduate class sessions by dedicating a few minutes at the beginning to a review of the main ideas from the previous session before moving on to the day’s new material, while also leaving plenty of time for discussion. Especially in smaller courses, I review previous material by asking my students a series of leading questions intended to test their recall and comprehension of content from the previous class without immediately giving away the answers. Asking students to restate philosophical views in their own words helps them to develop their own understanding and also provides me with an

opportunity to correct any confusions or gaps that remain after the original presentation of the course material. Being exposed to a new idea just once, on one day, simply is not enough to make that idea stick. Several of my past students have noted that this ongoing review process helps them to enhance their understanding and develop connections between ideas as we move from one topic to another.

Phil-UA 103 : Topics in Metaphysics & Epistemology: “Moral Epistemology & The Debate Over Moral Realism”

NYU Spring 2019

Course Syllabus

Michelle M. Dyke

michelle.dyke@nyu.edu

Meets Tu/Th from 9:30 - 10:45 am at 194 Mercer Street, #201

My open office hours are 2-3:45 on Tuesdays (or also by appointment). My office (#304) is in the Philosophy department (5 Washington Place). During that time, please feel free to come by to discuss the course material or assignments.

Course Description

“You shouldn’t lie to your sister.”

“It is wrong to harm an innocent creature for personal gain.”

“Parents have a moral duty to take care of their children.”

Claims like these, which express moral demands, strike many of us as obviously true. Yet how do we know them? What kinds of evidence could we provide to justify our beliefs in these claims? Unlike “descriptive” claims about how the world *is*, moral claims instruct us about what to *do*. If there are facts about what morality demands of us, these facts would have to be importantly different from the many other sorts of descriptive facts with which we are familiar, such as facts about astronomy, geology, medicine, psychology, economics, and history.

Some philosophers, precisely because they find it so difficult to explain how it is that we could acquire any evidence that bears directly upon the answers to moral questions, have argued that this point undermines the “realist” idea that there are objective facts about what we are all morally obligated to do. Unlike the answers to scientific questions, the answers to moral questions cannot be observed via the senses, encountered in nature, or tested in a laboratory experiment. According to some “antirealist” views, the moral facts are not objective and mind-independent (as are facts about protons and galaxies), but are instead dependent upon us; moral claims are made true by things like our desires, values, or cultural norms. Other antirealists defend the view that there aren’t actually any facts about morality at all.

In this course, we will learn about how *epistemological* considerations regarding the ways in which we acquire and justify our moral beliefs might (or might not) help us to resolve this debate regarding the nature of the moral facts. Our readings will consist mostly of recent journal articles and book excerpts by philosophers.

Prerequisites

Before enrolling in this course (Topics in M&E), students should already have completed at least one of: Epistemology (Phil-UA 76) OR Metaphysics (Phil-UA 78) OR Philosophy of Science (Phil-UA 90). Prerequisite for enrollment in any of *these* courses is one introductory-level course in philosophy. If you have not completed these courses at NYU, but believe you have comparable preparation sufficient to enable you both to contribute to and benefit from this seminar, please email me to discuss your situation. (Given this year’s topic, I am inclined to welcome students who have completed coursework in ethics beyond the introductory level even if they have not completed Epistemology, Metaphysics, or Philosophy

of Science.) Note that students who enroll without either completing the designated prerequisites or securing the permission of the instructor may be asked to drop the course, especially if there is a waitlist.

Schedule of Readings and Assignments

All readings will be distributed in .pdf form and will be made available on our NYU Classes website. (**No textbook is required.**) Each passage listed below will be discussed in class on the dates listed above the title; please do the readings in advance and be ready to talk about them. This seminar will revolve around student discussion. *Passages marked as “in class”, do not need to be read in advance, though this material is important for the course.

“Optional” supplementary readings are also listed in turquoise. These may be useful to students who are in the process of writing their final papers, or who are simply curious to learn more about a given topic, but there is no expectation that students must do any of the optional readings. These articles will often, though not always, be more challenging reads than our initial assignments. Some of them presuppose quite a bit of background knowledge and will be most useful to students looking for a more detailed discussion of a particular issue for the final paper. (If you’ve started reading any of these articles and have questions, come by my office hours and let’s chat!)

By Week:

1. What is Moral Realism? (January 29/31)

- *In class: Excerpts from Russ Shafer-Landau (2003, 2012), David Enoch (2011), Matti Eklund (2017)
- *In class: Excerpts from T.M. Scanlon (2014)

*Note that these entire chapters are now online on our NYUClasses site. We’ll only be looking at short excerpts of each chapter as our assigned reading in class.

Further reading: The rest of any of these books. Note that while logged in through NYU, you can access books from Oxford University Press via “Oxford Scholarship Online.”

2. The Strangeness of Moral Facts (February 5/7)

- J.L. Mackie, “The Subjectivity of Values,” *Ethics: Inventing Right and Wrong* (1977)

Some Further Reading (realist replies to epistemological and metaphysical objections):

- Scanlon 2014, Chapter 2: “Metaphysical Objections” and Chapter 4: “Epistemology and Determinateness”
- Justin Morton and Eric Sampson, “Parsimony and the Argument from Queerness” (2014)

3. Moral Facts and Empirical Explanations (February 12/14)

- Gilbert Harman, “Ethics and Observation,” *The Nature of Morality: An Introduction to Ethics* (1977)
- Nicholas Sturgeon, “Moral Explanations” (1985)
- *In class: Short Excerpt from Thomas Nagel’s 1980 Tanner Lectures

Further reading:

- Harman Chapter 2
- Sturgeon, “Moral Explanations Defended,” *Contemporary Debates in Moral Theory* (2006)
- Sturgeon, “Harman on Moral Explanations of Natural Facts” (1986)

More on Naturalist Moral Realism (beyond Sturgeon):

- Richard Boyd, "How to Be a Moral Realist" (1988)

See also, in reply, the "Moral Twin Earth" objections

FIRST MINI PAPER DUE FEBRUARY 15, 5 PM

4. Moral Antirealism: Error Theory & Non-cognitivism (February 19/21)

- *In class: Excerpt from A.J. Ayer, *Language, Truth and Logic* (1936)

- Short excerpts from Allan Gibbard, *Wise Choices, Apt Feelings* (1990)

- Simon Blackburn, "Antirealist Expressivism and Quasi-Realism," *The Oxford Handbook of Ethical Theory*, Ed. David Copp, 2005 (**focus on sections 2-4, skip the final section 5**)

Further reading on quasi-realism:

- Simon Blackburn, *Essays in Quasi-Realism* (1993)

- Selim Berker, "Quasi-Dependence" (2018/2019 working draft available online)

5. Moral Relativism & Intercultural Diversity (February 26/28)

- *In class: Excerpt from Gilbert Harman, *Moral Relativism and Moral Objectivity* (1996)

- Short excerpt from David Wong, "Pluralism and Ambivalence," *Natural Moralities: A Defense of Pluralistic Relativism* (2006)

- Excerpt from J. David Velleman, *Foundations for Moral Relativism*, 2nd ed. (2015)

Ebook here: <https://www.openbookpublishers.com/reader/416#page/88/mode/2up>

Please read Chapter V, pages 75-100

Further reading on relativism & problems for the view:

- Paul Boghossian, "What is Relativism?" *Truth and Relativism* (2006)

A defense of moral realism in light of intercultural disagreement:

- David Enoch, "How is Moral Disagreement a Problem for Realism?" (2008)

An alternative form of normative relativism:

- *Michelle Dyke, "Group Agency Meets Meta-Ethics: How to Craft a More Compelling Form of Normative Relativism" forthcoming in *Oxford Studies in Metaethics Vol. 15*

SECOND MINI PAPER DUE MARCH 1, 5 PM

6. The Epistemology of Moral Disagreement (March 5/7)

- Alison Hills, "Faultless Moral Disagreement" (2013)

Further reading on the epistemology of moral disagreement:

- Katia Vavova, "Moral Disagreement and Moral Skepticism" (2014)

- Sarah McGrath, "Moral Realism without Convergence" (2010)

7. Moral Beliefs and Our Evolutionary History (March 12/14)

- Philip Kitcher, "Biology and Ethics," *The Oxford Handbook of Ethical Theory* (2005)

- Richard Joyce, "The Evolutionary Debunking of Morality," *The Evolution of Morality* (2006)

Further reading on evolutionary debunking arguments:

- Katia Vavova, "Evolutionary Debunking of Moral Realism" *Philosophy Compass* (2015)

- Joyce, "Irrealism and the Genealogy of Morals" (2013)

THIRD MINI-PAPER DUE MARCH 15, 5 PM

SPRING BREAK

8. Moral Beliefs and Evolution, continued (March 26/28)

- Sharon Street, "A Darwinian Dilemma for Realist Theories of Value" (2006)

Further reading on the power of Street's argument:

- Street, "Evolution and the Normativity of Epistemic Reasons" (2009)

- Selim Berker, "Does Evolutionary Psychology Show That Normativity is Mind-Dependent?" (2014)

Another defense of Subjectivism about normative reasons:

- David Sobel, *From Valuing to Value* Oxford University Press 2016

Kantian (as opposed to Street's *Humean Constructivism*):

- Christine Korsgaard, *The Sources of Normativity* (Tanner Lectures), 1992

For an objection to this approach, see

- David Enoch, "Agency, Shmagency: Why Agency Won't Come From What Is Constitutive of Action" (2006)

- Sharon Street, "What is Constructivism in Ethics and Metaethics?" (2010)

9. Moral Beliefs and Evolution, continued 2 (April 2/4)

- David Enoch, "Epistemology," *Taking Morality Seriously: A Defense of Robust Realism* (2011)

Further reading on "third factor replies":

- Knut Skarsaune, "Darwin and moral realism: survival of the fittest" (2011)

- Erik Wielenberg, "On the Evolutionary Debunking of Morality" (2010)

- *Michelle Dyke, "Bad Bootstrapping: The Problem with Third-Factor Replies to the Darwinian Dilemma for Moral Realism," manuscript, forthcoming in *Philosophical Studies*

MIDTERM PAPER DUE APRIL 5, 5PM

10. Moral (vs. Mathematical) Knowledge & Causal Conditions (April 9/11)

- Excerpts from Paul Benacerraf, "Mathematical Truth," (1973) and Alvin Goldman, "A Causal Theory of Knowing" (1967)

- Matthew Bedke, "Intuitive Non-Naturalism Meets Cosmic Coincidence" (2009)

More on the "Benacerraf-Field Problem" for Mathematics:

- Excerpt from Hartry Field, "Realism, Mathematics and Modality" (1988)

See also:

- Matthew Bedke, "No Coincidence?*" (2014)

11. The "Reliability Challenge" for Beliefs about Morality, Mathematics & Logic (April 16/18)

- Joshua Schechter, "The Reliability Challenge and the Epistemology of Logic" (2010)

Further reading:

- Justin Clarke-Doane, "Moral Epistemology: The Mathematics Analogy" (2014)

- Justin Clarke-Doane, "Morality and Mathematics: The Evolutionary Challenge" (2012)

12. The Source of Our Moral Intuitions (April 23/25)

- Excerpts on Robert Audi's Moral "Intuitionism" from *Reasons, Rights, and Values* (2015)

Further reading, another proponent of ethical intuitionism:

- Michael Huemer, *Ethical Intuitionism* (2005) - a very short excerpt is up on Classes

FOURTH MINI PAPER DUE APRIL 26, 5 PM

13. The Source of Moral Intuitions, continued (April 30/May 2)

- Excerpts from Peter Railton, "The Affective Dog and Its Rational Tale: Intuition and Attunement" (2014)

Further reading. Railton's version of moral realism:

- Peter Railton, "Moral Realism" (1986)

14. The Epistemology of Moral Testimony and the Possibility of Moral Experts (May 7/9)

- Sarah McGrath, "Skepticism about Moral Expertise as a Puzzle for Moral Realism" (2011)

Optional rough draft or outline of the final paper is due by May 7, please

My last regularly scheduled office hours are on May 7. I'll also take appointments to discuss the final paper on May 9 (Thursday) and May 10 (Friday).

FINAL PAPER DUE MAY 17, 5PM (firm deadline – term grades to be calculated shortly thereafter)

Course Requirements

The requirements for the course include the completion of **four mini writing assignments** (2 double-spaced pages each), a **short midterm paper** (4-5 double-spaced pages) and a **final paper** (8-12 double-spaced pages) with **optional outline/rough draft** submitted in advance for comments without a grade. There is no final exam. Seminar participation will also count towards the term grade. For the midterm and final paper, I will suggest possible topics as a starting point, though students are also welcome to pursue their own projects.

The four mini papers will be responses to the current or previous week's assigned reading. **There is no requirement that the final paper and midterm papers must be on separate topics.** Content for each of these papers (along with the mini papers) may overlap as students continue to think through related material over the course of the term. Yet the longer papers should include substantial additions to (or modifications of) the thoughts expressed in the student's shorter papers.

Grades will be calculated as follows:

5% for each mini paper (x4 = 20%)

25% midterm paper

40% final paper

15% participation in class

Mini-papers will be graded as follows:

A: Demonstrates that the student read and engaged with the reading. The student raises one or two thoughtful points or questions. (I expect most mini-papers will earn this grade.)

B: The assignment is complete, but substantially lacking, e.g. the paper demonstrates a major misunderstanding of a core theme from the reading, or suggests the student didn't actually read the relevant article.

C: A totally inadequate assignment that is totally off-topic or only a couple sentences long. (I don't expect to give any C's.)

Late papers will receive a deduction of 1/3 letter grade for each day they are late. For example, an A-quality paper turned in 7 hours after the deadline will receive a B+. If it's 37 hours late, it will receive a B. And so on. (No paper of passing quality will receive lower than a D for reasons of lateness. Any assignments that are still missing 72 hours after the *final* course paper deadline will receive a 0 in the calculation of the term grade; a D (>50%) is much better than 0% !) The penalty will only be waived for medical, mental health or family emergencies (please provide documentation). This is an issue of fairness to your fellow students.

Please note that all assignments and deadlines for this course are listed here on the syllabus for your information at the start of term. If you are aware of any upcoming schedule conflicts or other considerations that may prevent you from completing the work as asked, please discuss your situation with me in person as soon as possible rather than waiting until a paper is about to be due, or is already late, in order to ask for an extension. Extensions are less likely to be granted closer to the due date, except in cases of emergency as noted above.

Plagiarism (whether using published sources without citation or passing off another student's work as your own) merits an automatic 0 for the assignment and risks failure for the course.

Students are welcome to discuss the assignments with each other, but all submitted written documents should be the original work of the student submitting them. **Again, it's an issue of fairness.**

Other Course Policies

Note that class participation counts for 15% of your term grade. A long-standing pattern of repeated, unexcused absences will result in an F for that portion of the grade. Please come to class even if you were not able to complete the reading for that day, so as not to fall further behind. Discussion is an important part of philosophy and this is your chance to make sure you're clear on both the course content and assignments.

Please note that students who have *unexcused* absences totaling >40% of our total class time may receive an F as their final *course grade* in accordance with NYU college policy: <http://cas.nyu.edu/content/nyu-as/cas/academic-programs/bulletin/policies/academic-policies.html>

Moses Center

Students who require accommodation for a disability should consult with the Henry and Lucy Moses Center for Students with Disabilities at <https://www.nyu.edu/life/safety-health-wellness/students-with-disabilities>. If you do request accommodation regarding the course policies in light of a disability, please also notify me (via email or in person) so that I can cooperate fully with the Moses Center and plan accordingly.

Phil-UA 1 : Central Problems in Philosophy

NYU Fall 2018

Course Syllabus as of 9/4/2018

Michelle M. Dyke

michelle.dyke@nyu.edu

Lecture Meets Tu/Th from 9:30 - 10:45 am in Silver 101A

My open office hours are on Thursdays from 5:00-6:00 pm (or also by appointment). My office (#208) is on the second floor of the Philosophy department (5 Washington Place). During that time, please feel free to come by to discuss the course material or assignments.

There are two preceptors for the course:

Rob Long

[\[email redacted\]](#)

Section on Mondays: 12:30-1:45, 2:00-3:15

Office hours: Tuesdays 11:00-12:00*

@ room # TBA

*tentative – contact Rob

Alex Rigas

[\[email redacted\]](#)

Section on Fridays: 9:30-10:45, 11:00-12:15

Office hours: Wednesdays, 2:30-3:30*

@Irving Farm coffee, Thompson & W 3rd

*tentative – contact Alex

Course Description

This course will provide an introduction to some of the classic and enduring problems in philosophy and to the methods that philosophers use for tackling them. Our readings, writing assignments, and class discussions will be structured around four central questions: What is knowledge? What is the relationship between the human mind and the physical body? Is our world causally determined, and does that preclude the possibility of free will? What is required for moral responsibility? We will compare historical discussions of each of these issues with work by more recent philosophers.

Schedule of Readings and Assignments

All readings will be distributed in .pdf form and will be made available on our NYU Classes website. Each passage listed below will be discussed in lecture on the date listed to the left of the title; please do the readings in advance and be ready to talk about them in the following discussion section. *Passages marked as “in class” do not need to be read in advance.

Unit 1. What is Knowledge?

Tuesday, September 4

- René Descartes, *Meditations* (1641): Meditation I

Thursday, Sep. 6

- no new reading: review Meditation I

Tuesday, Sep. 11

- Descartes, Meditation II

Thursday, Sep. 13

- Edmund Gettier, “Is Justified True Belief Knowledge?” (1963)

Tuesday, Sep. 18

- Alvin Goldman, “A Causal Theory of Knowing” (1967)
(Read pages 357-362 and 369-370 of Goldman)

Thursday, Sep. 20 - Timothy Williamson, *Knowledge and its Limits* (2002)
(read Introduction: Sec. 2 and Chapter 2: Secs. 1 & 4)

Please submit the first mini-paper (2 double-spaced pages) to your preceptor by 5 pm on Friday, September 21.

Unit 2. What is the Relationship between *Mind and Body*?

Tuesday, Sep. 25 - Descartes and Princess Elisabeth, correspondence
*In Class: David Hume's "bundle theory" of mind

Thursday, Sep. 27 - no new reading

Tuesday, October 2 - Frank Jackson, "Epiphenomenal Qualia" (1982) (*stop before Section II*) and "What Mary Didn't Know" (1986)

Thursday, Oct. 4 - Excerpt from David Chalmers, *The Conscious Mind* (1996)

Tuesday, Oct. 9 Legislative Monday – Our Class Will NOT Meet

Thursday, Oct. 11 - John Heil textbook chapter on "Functionalism"

Tuesday, Oct. 16 - Hilary Putnam, "The nature of mental states" (1969), *Sec II-V*

Thursday, Oct. 18 - Sydney Shoemaker, "The Inverted Spectrum" (1982)
(*Stop at Sec. IV on pg. 368*)

Unit 3. If our World is Causally Determined, does that Preclude the Possibility of Free Will?

Tuesday, Oct. 23 - Peter van Inwagen, "The Incompatibility of Free Will and Determinism" (1974)
*In Class: LaPlace's Demon

Thursday, Oct. 25 - Short Excerpt from Cicero on the swerve of the atom
*In class: BBC Youtube video on Benjamin Libet's experiments

Please submit the second paper (4-5 double-spaced pages) to your preceptor by 5 pm on Friday, October 26.

Tuesday, Oct. 30 - Roderick Chisholm, "Human Freedom and the Self" (1964)

Thursday, November 1 - Excerpt from Ned Markosian, "A Compatibilist Version of the Theory of Agent Causation" (1999)

Tuesday, Nov. 6 - Harry Frankfurt, "Alternate Possibilities and Moral Responsibility" (1969)

Thursday, Nov. 8 - no new reading, Discussion of Writing Assignments

Unit 4. What Does it Take to be a Morally Responsible Agent?

Tuesday, Nov. 13 - P.F. Strawson, "Freedom and Resentment" (1962)

Thursday, Nov. 15 - Selection from David Hume's *Enquiry* (1748) on enduring

character traits and moral responsibility
Tuesday, Nov. 20 - no new reading

Wednesday, November 21 – Friday Nov. 23 Thanksgiving Break – No Classes

Tuesday, November 27 -Heather Battaly, from *Current Controversies in Virtue Theory* (2015)
Thursday, Nov. 29 - Short selection from Aristotle on virtues

Tuesday, December 4 - Kant, *Groundwork* (1785) (selections)
Thursday, Dec. 6 - review Kant

Please submit the third and final paper (6-8 double-spaced pages) to your preceptor via email by 5 pm on Friday, December 7.

Tuesday, Dec. 11 - Susan Wolf, “Moral Saints” (1982)
Thursday, December 13 - last class, no new reading, come with questions

OFFICIAL FINAL EXAM: Tuesday, December 18, 8:00 am – 9:50 am
(in our usual lecture hall, attendance is mandatory)

Course Requirements

The requirements for the course include **three writing assignments** of varied length (2, 4-5, or 6-8 double-spaced pages each) and a **cumulative, multiple-choice final exam**.

A choice of possible paper topics will be provided for all three writing assignments. The prompts will ask you to engage carefully with an idea or debate that we have discussed in class. For the first mini-paper, you will be asked to *summarize*, in your own words, an idea or argument from our assigned reading. For both of the subsequent papers, you will be asked to *take a stance* on a question that arose during our discussion of the readings. You will be asked to provide an argument in support of your chosen thesis. These paper prompts will ask you to explain: Are you convinced by the author(s) from our reading? Why or why not? The exam will be designed to test your recall and understanding of the philosophical views and arguments that were discussed in our required course readings and in lecture. I recommend studying for the exam by reviewing our lecture handouts.

Grades will be calculated as follows:

15% first 2-page paper
20% second 4-5 page paper
25% final 6-8 page paper
25% final exam
15% participation in discussion section

Late papers will receive a deduction of 1/3 letter grade for each day they are late. For example, an A-quality paper turned in 7 hours after the deadline will receive a B+. If it's 37 hours late, it will receive a B. And so on. No paper of passing quality will receive lower than a D for reasons of lateness. Any assignments that are still missing 72 hours after the *final* course paper deadline will receive a 0 in the calculation of the term grade; a grade of D (>50%) is much better than 0% !

The penalty will only be waived for medical, mental health or family emergencies (please provide documentation to your preceptor). This is an issue of fairness to your fellow students. Please note that all assignments and deadlines for this course are listed here on the syllabus for your information at the start of term. If you are aware of any upcoming schedule conflicts or other considerations that may prevent you from completing the work as asked (especially the final exam), please discuss your situation with me (rather than your preceptor) in person as soon as possible rather than waiting until a paper is about to be due, or is already late, in order to ask your preceptor for an extension. (Extensions are less likely to be granted closer to the due date, except in cases of emergency as noted above.)

Plagiarism (whether using published sources without citation or passing off another student's work as your own) merits an automatic 0 for the assignment and risks failure for the course.

Students are welcome to discuss the assignments with each other, but all submitted written documents should be the original work of the student submitting them. **Again, it's an issue of fairness.**

Other Course Policies

Note that participation in discussion section counts for 15% of your term grade. Your preceptor will record class **attendance**; a long-standing pattern of repeated, unexcused absences will result in an F for that portion of the grade. Please come to class even if you were not able to complete the reading for that day, so as not to fall further behind. Discussion is an important part of philosophy and this is your chance to make sure you're clear on both the course content and assignments.

Please note that students who have *unexcused* absences totaling >40% of our total class time (lecture & section) are at risk of receiving an F as their final *course grade* in accordance with NYU college policy: <http://cas.nyu.edu/content/nyu-as/cas/academic-programs/bulletin/policies/academic-policies.html>

Moses Center

Students who require accommodation for a disability should consult with the Henry and Lucy Moses Center for Students with Disabilities at <https://www.nyu.edu/life/safety-health-wellness/students-with-disabilities>. If you do request accommodation regarding the course policies in light of a disability, please also notify me (via email or in person) so that I can cooperate fully with the Moses Center and plan accordingly.

(No) Textbooks

All required readings will be made available in .pdf form on our NYU Classes website. No textbook purchase is required.

Phil-UA 8o : Philosophy of Mind

NYU Summer Session I 2017

Michelle Dyke

michelle.dyke@nyu.edu

Meets MTuWTh from 11:30 am - 1:05 pm in room 202 at 5 Washington Place
Monday, May 22 – Thursday, June 29

My office hours are on Thursdays from 10:30-11:30 am (or also by appointment). My office (#315) is on the third floor of the Philosophy department (5 Washington Place). During that time, feel free to come by to discuss the course material or assignments.

Course Description

This course will provide an introduction to some of the major themes and ongoing debates in the Philosophy of Mind. Our readings and class discussions will focus on questions such as the following: What is the relationship between the mind and the body (especially the brain)? Can mental states, like belief and intention, be explained wholly in physical terms? How does the mind represent information about the external world? What is the self - Am I identical to my mind? What is consciousness? Does it come in degrees, for example with humans possessing higher degrees of consciousness than lower animals like mollusks? What other sorts of things, if any, could be conscious? Previous background in philosophy is not a requirement for enrollment in this course.

Schedule of Readings and Assignments

Readings will be distributed in .pdf form and will be made available on our NYU Classes website. Each passage listed below will be discussed in class on the date listed to the left of the title; please do the readings in advance and be ready to talk about them. Passages marked as “in class” do not need to be read in advance.

Week I (Historical Introduction & Problems for Physicalism)

for Monday, May 22

- In class: Historical Introduction on Descartes’
Dualism & objections, other views

for Tuesday

- Frank Jackson, “What Mary Didn’t Know” and
“Epiphenomenal Qualia” (both very short)

for Wednesday

- Thomas Nagel, “What Is It Like to Be a Bat?” (short)
and excerpts from *The View from Nowhere*

for Thursday

- Excerpts from David Chalmers’ *The Conscious Mind*
- In class: Excerpt from Leibniz: The Mill Argument

Week II (Mental and Physical Properties: Identity & Supervenience)

Monday, May 29

MEMORIAL DAY: NO CLASS

Tuesday

- George Bealer, “Mental Properties”

Wednesday

- Jaegwon Kim, “Concepts of Supervenience”

Thursday

No new reading

Please submit the first paper (4-5 double-spaced pages) to me via email by 5 pm on Saturday, June 3.

Week III (Functionalism & Some Objections)

- Monday, June 5 - "Functionalism" from John Heil's *Philosophy of Mind*
- Tuesday - Hilary Putnam, "The nature of mental states"
- Wednesday - Excerpts from Sydney Shoemaker's "The Inverted Spectrum"
- for Thursday - John Searle: "Minds, brains, and programs"

Week IV (Consciousness)

- Monday, June 12 - David Chalmers, "Absent Qualia, Fading Qualia, Dancing Qualia"
- Tuesday - David Rosenthal on HOT: *Analysis* 2011
- Wednesday - Excerpts from Ned Block, "On a confusion about a function of consciousness"
- Thursday - Excerpts from Daniel Dennett, "Quining Qualia" and from John Heil's *Philosophy of Mind*

Please submit the second paper (4-5 double-spaced pages) to me via email by 5 pm on Saturday June 17.

Week V (Intentionality & Mental Representation)

- Monday, June 19 - Gilbert Harman, "The Intrinsic Quality of Experience"
- Tuesday - Ned Block, "Inverted Earth"
- Wednesday - review of Armstrong's *Perception and the Physical World* and Fred Dretske's "Phenomenal Externalism"
- Thursday - No new reading

Week VI (Personal Identity & Special Topics)

- Monday, June 26 - Selection from John Locke's *An Essay Concerning Human Understanding*
- Tuesday - Derek Parfit, "Personal Identity"
- Wednesday - Selections: Free Will and Libet's experiments
- Thursday - Skim Berys Gaut, "Educating for Creativity" and Alan Hajek, "Philosophical Heuristics and Philosophical Creativity"

Please submit the third paper (4-5 double-spaced pages) to me via email by 5 pm on FRIDAY, June 30.

Course Requirements

The required assignments for the course are **three papers** (4-5 double-spaced pages each). A choice of possible paper topics will be provided for all three writing assignments. The prompts will ask you to engage carefully with an idea or debate that we have discussed in class. You will be asked to provide arguments (offering examples or counterexamples where appropriate) in support of your chosen thesis. Every paper prompt, in some form or other, will ask you to explain: Do you agree or disagree with the author(s) from our reading? Why?

Grades will be calculated as follows:

30% (x3) each paper

10% participation (attendance, engagement in class discussions, asking questions, etc.)

Late papers will receive a deduction of 1/3 letter grade for each day they are late. For example, an A-quality paper turned in 7 hours after the deadline will receive a B+. If it's 37 hours late, it will receive a B. And so on. The penalty will only be waived for medical, mental health or family emergencies (please provide documentation). This is an issue of fairness to your fellow students.

Plagiarism (whether using published sources without citation or passing off another student's work as your own) merits an automatic o for the assignment and risks failure for the course.

Students are welcome to discuss the assignments with each other, but all submitted written documents should be the original work of the student submitting them. Again, it's an issue of fairness.

Other Course Policies

Note that class participation counts for 10% of your term grade. I'll take attendance in class; a long-standing pattern of repeated, unexcused absences may result in an F for that portion of the grade. Please do come to class even if you were not able to complete the reading for that day in order to avoid falling further behind.

Please do bring your reading(s) to class. During the class, I'll ask you to put your cellphones and any other electronics away. We'll take a 5-minute break halfway through the session and you're welcome to access them then.

Moses Center

Students who require accommodation for a disability should consult with the Henry and Lucy Moses Center for Students with Disabilities at <https://www.nyu.edu/life/safety-health-wellness/students-with-disabilities>. If you do request accommodation, please send me an email as well so that I can cooperate with the Moses Center and plan accordingly.

Textbooks

All required readings will be made available in .pdf form on our NYU Classes website. No textbook purchase is required.

In case you have trouble completing the reading at home, note that there are student-access computers available in the philosophy department (e.g. on the 3rd floor, near the elevator).

Phil-UA 21 : History of Modern Philosophy

NYU Summer Session II 2017

Michelle Dyke

michelle.dyke@nyu.edu

Meets MTuWTh from 1:30 pm - 3:05 pm in **room 302 at 5 Washington Place**
Monday, July 3 – Thursday, August 10

My office hours are on Wednesdays from 3:05-4:05 pm (or also by appointment). My office (#315) is right across the hall from our classroom in the Philosophy department. During that time, feel free to come by to discuss the course material or assignments.

Course Description

This course will provide an introduction to the works of some major figures in philosophy from the 17th and 18th centuries. Authors will include (but are not limited to) Descartes, Spinoza, Locke, Leibniz, Berkeley, Hume, and Kant. We will compare their views on a variety of topics in metaphysics & epistemology including knowledge and skepticism, causation, essence and identity, the relationship between the mental and the physical, and the role of God. Students will be encouraged to engage critically with the arguments of each author.

Schedule of Readings and Assignments

Readings with asterisks (*) will be made available in .pdf form on our NYU Classes website. Each passage listed below will be discussed in class on the date listed to the left of the title; please do the readings in advance and be ready to talk about them. Passages marked as “in class” or “for fun” do not need to be read in advance.

Week I (Descartes' *Meditations*: Foundationalism, *A Priori* Knowledge, and Proof of God)

for Monday, July 3	- Meditation I
for Tuesday	NO NYU CLASSES: INDEPENDENCE DAY
for Wednesday	- Meditation II
for Thursday	- Meditation III

Week II (*Meditations* cont'd and Spinoza's *Ethics*: Monism, Parallelism, Panpsychism & the PSR)

Monday, July 10	- Meditations IV and VI (skip V) In class: Excerpt of Descartes' Correspondence with Princess Elisabeth*
Tuesday	- Part I of Spinoza's <i>Ethics</i> (skip the Appendix)
Wednesday	- Review Part I (and <i>do</i> read the Appendix)
Thursday	- Skim Part II (skipping pages 42, 43) Please take note of P2, P5, P6, P7, P13

On Friday, July 14 by 5 pm, please submit a rough draft/outline of a short paper to me via email.

Week III (Locke's *Essay*: Empiricism, Identity, and Freedom of the Will)

- Monday, July 17 - Book I: Chapters i and ii
- Tuesday - Book II: Chapters i.1-5, ii, iii, v, vi, vii, viii, xii
- Wednesday - Book II: Ch xxiii.1-15 and Ch xxvii.1-15
- Thursday - Book II: Chapter xxi Sections 1-37, 47-56

On Friday, July 21 by 5 pm, please submit a final version of the short paper (4-5 double-space pages) to me via email.

Week IV (Leibniz and Berkeley: Theodicy, Pre-Established Harmony, and Idealism)

- Monday, July 24 (Leibniz) - Excerpts from *Discourse on Metaphysics**
In class: Letter excerpt* (Lady Masham)
- Tuesday (Leibniz) - Excerpt from *The Monadology**
For fun: Short excerpt from Voltaire's *Candide**
- Wednesday (Leibniz) - *New Essays**: Preface (through pg 10 only) and
Book I: Chapters i & iii (skip ch ii)
- Thursday (Berkeley) - Excerpt from Berkeley's *Treatise**

Week V (Berkeley and Hume: Idealism cont'd/ Induction, Belief and Miracles)

- Monday, July 31 (Berkeley) - Review Berkeley's *Treatise*
- Tuesday (Hume) - *Enquiry* Sections 2, 4 (online or paper text)
- Wednesday (Hume) - *Enquiry* Sections 5, 9
- Thursday (Hume) - *Enquiry* Sections 6, 10

On Friday, August 4 by 5 pm, please submit a draft/outline of a medium-length paper to me via email.

(I will distribute the study guide for the final exam.)

Week VI (Kant: The 'Copernican Revolution' and the Synthetic *A Priori*)

- Monday, August 7 - 2nd ed. Preface to the *Critique of Pure Reason**
- Tuesday - *Prolegomena*: Sec 1-3, 14-22, 27-30*
- Wednesday (Review session in class) - Bring your study guides and plan on working
with your classmates

On Thursday, August 10: Final Exam in class

On Friday, August 11 by 5 pm, please submit a final version of the medium-length paper (6-8 double-spaced pages) to me via email.

Course Requirements

The required assignments for the course include **one short paper** (4-5 double-spaced pages), **one medium-length paper** (6-8 double-spaced pages) and **one in-class final exam**. A choice of possible paper topics will be provided for both assignments. **Drafts or outlines of each paper** will be due one week before the final versions. The drafts will not be graded, but comments will be provided within 2-3

days. Submission of drafts will count towards participation. (Drafts must be submitted on time for full credit.)

Unlike the papers, the exam will be designed to test only your recall and understanding of the assigned authors' views rather than your ability to critically assess their arguments. A study guide will be distributed one week in advance. That study guide will be composed of questions of the same format as on the exam, but it will include about 3x as many questions as will appear on the final. The questions to appear on the exam will be chosen from among those on the study guide.

Grades will be calculated as follows:

25% short paper

30% medium paper

30% final exam

15% participation (5% x2 for submission of each paper draft, 5% for engagement in class discussions)

Late papers will receive a deduction of 1/3 letter grade for each day they are late. For example, an A-quality paper turned in 7 hours after the deadline will receive a B+. If it's 37 hours late, it will receive a B. And so on. The penalty will only be waived for medical, mental health or family emergencies (please provide documentation). Timely paper drafts will receive 5/5 points. One point will be lost for each day the draft is late. (5/5 = A, 4/5 = B+, 3/5 = B-, 2/5 = C, 1/5 = D+, 0/5 = F) This is an issue of fairness to your fellow students.

Plagiarism (whether using published sources without citation or passing off another student's work as your own) merits an automatic o for the assignment and risks failure for the course.

Students are welcome to discuss the assignments with each other, but all submitted written documents should be the original work of the student submitting them. Again, it's an issue of fairness.

Other Course Policies

Note that engagement in class discussions counts for 5% of your term grade. I'll take attendance in class; a pattern of repeated, unexcused absences may result in an F for that portion of the grade. Please do come to class even if you were not able to complete the reading for that day in order to avoid falling further behind.

Please do bring your book(s) or reading(s) to class. During the class, I'll ask you to put your laptops, cellphones, and any other electronics away. We'll take a 5-minute break halfway through the session and you're welcome to access them then.

Moses Center

Students who require accommodation for a disability should consult with the Henry and Lucy Moses Center for Students with Disabilities at <https://www.nyu.edu/students/communities-and-groups/students-with-disabilities.html>. If you do request accommodation (regarding the administration of the final exam, for example), please do send me an email as well so that I can cooperate with the Moses Center and plan accordingly.

Textbooks

The following three books are required texts and are available at the NYU Bookstore (as well as on Amazon.com, etc.):

1. An Essay Concerning Human Understanding

John Locke, ed. Nidditch
Oxford University Press

These two are very small, inexpensive paperbacks:

2. Discourse on Method and Meditations on First Philosophy (4th edition)

René Descartes, trans. Cress
Hackett Publishing Company

3. Ethics

Spinoza, trans. Curley
Penguin Classics

The following text, also available at the NYU Bookstore, is *optional*:

4. An Enquiry Concerning Human Understanding

David Hume, ed. Buckle
Cambridge University Press

Purchasing the text is optional because a free online version (carefully prepared and fully legitimate) is also available at www.davidhume.org. (The readings will be required, though purchasing a paper version of the text is not.)



NYU

**SCHOOL OF GLOBAL
PUBLIC HEALTH**

GPH-GU 1005
Advanced Introduction to Bioethics³
(3 credits)

Class Schedule: Wed 6:45-8:45 pm EST
Live (“synchronous” instruction) in hybrid format,
in person and online
Class location: GCASL 261

Simultaneously over Zoom for virtual students;
Access link from NYUClasses course site
Semester and Year: Fall 2020

Professor: Michelle M. Dyke
Virtual office hour: Mondays 4-5 EST via Zoom;
See recurring meeting link on NYUClasses,
“Waiting room” will be enabled to allow private,
one-on-one meetings

I will not be on campus daily; please use
Email: michelle.dyke@nyu.edu
Office hours TBA for in-person students
(meetings also available by appointment)

Course Assistant: Ryan Felder
Course Assistant Email: [email redacted]

COURSE DESCRIPTION:

Advanced Introduction to Bioethics - Open only to Graduate Students in Bioethics or Philosophy or by Permission of Instructor. This seminar is intended to introduce students to the central methods and concerns of contemporary Bioethics. We will consider topics including the grounds for respecting human (and other) life, the concepts of well-being and autonomy, decisions about future people, and justice in distribution of scarce medical resources. Students will develop familiarity with these concepts as well as the conventions and standards of bioethical debate.

PRE-REQUISITES:

No Pre-requisites. Students must either be enrolled in the MA program in Bioethics at NYU or have permission from the instructor to take this class.

COURSE REQUIREMENTS AND EXPECTATIONS:

- Students are expected to complete assignments on time and at a standard appropriate to a graduate level course. See below for policies on grading and late work.
- Students are expected to come to class having read the assigned readings for that session. Note that the assignment of an article does *not* indicate that the course instructor agrees with everything the author has written. The purpose of our discussions and writing assignments will be to engage critically with the views and arguments we encounter.

³ This is an abridged version of the official syllabus, which is 12 pages long and includes even more detail, on e.g. grading policies, in accordance with NYU GPH requirements.

- Students are expected to participate actively in class discussions and to treat all others with respect. For more detail on classroom policies, see the sections below.

ASSIGNMENTS:

Attendance and Participation (10%):

This is a discussion-based graduate seminar. Regular seminar attendance is required for this course. Material may be covered in class that is not covered in the reading.

- Each student is allowed one unexcused absence, no questions asked, before the participation grade is affected. Further unexcused absences will negatively affect participation as follows:
 - One unexcused absence: Student may receive a maximum grade of 'A-' for participation, but may receive a lower grade depending on other aspects of participation.
 - Two unexcused absences: Student may receive a maximum grade of 'B+' for participation, but may receive a lower grade depending on other aspects of participation.
 - Three unexcused absences: Student may receive a maximum grade of 'B' for participation, but may receive a lower grade depending on other aspects of participation.
 - More than three unexcused absences: Student may receive a maximum grade of 'B-' for participation, but may receive a lower grade depending on other aspects of participation.
- If a student must be absent more than one time from this course, that student should seek permission from our course assistant, Ryan, via email at least twelve hours before the beginning of class. If permission is granted, the absence counts as excused. (Note that religious holidays count as excused, but please do notify us in advance.) Sometimes (e.g. for medical or family emergencies), I understand that advance notice is not possible; please send an email once you're able.
- Regular attendance is not all that is required for satisfactory participation. Students must come to class having completed the assigned readings and must actively contribute to classroom discussions in a way that is respectful and on-topic. (This includes asking questions!) Participation grades will be determined as follows:

Short Writing Assignments (30% of total grade at 10% each):

Throughout the semester, you will be required to hand in three short writing assignments in response to our course readings.

- Please use 1" margins, in Times New Roman font, 12-point. (The point of standardizing this is to minimize potential bias in grading.)
- These written exercises should be no more than two-three pages in length, double-spaced.
- This means that your writing must be focused and free of unnecessary detail. Avoid summarizing the whole article. Instead, select some component of the article (an argument, a definition, an assumption, etc.) that strikes you as noteworthy, reconstruct it briefly, and most importantly, critically evaluate it. State your opinion and defend that viewpoint. Walk your reader through your reasoning process.
- For the first assignment, you will be given prompts to choose from.
 - Topics will be announced on NYU Classes one week before the deadline.
- Starting with the second assignment, you may come up with your own topics, but potential suggestions will also be provided.
 - Writing assignments must discuss course material that was assigned reading for class meetings *after* the previous assessment (writing assignment or mini-quiz). The point of these assignments is to make sure that you're keeping up with the course material and thinking critically about it.
 - Generally speaking, in these short assignments (esp. after the first), you should aim to briefly raise and respond to at least one potential objection to an argument that appears in the assigned readings. (We'll begin discussing this in advance of the second writing assignment.)
- These assignments will help you to gain experience choosing your own research topics, and will give you practice with critical ethical writing.
- Submission will be via our NYUClasses site under "Assignments." (See the tab at left.)

Mini-quizzes (10% of total grade at 5% each):

Two of these will be held at the start of two different classes early in the term. For virtual students, they'll be released and submitted on NYUClasses. In-person students can take them on a laptop or on scratch paper.

- These will involve only a handful of short questions designed to test basic comprehension of the assigned readings for that week's class meeting. You will have 15 minutes to complete them. They are closed-book, closed-note. (Students will sign an honor pledge at the bottom of the quiz.)
- These are intended to help you gauge whether you're reading and understanding the assigned articles at the level of detail and sophistication expected for the course.
- Students with an excused absence on the day of the mini-quiz will make up an alternate version by arrangement with me. Students who miss a mini-quiz due to an unexcused absence will receive a 0 for the quiz.

Final Paper (50% total):

Topic Proposal with Outline—5%

- Note: This assignment will be graded A (100) or F (0) for completion (subject also to late penalties).
- An instruction sheet will be uploaded to NYUClasses with more details on this assignment closer to the deadline.

Final Paper—45%

- Write a final paper based on your outline. Your paper must be between 14 and 17 pages in length (before References), double-spaced, 1" margins, in Times New Roman font, 12-point. (The point of standardizing this is to minimize bias in grading.)
- This paper must be an argumentative piece of philosophical writing. It must have a thesis statement (to appear by the end of the first page), to which the rest of the paper is dedicated to proving. You must advance and defend an argument, and raise and respond to objections.
- It will be up to you to choose the topic of your term paper. The paper must engage directly and in detail with some of the views advanced in assigned readings from this course.
- If you do not have much experience writing philosophy papers, I encourage you to check out Professor Jim Pryor's guide: <http://www.jimpryor.net/teaching/guidelines/writing.html> . We will also discuss expectations in class.
- Remember to include grammatically correct and academically responsible citations of sources. This is a graduate-level course with corresponding expectations; students must engage in proper citation practices. See the below statement on Academic Integrity.
- These assignments will receive letter grades in accordance with the standards described below under "Grading Scale." I will also provide written comments. I will be looking above all for accuracy, originality, and clarity, in addition to proper citation of source material.

GRADING COMPONENTS:

Item:	Percentage or Points:
Participation	10%
Short Writing Assignments	10% each X3
Mini-quizzes	5% each X2
Final Paper Proposal with Outline	5%
Final Paper	45%

Policy on Late Work

Work submitted after the deadline will be penalized by 1/3 of a letter grade (e.g. from what would have been an A- to a B+) for each additional 24-hour period the assignment is late. The first deduction occurs after the deadline has passed. (The late penalty is capped at one full letter grade lost.) This is an issue of fairness to your fellow students. Exceptions will be granted only in cases of emergency. All deadlines are indicated here for your information at the start of term. If you know in advance that you will be unable to meet one of these deadlines, please send me an email or see me in person after class to discuss your situation.

Note: The past few months have been especially challenging for many of us, and often in surprising and unforeseen ways. If your circumstances change quickly in a way that prevents you from completing the assigned work on time (e.g. medical needs, mental health, family emergencies, loss of employment, change in residence, lack of access to technology/the internet, etc.) please don't be shy about reaching out. I'm happy to work with you to decide upon a fair and reasonable extension.

NYU CLASSES:

NYU Classes will be used extensively throughout the semester. This where *all* students will access the syllabus and course readings (in pdf form) and submit their assignments. NYUClasses will also be used to send announcements via email; past announcements from the whole term are always visible on our NYUClasses course site. NYU Classes is accessible using your NYU login at <https://home.nyu.edu/academics>

TECHNOLOGY POLICY:

In olden times, use of electronic devices (esp. for non-academic purposes) during class was discouraged. This term, some of you will be taking this course over Zoom from home. All of our readings will be posted in .pdf form on our NYUClasses course site. In-person students are welcome to access these on a computer or other device during class. (We will refer in detail to the readings during class.) I will *not* hand out paper copies of the readings or other course materials. In-person students should mute laptop speakers to prevent interference with the Zoom setup. In-person students should *not* log into the Zoom class meeting from their laptops while in the classroom. Installed classroom mics will pick up their audio to be heard by remote students. All students should remember to disable ringers and notification sounds during class so as not to distract others. Those attending virtually via Zoom should have, as a default, videos enabled and microphones muted. (Those called on to speak can unmute. Ryan will be helping to moderate questions and comments from virtual students.) Virtual students should keep in mind that a class from home is still a university course; they should be ready and willing to participate in class discussions, and to maintain an attitude of professionalism.

COVID POLICIES:

According to NYU policy this term, students attending in person should sit with at least 6 feet of space between each other and 10 feet away from the course instructor. Masks must be worn at all times within the classroom. (Students should expect to bring masks from home.) For this course, I'll add that if at any point a student removes a mask, I will stop and wait until all students are wearing masks for the course to continue. (Any student who declines to wear a mask will be asked to leave the classroom.) Due to spacing constraints, no more than 15 students (+1 instructor) may be in our classroom at any one time. Depending upon final total enrollment and interest in attending in person, students may attend in person either every week or every other week in an A/B cohort system. A separate form for declaring one's preference to take the class in person vs. fully online will be emailed in mid-August and must be submitted via our NYUClasses course site by the end of August 31. This form contains more detailed information about the in-person vs. online format options and should be considered a supplement to the syllabus. Per NYU policy, assigned seats in class will now be required (to aid any necessary contact tracing efforts). Wherever you sit on the first day, you should note the seat number and expect to sit there for the rest of the term.

COURSE OUTLINE:

Note that assigned readings and deadlines are subject to modification if appropriate; I will email you well in advance if this occurs. Please come to class having read the articles listed to the right of the date.

Date	Topics	Readings/Materials Due	Assignments Due
Week 1 Sep 2	Moral Theory - Utilitarianism	Come to class having read Singer (1974)	
Week 2 Sep 9	NYU Legislative Monday – No Class		
Week 3 Sep 16	Moral Theory - Deontology	Read Hill (1984) & Darwall (1977) First Mini-Quiz	First 15 min. of class
Week 4 Sep 23	Autonomy and Paternalism	Read Conly (2013) & Flanigan (2017)	
Week 5 Sep 30	Patient Rights & Informed Consent	Wells and Kaptchuk (2012) & Ackerman (1982) First Short Writing Assignment	Due before start of class
Week 6 Oct 7	Well-Being	Read Bradley (2009 book, selections) & Hawkins (2014)	
Week 7 Oct 14	Abortion	Read Thomson (1971) & Marquis (1989) Second Mini-Quiz	First 15 min. of class
Week 8 Oct 21	The Non-Identity Problem	Read Parfit (1986) & Kumar (2003)	
Week 9 Oct 28	Defining Death (& Related Ethical Issues for Healthcare – the “dead donor rule”)	Read Veatch (2004) & McMahan (2006)	
Week 10 Nov 4	Euthanasia and Related Practices	Read Thomson (1999) & Hardwig (1997) Second Short Writing Assignment	Due before start of class

Week 11 Nov 11	Enhancement, Genetic Engineering	Read DeGrazia (2000) & Bostrom and Ord (2006) *Optional: Watch <i>Gattaca</i> (1997)	
Week 12 Nov 18	Defining Health (and esp. Mental Health)	Read Wakefield (1992) & Kukla (2014) Third Short Writing Assignment	Due before start of class
Week 13 Nov 25	Thanksgiving	Schedule an individual consultation for term paper with Prof. Dyke via Zoom	
Week 14 Dec 2	Collective Responsibility and the Environment	Read Wringe (2019) & Jamieson (2015)	
Week 15 Dec 9	Final Topic TBD Based on Student Interest In-Class Debate	Final Paper Outline	Due before start of class on the 9th
		Final Paper	Due 11:59 pm on Monday, December 21

READING/VIEWING LIST:

- Ackerman, Terrence. (1982). "Why Doctors Should Intervene," *The Hastings Center Report*, 12(4), 14-17.
- Bostrom, Nick and Toby Ord. (2006). "The Reversal Test: Eliminating Status Quo Bias in Applied Ethics," *Ethics*, 116, 656-679.
- Bradley, Ben. (2009). "Well-Being," *Well-Being and Death*. Oxford University Press.
- Conly, Sarah. (2013). "Chapter 1: Why Value Autonomy?" *Against Autonomy: Justifying Coercive Paternalism*. Cambridge University Press.
- Darwall, Stephen. (1977). "Two Kinds of Respect," *Ethics*, 88, 36-49.
- DeGrazia, David. (2000). "Prozac, Enhancement, and Self-Creation," *Hastings Center Report*, 30(2), 34-40.
- Flanigan, Jessica. (2017). "Seat Belt Mandates and Paternalism," *Journal of Moral Philosophy*, 14, 291-314.
- Hardwig, John. (1997). "Is There a Duty to Die?" *The Hastings Center Report*, 27(2), 34-42.
- Hawkins, Jennifer. (2014). "Well-Being, Time, and Dementia," *Ethics*, 124, 507-542.
- Hill, Thomas. (1984). "Autonomy and Benevolent Lies," *Journal of Value Inquiry*, 18, 251-267.
- Jamieson, Dale. (2015). "Responsibility and Climate Change," *Global Justice: Theory Practice Rhetoric*, 8(2), 23-42.

- Kukla, Rebecca. (2014). "Medicalization, 'Normal Function,' and the Definition of Health," In *The Routledge Companion to Bioethics*, Ed. John D. Arras, Elizabeth Fenton, Rebecca Kukla. 515-530.
- Kumar, Rahul. (2003). "Who Can Be Wronged?" *Philosophy & Public Affairs*, 31(2), 99-118.
- Marquis, Don. (1989). "Why Abortion Is Immoral," *The Journal of Philosophy*, 86(4), 183-202.
- McMahan, Jeff. (2006). "An Alternative to Brain Death," *Journal of Law, Medicine & Ethics, Symposium: Defining the Beginning and the End of Human Life*, Spring 2006. 44-48.
- Parfit, Derek. (1986). "Chapter 16: The Non-Identity Problem," *Reasons and Persons*. Oxford University Press.
- Singer, Peter. (1974). "All Animals are Equal," *Philosophic Exchange*, 1(5), 103-16. Reprinted in *Bioethics: An Anthology*. Third Edition. (2016). Ed. Helga Kuhse, Udo Schüklenk, and Peter Singer. Wiley Blackwell. 530-539.
- Thomson, Judith Jarvis. (1971). "A Defense of Abortion," *Philosophy & Public Affairs*, 1(1), 47-66.
- Thomson, Judith Jarvis. (1999). "Physician-Assisted Suicide: Two Moral Arguments," *Ethics*, 109, 497-518.
- Wakefield, Jerome. (1992). "The Concept of Mental Disorder," *American Psychologist*, 47(3), 373-388.
- Wells, Rebecca Erwin and Ted J. Kaptchuck. (2012). "To Tell the Truth, the Whole Truth, May Do Patients Harm: The Problem of the Nocebo Effect for Informed Consent," *The American Journal of Bioethics*, 12(3), 22-29.
- Wringer, Bill. (2019). "Global obligations, collective capacities, and 'ought implies can,'" *Philosophical Studies*, Online First 07 March 2019.
- Veatch, Robert M. (2004). "Abandon the Dead Donor Rule or Change the Definition of Death?" *Kennedy Institute of Ethics Journal*, 14(3), 261-276.
- *Gattaca*, 1997 film directed and written by Andrew Niccol (*optional)
- Additional Readings TBD for students' choice topic at the end

STATEMENT OF ACADEMIC INTEGRITY:

The NYU School of Global Public Health values both open inquiry and academic integrity. Students in the program are expected to follow standards of excellence set forth by New York University. Such standards include respect, honesty and responsibility. The SGPH does not tolerate violations to academic integrity including:

- Plagiarism
- Cheating on an exam
- Submitting your own work toward requirements in more than one course without prior approval from the instructor
- Collaborating with other students for work expected to be completed individually
- Giving your work to another student to submit as his/her own
- Purchasing or using papers or work online or from a commercial firm and presenting it as your own work

STUDENTS WITH DISABILITIES:

Students with disabilities should contact the Moses Center for Students with Disabilities regarding the resources available to them, and to determine what classroom accommodations should be made available. More information about the Moses Center can be found here: <https://www.nyu.edu/life/safety-health-wellness/students-with-disabilities.html>. Students requesting accommodation must obtain a letter from the Moses Center to provide to me as early in the semester as possible.



NYU

**COLLEGE OF GLOBAL
PUBLIC HEALTH**

GPH-GU 1230

Advanced Introduction to Public Health Ethics⁴

Summer Session II 2020

(3 credits)

Class Schedule: Tu Th 6:00-8:30 PM

Class Location: Virtually on Zoom,
link accessible from NYUClasses

Semester and Year: Summer II 2020

Professor: Michelle M. Dyke

Office hours are on Zoom (see the link for the
recurring meeting, "Office Hours" on Classes,
or also by appointment)

Office Hours: Mon 4-5 PM or by appointment

Email: michelle.dyke@nyu.edu

COURSE DESCRIPTION:

This course examines the ethical foundations of public health and ethical issues that arise in the context of public health work. Topics will include, for example, balancing individual autonomy and community health, rights to health and healthcare, culturally respectful global health interventions, and the risk of generating stigma through public health campaigns. We will also discuss the ethics of public health research, exploring topics such as privacy considerations in data gathering and informed consent in a community health context. Attention will be paid to the unique ethical challenges that arise in the context of responses to natural disasters and to public health emergencies such as the current coronavirus pandemic.

PRE-REQUISITES:

No Pre-requisites. Students must either be enrolled in the MA program in Bioethics at NYU or have permission from the instructor to take this class.

COURSE REQUIREMENTS AND EXPECTATIONS:

- Students are expected to complete assignments on time and at a standard appropriate to a graduate level course. See below for policies on grading and late work.
- Students are expected to come to class having read the assigned readings for that session. Note that the assignment of an article does *not* indicate that the course instructor agrees with everything the author has written. The purpose of our discussions and writing assignments will be to engage critically with the views and arguments we encounter.
- Students are expected to participate actively in class discussions and to treat all others with respect. For more detail on classroom policies, see the sections below.

⁴ This is an abridged version of the official syllabus, which is 15 pages long and includes even more detail, on e.g. grading policies, in accordance with NYU GPH requirements.

ASSIGNMENTS:

Seminar Attendance and Participation (15% of term grade):

- This is a discussion-based graduate seminar. Regular attendance and participation is required for this course. Material may be covered in class that is not covered in the reading.
- **As part of this grade, each student will come prepared with comments in order to lead discussion in the final segment of one class meeting. Students will sign up in advance for a particular class in the first week of the course.**
- Each student is allowed one absence, no questions asked, before the participation grade is affected. Further unexcused absences will negatively affect participation grades as follows:
 - One additional unexcused absence: Student may receive a maximum grade of 'A-' for participation, but may receive a lower grade depending on other aspects of participation.
 - Two additional unexcused absences: Student may receive a maximum grade of 'B+' for participation, but may receive a lower grade depending on other aspects of participation.
 - Three additional unexcused absences: Student may receive a maximum grade of 'B' for participation, but may receive a lower grade depending on other aspects of participation.
 - More than three additional unexcused absences: Student may receive a maximum grade of 'B-' for participation, but may receive a lower grade depending on other aspects of participation.
- If a student must be absent more than one time from this course, that student should seek permission from the instructor via email at least twelve hours before the beginning of class. If permission is granted, the absence counts as excused. (Note that religious holidays count as excused, but please do notify me in advance.) Sometimes (e.g. for medical or family emergencies), I understand that advance notice is not possible. Please send me an email once you're able.
- Regular attendance is not all that is required for satisfactory participation. Students must come to class having completed the assigned readings and must actively contribute to classroom discussions in a way that is respectful and on-topic. (Asking questions counts as participation.) Participation grades will be determined as follows:

Midterm Paper (35% of term grade): This is a relatively short paper that should engage critically with one or more of our assigned course readings.

- It should be 5-7 pages (before References), double-spaced, Times New Roman 12-pt, with 1" margins. (The point of standardizing this is to minimize bias in grading.)
- This is an argumentative paper. Your thesis statement (which should appear by the end of the first page) must take an opinionated ethical stance. (This means that the thesis should not be obviously true. Nor should it be the kind of straightforwardly factual claim that would be apparent to anyone who has done adequate empirical research.) The rest of your paper will be dedicated to proving your thesis true, using arguments and examples of your own. Walk your reader slowly through your process of reasoning. This is your chance to make clear, and to defend, your own opinion on the issues we have been discussing in class.
- As a guideline, "mere summary" of the views and arguments of our assigned course authors should take up no more than half of the paper. Remember you don't need to (and should not!) summarize the whole paper(s) to which you are responding. Ideally, you want to present just as much background information as is necessary in order for the rest of your paper (that is, your arguments for your own view) to make sense. Think of yourself as setting the stage for in-depth discussion of a particular issue.
- Towards the end of the paper, you should raise and respond to (at least) one potential objection to your thesis. Imagine: What would some smart friends or colleagues of yours say if they weren't fully convinced yet by your case for your thesis? What could you say in reply? How devastating do you find this objection in the end?

- Additional outside research is not necessary for this paper. (It will be required for the longer term paper.) This shorter assignment is intended to provide practice with philosophical writing for the term paper.
- You will be given some prompts/topic ideas for this paper, though you're also welcome to pick your own topic. I will post an Assignment Sheet with more details on NYUClasses in advance of the due date. Your topic should be obviously and directed related to the course readings we have already discussed in class.
- The assignment will be submitted online via NYUClasses.
- These assignments will receive letter grades in accordance with the standards described below under "Grading Scale." I will also provide written comments, with an eye to helping students strengthen their writing in preparation for the final paper.

Research Paper (50% in total of term grade):

Proposal with Outline—5%

- Note: This proposal assignment will be graded A (100) or F (0) for completion. (Late penalties may also apply.) I will also provide written comments.
- I encourage you to speak with me individually at least once to discuss paper ideas.
- If your proposed topic is not appropriate for this course, you will be asked to write another proposal on another topic. You will not be penalized for handing in that second proposal after the assignment deadline.
- Write a short summary of the topic upon which you plan to write your final paper.
 - This summary does not need to be more than two pages in length (and can, in fact, be shorter), but it must give me an idea of the ethical question that you plan to answer as well as the argument(s) that you plan to use to respond to it and the sources you will be citing.
 - This assignment itself does not need to be an argumentative piece of philosophical writing; it is a descriptive proposal regarding the arguments you wish to pursue.
 - Like the midterm paper, the final paper will be an opinionated piece of argumentative writing. You will be expected to take a stance on the relevant issue in your final paper. It will not be enough to simply describe an existing bioethical debate.
 - Your proposal should include a draft of your thesis statement. This should be clearly marked.
 - Please also include, after the short proposal written in full sentences, an outline of the overall structure of your paper, including the main views you intend to address and some of the arguments you intend to make in your paper. The outline should be about 1-3 pages in length and does not need to be written in full sentences. Bullet points are fine as long as I can tell what you mean.
 - Please include a draft of a References list.
- The topic of your paper is entirely up to you, so long as it engages in depth with one of the topics or themes covered in this course. The final paper must cite, at minimum, two of the course readings from our syllabus and also two additional sources from your own research (academic books or journal articles or pieces of serious journalism). See below for NYU policy reminders on academic integrity and proper citation of sources. This is your chance to dive into more detail regarding a topic that came up in our seminar that was of special interest to you. You will be defending your own view, which should be informed by additional outside research of your own.
- An Assignment Sheet that describes expectations for the final paper project will be uploaded to NYUClasses before the due date of the outline.
- Submission of the outline will be online via NYUClasses.

Final Research Paper—45%

- Write a final paper based on your outline. Your paper must be between 14 and 17 pages in length (before References), double-spaced, 1" margins, in Times New Roman font, 12-point. (The point of standardizing the format is to minimize bias in grading.)
- Like the midterm, this paper must be an argumentative piece of writing. It must have a thesis statement (to appear by the end of the first page), to which the rest of the paper is dedicated to proving. You must advance and defend an argument, and raise and respond to potential objections. (At least two for the final paper)
- Remember to include grammatically correct and academically responsible citations of sources. This is a graduate-level course with corresponding expectations; students must engage in proper citation practices. See the below statement on Academic Integrity.
- If you do not have much experience writing philosophy papers, I encourage you to check out NYU Professor Jim Pryor's guide: <http://www.jimpryor.net/teaching/guidelines/writing.html>. We will also discuss expectations in class.
- Submission of the final paper will be via NYUClasses.
- These assignments will receive letter grades in accordance with the standards described below under "Grading Scale." I will also provide written comments. I will be looking above all for accuracy, originality, and clarity, in addition to proper citation of source material.
- **Note for Bioethics MA students:** If you're on the lookout for a paper to develop into a writing sample or MA thesis, this assignment is a great starting point. I'd be happy to talk to students individually about how to get the most out of this project, given their particular academic goals.

GRADING COMPONENTS:

Item:	Percentage or Points:
Seminar Participation	15%
Midterm paper	35%
Final paper proposal/outline	5%
Final paper	45%

Policy on Late Work

Work submitted after the deadline will be penalized by 1/3 of a letter grade (e.g. from what would have been an A- to a B+) for each additional 24-hour period the assignment is late. The first deduction occurs after the deadline has passed. (The late penalty is capped at one full letter grade lost.) This is an issue of fairness to your fellow students. Exceptions will be granted only in cases of emergency. All deadlines are indicated here for your information at the start of term. If you know in advance that you will be unable to meet one of these deadlines, please send me an email or see me in person to discuss your situation.

Note: The past few months have been especially challenging for many of us, and often in surprising and unforeseen ways. If your circumstances change quickly in a way that prevents you from completing the assigned work on time (e.g. medical needs, mental health, family emergencies, loss of employment, change in residence, lack of access to technology/the internet, etc.) please don't be shy about reaching out. I'm happy to work with you to decide upon a fair and reasonable extension.

NYU CLASSES:

NYU Classes will be used throughout the semester for assignments, readings, and announcements. NYU Classes is accessible using your NYU login at <https://home.nyu.edu/academics>

TECHNOLOGY POLICY:

This class is being offered remotely. You’ll be using NYUClasses to access the link to our Zoom class meetings and office hours. All assigned readings and any other materials will be made available via Classes. Submission of assignments will also occur via Classes.

A Zoom class meeting is still a university class meeting. Please do remember to silence unnecessary features on other electronic devices nearby (e.g. text message alerts on cell phones) and silence your audio temporarily in case of background noise that would distract other students. Your video should be enabled during class. Please come to class ready to participate.

Our class meetings will not be recorded.

COURSE OUTLINE:

Note that assigned readings and deadlines are subject to modification if appropriate; I will email you well in advance if this occurs.

Date	Topics	Readings for Session	Assignments Due
Week 1 July 7	Introduction: Moral Theory & The Social Goals of Public Health 1. What Kinds of Aims and Principles Might Guide Decision-Making for Public Health?	Bognar & Hirose (2014), Chapter 1 Volume Intro & Persad (2019), “Justice and Public Health” <i>Optional</i> further reading: Martha Nussbaum (2003); Mark Timmons (2013)	
July 9	2. Just How Broad are the Goals of <i>Public Health</i> ? (and “social determinants of health”)	Rothstein (2002), “Rethinking the Meaning of Public Health” Goldberg (2009), “In Support of a Broad Model of Public Health”	
Week 2 July 14	Individual Rights, Autonomy & Public Health Policy 1. What Justifies Public Health Interventions? Powers & Faden’s Social Justice Model	Faden & Powers (2011), “A Social Justice Framework for Health and Science Policy” Powers, Faden & Saghai (2012), “Liberty, Mill and the Framework of Public Health Ethics” <i>Optional</i> further reading: John	

		Stuart Mill, <i>On Liberty</i> ; John Rawls (1971), <i>A Theory of Justice</i>	
July 16	2. How Should Public Health Policies Protect Individual Autonomy?	Buchanan (2008), "Autonomy, Paternalism, and Justice: Ethical Priorities in Public Health" Buchanan (2015), "Promoting Justice and Autonomy in Public Policies to Reduce the Health Consequences of Obesity" Conly (2014), "Against autonomy: justifying coercive paternalism" <i>Optional</i> further reading: Conly's (2012) book of same name	
Week 3 July 21	Global Health Interventions 1. Are we obligated to help improve health elsewhere around the world?	Wolff (2012), "The Basis of the Global Health Duty" Wringe (2018), "Global Obligations and the Human Right to Health" <i>Optional</i> further reading: Liao (2019), "Human Rights and Public Health Ethics"	
July 23	2. The 'Standard of Care' Debate: What do We Owe to Research Subjects in Developing Countries?	Ezekiel Emanuel (2012), "Global Justice and the 'Standard of Care' Debates" Lignou (2011), "The 'standard of care' debate and global justice in research" <i>Optional</i> further reading: MacKay (2013)	Midterm paper due via Classes by 11:59 pm on Friday, July 24
Week 4 July 28	Contact Tracing Study: Public Trust in Institutions & Privacy Concerns 1. Do Tracing Apps Violate Privacy?	Hastings Center webinar recording, 18 May 2020: "Re-Opening the Nation: Privacy, Surveillance and Digital Tools for Contact Tracing"	

		<p>Soltani, Calo & Bergstrom (2020), "Contact-tracing apps are not a solution to the COVID-19 crisis"</p> <p>Morley et al. (2020), "Ethical guidelines for COVID-19 tracing apps"</p>	
July 30	2. What is it to <i>Trust</i> a Person or an Institution?	<p>Gopichandran et. al (2020), "COVID-19 Pandemic: a Litmus Test of Trust in the Health System"</p> <p>Alfano & Huijts (forth.), "Trust and distrust in institutions and governance"</p> <p><i>Optional</i> further reading: Hawley (2014), "Trust, Distrust and Commitment," C. Thi Nguyen (forth.), "Trust as an Unquestioning Attitude"</p>	
<p>Week 5</p> <p>August 4</p>	<p>Race, Public Health, and Dismantling Systemic Injustices</p> <p>1. How Does Systemic Racism Affect Public Health?</p>	<p>Background: Lillie-Blanton, Maleque, and Miller (2008), "Reducing Racial, Ethnic, and Socioeconomic Disparities in Health Care"</p> <p>Focus: Valles (2019), "A pluralistic and socially responsible philosophy of epidemiology field should actively engage with social determinants of health and health disparities"</p> <p>Courtwright (2009), "Justice, Stigma, and the New Epidemiology of Health Disparities"</p> <p><i>Optional</i> further reading: Anand, Peter & Sen, Eds. (2006), <i>Public Health, Ethics, and Equity</i></p>	
August 6	2. How Can (Rational) <i>Distrust</i> of Institutions Affect Health Care in Minority Communities?	McGary (2015), "Racial Groups, Distrust, and the Distribution of Health Care"	Final Paper Proposal with Outline due

	How is the phenomenon of “epistemic injustice” relevant for public health?	Miranda Fricker (2013), “Epistemic justice as a condition of political freedom?” excerpts <i>Optional</i> (Hurricane Katrina, Race and Public Health): Quinn (2006); Johns Hopkins (2005)	via Classes by start of class on August 6
Week 6 August 11	COVID-19 Case Study , TBA based on current events and student input Possible topics: Decision-Making for “Reopening,” Distribution of Scarce Resources (e.g. ventilators, PPE), Ethics of Human Trials of Vaccines (e.g. permissibility of ‘challenge’ trials)	<i>Optional</i> : Hastings Center Webinar recording, 21 April 2020: “Re-Opening the Nation: Which Values Should Guide Us?” <i>Optional</i> : “When to Reopen the Nation is an Ethics Question-Not Only a Scientific One” by Travis Rieder, Anne Barnhill, Justin Bernstein and Brian Hutler for the Hastings Center (2020), see also linked paper “An Ethics Framework for the COVID-19 Reopening Process” (2020), Johns Hopkins Berman Institute of Bioethics	
August 13	Mock Academic Conference: Student Presentations of Their Research Papers with Collaborative Q&A		
			Final Paper Due via Classes by 11:59pm on Friday, August 14 Final grades due to Registrar on August 16

READING/VIEWING LIST (including *optional* further reading):

- Alfano, Mark and Nicole Huijts. (forth. pre-print) “Trust and distrust in institutions and governance” In Judith Simon (ed.), *Handbook of Trust and Philosophy*. Routledge.

- Anand, Sudhir, Fabienne Peter and Amartya Sen (eds.) (2006). *Public Health, Ethics, and Equity*. Oxford University Press.
- Justin Bernstein, Brain Hutler, Travis N. Rieder, Ruth Faden, Hahrie Han, and Anne Barnhill. (2020). "An Ethics Framework for the COVID-19 Reopening Process," working paper from the Johns Hopkins Berman Institute of Bioethics & the SNF Agora Institute, last updated 27 May 2020, <https://bioethics.jhu.edu/research-and-outreach/covid-19-bioethics-expert-insights/resources-for-addressing-key-ethical-areas/grappling-with-the-ethics-of-social-distancing/>
- Bognar, Greg and Iwao Hirose. (2014). *The Ethics of Health Care Rationing: An Introduction*. Routledge. (electronic whole text available online via NYU Library search)
- Buchanan, David R. (2008). "Autonomy, Paternalism, and Justice: Ethical Priorities in Public Health," *Health Policy and Ethics*, 98(1): 15-21.
- Buchanan, David R. (2015). "Promoting Justice and Autonomy in Public Policies to Reduce the Health Consequences of Obesity," *Kennedy Institute of Ethics Journal*, 25(4): 395-417.
- Conly, Sarah. (2012). *Against autonomy: justifying coercive paternalism*. Cambridge University Press.
- Conly, Sarah. (2014). "Against autonomy: justifying coercive paternalism," Author meets critics: precis, *Journal of Medical Ethics*, 40(5): 349.
- Courtwright, Andrew. (2009). "Justice, Stigma, and the New Epidemiology of Health Disparities," *Bioethics*, 23(2): 90-96.
- Emanuel, Ezekiel J. (2012). "Global Justice and the 'Standard of Care' Debates." In Joseph Millum and Ezekiel J. Emanuel (eds.), *Global Justice and Bioethics*. Oxford University Press.
- Faden, Ruth and Madison Powers. (2011). "A Social Justice Framework for Health and Science Policy," *Cambridge Quarterly of Healthcare Ethics*, 20, 596-604.
- Fricker, Miranda. (2013). "Epistemic justice as a condition of political freedom?" *Synthese*, 190: 1317-1332.
- Goldberg, Daniel. (2009). "In Support of a Broad Model of Public Health: Disparities, Social Epidemiology and Public Health Causation," *Public Health Ethics*, 2(1): 70-83.
- Gopichandran, Vijayaprasad et. al. (2020). "COVID-19 Pandemic: a Litmus Test of Trust in the Health System," *Asian Bioethics Review*, 12: 213-221.
- Hawley, Katherine. (2014). "Trust, Distrust, and Commitment," *Noûs*, 48(1): 1-20.
- "Katrina's Aftermath: Public Health Concerns." (6 September 2005). News Release, Johns Hopkins Bloomberg School of Public Health: https://www.jhsph.edu/news/news-releases/2005/katrina/katrina_health.html
- Liao, Matthew S. (2019). "Human Rights and Public Health Ethics." *The Oxford Handbook of Public Health Ethics*, Ed. Mastroianni, Kahn and Kass. Oxford University Press.
- Lignou, Sapfo. (2011). "The 'standard of care' debate and global justice in research," *Research Ethics*, 7(1): 5-12.
- Lillie-Blanton, Marsha et al. (2008). "Reducing Racial, Ethnic, and Socioeconomic Disparities in Health Care: Opportunities in National Health Reform," *Journal of Law, Medicine & Ethics*, Health Care Symposium Winter 2008, 693-702.
- MacKay, Douglas. (2015). "Standard of Care, Institutional Obligations, and Distributive Justice," *Bioethics*, 29(4): 262-273.

- McGary, Howard. (2015). "Racial Groups, Distrust, and the Distribution of Health Care." In Rhodes, Battin and Silvers (eds.), *Medicine and Social Justice: Essays on the Distribution of Health Care*. Oxford University Press.
- Mill, J.S. (2007). In Stefan, Collini (ed.), *On Liberty and Other Writings*. Cambridge University Press.
- Morley, Jessica et al. (4 June 2020). "Ethical guidelines for COVID-19 tracing apps," *Nature*, Comment, 582, 29-31.
- Nguyen, C. Thi. (forth. pre-print) "Trust as an Unquestioning Attitude" In *Oxford Studies in Epistemology*
- Nussbaum, Martha. (2003). "Capabilities as Fundamental Entitlements: Sen and Social Justice." *Feminist Economics*, 9(23): 33-59.
- Persad, Govind. (2019). "Justice and Public Health." *The Oxford Handbook of Public Health Ethics*, Ed. Mastroianni, Kahn and Kass. Oxford University Press.
- Powers, Madison, Ruth Faden and Yashar Saghai. (2012). "Liberty, Mill and the Framework of Public Health Ethics," *Public Health Ethics*, 5(1): 6-15.
- Quinn, Sandra Crouse. (2006). "Hurricane Katrina: A Social and Public Health Disaster," *American Journal of Public Health*, 96(2): 204.
- Rawls, J. (1971). *A Theory of Justice*. Harvard University Press.
- "Re-Opening the Nation: Privacy, Surveillance, and Digital Tools for Contact Tracing" with Mildred Solomon, Ed Felton and Ryan Calo, The Hastings Center webinar recording, 18 May 2020, <https://www.thehastingscenter.org/re-opening-the-nation/>
- "Re-Opening the Nation: What Values Should Guide Us?" with Mildred Solomon, Danielle Allen, and Ezekiel Emanuel, Hastings Center webinar recording, 21 April 2020, https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=ahjo9oQ4lk8&feature=emb_title
- Rothstein, Mark. (2002). "Rethinking the Meaning of Public Health," *The Journal of Law, Medicine & Ethics*, 30, 144-149.
- Travis R. Rieder, Anne Barnhill, Justin Bernstein and Brian Hutler. (28 April 2020). "When to Reopen the Nation is an Ethics Question-Not Only a Scientific One," The Hastings Center, Bioethics Forum Essay, <https://www.thehastingscenter.org/when-to-reopen-the-nation-is-an-ethics-question-not-only-a-scientific-one/>
- Ashkan Soltani, Ryan Calo and Carl Bergstrom. (27 April 2020). "Contact-tracing apps are not a solution to the COVID-19 crisis," Brookings
- Timmons, Mark. (2013). *Moral Theory: An Introduction*. 2nd Ed. Rowman & Littlefield. (electronic whole text available online via NYU Library search)
- Valles, Sean. (2019). "A pluralistic and socially responsible philosophy of epidemiology field should actively engage with social determinants of health and health disparities," *Synthese*, Online first 05 March 2019, doi.org/10.1007/s11229-019-02161-5
- Wolff, Jonathan. (2012). "The Basis of the Global Health Duty." In Joseph Millum and Ezekiel Emanuel (eds.), *Global Justice and Bioethics*. Oxford University Press.
- Wringe, Bill. (2018). "Global Obligations and the Human Right to Health." In Kendy Hss, Violetta Ighneski and Tracy Isaacs (eds.), *Collectivity: Ontology, Ethics, and Social Justice*. Rowman and Littlefield.
- Additional reading TBA based on current events

STATEMENT OF ACADEMIC INTEGRITY:

The NYU College of Global Public Health values both open inquiry and academic integrity. Students in the program are expected to follow standards of excellence set forth by New York University. Such standards include respect, honesty and responsibility. The CGPH does not tolerate violations to academic integrity including:

- Plagiarism
- Cheating on an exam
- Submitting your own work toward requirements in more than one course without prior approval from the instructor
- Collaborating with other students for work expected to be completed individually
- Giving your work to another student to submit as his/her own
- Purchasing or using papers or work online or from a commercial firm and presenting it as your own work

STUDENTS WITH DISABILITIES:

Students with disabilities should contact the Moses Center for Students with Disabilities regarding the resources available to them, and to determine what classroom accommodations should be made available. More information about the Moses Center can be found here: <https://www.nyu.edu/life/safety-health-wellness/students-with-disabilities.html>.

Students requesting accommodation must obtain a letter from the Moses Center to provide to me as early in the semester as possible.



NYU

**COLLEGE OF GLOBAL
PUBLIC HEALTH**

GPH-GU 1008

Topics in Bioethics: Controversies and Politics⁵
(4 credits)

Class Schedule: W 6:45-8:45 PM

Class Location: SILV 506

Semester and Year: Spring 2020

Professor: Michelle M. Dyke

Phone: +1 212 998 3867 (extension 83867)

Email: michelle.dyke@nyu.edu

Office: Room 1226 at 719 Broadway

Office Hours: M 3-5 PM or by appointment

COURSE DESCRIPTION:

While medicine may aspire to objectivity, it remains a human practice that is often shaped by our personal values and political commitments. In this course, we will examine some of the ways in which medicine is 'value-laden' and in which our political commitments may inform our medical practices. We will ask questions like: how do we define health and disease? How do we draw the line between mental illness and mere mental difference? What role should a medical professional's personal values play in their practice? Should doctors have a right to refuse to perform medical procedures that violate their personal moral commitments? To what extent should medical systems accommodate patients' religious and cultural practices? We will address these questions, among others, by reading work from philosophy, political theory, and by examining case studies.

PRE-REQUISITES:

No Pre-requisites. Students must either be enrolled in the MA program in Bioethics at NYU or have permission from the instructor to take this class.

COURSE REQUIREMENTS AND EXPECTATIONS:

- Students are expected to complete assignments on time and at a standard appropriate to a graduate level course. See below for policies on grading and late work.
- Students are expected to come to class having read the assigned readings for that session. Note that the assignment of an article does *not* indicate that the course instructor agrees with everything the author has written. The purpose of our discussions and writing assignments will be to engage critically with the views and arguments we encounter.
- Students are expected to participate actively in class discussions and to treat others with respect. For more detail on classroom policies, see the sections below.

ASSIGNMENTS:

Seminar Attendance and Participation (15% of term grade):

⁵ This is an abridged version of the official syllabus, which is 14 pages long and includes even more detail, on e.g. grading policies, in accordance with NYU GPH requirements.

- This is a discussion-based graduate seminar. Regular seminar attendance is required for this course. Material may be covered in class that is not covered in the reading. Each student is allowed one unexcused absence. Further unexcused absences will negatively affect participation as follows:
 - One unexcused absence: Student may receive a maximum grade of 'A-' for participation, but may receive a lower grade depending on other aspects of participation.
 - Two unexcused absences: Student may receive a maximum grade of 'B+' for participation, but may receive a lower grade depending on other aspects of participation.
 - Three unexcused absences: Student may receive a maximum grade of 'B' for participation, but may receive a lower grade depending on other aspects of participation.
 - More than three unexcused absences: Student may receive a maximum grade of 'B-' for participation, but may receive a lower grade depending on other aspects of participation.
- If a student must be absent more than one time from this course, that student should seek permission from me via email at least twelve hours before the beginning of class. If permission is granted, the absence counts as excused. (Note that religious holidays count as excused, but please do notify me in advance.) Sometimes (e.g. for medical or family emergencies), I understand that advance notice is not possible; please send me an email once you're able.
- Regular attendance is not all that is required for satisfactory participation. Students must come to class having completed the assigned readings and must actively contribute to classroom discussions in a way that is respectful and on-topic. (Asking questions does count as participation!) Participation grades will be determined as follows:

Midterm Paper (35% of term grade): This is a relatively short paper that should engage critically with one or more of our assigned course readings.

- It should be 5-7 pages (before References), double-spaced, Times New Roman 12-pt, with 1" margins.
- This is an argumentative paper. Your thesis statement (which should appear by the end of the first page) must take an opinionated ethical stance. The thesis should not be obviously true. (Nor should it be the kind of straightforwardly factual claim that would be apparent to anyone who has done adequate empirical research.) The rest of your paper will be dedicated to proving your thesis true, using arguments and examples of your own. Walk your reader slowly through your process of reasoning. This is your chance to make clear, and to defend, your own opinion on the issues we have been discussing in class.
- "Mere summary" of the views and arguments of our assigned course authors should take up no more than half of the paper. Remember you don't need to (and should not!) summarize the whole paper(s) to which you are responding. You want to present as much background information as is necessary for the rest of your paper (focusing on your own arguments for your own view) to make sense.
- Towards the end of the paper, you should raise and respond to (at least) one potential objection to your thesis. Imagine: What would some smart friends or colleagues of yours say if they weren't fully convinced yet by your case for your thesis? What could you say in reply? How devastating do you find this objection in the end?
- Additional outside research is not necessary for this paper. (It will be required for the longer term paper.) This shorter assignment is intended to provide practice with philosophical writing for the term paper.
- You will be given some prompts/topic ideas for this paper, though you're also welcome to pick your own topic. I will post an Assignment Sheet with more details on NYUClasses at least two weeks in advance of the due date. Your topic should be related to the course readings we have already discussed in class.
- The assignment will be submitted online via NYUClasses.
- These assignments will receive letter grades in accordance with the standards described below under "Grading Scale." I will also provide written comments.

Research Paper (50% in total of term grade):

Proposal with Outline—5%

- Note: This assignment will be graded A (100) or F (0) for completion. (Late penalties may also apply.) I will also provide written comments.
- If your proposed topic is not appropriate for this course, you will be asked to write another proposal on another topic. You will not be penalized for handing in that second proposal after the assignment deadline.
- I encourage you to meet with me at least once during this term to discuss paper ideas.
- An Assignment Sheet that describes expectations for the final paper project will be uploaded to NYUClasses at least two weeks before the due date of the outline. Submission of the outline will be online via NYUClasses.

Final Research Paper—45%

- Write a final paper based on your outline. Your paper must be between 14 and 17 pages in length (before References), double-spaced, 1" margins, in Times New Roman font, 12-point.
- Like the midterm, this paper must be an argumentative piece of writing. It must have a thesis statement (to appear by the end of the first page), to which the rest of the paper is dedicated to proving. You must advance and defend an argument, and raise and respond to potential objections. (At least two for the final paper!)
- Remember to include grammatically correct and academically responsible citations of sources. This is a graduate-level course with corresponding expectations; students must engage in proper citation practices. See the below statement on Academic Integrity.
- If you do not have much experience writing philosophy papers, I encourage you to check out Professor Jim Pryor's guide: <http://www.jimpryor.net/teaching/guidelines/writing.html>. We will also discuss expectations in class.
- Submission of the final paper will be via NYUClasses.
- These assignments will receive letter grades in accordance with the standards described below under "Grading Scale." I will also provide written comments. I will be looking above all for accuracy, originality, and clarity, in addition to proper citation of source material.
- **Note for Bioethics MA students:** If you're on the lookout for a paper to develop into a writing sample or MA thesis, this assignment is a great starting point. I'd be happy to talk to students individually about how to get the most out of this project, given your particular academic goals.

GRADING COMPONENTS:

Item:	Percentage or Points:
Seminar Participation	15%
Midterm paper	35%
Final paper proposal/outline	5%
Final paper	45%

Policy on Late Work

Work submitted after the deadline will be penalized by 1/3 of a letter grade (e.g. from what would have been a B+ to a B) for each additional 24-hour period the assignment is late. (The first deduction occurs after the deadline has passed.) This is an issue of fairness to your fellow students. Exceptions will be granted only in cases of emergency. All deadlines are indicated here for your information at the start of term. (If you know in advance that you will be unable to meet one of these deadlines, please send me an email or see me in person to discuss your situation.)

NYU CLASSES:

NYU Classes will be used extensively throughout the semester for assignments, readings, and announcements. NYU Classes is accessible using your NYU login at <https://home.nyu.edu/academics>

TECHNOLOGY POLICY:

Ringers of mobile devices (phones, pagers, tablets, etc.) will be turned off or, if absolutely necessary, placed on vibrate prior to class. Laptops and tablets can be used in the classroom if necessary to take notes and download/read course materials. However, laptop use is discouraged and the taking of paper notes is preferred. (Students should also close laptops whenever possible to facilitate seminar-style discussion.) Research suggests that non-academic use of the internet is associated with poorer learning outcomes. Non-academic use of the internet in class will affect one's participation grade.

COURSE OUTLINE:

Note that assigned readings and deadlines are subject to modification if appropriate; I will email you well in advance if this occurs.

Date	Topics	Readings for Session	Assignments Due
Week 1 Jan 29	Introduction: Values, Objectivity, and the Practice of Medicine	Kelly et al. (2015), "The importance of values in evidence-based medicine" Optional further reading: Howick (2011)	
Week 2 Feb 5	A Right to Healthcare? I: Philosophical Foundations for Human Rights and the Link to Healthcare	Daniels, (2008), "5: What Do We Owe Each Other?" <i>Just Health</i> Nickel (2016), "Can a right to health care be justified by linkage arguments?" Optional Background: Liao (2016) Optional further reading: Ram-Tiktin (2012)	
Week 3 Feb 12	A Right to Healthcare? II: American and International Politics	Schimmel (2013), "The Place of Human Rights in American Efforts to Expand and Universalize Healthcare" Watch "Why the U.S. pays	

		<p>more for health care than the rest of the world,” <i>PBS NewsHour</i>, Apr 27 2017</p> <p>Current journalism TBA</p>	
<p>Week 4 Feb 19</p>	<p>A Right to Healthcare? III: What Counts as “Healthcare?” Case Study: Insurance Coverage of Facial Feminization Surgery for Trans Individuals</p>	<p>Dubov and Fraenkel (2018), “Facial Feminization Surgery: The Ethics of Gatekeeping in Transgender Health”</p> <p>Antommara (2018), “Accepting Things at Face Value: Insurance Coverage for Transgender Health Care”</p> <p>Optional further reading: Ashley & Ells (2018)</p>	
<p>Week 5 Feb 26</p>	<p>Religious and Personal Exemption I: Arguments Against the “Conscience Objection” for Healthcare Providers</p>	<p>Schuklenk (2019), “Conscience-based refusal of patient care in medicine: a consequentialist analysis”</p> <p>Hughes (2017), “Conscientious objection, professional duty and compromise: A response to Savulescu and Schuklenk”</p> <p>Savulescu & Schuklenk, (2018), “Conscientious objection and compromising the patient: Response to Hughes”</p>	
<p>Week 6 Mar 4</p>	<p>Religious and Personal Exemption II: A Feminist Argument in Favor of Conscience Objection (with Patient Protection Clauses)</p>	<p>Burke (2016), “Conscience Exemptions in Medicine: A Hegelian Feminist Perspective”</p> <p>Optional further reading: Maclure & Dumont (2017) (and more from same journal issue)</p>	
<p>Week 7 Mar 11</p>	<p>Religious and Personal Exemption III: Case Study: Childhood Measles Vaccination in Brooklyn, NY</p>	<p>Pager & Mays (2019), NYTimes, “New York Declares Measles Emergency, Requiring Vaccinations in Parts of Brooklyn”</p> <p>Jamrozik et al. (2016), “Victims, vectors and villains”</p>	

		Optional further reading: Bester (2018), "Not a matter of parental choice but of social justice obligation: Children are owed measles vaccination"	
NO CLASS SPRING BREAK WEEK			
Week 8 Mar 25	Controversies in Medical Research I: The Ethics of Human Embryonic Stem Cell Research	Marquis, (2007), "The Moral-Principle Objection to Human Embryonic Stem Cell Research"	Midterm Paper Due via NYUClasses by Start of Class on the 25th
Week 9 Apr 1	Controversies in Medical Research II: Non-Christian Perspectives on Embryonic Stem Cell Research	Sivaraman & Noor, (2016), "Human Embryonic Stem Cell Research: Ethical Views of Buddhist, Hindu and Catholic Leaders in Malaysia" Fadel, (2012), "Developments in Stem Cell Research and Therapeutic Cloning: Islamic Ethical Positions, A Review"	
Week 10 Apr 8 *Passover	Controversies in Medical Research III: Case Study: Motives for Egg Donation in a (2004/2005) South Korean Study	Baylis, (2009), "For love or money? The saga of Korean women who provided eggs for embryonic stem cell research" Optional further reading: McLeod and Baylis, (2007), "Donating Fresh Versus Frozen Embryos to Stem Cell Research: In Whose Interest?"	
Week 11 Apr 15	Bioethical Controversies in Psychiatry I: Personality Disorders – Moral or Medical?	Pickard, (2009), "Mental illness is indeed a myth" Background reading: Charland, (2006), "Moral Nature of the DSM-IV Cluster B Personality Disorders"	
Week 12 Apr 22	Bioethical Controversies in Psychiatry II: Agency and Authenticity - Medication for ADHD in Children	Singh, (2005), "Will the 'Real Boy' Please Behave: Dosing Dilemmas for Parents of Boys with ADHD"	

		Hughes, (2005), "Beyond 'Real Boys' and Back to Parental Obligations" Erlor, (2013), "ADHD and Stimulant Drug Treatment: What Can the Children Teach Us?"	
Week 13 Apr 29	Topic TBD in Light of Current Events	Readings TBA	Final Paper Proposal with Outline Due, NYUClasses, by Start of Class on the 29th
Week 14 May 6 May 13 Wednesday	Class Debates on TBD Topic	No new reading Final Research Paper	Due 6:45 pm, NYUClasses, on May 13

READING/VIEWING LIST (including optional suggestions for further reading):

- Antommaria, Armand H. Matheny. (2018). "Accepting Things at Face Value: Insurance Coverage for Transgender Health Care," *The American Journal of Bioethics*, 18(12), 21-23.
- Ashley, Florence and Carolyn Ells. (2018). "In Favor of Covering Ethically Important Cosmetic Surgeries: Facial Feminization Surgery for Transgender People," *The American Journal of Bioethics*, 18(12), 23-25.
- Baylis, Françoise. (2009). "For love or money? The saga of Korean women who provided eggs for embryonic stem cell research," *Theoretical Medicine and Bioethics*, 30, 385-396.
- Bester, Johan. (2018). "Not a matter of parental choice but of social justice obligation: Children are owed measles vaccination," *Bioethics*, 32, 611-619.
- Burke, Victoria. (2016). "Conscience Exemptions in Medicine: A Hegelian Feminist Perspective," *International Journal of Applied Philosophy*, 30(2), 267-287.
- Charland, Louis C. (2006). "Moral Nature of the DSM-IV Cluster B Personality Disorders," *Journal of Personality Disorders*, 20(2), 116-125.
- Daniels, Norman. (2008). *Just Health: Meeting Health Needs Fairly*. Cambridge University Press.
- Dubov, Alex and Liana Fraenkel. (2018). "Facial Feminization Surgery: The Ethics of Gatekeeping in Transgender Health," *The American Journal of Bioethics*, 18(12), 3-9.
- Erlor, Alexandre. (2013). "ADHD and stimulant drug treat: What can the children teach us?" *Journal of Medical Ethics*, 39(6), 357-358.
- Fadel, Hossam E. (2012). "Developments in Stem Cell Research and Therapeutic Cloning: Islamic Ethical Positions, A Review," *Bioethics*, 26(3), 128-135.
- Howick, Jeremy. (2011). *The Philosophy of Evidence-Based Medicine*. Wiley-Blackwell.

- Hughes, James. (2005). "Beyond 'Real Boys' and Back to Parental Obligations," *The American Journal of Bioethics*, 5(3), 61-62.
- Hughes, Jonathan A. (2017). "Conscientious objection, professional duty and compromise: A response to Savulescu and Schuklenk," *Bioethics*, 32, 126-131.
- Jamrozik et al. (2016). "Victims, vectors and villains: are those who opt out of vaccination morally responsible for the deaths of others?" *Journal of Medical Ethics*, 42, 762-768.
- Kelly, Michael et al. (2015), "The importance of values in evidence-based medicine," *BMC Medical Ethics*, 16(69), 1-8.
- Liao, S. Matthew. (2016). "Health(care) and human rights: a fundamental conditions approach," *Theoretical Medical Bioethics*, 37, 259-274.
- Maclure, Jocelyn and Isabelle Dumont. (2017). "Selling conscience short: a response to Schuklenk and Smalling on conscientious objections by medical professionals," *Journal of Medical Ethics*, 43(4), 241-244.
- Marquis, Don. (2007). "The Moral-Principle Objection to Human Embryonic Stem Cell Research," *Metaphilosophy*, 38(2-3), 190-206.
- McLeod, Carolyn and Françoise Baylis. (2007). "Donating Fresh Versus Frozen Embryos to Stem Cell Research: In Whose Interests?" *Bioethics*, 21(9), 465-477.
- Nickel, James. (2016). "Can a right to health care be justified by linkage arguments?" *Theoretical Medicine and Bioethics*, 37, 293-306.
- Pager, Tyler and Jeffery C. Mays. (Apr 9 2019). "New York Declares Measles Emergency, Requiring Vaccinations in Parts of Brooklyn," *The New York Times*.
- *PBS NewsHour*, feat. Paul Solman and Elisabeth Rosenthal. Apr 27 2017. "Why the U.S. pays more for health care than the rest of the world."
- Pickard, Hanna. (2009). "Mental illness is indeed a myth." In Matthew Broome and Lisa Bortolotti (Eds.) *Psychiatry as Cognitive Neuroscience: Philosophical Perspectives*. Oxford University Press. 83-101.
- Ram-Tiktin, Efrat. (2012). "The Right to Health Care as a Right to Basic Human Functional Capacities," *Ethical Theory and Moral Practice*, 15, 337-351.
- Savulescu, Julian and Udo Schuklenk. (2018). "Conscientious objection and compromising the patient: Response to Hughes," *Bioethics*, 32, 473-476.
- Schimmel, Noam. (2013). "The Place of Human Rights in American Efforts to Expand and Universalize Healthcare," *Human Rights Review*, 14, 1-29.
- Schuklenk, Udo. (2019). "Conscience-based refusal of patient care in medicine: a consequentialist analysis," *Theoretical Medicine and Bioethics*, 40, 523-538.
- Singh, Iina. (2005). "Will the 'Real Boy' Please Behave: Dosing Dilemmas for Parents of Boys with ADHD," *The American Journal of Bioethics*, 5(3), 34-47.
- Sivaraman, Mathana Amaris Fiona and Siti Nurani Mohd Noor. (2016). "Human Embryonic Stem Cell Research: Ethical Views of Buddhist, Hindu and Catholic Leaders in Malaysia," *Science and Engineering Ethics*, 22(2), 467-485.
- Additional reading TBD based on current events

STATEMENT OF ACADEMIC INTEGRITY:

The NYU College of Global Public Health values both open inquiry and academic integrity. Students in the program are expected to follow standards of excellence set forth by New York University. Such standards include respect, honesty and responsibility. The CGPH does not tolerate violations to academic integrity including:

- Plagiarism
- Cheating on an exam
- Submitting your own work toward requirements in more than one course without prior approval from the instructor
- Collaborating with other students for work expected to be completed individually
- Giving your work to another student to submit as his/her own
- Purchasing or using papers or work online or from a commercial firm and presenting it as your own work

STUDENTS WITH DISABILITIES:

Students with disabilities should contact the Moses Center for Students with Disabilities regarding the resources available to them, and to determine what classroom accommodations should be made available. More information about the Moses Center can be found here: <https://www.nyu.edu/life/safety-health-wellness/students-with-disabilities.html>.

Students requesting accommodation must obtain a letter from the Moses Center to provide to me as early in the semester as possible.

**UGPH-GU 28*****Ethics and Identity: Disability, Gender, and Race⁶***
(4 credits)

Class Schedule: MW 9:30-10:45 AM

Class Location: BOBS Room LL 150

Semester and Year: Spring 2020

Professor: Michelle M. Dyke

Phone: +1 212 998 3867 (extension 83867)

Email: michelle.dyke@nyu.edu

Office: Room 1226 at 719 Broadway

Office Hours: M 3-5 or by appointment

COURSE DESCRIPTION:

This course will involve an examination of a variety of ethical issues of contemporary significance that arise in connection with our evolving understanding of disability, gender and race. We will address foundational metaphysical questions such as: What is disability? What is gender, and how might it be different from biological sex? What defines race, and to what extent are these factors natural or social? We will focus especially on ethical questions regarding how disability status, gender or race should affect (or should not affect) how we treat others. For example: Should we regard a person's own self-identification with a particular racial group as fully authoritative? Should new medications be tested for safety and efficacy separately in men and in women? What would justice for the disabled involve? Is there something ethically objectionable about using modern medical technology to prevent children from being born with disabilities?

PRE-REQUISITES:

No Pre-requisites. Open to all undergraduates.

COURSE REQUIREMENTS AND EXPECTATIONS:

- Students are expected to complete readings and assignments on time and at a standard appropriate for a college course. See below for policies on grading and late work.
- Students are expected to come to class having read the assigned readings for that session. Note that the assignment of an article does *not* indicate that the course instructor agrees with everything the author has written. The purpose of our discussions and writing assignments will be to engage critically with the views and arguments we encounter.
- Students are expected to participate actively in class discussions and to treat others with respect. For more detail on classroom policies, see the sections below.

ASSIGNMENTS:***Attendance and Participation (10%):***

⁶ This is an abridged version of the official syllabus, which is 12 pages long and includes even more detail, on e.g. grading policies, in accordance with NYU GPH requirements.

- Regular class attendance is required for this course. Material may be covered in class that is not covered in the reading. Each student is allowed two unexcused absences. Further unexcused absences will negatively affect participation as follows:
 - Three unexcused absences: Student may receive a maximum grade of 'A-' for participation, but may receive a lower grade depending on other aspects of participation.
 - Four unexcused absences: Student may receive a maximum grade of 'B+' for participation, but may receive a lower grade depending on other aspects of participation.
 - Five unexcused absences: Student may receive a maximum grade of 'B' for participation, but may receive a lower grade depending on other aspects of participation.
 - More than five unexcused absences: Student may receive a maximum grade of 'B-' for participation, but may receive a lower grade depending on other aspects of participation.
- If a student must be absent more than one time from this course, that student should seek permission from me via email at least twelve hours before the beginning of class. If permission is granted, the absence counts as excused. (Note that religious holidays count as excused, but please do notify me in advance.) Sometimes (e.g. for medical or family emergencies), I understand that advance notice is not possible; please send me an email once you're able.
- Regular attendance is not all that is required for satisfactory participation. Students must come to class having completed the assigned readings and must actively contribute to classroom discussions in a way that is respectful and on-topic. (Asking questions does count as participation!) Participation grades will be determined as follows:

Short Papers (60% of total grade at 20% each): Throughout the semester, you will be required to hand in three short papers, each of which will be written in response to one or more of our course readings. Each paper will be of the same style (and will be graded with the same criteria in mind).

- These papers should be no more than 4-6 pages in length, double-spaced (before References).
- No outside research is necessary for these assignments. Still, it's important to get in the habit of providing academically responsible and grammatically correct citations. You should provide a full citation for each reading you discuss, either in a Works Cited Page at the end (in the spirit of MLA style) or in a footnote the first time you mention the piece (in the spirit of Chicago style). Direct quotes must include page numbers for reference.
- These papers should demonstrate (i) that you have read and understood the views and arguments made in the relevant course reading, and, equally importantly, (ii) that you have thought on your own about those views and have developed an opinion about whether you find those views compelling or not (AND WHY).
- Your paper should be an argumentative piece of philosophical writing. It's an opinion paper. That means that the most important element of this kind of paper is your thesis statement. Take a stance. Do you agree or disagree with the author of our reading(s), and *WHY*? Your goal in this paper is to defend your thesis by providing arguments and examples of your own. Make your line of thought clear to your reader.
- Mere summary of the readings you're discussing should take up, ideally, no more than half of your paper. Summarize as much of the reading as is necessary to give background for the position for which you're arguing. Keep in mind: Every sentence in the paper should contribute to the goal of proving your thesis true.
- You can strengthen your arguments in support of your view by considering a potential objection and offering a reply. Ask yourself: What would a smart friend of yours ask if he or she was not yet fully convinced by your case for your thesis? What would you say in response? Walk your reader through this imagined debate.
- Each paper should also include a clear introduction paragraph at the beginning (which announces the topic of your paper, includes your thesis, and "signposts" the structure of the rest of the paper) as well

as a clear conclusion paragraph at the end (which briefly and succinctly summarizes what you've just argued). No need to wax poetic either at the beginning or the end. Keep it clear and succinct.

- For each assignment, you will be given options for topics to write about.
 - Topics will be announced two weeks before the deadline. A sheet will be uploaded to NYUClasses with more detailed instructions and expectations for writing and submitting the assignment.
 - I will grade these assignments in accordance with the standards described below under "Grading Scale." I will provide written comments along with the grade. I'll be looking, above all, for *accuracy* (in reconstructing the views of our course authors), *clarity* (sentence by sentence and also with regard to what opinion you've taken), and *engagement* with our course readings; I want to see a careful and in-depth explanation of why you hold the view that you do.

Initial Mini-quiz (5%): One quiz will be held at the start of a class early in the term.

- This will involve only a handful of short-answer (multiple-choice, T/F and fill-in-the-blank) questions designed to test comprehension of the assigned readings for that week's class meeting. You will have 20 minutes to complete the quiz. It will be closed-book, closed-note.
- This quiz is intended to help you gauge whether you're reading and understanding the assigned articles at the level of detail and sophistication expected for the course.
- Students with an excused absence on the day of the mini-quiz will make up an alternate version by arrangement with me. Students who miss the mini-quiz due to an unexcused absence will receive a 0 for the quiz.
- The questions on this quiz will also provide a model for the style of the short-answer questions to appear on the final exam. The final exam, however, will be cumulative, unlike this quiz, which will cover only one week's worth of reading. (And the final exam may cover some material that is presented in class but not in the assigned readings.)

Final Exam (25%):

- This will involve a combination of (more) short-answer and (fewer) long-answer questions. The short-answer questions will be modeled on the style of the initial mini-quiz and may include multiple-choice, T/F, and fill-in-the blank. The long-answer questions (answers of approx. two paragraphs each) to appear on the exam will be drawn from a study guide to be distributed in advance.
- The exam is cumulative for the term. Questions may cover material presented in class and/or in the readings.
- We will review more detailed expectations for the exam, and discuss practice questions, during the last class meeting.
- The exam will be held during the officially scheduled final exam block for the class. (See NYUAlbert for time and location.)

GRADING COMPONENTS:

Item:	Percentage
Participation	10%
Short Papers	20% each X3
Initial mini-quiz	5%
Final Exam	25%

Policy on Late Work

Work submitted after the deadline will be penalized by 1/3 of a letter grade (e.g. from what would have been a B+ to a B) for each additional 24-hour period the assignment is late. (The first deduction occurs after the deadline has passed.) This is an issue of fairness to your fellow students. Exceptions will be granted only in cases of emergency. All deadlines are indicated here for your information at the start of term. (If you know in advance that you will be unable to meet one of these deadlines, please send me an email or see me in person to discuss your situation.)

NYU CLASSES:

NYU Classes will be used extensively throughout the semester for assignments, readings, and announcements. NYU Classes is accessible using your NYU login at <https://home.nyu.edu/academics>

TECHNOLOGY POLICY:

Ringers of mobile devices (phones, pagers, tablets, etc.) will be turned off or, if absolutely necessary, placed on vibrate prior to class. Laptops and tablets can be used in the classroom if necessary to take notes and download/read course materials. However, laptop use is discouraged and the taking of paper notes is preferred. (Students should also close laptops whenever possible to facilitate seminar-style discussion.) Research suggests that non-academic use of the internet is associated with poorer learning outcomes. Non-academic use of the internet in class will affect one's participation grade.

COURSE OUTLINE:

Note that assigned readings and deadlines are subject to modification if appropriate; I will email you well in advance if this occurs.

Date	Topics	Readings for Week	Assignments Due
Week 1 Jan 27 Jan 29	Introduction: Ethics and Identity	Paula Moya (2006), "What's Identity Got to Do with It?" esp. pp. 96-104	
Week 2 Feb 3 Feb 5	Disability I: What is Disability?	Elizabeth Barnes (2016), <i>The Minority Body: A Theory of Disability</i> , Introduction and Chapter 1	
Week 3 Feb 10 Feb 12	Disability II: What is Disability, cont'd	Elizabeth Barnes, <i>The Minority Body</i> , Chapter 3 and "Replies"	Mini-Quiz in Class on the 12th
Week 4 Feb 17 NO CLASS (Pres' Day) Feb 19	Disability III: Justice for the Disabled	Adam Cureton (2016), "Offensive Beneficence"	
Week 5 Feb 24 Feb 26	Disability IV: Disability and Reproductive Ethics	Erik Parens and Adrienne Asch (1999), "The Disability Rights Critique of Prenatal	

	Case Study: Choosing Deafness	Genetic Testing” In class: N Levy (2002), “Deafness, culture, and choice”	Feb 28, 5pm: 1st Short Paper due via NYUClasses
Week 6 Mar 2 Mar 4	Gender I: Gender vs. Sex	Sally Haslanger and Jennifer Saul (2006), “Philosophical Analysis and Social Kinds,” selections	
Week 7 Mar 9 Mar 11	Gender II: Gender vs. Sex cont’d	Sally Haslanger (2013), “Gender and Race: What Are They? What Do We Want Them to Be?”	
NO CLASS SPRING BREAK WEEK			
Week 8 Mar 23 Mar 25	Gender III: Genderqueer Identity Discussion of Short Papers in Class	Robin Dembroff (forth.), “Beyond Binary: Genderqueer as Critical Gender Kind” *Optional: Dembroff (2019), “‘Yep, I’m Gay’: Understanding Agential Identity”	
Week 9 Mar 30 Apr 1	Gender IV: Case Studies: Representation of Women in Medical Research	Van der Zande et al. (2017), “Vulnerability of pregnant women in clinical research” Carleigh Krubiner and Ruth Faden (2017), “Pregnant women should not be categorized as a ‘vulnerable population’...” In class: Melloni et al. (2010), “Representation of Women in Randomized Clinical Trials of Cardiovascular Disease Prevention”	Apr 3, 5pm: 2nd Short Paper due via NYUClasses
Week 10 Apr 6 Apr 8 *Passover	Race I: What is Race?	Kwame Anthony Appiah (1996), “Race, Culture, Identity: Misunderstood Connections” in <i>Color Conscious: The Political</i>	

		<i>Morality of Race</i>	
Week 11 Apr 13 Apr 15	Race II: What is Race?, cont'd	Chike Jeffers (2019), "Cultural Constructionism," in <i>What is Race?: Four Philosophical Views</i>	
Week 12 Apr 20 Apr 22	Race III: Addressing Racial Injustice in the U.S. Case Study: Is One's Self-Identification Definitive?	Amy Gutman (1996), "Responding to Racial Injustice" in <i>Color Conscious: The Political Morality of Race</i> "Rachel Dolezal's True Lies: An Interview with Rachel Dolezal," July 19, 2015	
Week 13 Apr 27 Apr 29	Race IV: Healthcare Disparities and Trust in Healthcare Providers	Howard McGary (2015), "Racial Groups, Distrust, and the Distribution of Health Care"	May 1, 5pm: 3rd Short Paper due via NYUClasses
Week 14 May 4 May 6	"Epistemic Injustice" and Minorities	Jackie Leach Scully (2019), "Epistemic Exclusion, Injustice, and Disability" In class: excerpts from Fricker (2013), "Epistemic justice as a condition of political freedom?" Study guide to be distributed	
Week 15 May 11	Exam Review in Class We will have a final exam during the regularly scheduled exam block. Check NYU Albert for time & location.	See study guide Exam on Friday 5/15, 8:00 am – 9:50 am	

READING LIST:

- Appiah, Kwame Anthony. (1996). "Race, Culture, Identity: Misunderstood Connections" in *Color Conscious: The Political Morality of Race* by Kwame Anthony Appiah and Amy Gutman. Princeton University Press.
- Barnes, Elizabeth. (2018). "Against impairment: replies to Aas, Howard, and Francis," *Philosophical Studies* 175: 1151-1162.

- Barnes, Elizabeth. (2016). *The Minority Body: A Theory of Disability*. Oxford University Press, Oxford Scholarship Online.
- Cureton, Adam. (2016). "Offensive Beneficence," *Journal of the American Philosophical Association* 2(1): 74-90.
- Dembroff, Robin. (forthcoming). "Beyond Binary: Genderqueer as Critical Gender Kind," *Philosophers' Imprint*
- Dembroff, Robin. (2019). "'Yep, I'm Gay': Understanding Agential Identity," *Ergo* 6(20): 571-599.
- Fricker, Miranda. (2013). "Epistemic justice as a condition of political freedom?" *Synthese* 190: 1317-1332.
- Gutman, Amy. (1996). "Responding to Racial Injustice" in *Color Conscious: The Political Morality of Race* by Kwame Anthony Appiah and Amy Gutman. Princeton University Press.
- Haslanger, Sally. (2013). "Gender and Race: (What) Are They? (What) Do We Want Them to Be?" *Resisting Reality: Social Construction and Social Critique*. Oxford University Press, Oxford Scholarship Online.
- Haslanger, Sally and Jennifer Saul. (2006). "Philosophical Analysis and Social Kinds," *Proceedings of the Aristotelian Society, Supplementary Volumes* 80: 89-143.
- Jeffers, Chike. (2019). "Cultural Constructionism" in Joshua Glasgow, Sally Haslanger, Chike Jeffers, and Quayshawn Spencer (Eds.) *What is Race?: Four Philosophical Views*, Oxford University Press, Oxford Scholarship Online.
- Krubiner, Carleigh and Ruth Faden. (2017). "Pregnant women should not be categorised as a 'vulnerable population' in biomedical research studies: ending a vicious cycle of 'vulnerability'," *Journal of Medical Ethics* 43(10): 664-665.
- Levy, N. (2002). "Deafness, culture, and choice," *Journal of Medical Ethics* 28: 284-285.
- McGary, Howard. (2015). "Racial Groups, Distrust, and the Distribution of Health Care" in Rosamond Rhodes, Margaret Battin, and Anita Silvers (Eds.) *Medicine and Social Justice: Essays on the Distribution of Health Care*, Oxford University Press, Oxford Scholarship Online.
- Melloni et al. (2010). "Representation of Women in Randomized Clinical Trials of Cardiovascular Disease Prevention," *Circulation: Cardiovascular Quality and Outcomes* 3: 135-142.
- Moya, Paula. (2006). "What's identity got to do with it? Mobilizing identities in the multicultural classroom." In Linda Alcoff, Michael Hames-Garcis, Satya Mohanty & Paul Moya (Eds.) *Identity Politics Reconsidered*. Palgrave-Macmillan. 96-117.
- Parens, Erik and Adrienne Asch. (1999). "The Disability Rights Critique of Prenatal Genetic Testing," *The Hastings Center Report*, Special Supplement, 29(5): S1-S22.
- Samuels, Allison. (July 19, 2015). "Rachel Dolezal's True Lies: An Interview with Rachel Dolezal," *Vanity Fair*
- Scully, Jackie Leach. (2019). "Epistemic Exclusion, Injustice, and Disability." In Adam Cureton and David T. Wasserman (Eds.) *The Oxford Handbook of Philosophy and Disability*. Oxford University Press, Oxford Scholarship Online.
- Van der Zande et al. (2017). "Vulnerability of pregnant women in clinical research," *Journal of Medical Ethics* 43: 657-663.

STATEMENT OF ACADEMIC INTEGRITY:

The NYU College of Global Public Health values both open inquiry and academic integrity. Students in the program are expected to follow standards of excellence set forth by New York University. Such standards include respect, honesty and responsibility. The CGPH does not tolerate violations to academic integrity including:

- Plagiarism
- Cheating on an exam
- Submitting your own work toward requirements in more than one course without prior approval from the instructor
- Collaborating with other students for work expected to be completed individually
- Giving your work to another student to submit as his/her own
- Purchasing or using papers or work online or from a commercial firm and presenting it as your own work

STUDENTS WITH DISABILITIES:

Students with disabilities should contact the Moses Center for Students with Disabilities regarding the resources available to them, and to determine what classroom accommodations should be made available. More information about the Moses Center can be found here: <https://www.nyu.edu/life/safety-health-wellness/students-with-disabilities.html>.

Students requesting accommodation must obtain a letter from the Moses Center to provide to me as early in the semester as possible.

Sample Course Syllabus
Is There Anything We Ought to Do?
Collective Responsibility and the Ethics of Group Agency
(intended as an advanced undergraduate, or graduate, seminar)
Michelle M. Dyke

Course Description

We are familiar with the claims that single human beings can act intentionally, may be ethically responsible for their actions, and may be judged as rational or irrational in light of their attitudes and behaviors. But what about the many social groups of which we are members, such as volunteer organizations, hobby clubs, sports teams, committees, juries, corporations, universities, societies, and states? Can these groups or collectives act intentionally? Is their behavior wholly reducible to the contributing acts of their members? Are they ethically responsible for their actions? Is it ever right to say that the group as a whole is responsible *independently* of the sense in which each individual member bears responsibility? And as members of various kinds of social collectives, do we as individuals also have special duties or obligations? In this course, we will discuss some of the ethical issues that arise in connection with collective action and group agency. *We will conclude by debating applications to two urgent contemporary case studies: collective responsibility for global climate change and moral responsibility for structural injustices faced by minority groups in academia and in society at large.*

Sample Reading List

I. What is Collective Intention?

- Excerpts: Gilbert, Margaret. (1989). *On Social Facts*. New York: Routledge.
- Gilbert, Margaret. (1990). "Walking Together: A Paradigmatic Social Phenomenon," *Midwest Studies in Philosophy*, 15(1), 1-14. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1475-4975.1990.tb00202.x>
- Excerpts: Bratman, Michael E. (2014). *Shared Agency: A Planning Theory of Acting Together*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

II. Collective Moral Obligations

- Wringer, Bill. (2014). "Collective Obligations: Their Existence, Their Explanatory Power, and Their Supervenience on the Obligations of Individuals," *European Journal of Philosophy*, 24(2), 472-497. <https://doi.org/10.1111/ejop.12076>
- Giubilini, Alberto and Neil Levy. (2018). "What in the World Is Collective Responsibility?" *dialectica*, 72(2), 191-217. <https://doi.org/10.1111/1746-8361.12228>
- Stilz, Anna. (2011). "Collective Responsibility and the State," *The Journal of Political Philosophy*, 19(2), 190-208. <https://onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/abs/10.1111/j.1467-9760.2010.00360.x>

III. Making Sense of Group Agency

- Excerpts: List, Christian and Philip Pettit. (2011). *Group Agency: The Possibility, Design, and Status of Corporate Agents*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- List, Christian. (2014). "Three kinds of collective attitudes," *Erkenntnis*, 79(9 Supp.), <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10670-014-9631-z>
- Miller, Seumas and Pekka Makela. (2005). "The Collectivist Approach to Collective Moral Responsibility." *Metaphilosophy*, 36(5), 634-651.
- Hess, Kendy. (2018). "Does the Machine Need a Ghost? Corporate Agents as Nonconscious Kantian Moral Agents." *Journal of the American Philosophical Association*, 4(1), 67-86. <https://doi.org/10.1017/apa.2018.10>
- Excerpts: Rovane, Carol. (1998). *The Bounds of Agency: An Essay in Revisionary Metaphysics*. Princeton: Princeton University Press.
- Rovane, Carol. (2004). "Rationality and Persons." In *The Oxford Handbook of Rationality*. Ed. Alfred R. Mele and Piers Rawling. Oxford University Press.

*Optional Further reading:

- List, Christian. (2018). "What is it Like to be a Group Agent?" *Noûs*, 52(2), 295-319. <https://doi.org/10.1111/nous.12162>
- Dietz, Alexander. (2018). "Are My Temporal Parts Agents?" *Philosophy and Phenomenological Research*, Early View 19 September 2018. <https://doi.org/10.1111/phpr.12553>

IV. The Ethics of Group Agency

- French, Peter. (1979). "The Corporation as a Moral Person." *American Philosophical Quarterly*, 16(3), 207-215. <https://www.jstor.org/stable/20009760>
- Velasquez, Manuel. (2003). "Debunking Corporate Moral Responsibility." *Business Ethics Quarterly*, 13(4), 531-562. <https://www.jstor.org/stable/3857970>
- Copp, David. (2006). "On the Agency of Certain Collective Entities: An Argument from 'Normative Autonomy,'" *Midwest Studies in Philosophy*, 30, 194-221. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1475-4975.2006.00135.x>
- Pettit, Philip. (2007). "Responsibility Incorporated," *Ethics*, 117, 171-201. *Philosophy*, 48(1), 38-57. <https://doi.org/10.1111/josp.12181>
- Björnsson, Gunnar and Kendy Hess. (2017). "Corporate Crocodile Tears? On the Reactive Attitudes of Corporate Agents," *Philosophy and Phenomenological Research*, 94(2), 273-298. <https://doi.org/10.1111/phpr.12260>
- Haji, Ish. (2006). "On the Ultimate Responsibility of Collectives," *Midwest Studies in Philosophy*, 30(1), 292-308. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1475-4975.2006.00141.x>
- Hess, Kendy. (2014). "The free will of corporations (and other collectives)," *Philosophical Studies*, 168, 241-260. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11098-013-0128-4>
- Collins, Stephanie. (2017). "Duties of Group Agents and Group Members," *Journal of Social*

V. Non-Agent Social Groups

- Ritchie, Katherine. (2018). "Social Structures and the Ontology of Social Groups," *Philosophy and Phenomenological Research*, Early View 20 September 2018. <https://doi.org/10.1111/phpr.12555>
- Epstein, Brian. (2016). "What are social groups? Their metaphysics and how to classify them," *Synthese*, Online First 06 April 2017. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11229-017-1387-y>

VI. Real-World Case Studies:

Our Responsibility for Climate Change

- Wringer, Bill. (2019). "Global obligations, collective capacities, and 'ought implies can,'" *Philosophical Studies*, Online First 07 March 2019. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11098-019-01272-6>
- Jamieson, Dale. (2015). "Responsibility and Climate Change," *Global Justice: Theory, Practice, Rhetoric*, 8(2), 23-42. <https://doi.org/10.21248/gjn.8.2.86>

Responsibility for Structural Injustices in Academia and in Society

- Sangiovanni, Andrea. (2018). "Structural Injustice and Individual Responsibility," *Journal of Social Philosophy*, 49(3), 461-483. <https://doi.org/10.1111/josp.12250>
- Zheng, Robin. (2018). "What is My Role in Changing the System? A New Model of Responsibility for Structural Injustice," *Ethical Theory & Moral Practice*, 21, 869-855. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10677-018-9892-8>
- Atenasio, David. (2019). "Blameless Participation in Structural Injustice," *Social Theory and Practice*, 45(2), 149-177. <https://doi.org/10.5840/soctheorpract201942655>
- American Philosophical Association, (2019), "The Diversity and Inclusivity Survey: Final Report," Carolyn Dicey Jennings et al.
- Excerpts, *Advancing Diversity and Inclusion in Higher Education: Key Data Highlights Focusing on Race and Ethnicity and Promising Practices*, (November 2016), report in public domain by Office of Planning, Evaluation and Policy Development, Office of the Under Secretary, U.S. Department of Education

Course Requirements

The assignments for the course include one short **mid-term paper** (5-7 double-spaced pages) and one longer **final paper** (14-18 double-spaced pages). A list of suggested paper topics will be provided; students may also propose their own topics. The final paper may involve either a development of the ideas from the short paper assignment or an entirely new project. Students who elect to write their final papers on a new topic are highly encouraged to submit a draft/outline (2-4 pages, including a thesis statement) for preliminary feedback at least three weeks before the end of the term. All students are encouraged to schedule an optional meeting to discuss their final papers.

There will also be four informal "**mini-papers**" (1-2 double-spaced pages) due throughout the term. Each must present students' reactions to course readings assigned *after* the due date of the last mini-paper. They will be graded mostly for participation credit with written comments returned. These assignments are intended to ensure that students are keeping up with, and continuing to engage thoughtfully with, the assigned readings.

Grades will be calculated as follows:

25% midterm paper

45% final paper

20% mini-papers at 5% each x4

10% class participation

Sample Course Syllabus
Comparing Moral & Epistemic Normativity
(intended as an advanced undergraduate, or graduate, seminar)
Michelle M. Dyke

Course Description

Investigating the nature of moral demands has long been a central focus of philosophical inquiry. By comparison, far less attention has been devoted to investigating the nature of norms of epistemic rationality that govern what we ought to believe. In this course, we'll discuss recent work at the intersection of Epistemology, Ethics, and Metaethics that tackles important debates about the extent to which epistemic duties and reasons display some of the classic features of moral ones. We'll begin by discussing whether well-known meta-ethical objections to moral realism apply equally in the case of epistemic norms. Should we be realists about the requirements of epistemic rationality? We'll then turn to a cluster of related questions regarding what conditions are necessary for epistemic responsibility and whether the familiar slogan that "ought implies can" holds in the epistemic case. We'll debate the extent to which attributions of epistemic blame are analogous to attributions of moral blame. Next, we'll investigate whether epistemic norms directly regulate actions (such as inquiry) in addition to mental states like belief. We'll conclude the course by considering some of the special ways in which moral and epistemic reasons may interact. We'll begin by discussing the phenomenon of moral "encroachment" on what counts as epistemically rational. We'll then turn to consider how it might be appropriate to weigh epistemic vs. other practical reasons for belief in various contexts where they conflict.

Sample Reading List

I. Do Meta-Ethical Concerns Regarding Moral *Realism* Apply Equally to Epistemic Norms?

- Cuneo, Terence. (2007). *The Normative Web*, OUP, excerpts from Chapters 1-3 including "1: Moral Realism of a Paradigmatic Sort," "2: Defending the Parallel, and "3: The Parity Premise"
<https://doi.org/10.1093/acprof:oso/9780199218837.001.0001>
- Street, Sharon. (2009). "Evolution and the normativity of epistemic reasons," *Canadian Journal of Philosophy*, 39(S1), 213-248. <https://doi.org/10.1080/00455091.2009.10717649>
- Wedgwood, Ralph. (2007). "The Status of Normative Intuitions," *The Nature of Normativity*, OUP
<https://doi.org/10.1093/acprof:oso/9780199251315.003.0011>

II. 'Ought Implies Can,' Doxastic Voluntarism and Moral vs. Epistemic Agency

- Côté-Bouchard, Charles. (2019). "'Ought' implies 'can' against epistemic deontologism: beyond doxastic involuntarism," *Synthese*, 196, 1641-1656, <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11229-017-1531-8>
- Rott, Hans. (2017). "Negative Doxastic Voluntarism and the concept of belief," *Synthese*, 194, 2695-2720, <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11229-016-1032-1>
- Nelkin, Dana Kay. (2020). "Equal Opportunity: A Unifying Framework for Moral, Aesthetic, and Epistemic Responsibility," *Proceedings of the Aristotelian Society*, Vol. CXX, Part 2, 203-235.
<https://doi.org/10.1093/arisoc/aoaa010>

**Background:*

- Alston, W.P. (1988). "The deontological conception of epistemic justification," *Philosophical Perspectives*, 2, 257-299.

III. Moral vs. Epistemic *Blame*

- Kauppinen, Antti. (2018). "Epistemic Norms and Epistemic Accountability," *Philosophers' Imprint*, 18(8), www.philosophersimprint.org/018008/
- Boulton, Cameron. (2020). "There is a distinctively epistemic kind of blame," *Philosophy and Phenomenological Research*, <https://doi.org/10.1111/phpr.12726>
- Boulton, Cameron. (2017). "Epistemic normativity and the justification-excuse distinction," *Synthese*, 194, 4065-4081, <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11229-016-1127-8>
- Dougherty, Trent. (2010). "Reducing Responsibility: An Evidentialist Account of Epistemic Blame," *European Journal of Philosophy*, 20(4), 534-547, <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1468-0378.2010.00422.x>
- Dogramaci, Sinan. (2012). "Reverse Engineering Epistemic Evaluations," *Philosophy and Phenomenological Research*, 84(3), 513-530, <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1093-1592.2011.00566.x>

*Optional Historical Background:

- Clifford, W.K. (1877, republished 1999). "The ethics of belief," In T. Madigan (Ed.), *The ethics of belief and other essays*, Amherst, MA: Prometheus, 70-96.
- James, William. (1896, republished 1956). *The Will to Believe and other essays in popular philosophy*, New York: Dover, 1-31.

IV. Do Epistemic Norms Directly Regulate Actions Beyond Mental States?

- Leary, Stephanie. (2020). "Grounding the Domains of Reasons," *Australasian Journal of Philosophy*, 98(1), 137-152, <https://doi.org/10.1080/00048402.2019.1612930>
- Friedman, Jane. (2019). "Checking again," *Philosophical Issues*, 29(1), 84-96, <https://doi.org/10.1111/phis.12141>
- Friedman, Jane. (2019). "Inquiry and belief," *Noûs*, 53(2), 296-315, <https://doi.org/10.1111/nous.12222>
- Hedberg, Trevor. (2014). "Epistemic supererogation and its implications," *Synthese*, 191, 3621-3637, <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11229-014-0483-5>

V. Moral "Encroachment" (into epistemic territory)

- Bolinger, Renée Jorgensen. (2020). "Varieties of Moral Encroachment," *Philosophical Perspectives*, <https://doi.org/10.1111/phpe.12124>
- Fritz, James. (2020). "Moral encroachment and reasons of the wrong kind" *Philosophical Studies*, 177, 3051-3070. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11098-019-01359-0>
- Fritz, James and Elizabeth Jackson. (2020). "Belief, credence, and moral encroachment," *Synthese*, <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11229-020-02799-6>
- Worsnip, Alex. (2020). "Can Pragmatists Be Moderate?" *Philosophy and Phenomenological Research*, <https://doi.org/10.1111/phpr.12673>

VI. Comparing Our Different Kinds of Reasons for Belief

- Howard, Christopher. (2019). "Weighing epistemic and practical reasons for belief," *Philosophical Studies*, 177, 2227-2243. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11098-019-01307-y>
- Steglich-Petersen, Asbjorn and Mattias Skipper. (2019). "An Instrumentalist Account of How to Weigh Epistemic and Practical Reasons for Belief," *Mind* <https://doi.org/10.1093/mind/fz062>

- Maguire, Barry and Jack Woods. (2020). "The Game of Belief," *Philosophical Review*, 129(2), 211-249. <https://doi.org/10.1215/00318108-8012843>

Course Requirements

The assignments for the course include one short **mid-term paper** (5-7 double-spaced pages) and one longer **final paper** (14-18 double-spaced pages). A list of suggested paper topics will be provided; students may also propose their own topics. The final paper may involve either a development of the ideas from the short paper assignment or an entirely new project. Students who elect to write their final papers on a new topic are highly encouraged to submit a draft/outline (2-4 pages, including a thesis statement) for preliminary feedback at least three weeks before the end of the term. All students are encouraged to schedule an optional meeting to discuss their final papers.

There will also be four informal "**mini-papers**" (1-2 double-spaced pages) due throughout the term. Each must present students' reactions to course readings assigned *after* the due date of the last mini-paper. They will be graded mostly for participation credit with written comments returned. These assignments are intended to ensure that students are keeping up with, and continuing to engage thoughtfully with, the assigned readings.

Grades will be calculated as follows:

25% midterm paper

45% final paper

20% mini-papers at 5% each x4

10% class participation

Evidence of Teaching Effectiveness

Course Evaluation Results from NYU Students

The following pages include student evaluation results of all previous courses for which I was the sole or primary instructor, as conducted online by New York University.

In response to survey items, students submit scores between 1 and 5 (with higher numbers indicating a better evaluation).

The table below summarizes the key results (including averages for “overall evaluation of the course” and “overall evaluation of the instructor” for each course).

Term	Course	Course Rating	Instructor Rating	See pdf. pp. for full results
Summer 2020	Advanced Introduction to Public Health Ethics	5.0	5.0	66-67
Spring 2020	Topics in Bioethics: Controversies & Politics	4.5	4.6	68-71
Spring 2020	Ethics & Identity: Disability, Gender, and Race	4.3	4.5	72-74
Fall 2019	Advanced Introduction to Bioethics	4.5	4.6	75-77
Spring 2019	Topics in M&E: Moral Epistemology and the Debate Over Moral Realism	4.8	4.8	78-80
Fall 2018	Central Problems in Philosophy	4.3	4.4	81-83
Summer 2018	Central Problems in Philosophy	5.0	5.0	84-85
Summer 2017	Philosophy of Mind	4.8	4.8	86-87
Summer 2017	History of Modern Philosophy	4.5	4.7	88-89
Summer 2016	History of Modern Philosophy	4.5	4.7	90-91
Summer 2015	History of Modern Philosophy	4.07/4.75*	4.50/4.50*	92-95

*For the summer term 2015, the evaluation results are divided into two class sections. Regularly enrolled NYU undergraduates and visiting students enrolled in the same course under two different section numbers. These are 210001 for the regularly enrolled undergraduates and 2100060 for the visiting students.

Teaching Reference Letter

Professor Don Garrett will be providing a reference letter specifically describing my effectiveness as an instructor. This letter is based on his observation of a meeting of my History of Modern Philosophy course at NYU in 2017. It is also based on confidential reports from class observations by NYU faculty of some of my other previous courses and on my students' course evaluations. This letter will be sent from NYU along with my other confidential letters of reference.