

Teaching Portfolio

Last updated October 2022

Michelle M. Dyke

michelle.dyke@nyu.edu

www.michellemdyke.net

Contents

Teaching Experience and Qualifications

List of Courses Taught.....	page 2
Additional Training and Experience.....	3
Statement on Teaching and Advising Practices.....	4-5
Statement on Diversity, Equity, and Inclusion (DEI).....	6

Current and Previous Syllabi

Undergraduate:

Great Works in Philosophy (seminar format).....	pages 7-13
Central Problems in Philosophy (lecture).....	14-17
Topics in Metaphysics & Epistemology: Moral Epistemology and the Debate Over Moral Realism.....	18-23
Philosophy of Mind.....	24-26
History of Modern Philosophy.....	27-30
Ethics & Identity: Disability, Gender, and Race.....	31-42

MA:

Advanced Introduction to Bioethics.....	pages 43-53
Advanced Introduction to Public Health Ethics.....	54-67
Topics in Bioethics: Controversies & Politics.....	68-81

Additional Sample Syllabus

Seminar: Comparing Moral & Epistemic Normativity.....	pages 82-84
---	-------------

Evidence of Teaching Effectiveness

Student Course Evaluation Results

Summary Table and Selected Comments.....	pages 85-87
Full results.....	88-end

Teaching Experience and Qualifications

I have taught a variety of courses as the sole or primary instructor at New York University, beginning in 2015. 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 targeted primarily at undergraduate philosophy majors or bioethics MA students as well as courses for a general undergraduate audience with no prior instruction in philosophy.

Syllabi for all of my current and previous courses are included as part of this portfolio, along with complete results from my student course evaluations. I have also included a sample syllabus for an elective course in metaethics/meta-normative theory (“Comparing Moral and Epistemic Normativity”).

Courses Taught as Sole or Primary Instructor (New York University)

Undergraduate Seminar, Dept. of Philosophy

- Topics in the History of Philosophy: “Philosophy of Mind in the Early Modern and Modern Periods” (Spring 2023)
- Great Works in Philosophy (Fall 2022)
- 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 (Summers 2015, 2016 and 2017)

Undergraduate Lecture Course, Dept. of Philosophy

- Central Problems in Philosophy (Fall 2018)

Undergraduate Seminar, Center for Bioethics

- Ethics & Identity: Disability, Gender, and Race (Spring 2020 and Spring 2021)

Graduate (MA) Seminar, Center for Bioethics

- Advanced Introduction to Bioethics (Fall 2019, Fall 2020, and Fall 2021)
- Advanced Introduction to Public Health Ethics (Summer 2020 and Spring 2022)
- Topics in Bioethics: Controversies and Politics (Spring 2020, Spring 2021, and Spring 2022)

As Primary Instructor (The City College of New York, CUNY)

Undergraduate, Dept. of Philosophy

- Introduction to Philosophy (Spring 2023)

Previous Experience as Teaching Assistant (New York University)

College of Arts & Science Core Curriculum

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

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)

Additional Training and Experience

MA Thesis Advising

As a faculty member of NYU's Center for Bioethics from 2019-2022, I was responsible for the academic advising of a share of the MA students in Bioethics. Academic advising included supervision of the writing and defense of an MA thesis of 15,000 words. The thesis incorporates original analysis of ethical issues with discussion of the student's work or volunteer experience in an external practicum component of the program.

Experience Supervising Teaching Assistants

While 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, as well as for the "Advanced Introduction to Public Health Ethics." 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 onward) assisting with hybrid-format teaching of both in-person and virtual students.

Teacher Training Completed

- Workshop: Improving Student Writing, NYU 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

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 while participating in these programs has been to convey excitement about the study of philosophy while helping students to strengthen their skills in critical thinking and collaborative discussion. It has also been my aim to help normalize the idea of an academic career path in any discipline.

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

² <https://highschoollethicsbowl.com>

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

Great teachers have many things in common; they are knowledgeable, well prepared, passionate about their subject matter, and dedicated to their students' success. I aspire to demonstrate all of these qualities whenever I interact with students. In this short document, I will take the opportunity to highlight a few specific teaching practices that I have found to be especially effective.

In my written feedback to students, I have made it my goal to include with every graded paper a manageable selection of specific pieces of advice that students can implement right away in completing their next assignment. While it is important to explain to students why they have received the grade that they have, I always try to approach the phrasing of my comments with this question in mind: "What can this student *do*, moving forward, to improve their writing?" I have found that constructive criticism is most useful to students, and that they are most receptive to it, when that commentary involves a clear plan for how students can effectively improve their work in the short term. For this reason, I do not grade all assignments "blind," that is, by concealing authorship until the work is returned. I have found that students find my feedback most helpful when it addresses particular ways in which their own writing has developed, and can continue to develop, over the course of the term. When I design syllabi for introductory classes, I include multiple short paper assignments (typically 3) to give students a chance to work consistently at strengthening their writing in response to these comments throughout the semester.

Where possible, especially for introductory students, I also include more objective assessments as part of the overall course grade, such as short multiple-choice quizzes for reading comprehension. This helps students who are new to philosophy to develop an awareness of whether they are tracking important subtleties in the views and arguments endorsed by our assigned authors. It also gives them a way of verifying that they have become more careful readers. One of my goals is to give students faith that while critical discussion of work in philosophy may not always appear as objective as the grading of an anatomy test or a statistics problem set, the standards of philosophy are not arbitrary. Learning to be a careful reader of philosophical writing is a skill at which students can steadily improve if they make the effort to do so.

For more advanced seminars that treat one central topic in depth throughout the term, I assign a series of 2-page response 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. I grade these informal assignments mostly for participation credit but with plenty of written comments. I learned this technique from my own experience in a philosophy seminar that I took as undergraduate. I do not think it was a coincidence that my final paper for the course was some of the most sophisticated writing that I produced that year. Once the course had concluded, I could see the immense benefit of being asked to remain fully and consistently engaged with the course throughout the term. Some of my own students have commented in their course evaluations that these assignments have been especially effective at helping them to stay engaged with the material and to receive consistent, constructive feedback on their ideas without the unnecessary pressure of a major assessment.

During class sessions, I also seek to promote active participation of a kind that will lead to deeper understanding and long-term memory of the course material. One method I use regularly is to break up a lecture format by dividing students into pairs. I allow them a few minutes (about 3-5) to discuss short passages from our readings 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. This exercise promotes a higher degree of engagement with the course texts than a lecture alone. Most importantly, it 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. This practice helps to lead to class discussions that are more balanced in participation rather than being dominated by a handful of the most outspoken students. This in turn improves the quality of the discussion for all students.

In larger courses where I am fortunate enough to have the help of one or more graduate teaching assistants, I seek to take full advantage of the chance to help those students mature as teachers in their own right. During the time that I worked as a graduate teaching assistant, several of my professors gave me the helpful opportunity to teach a single lecture, or a portion of a lecture, at some point during the semester. They also worked with me to discuss my lesson plan for the “guest lecture” in advance and offered feedback before and after the class session. I found this to be a great way to acquire some initial practice and gain confidence teaching a larger audience. I have since had the opportunity to continue that tradition with a few of my own assistants.

When I advise students one-on-one in the writing of a thesis, there are a few things I seek to do in order to help students get the most out of our meetings. In our initial meeting, I ask students to be transparent with me about their own academic goals for the project as well as the style in which they find it most helpful to receive feedback. For instance, do they prefer comments on papers to be delivered orally and in person, so they can ask questions immediately, or in writing so that they have a written record directly from me of those comments? Whenever I give feedback on written drafts, I also try to indicate clearly the relative priority of the questions or criticisms I have raised. I want students to approach the process of revision with a clear sense of which comments need to be considered carefully and addressed fully for the success of the core arguments of the paper, and which are more optional suggestions for enriching the content of the paper, which the student might, or might not, pursue, depending on time and interest. Finally, I seek to encourage students by drawing on examples from my own experience at the professional level in order to demonstrate that the need to engage in a continued process of revision of one’s writing is the norm in academia, rather than being indicative of any fault or shortcoming of the student. For instance, I might describe an occasion where a journal reviewer requested that I include consideration of their objection before publication, or a time when I had to make choices about what material to cut to meet a word limit. My hope is that students will leave my office feeling energized by the prospect of being treated like a mature academic, rather than being disheartened by the need to continue revising their written work.

Lastly, when I am choosing readings for course syllabi or to recommend to MA students who are in the process of writing their theses, I try to include some very recent publications by early-career academics (i.e. PhD students, Post-doctoral fellows and Assistant Professors) as well as foundational texts by established scholars in philosophy. This gives students a sense of the direction in which major philosophical debates are currently moving. It also carries the benefit of making it easier to cite a greater proportion of female authors, since the number of women in philosophy has increased over time. Graduate students are especially curious to get a feel for what some of the best work by junior faculty, who are closer to them in age and career stage, looks like. It can be especially helpful to try to learn by imitation when one takes as a model the work of someone who is closer to one’s own starting point. My sample syllabus for a seminar on “Comparing Moral and Epistemic Normativity,” which I have included here as part of my Teaching Portfolio, provides one example of this practice of citing work by junior faculty as well as by familiar names within the discipline.

Statement on Diversity, Equity, and Inclusion (DEI)

I am committed to doing my part as a member of the university to ensure that academic institutions are fully open to, and representative of, all people.

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, and attainable, option for them. One way I have sought to do this during my time at NYU is by getting involved as a volunteer in the teaching of elective and extracurricular programs in philosophy for students in New York City public high schools. In the fall of 2018 and 2019 (and virtually in 2020), I led small-group discussions of issues in applied ethics at New York City's High School for Environmental Studies as part of a team of four visiting volunteers from NYU. In the spring of 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.³ Each year, I also volunteer as a judge for New York City's High School Ethics Bowl.⁴ It has been my goal while participating in these programs to convey excitement about the study of philosophy, as well as to help normalize the idea of an academic career path in any discipline. In acknowledgment of these efforts, NYU's Faculty of Arts and Science awarded me a 2019 Postdoctoral Travel Grant for conference expenses; these are awarded preferentially to those "with an established track record of effort to diversify the academy."

In philosophy as well as in other academic disciplines, women remain underrepresented, especially among tenured faculty. As a woman in philosophy, I have a unique opportunity to serve as a role model for other young women who are first considering an academic career path.

Working with local high school students on a volunteer basis is something that I intend to continue throughout my academic career.

While it is important to spark the initial interest of younger students in higher education, it is equally important to be supportive of all students' efforts to complete their university education despite the diverse challenges they may face. This fall term 2022, I have had the opportunity to tutor a highly diverse body of students in the Writing Center at City College, CUNY. One of the simplest and most effective ways to support students of a wide variety of personal and educational backgrounds is to communicate openly and supportively with them about their goals as well as any potential obstacles they may face.

No two students face the same set of potential obstacles in achieving their goals. The experience of teaching through the COVID-19 pandemic in New York City has made me especially appreciative of the need for those in positions of power in academia to be on the lookout for the tangible effects of systemic inequalities and to do what they can to minimize them. During our transition to an online course format in the spring of 2020, I saw firsthand how sudden changes could lead to compounded difficulties for some students, while these burdens did not fall equally on everyone. I learned that a significant minority of my students faced special hurdles including lack of internet access or computer resources at home, financial difficulties with travel, or an unanticipated need to redirect much of their time toward e.g. working to support a family business, or providing medical care for relatives, despite having every intention to dedicate themselves to their coursework.

During the spring term 2020, I encouraged all of my students to communicate with me about any challenges they faced in completing our course and I emphasized a commitment to being especially flexible, given the circumstances, about late penalties and other course policies from the initial syllabus. Some of my students initially struggled to complete their assignments on time, but in the end every student was able to make progress on their work and to complete the course with a passing grade. The lesson I have taken with me is that it is worthwhile to continue to communicate with my students throughout the term and to express my commitment to helping all of my students succeed in my courses. I am willing to work with students to make fair and reasonable accommodations that provide everyone with the opportunity to complete, and be judged by, their best work.

³ <https://corrupttheyouth.weebly.com/about.html>

The phrase "corrupt the youth" is a reference to Socrates.

⁴ <https://highschoolethicsbowl.com>

Phil-UA 2 (Section 006)
Great Works in Philosophy
New York University, Fall 2022
Meets M/W 3:30 – 4:45 pm at 60 5th Avenue, Room 265
4 units

Dr. Michelle M. Dyke
michelle.dyke@nyu.edu

Office Hours: TBA
(In-person and Zoom options)

Our Brightspace course site is accessible via NYUHome. Log into NYUHome, search for “Brightspace” at the top right, click Go, and select our course title under 2022 Fall.

Course Description

This course provides a general introduction to western philosophy through the study of some of the most influential writings in its history (up to the present day). Some of the questions to be discussed include the following: Can we know that there is an external world outside of our minds, or are there any reasons for skepticism? Can we prove the existence of God? Can we know anything with absolute certainty? What is the self? Are we free to act, and believe, at will? What obligations do we have to other people? What makes for a just society? We will discuss answers to these questions from authors including Epicurus, Descartes, Pascal, Locke, Hume, Mill, James, Rawls, Nozick, and Korsgaard.

No prerequisites. Undergraduates from all backgrounds and degree programs are welcome.

The “Works” We’ll Discuss:

Author, Title (year of original publication)

Course text format:

1. René Descartes, *Meditations on First Philosophy* (published 1641)

Hackett print edition OR find the same edition as an Ebook via NYU Library search

2. Blaise Pascal, *Pensées* (1670, posthumously) (excerpts)

.pdf on Brightspace course site

3. John Locke’s *An Essay concerning Human Understanding* (1st ed. 1690) (excerpts)

www.gutenberg.org/ebooks/10615

4. David Hume’s *An Enquiry concerning Human Understanding* (1748) (excerpts)

Free online at www.davidhume.org

5. John Stuart Mill, *On Liberty* (1859)

Hackett print edition OR
www.gutenberg.org/ebooks/34901

with discussion of Harriet Taylor Mill’s “The Enfranchisement of Women” (1851)

.pdf on Brightspace course site

6. William K. Clifford “The Ethics of Belief” (1877)

.pdf on Brightspace course site

7. William James, “The Will to Believe” (1896/1897 print volume)

.pdf on Brightspace course site

8. John Rawls, *A Theory of Justice* (1st ed. 1971) (excerpts)

EBook via NYU Library search

9. Robert Nozick, *Anarchy, State, and Utopia* (1974) (excerpts)

.pdf on Brightspace course site

10. Christine M. Korsgaard, *The Sources of Normativity* (1996)

EBook via NYU Library search

With selections on the views of Epicurus (lived 341-270/271 BCE)

.pdf on Brightspace course site

Textbooks

The purchase of textbooks is *not required* for the course, but the purchase of these two inexpensive paperbacks from Hackett Publishing Company (<\$15 each on Amazon.com) is recommended.

(For a photo of the covers, see our Brightspace course site -> Content button -> Syllabus etc. tab)

- René Descartes, *Discourse on Method* and *Meditations on First Philosophy* (4th edition, trans. Donald A. Cress, Hackett Publishing Company)

- John Stuart Mill, *On Liberty* (ed. Elizabeth Rapaport, Hackett Publishing Company)

The *Meditations* will be the first text that we read in the course. The same edition is available for free as an Ebook through NYU library, but since we'll read all of the *Meditations*, I think it will make for a better reading experience to have a paper copy. Your choice! (We'll also read all of *On Liberty*.)

All other materials (including an alternate version of *On Liberty*) will be provided in an electronic format- via web links, as .pdf files on our Brightspace course site, or as Ebooks via NYU library: Just search the title and author using <https://library.nyu.edu/about/collections/search-collections/> and click "online access." (I'll say more about this as we go to confirm we're all reading the same edition.) Our course is *not* registered with the NYU Bookstore.

Course Requirements and Assessments

The requirements for the course include **three short papers** and **four in-class quizzes**. A selection of 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 paper, you will be asked to *summarize*, in your own words, a key view 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? Detailed assignment sheets for each of the papers will be uploaded to Brightspace at least two weeks before the submission deadline. Paper submission will be online via Brightspace.

The quizzes will be designed to test your recall and understanding of the key philosophical views and arguments that were discussed in our required course readings and in class. I recommend studying for the quizzes by reviewing our class handouts. We'll discuss a few practice questions before the first quiz.

Grades will be calculated as follows:

15% 1st paper (4-6 double-spaced pages)
25% 2nd paper (5-6 double-spaced pages)
30% 3rd paper (6-8 double-spaced pages)
20% (at 5% each x4) in-class quizzes
10% class participation

Papers will receive letter grades. General rubric:

For an A: Clear and mature written communication, accurate summary of course authors, and (for papers #2 and #3) a clearly articulated thesis (opinion) with relevant, detailed reasoning offered in support
A-: Clear written communication, almost totally accurate summary of course authors, clearly articulated thesis with plenty of relevant reasoning offered in support

B+: Mostly clear written communication, mostly accurate summary of course authors, clearly articulated thesis with relevant reasoning offered in support

B: Reasonably (if not always) clear written communication, reasonably accurate summary of course authors with some errors, reasonably clear thesis with some relevant reasoning offered in support

B-: Occasionally unclear written communication, some significant errors in summary of course authors, some problems with clarity of thesis or reasoning offered in support

C+: Serious problems with accuracy of summary, relevance of topic for assignment, or submission length

C and below: Totally inadequate submission due to topic, length, or accuracy

F at 0%: No submission or confirmed case of plagiarism

Late papers will receive a deduction of 1/3 letter grade for each 24-hour period of lateness beyond the deadline (excluding holidays, including weekends). 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. This is an issue of fairness to your fellow students. However, the penalty is capped at 1 full letter grade lost (e.g. from B to C). It's to your advantage to finish any late papers before the end of the term, even if they're late! The absolute final deadline for submission of any late work is 9:00 am (Eastern) on Wednesday, December 21. Please submit on Brightspace using the original link.

The penalty will be waived for medical, mental health or family emergencies. **Don't be shy about reaching out if something unexpected has come up that prevents you from completing your work on time!** We're still dealing with the effects of a global pandemic and a generally stressful time to work and study. **I'm happy to work with you to decide upon a fair and reasonable extension.**

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 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.)

Missed quizzes will be made up (using an alternate version of the quiz) by arrangement with the instructor.

No extra credit. If you're concerned about any of your grades, please don't be shy about arranging a time to meet with me so we can discuss how to improve your future work. There's no need to be embarrassed- Responsible students are proactive about asking for help. I'm happy to do everything that I can to help you succeed.

Other Course Policies

Note that participation in discussion section counts for 10% of your term grade. To receive an A, all you need to do is keep coming to class ready to contribute to our discussion. Asking questions counts!

In case of emergency, please email me (michelle.dyke@nyu.edu) for an excused absence. Excused absences will not negatively affect your grade. I'll keep track of class attendance; a long-standing pattern of repeated, *unexcused* absences may result in an F for the participation grade. Please do 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 studying philosophy.

Participation grade rubric:

A: no more than 2 *unexcused* absences
A-: no more than 3 *unexcused* absences
B+: no more than 4
B: no more than 5
B-: no more than 6,
etc.

In order to receive the highest possible grade, you'll need to contribute to class in addition to being present.

COVID-19: I'll comply with the current university regulations at all times. I expect you to do so, too, out of respect for me and for your fellow students. These regulations may change throughout the term; you'll be notified by email by NYU if that happens.

Electronic Devices: Students are welcome to use electronic devices like laptops, iPads, etc. during class to access readings and take notes. Please silence all ringers and notifications. Students who spend significant amounts of time using these devices for purposes unrelated to the class may receive a lower participation grade (comparable to being absent for that class).

Please bring a copy of the day's reading to class, whether that's in electronic or paper form. We'll be looking closely at the texts during class. Note: Our course readings involve dense, challenging material that may be quite different from anything you've encountered before. Students are encouraged to leave plenty of time for reading even if (or especially if) the page range appears short.

Schedule of Readings and Assignments

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 discuss them.

I. René Descartes's *Meditations on First Philosophy* (1641)

Monday, 9/5	LABOR DAY – No Classes
Wednesday, 9/7	First Class Meeting – No Required Reading <i>Optional:</i> Letter of Dedication, Preface, Synopsis for <i>Meditations</i>
Monday, 9/12	Meditations I-III
Wednesday, 9/14	Meditations IV-VI

II. John Locke's *An Essay concerning Human Understanding* (1st ed. 1690) (excerpts)

Monday, 9/19	Book II, Chapter XXVII: <i>Of Identity and Diversity</i> 1st Quiz at End of Class (on Descartes)
Wednesday, 9/21	(continued)
Monday, 9/26	Book II, Chapter XXI: <i>Of Power</i>
Wednesday, 9/28	(continued)

1st Paper due on Brightspace by end of the night on Friday, September 30

III. David Hume's *An Enquiry concerning Human Understanding* (1748) (excerpts)

Monday, 10/3	Section X: Of Miracles
Wednesday, 10/5	(continued)
Monday, 10/10	FALL BREAK – No Classes
Tuesday, 10/11	LEGISLATIVE MONDAY (CLASS MEETS) – Please read Section VIII: Of Liberty and Necessity
Wednesday, 10/12	Selections on Epicurus 2nd Quiz at End of Class (on Locke, Hume, Epicurus)

IV. Blaise Pascal, *Pensées* (1670, post.) (excerpts) and William James, “The Will to Believe” (1897)

Monday, 10/17	James, full essay
Wednesday, 10/19	Pascal, excerpts

and William K. Clifford “The Ethics of Belief” (1877)

Monday, 10/24	Clifford, full essay
Wednesday, 10/26	(continued)

V. John Stuart Mill, *On Liberty* (1859)

Monday, 10/31	Chapters I, II
Wednesday, 11/2	Chapters III, IV

2nd Paper due on Brightspace by end of the night on Friday, November 4

Monday, 11/7	Chapter V
Wednesday, 11/9	Harriet Taylor Mill, “The Enfranchisement of Women” (1851) 3rd Quiz at End of Class (on Pascal – Mill)

VI. John Rawls, *A Theory of Justice* (1971) (excerpts)

Monday, 11/14	Chapter I, Sec 1-4 and Chapter II, Sec 11-17
Wednesday, 11/16	Chapter III through Sec 25

Monday, 11/21	“Philosophy Writing Workshop” (No new reading)
Wednesday, 11/23	FALL BREAK – No Classes

and Robert Nozick, *Anarchy, State, and Utopia* (1974) (excerpts)

Monday, 11/28	pp. 3-13, 52-34 and start...
Wednesday, 11/30	Chapter 7: Distributive Justice

VII. Christine M. Korsgaard, *The Sources of Normativity* (1996)

Monday, 12/5	Lecture 1
Wednesday, 12/7	Lecture 2
Monday, 12/12	Lectures 3-4 4 th Quiz at End of Class (on Rawls, Nozick, Korsgaard)
Wednesday, 12/14	No new reading

3rd Paper due on Brightspace by end of the night on Friday, December 16

Disability Disclosure Statement:

Academic accommodations are available for students with disabilities. The Moses Center website is www.nyu.edu/csd. Please contact the Moses Center for Student Accessibility (212-998-4980 or mosescsd@nyu.edu) for further information. **Students who are requesting academic accommodations are advised to reach out to the Moses Center as early as possible in the semester for assistance.**

***Note from the instructor: I will comply with any and all recommendations made by the Moses Center.**

Academic Integrity, Plagiarism, and Cheating:

Academic integrity means that the work you submit is original. Obviously, bringing answers into an examination or copying all or part of a paper straight from a book, the Internet, or a fellow student is a violation of this principle. But there are other forms of cheating or plagiarizing which are just as serious — for example, presenting an oral report drawn without attribution from other sources (oral or written); writing a sentence or paragraph which, despite being in different words, expresses someone else's idea(s) without a reference to the source of the idea(s); or submitting essentially the same paper in two different courses (unless both instructors have given their permission in advance). Receiving or giving help on a take-home paper, examination, or quiz is also cheating, unless expressly permitted by the instructor (as in collaborative projects).

***Note from the instructor: Plagiarism is a serious matter. Students who cheat on a quiz or engage in plagiarism will receive a 0% for that assignment and also (depending upon the severity of the case and at the discretion of the instructor) risk a final course grade of F.**

Avoiding this penalty is easy, however. Always cite your sources in written work, and ask your instructor whenever it's not clear to you whether collaboration with other students is appropriate. For this course, you're very welcome to discuss your paper drafts with other students to bounce ideas. Philosophy is all about discussion! But every student must submit their own original work. In such a small course, it will be obvious to me if your words and ideas are not your own.

The quizzes will be closed-book, closed-note, and will be completed privately by each student.

Student Wellness:

In a large, complex community like NYU, it's vital to reach out to others, particularly those who are isolated or engaged in self-destructive activities. Student wellness (<https://cas.nyu.edu/content/nyu-as/cas/academic-programs/student-wellness.html>) is the responsibility of all of us.

The NYU [Wellness Exchange](#) is the constellation of NYU's programs and services designed to address the overall health and mental health needs of its students. Students can access this service 24 hours a day, seven days a week - wellness.exchange@nyu.edu; (212) 443-9999. Students can call the Wellness Exchange hotline (212-443-9999) or the NYU Counseling Service (212-998-4780) to make an appointment for Single Session, Short-term, or Group counseling sessions.

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

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

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

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

- | | |
|----------------------------|---|
| Monday, July 31 (Berkeley) | - Review Berkeley's <i>Treatise</i> |
| Tuesday (Hume) | - <i>Enquiry</i> Sections 2, 4 (online or paper text) |
| Wednesday (Hume) | - <i>Enquiry</i> Sections 5, 9 |
| Thursday (Hume) | - <i>Enquiry</i> 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 | - 2 nd ed. Preface to the <i>Critique of Pure Reason</i> * |
| Tuesday | - <i>Prolegomena</i> : 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 $\frac{1}{3}$ 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.)



UGPH-GU 28

Ethics & Identity: Disability, Gender, and Race⁵

Class Schedule: M W 11:00 am – 12:15 pm EST
Live (“synchronous” instruction) in hybrid format
 Details depending upon final total enrollment,
 See Announcements on NYUClasses site
 NYU Campus Class Location: 5WP 101
 Simultaneously over Zoom for virtual students
 Semester and Year: Spring 2021

Professor: Michelle M. Dyke

Virtual office hours: Mondays 3-5 EST via Zoom;
 See recurring meeting link on NYUClasses
 “Waiting room” will be enabled to allow private,
 one-on-one meetings
 (other times also available by appointment)

Contact:

I will not be on campus daily. Please use
 Email: michelle.dyke@nyu.edu

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?

COURSE LEARNING OBJECTIVES AND RELATED COMPETENCIES AND COMPONENTS:

Learning Objective	Course component (lesson # & topic, assignment, etc.)
1. Identity the importance of identities, and especially minority group identities (whether chosen or socially imposed) for contemporary Ethics.	Week 1, All Subsequent Sessions

⁵ Note: NYU GPH policy requires detailed specification of learning objectives and grading procedures on the syllabus. Skip to p. 38 for an outline of the course readings.

<p>2. Examine the views of some leading scholars in Philosophy & Ethics on the extent to which the following identity statuses are natural/biological as opposed to socially constructed:</p> <p>Disability</p> <p>Gender</p> <p>Race</p>	<p>Weeks 2-5, Check-In Quiz</p> <p>Weeks 6-9, Check-In Quiz</p> <p>Weeks 9-13, Check-In Quiz</p> <p>Relevant Assignments: Final cumulative essay exam & Two papers: Choice of topics to integrate lessons</p>
<p>3. Explain the phenomenon of “epistemic injustice” and its importance for understanding current patterns of treatment of members of minority groups in our society.</p>	<p>Sessions: Week 14</p> <p>Relevant Assignments: Final Essay Exam</p>
<p>4. Identify contemporary Bioethical challenges that arise in connection with our different social treatment of others on the basis of disability status, gender and race. Debate how to address these ethical issues in clinical and research settings, with attention to real-world case studies.</p>	<p>Sessions: Week 5 (Disability & Reproductive Ethics), Week 8 (Gender & Representation in Research Trials), & Week 13 (Racial Health Disparities and Case Study on Trust in COVID vaccines)</p> <p>Relevant Assignments: 2 Papers</p>
<p>5. Strengthen skills for respectful and collaborative debate of difficult and sensitive bioethical questions.</p>	<p>Sessions: All</p> <p>Assignment: Participation Grade</p>
<p>6. Strengthen skills in critical thinking, ethical argument, and persuasive writing for Bioethics. Be able to critically and succinctly evaluate bioethical arguments, while raising original objections, and evaluating potential replies to those objections.</p>	<p>Relevant Assignments: 2 Papers, Participation Grade</p>

PRE-REQUISITES:

No Pre-requisites. Open to all undergraduates.

COURSE REQUIREMENTS AND EXPECTATIONS:

- Students are expected to complete assignments on time and at a standard appropriate to a college 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 (whether attending in person or online). For more detail on classroom policies, see the sections below.

ASSIGNMENTS:

Attendance and Participation (15%):

Regular attendance is required for this course. We will typically follow a weekly format of a lecture-style presentation on Monday (including Q&A), with group discussion on Wednesday. A satisfactory participation grade will require frequent participation in group discussions as well as submission of 3 ungraded in-class “check-in quizzes” on the week’s readings (in addition to consistent presence at lectures).

- Each student is allowed two absences, 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.
- In order to request an *excused* absence due to circumstances, students should seek permission 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 an email once you’re able. There is no limit to the number of excused absences a student may receive, but those who find themselves unable to continue keeping up with the course should consult with me about their options.
- 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. (Questions are one welcome form of participation!) Submission of (otherwise ungraded) check-in quizzes will also count toward this grade. Participation grades will be determined as follows:

Rubric for Class Participation Grades:

An A for participation indicates: This student has no unexcused absences and has commented during all/most classes attended. Comments will reflect a careful reading of course texts and will be of very high quality -- clear, well-reasoned and well-supported, on-topic, and respectful of others.

*To receive an A, students must submit all 3 in-class check-in quizzes. If a student is absent when the quiz is released online during class, the student must make up an alternate version by arrangement with me for full credit.

An A- for participation indicates: This student has no more than one unexcused absence and has commented during most of the classes attended. Comments are of generally good quality – usually clear, well-reasoned and well-supported, on-topic, and respectful of others. A maximum of 1 of the 3 quizzes may be missing.

A B+ for participation indicates: This student has no more than two unexcused absences and has commented during the majority of the class sessions. Comments are of acceptable quality – respectful of others and not involving large departures from the topics under discussion. Up to 2 of the 3 quizzes may be missing.

A B for participation indicates: This student has no more than three unexcused absences and has commented during at least several class sessions. Comments are usually of the quality described under B+, but may be less relevant, or more often unsupported.

Participation grades below a B: This student has not met the standards described above (under A, A-, B+, and B), either by not joining the discussion or making inappropriate or disruptive comments. Because these situations are often unique, participation grades below a B will be at the instructor's discretion.

Check-In Quizzes (part of participation, see above):

This will involve only a handful of short-answer questions (multiple-choice, T/F and fill-in-the-blank) designed to test comprehension of the assigned readings for the week. Students will have 10 minutes to complete the quiz. It will be closed-book, closed-note, on an honor system.

- The quiz will be posted online on NYUClasses, and screen-shared on Zoom, during class.
- Submission of the completed quiz will be online via NYUClasses. Submission counts for participation only; I will not record your score.
- 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.
- Each quiz will cover only the readings assigned for the week in which it is given. See the course schedule below. These will take place on Wednesdays, rather than Mondays.
- We'll reveal the answers, and score quizzes together, in class.
- Students with an excused absence on the day of the mini-quiz will make up an alternate version by arrangement with me. (Send me an email if you need to reschedule a quiz.) Students who miss the mini-quiz due to an unexcused absence will have their participation grade reduced as indicated above.

Two Papers (50% of total grade at 25% each):

These papers are your chance to engage deeply with the course material. In response to a prompt, you will develop and defend your own ethical viewpoint. Each paper will be of the same style (and will be graded with the same criteria in mind).

- Each paper should be 6-8 pages in length, double-spaced (before References).
- For each assignment, you will be given options for topics to write about.
 - The choice of prompts 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.
- No outside research will be 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 ethical 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 in response to the prompt about our course readings. 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 just 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).

Final Essay Exam (35%):

- This will take place in class during our last regularly scheduled meeting on Monday, May 10. The exam will be posted online in MSWord and PDF form on NYUClasses at the start of class and will be due online (via Assignments on NYUClasses) at the end of class. There will be an honor pledge to sign.
- The exam will consist of several open-ended long answer/short essay questions of 2-3 paragraphs each.
- The exam will be 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 sample questions, during the final weeks of the course.

GRADING COMPONENTS:

Item:	Percentage or Points:
Participation	15%
Short Check-In Quizzes	Count toward full participation only
Papers 1 & 2	25% each (x2 = 50%)
Final Essay Exam	35%

GRADING SCALE:

A:	94-100	C+:	77-79
A-:	90-93	C:	73-76
B+:	87-89	C-:	70-72
B:	83-86	D+:	67-69
B-:	80-82	D:	60-66
		F:	<60

A grade in the 'A' range demonstrates an impressive mastery of, and insightful engagement with, the course material. In written work, the student is able to reconstruct philosophical arguments with precision and accuracy and to articulate criticisms that are original, persuasive, and well-developed. In class, the A student attends all or almost all classes having completed the readings, and always or almost always makes exceptionally thoughtful and respectful contributions to class discussions.

A grade in the 'B' range denotes competent mastery of and reasonable insight into the course material. The B student is able to reconstruct philosophical arguments accurately and to articulate criticisms that are reasonably persuasive and well-developed. In class, the B student attends all or almost all classes, typically completes the readings, and often makes thoughtful and respectful contributions to class discussions.

A grade in the 'C' range denotes adequate comprehension and engagement with the course material. The C student is able to reconstruct philosophical arguments, with some errors, and to develop criticisms that are generally relevant to the course material, if not convincing. In class, the C student attends the majority of classes, regularly does the readings, and sometimes makes thoughtful and respectful contributions to class discussions.

A grade in the 'D' range denotes a lack of comprehension of and engagement with the course material. The D student is unable to accurately reconstruct philosophical positions or to develop critiques relevant to the course material. In class, the D student struggles with attendance, shows little evidence of having completed the readings, and rarely makes thoughtful and respectful contributions to class discussions.

A grade of 'F' may be awarded to students who fail to meet basic course requirements or who engage in plagiarism as outlined below.

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. If you need more time to complete coursework over the summer, you'll need to fill out a form, and obtain my signature, to formally request a temporary grade of "Incomplete" from NYU GPH.

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 on their devices 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.) 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. If your internet connection is breaking up and won't support video, please send me a private message over the Chat to let me know; I'll also use this for attendance records.

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 or fully online will be emailed in mid-late January and should be submitted via our NYUClasses course site by the end of January 29. This form contains more detailed information about the in-person and 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. We'll typically follow a format of Mondays being lecture-based and Wednesdays being discussion-based. Please complete the readings by Wednesday and be prepared to discuss them.

Date	Topics	Readings for Week	Assignments Due
------	--------	-------------------	-----------------

Week 1 Feb 1 Feb 3	Introduction: Ethics and Identity	Paula Moya (2006), “What’s Identity Got to Do with It?” esp. pp. 96-104	
Week 2 Feb 8 Feb 10	Disability I: What is Disability?	Elizabeth Barnes (2016), <i>The Minority Body: A Theory of Disability</i> , Introduction & Chapter 1	
Week 3 Feb 15: NO NYU CLASSES Feb 17 Thurs Feb 18: CLASS HELD “Legislative Monday”	Disability II: What is Disability, cont’d	Elizabeth Barnes, <i>The Minority Body</i> , Chapter 3 excerpts & “Replies” (2018)	In-Class Short Check- In Quiz for Participation Grade Only
Week 4 Feb 22 Feb 24	Disability III: Just Treatment of People with Disabilities	Adam Cureton (2016), “Offensive Beneficence”	
Week 5 Mar 1 Mar 3	Disability IV: Disability and Reproductive Ethics Case Study: Choosing Deafness	Erik Parens and Adrienne Asch (1999), “The Disability Rights Critique of Prenatal Genetic Testing” In class: N Levy (2002), “Deafness, culture, and choice”	
Week 6 Mar 8 Mar 10	Gender I: What is Gender (vs. Sex)?	Sally Haslanger (2013), “Gender and Race: What Are They? What Do We Want Them to Be?”	Wednesday: In-Class Short Check- In Quiz
Week 7 Mar 15 Mar 17 Fri Mar 19: NYU BREAK	Gender II: Genderqueer Identity	Robin Dembroff (forth.), “Beyond Binary: Genderqueer as Critical Gender Kind” *Optional: Dembroff (2019), “‘Yep, I’m Gay’: Understanding Agential Identity”	PAPER 1 DUE On NYUClasses by 11:59 pm on Tuesday, Mar 16

<p>Week 8 Mar 22</p> <p>Mar 24</p>	<p>Gender III: Case Study: Representation of Women in Medical Research Trials</p>	<p>Van der Zande et al. (2017), "Vulnerability of pregnant women in clinical research"</p> <p>Mara Gordon (22 Dec. 2020), NYTimes, "I'm a Pregnant Doctor. Should I get the Covid Vaccine?"</p> <p>In class: Carleigh Krubiner and Ruth Faden (2017), "Pregnant women should not be categorized as a 'vulnerable population'..." (very short)</p>	
<p>Week 9 Mar 29</p> <p>Mar 31</p>	<p>Transition/Race I: Social Constructionist Views of Gender vs. Race</p>	<p>Sally Haslanger and Jennifer Saul (2006), "Philosophical Analysis and Social Kinds," excerpts</p> <p>Chike Jeffers (2019), "Cultural Constructionism," in <i>What is Race?: Four Philosophical Views</i></p>	
<p>Week 10 Apr 5</p> <p>Apr 7</p>	<p>Race II: What is Race? con'td</p>	<p>Kwame Anthony Appiah (1996), "Race, Culture, Identity: Misunderstood Connections" in <i>Color Conscious: The Political Morality of Race</i></p>	<p>Wednesday: In-Class Short Check-In Quiz</p>
<p>Week 11 Apr 12</p> <p>Apr 14</p>	<p>Race III: What is 'Structural Injustice' or 'Structural Racism' ?</p>	<p>Robin Zheng (2018), "What is My Role in Changing the System? A New Model of Responsibility for Structural Injustice"</p>	<p>PAPER 2 DUE On NYUClasses by 11:59 pm on Thursday, Apr 15</p>
<p>Week 12 Apr 19: NO CLASSES NYU BREAK</p> <p>Apr 21</p>	<p>Case Study: Is One's Racial <i>Self-Identification</i> Definitive?</p>	<p>"Rachel Dolezal's True Lies: An Interview with Rachel Dolezal," July 19, 2015</p>	

<p>Week 13 Apr 26</p> <p>Apr 28</p>	<p>Race IV: Race, Healthcare Disparities, and Trust in Healthcare Providers</p> <p>Case Study: Mistrust of COVID Vaccines</p>	<p>Howard McGary (2015), "Racial Groups, Distrust, and the Distribution of Health Care"</p> <p>In class: Gina Kolata, NYTimes, 12/31/2020, "In Minority Communities, Doctors Are Changing Minds About Vaccination"</p>	
<p>Week 14 May 3 May 5</p>	<p>Concluding Lesson: "Epistemic Injustice" and Minority Groups</p>	<p>Jackie Leach Scully (2019), "Epistemic Exclusion, Injustice, and Disability"</p> <p>In class: excerpts from Miranda Fricker (2013), "Epistemic justice as a condition of political freedom?"</p> <p>Study guide to be distributed after Wednesday's class</p>	
<p>Week 15 May 10</p>	<p>In-Class Essay Exam</p>		<p>Essay Exam to be Submitted on NYUClasses by end of class block</p>

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.
- 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.
- Kolata, Gina. (31 Dec 2020). "In Minority Communities, Doctors Are Changing Minds About Vaccination," *The New York Times*.
- 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.
- 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.
- Zheng, Robin. (2018). "What is My Role in Changing the System? A New Model of Responsibility for Structural Injustice," *Ethical Theory & Moral Practice*, 21, 869-885.

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 are expected to familiarize themselves with the SGPH and University's policy on academic integrity as they will be expected to adhere to such policies at all times – as a student and an alumni of New York University.

Plagiarism

Plagiarism, whether intended or not, is not tolerated in the SGPH. Plagiarism involves presenting ideas and/or words without acknowledging the source and includes any of the following acts:

- Using a phrase, sentence, or passage from another writer's work without using quotation marks
- Paraphrasing a passage from another writer's work without attribution
- Presenting facts, ideas, or written text gathered or downloaded from the Internet as your own
- Submitting another student's work with your name on it
- Submitting your own work toward requirements in more than one course without prior approval from the instructor
- Purchasing a paper or "research" from a term paper mill.

Students in the SGPH and SGPH courses are responsible for understanding what constitutes plagiarism. Students are encouraged to discuss specific questions with faculty instructors and to utilize the many resources available at New York University.

Disciplinary Sanctions

When a professor suspects cheating, plagiarism, and/or other forms of academic dishonesty, appropriate disciplinary action is as follows:

- The Professor will meet with the student to discuss, and present evidence for the particular violation, giving the student opportunity to refute or deny the charge(s).
- If the Professor confirms that violation(s), he/she, in consultation with the Chairperson or Program Director may take any of the following actions:
 - Allow the student to redo the assignment
 - Lower the grade for the work in question
 - Assign a grade of F for the work in question
 - Assign a grade of F for the course
 - Recommend dismissal

Once an action(s) is taken, the Professor will inform the Chairperson or Program Director and inform the student in writing, instructing the student to schedule an appointment with the Senior Associate Dean for Academic Affairs, as a final step. The student has the right to appeal the action taken in accordance with the GPH Student Complaint Procedure.

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.



GPH-GU 1005 (Section 001)
Advanced Introduction to Bioethics6
(3 credits)

Class Schedule: Wednesdays 6:45-8:45 pm
Class Location: TISC Room LC4 (100% in person)
Semester and Year: Fall 2021

Professor: Michelle M. Dyke
Office: 708 Broadway, Office 634
Email: michelle.dyke@nyu.edu
Office Phone: 212-998-3867
(email is preferred)
Office Hours: Mondays 4-6 pm (in person)

Course Assistant: Tomasz Zyglewicz
Course Assistant Email: tba

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.

COURSE LEARNING OBJECTIVES AND RELATED COMPETENCIES AND COMPONENTS:

Table with 2 columns: Learning Objective, Course component (lesson # & topic, assignment, etc.)

6 Note: NYU GPH policy requires detailed specification of learning objectives and grading procedures on the syllabus. Skip to p. 50 for an outline of the course readings.

3. Explain the debate over the 'non-identity' problem and potential solutions.	Sessions: Week 7 Assignments: Short Writing Assignment 2
4. Critically compare different accounts of the treatment vs. enhancement distinction. Analyze justifications for enhancement.	Sessions: Week 10 Assignment: Short Writing Assignment 3
5. Critically compare different accounts of the requirements and importance of informed consent in healthcare.	Sessions: Week 4 Assignment: Short Writing Assignment 1
6. Critically compare leading accounts of autonomy, assessing their strengths and weaknesses, and considering how they may differ in their determinations about whether a person is autonomous. Discuss applications for public health & healthcare.	Sessions: Week 3 Assignments: Short Writing Assignment 1
7. Critique leading theories on the nature and disvalue of death, and explain how they come to different conclusions about brain death.	Sessions: Week 8 Assignment: Short Writing Assignment 2
8. Discuss different characterizations of the notion of 'health,' esp. with regard to mental health.	Sessions: Week 11
9. Discuss the notion of collective moral responsibility and applications for human responsibility for climate change.	Sessions: Week 13
10. Strengthen skills for respectful and collaborative debate of difficult bioethical questions.	Sessions: All Assignments: Participation Grade
11. Strengthen skills in critical thinking, ethical argument, and persuasive writing for Bioethics. Be able to critically and succinctly evaluate bioethical arguments, while raising original objections, and evaluating potential replies to those objections.	Sessions: All Assignments: Short Writing Assignments 1-3, Mini-Quiz 1 & 2, Research Paper, Participation Grade
12. Integrate central arguments and themes from this course into a self-directed term paper project, and identify appropriate secondary sources for that final paper.	Assignments: Final Paper Proposal with Outline Final Paper Final Draft

PRE-REQUISITES:

- No Pre-requisites. Students must either be enrolled in the MA in Bioethics at NYU or have written (emailed) 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 following sections.

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, Tomasz (NYU email tba)** 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:

Rubric for Class Participation Grades:

An A for participation indicates: This student has no unexcused absences and has commented during all classes attended. Comments will reflect a careful reading of course texts and will be of very high quality -- clear, well-reasoned and well-supported, on-topic, and respectful of others.

*Note: We'll have an in-class debate during the last class session. An 'A' for Participation will require participation in this debate (except in case of excused absence).

An A- for participation indicates: This student has no more than one unexcused absence and has commented during most of the classes attended. Comments are of generally good quality -- usually clear, well-reasoned and well-supported, on-topic, and respectful of others.

A B+ for participation indicates: This student has no more than two unexcused absences and has commented during the majority of the class sessions. Comments are of acceptable quality -- respectful of others and not involving large departures from the topics under discussion.

A B for participation indicates: This student has no more than three unexcused absences and has commented during at least several class sessions. Comments are usually of the quality described under B+, but may be less relevant, or more often unsupported.

Participation grades below a B: This student has not met the standards described above (under A, A-, B+, and B), either by not joining the discussion or making inappropriate or disruptive comments. Because these situations are often unique, participation grades below a B will be at the instructor's discretion.

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 2-3 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 Brightspace 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 throughout the term 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 online on Brightspace under "Assignments." (See the tab at the top.)
- Our course assistant will be grading the first and third short assignments. I will be grading the second.

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.

These will involve only a handful of short (e.g. multiple-choice) 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.

- 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):

Submission of each component will be online via Brightspace.

Topic Proposal with Outline—5%

- **Note: This assignment will be graded A (100) or F (0) for completion (subject also to late penalties).**
- Write a short summary of the topic upon which you plan to write your final paper. Think about the debate or question you're addressing. What side will you take?
- Note that you will be expected to take a stance on the relevant issue in your final paper and defend your view; it is not sufficient to simply describe an existing bioethical debate.
- **Please include a draft of your thesis statement. This should be clearly marked.**
- The topic summary portion of this assignment does not need to be any more than two pages, double-spaced in length (and can, in fact, be shorter), but it must give me an idea of both the ethical question that you plan to answer as well as the considerations that you plan to use to respond to it. After a description of your topic in complete sentences, please include an outline of your paper in 2-3 pages, summarizing some of the key views, arguments, and potential objections you anticipate addressing.
- **The outline should also include a draft of your References list.**
- 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.
- **The topic is entirely up to you, so long as it engages directly and in detail with one of the topics or themes covered explicitly in this course. The final paper should cite, at minimum, two of the required course readings from the syllabus. This is also your chance to delve into further detail and make the topic your own; some additional outside research will also be required. At a minimum, you'll be asked to cite two additional academic sources from your own independent research.**
- If your proposed topic is not appropriate for this course and assignment, you will be required to write another proposal. (Apart from checking to verify that the topic is relevant to our course, I'll be looking for an ethical question of the right size/scope to address in ~15 pages.) 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 by appointment to talk about paper ideas. This meeting is not required, but highly recommended.

Final Paper—45%

- Write a final paper based on your outline, of approximately 15 pages. Your paper must be between 13 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.
- 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%

GRADING SCALE:

A:	94-100	C+:	77-79
A-:	90-93	C:	73-76
B+:	87-89	C-:	70-72
B:	83-86	D+:	67-69
B-:	80-82	D:	60-66
		F:	<60

A grade in the 'A' range demonstrates an impressive mastery of, and insightful engagement with, the course material. In written work, the student is able to reconstruct philosophical arguments with precision and accuracy and to articulate criticisms that are original, persuasive, and well-developed. The student attends all or almost all classes having completed the readings, and always or almost always makes exceptionally thoughtful and respectful contributions to class discussions.

A grade in the 'B' range denotes competent mastery of and reasonable insight into the course material. The student is able to reconstruct philosophical arguments accurately and to articulate criticisms that are reasonably persuasive and well-developed. The student attends all or almost all classes, typically completes the readings, and often makes thoughtful and respectful contributions to class discussions.

A grade in the 'C' range denotes adequate comprehension and engagement with the course material. The student is able to reconstruct philosophical arguments, with some errors, and to develop criticisms that are generally relevant to the course material, if not convincing. The student attends the majority of classes, regularly does the readings, and sometimes makes thoughtful and respectful contributions to class discussions.

A grade in the 'D' range denotes a lack of comprehension of and engagement with the course material. The student is unable to accurately reconstruct philosophical positions or to develop critiques relevant to the course material. The student struggles with attendance, shows little evidence of having completed the readings, and rarely makes thoughtful and respectful contributions to class discussions.

A grade of 'F' may be awarded to students who fail to meet basic course requirements or who engage in plagiarism as outlined below.

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 BRIGHTSPACE:

NYU Learning Management System (Brightspace) is our online course site platform, which will be used extensively throughout the semester. This where students will access the syllabus, assignment instruction sheets, and course readings (in pdf form) as well as submit their assignments. Brightspace will also be used to send announcements via email. Students should expect to check their NYU email accounts regularly. Past announcements from the whole term are always visible on the course site. Brightspace is accessible at

<https://home.nyu.edu/academics>

You can also access Brightspace from NYUHome. (Just search for "Brightspace" and click Go.) Note that the entire university has *switched* from using NYU "Classes" to the "Brightspace" platform this term. (Some of you may have used NYUClasses in the past.)

TECHNOLOGY POLICY:

We currently expect to hold this semester's class entirely in person. Students are permitted to bring laptops/tablets to class for note-taking and in order to reference their copies of the readings. (Students should always expect to attend class with access to their own copies of the readings, whether they're printed on paper or digital.) Students are expected not to text, use social media, or browse the internet for non-academic reasons during class. (Those who do so regularly may lose credit for their class participation.) Please silence ringers and notifications during class.

COVID POLICIES:

Our classroom policies are set by New York University and the School of Global Public Health. As of August 16, that policy is that students should expect to wear masks inside the classroom at all times. As I hope you understand, covid response is an ongoing challenge; changes to course formats and policies may need to be made during the course of the term. If this happens, you will be notified by email as soon as possible.

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 8	Moral Theory - Utilitarianism	Come to class having read Singer (1974)	
Week 2 Sep 15	Moral Theory - Deontology	Read Hill (1984) & Darwall (1977)	
Week 3 Sep 22	Autonomy and Paternalism	Read Conly (2013) & Flanigan (2017) First Mini-Quiz	First 15 min. of class
Week 4 Sep 29	Patient Rights & Informed Consent	Wells and Kaptchuk (2012) & Ackerman (1982)	

		First Short Writing Assignment	Due before start of class
Week 5 Oct 6	Well-Being	Read Bradley (2009 book, selections) & Hawkins (2014)	
Week 6 Oct 13	Abortion	Read Thomson (1971) & Marquis (1989) Second Mini-Quiz	First 15 min. of class
Week 7 Oct 20	The Non-Identity Problem	Read Parfit (1986) & Kumar (2003)	
Week 8 Oct 27	Defining Death (& Related Ethical Issues for Healthcare – the “dead donor rule”)	Read Veatch (2004) & McMahan (2006) Second Short Writing Assignment	Due before start of class
Week 9 Nov 3	Euthanasia and Related Practices	Read Thomson (1999) & Hardwig (1997)	
Week 10 Nov 10	Enhancement, Genetic Engineering	Read DeGrazia (2000) & Bostrom and Ord (2006) *Optional: Watch <i>Gattaca</i> (1997) Third Short Writing Assignment	Due before start of class
Week 11 Nov 17	Defining Health (and esp. Mental Health)	Read Wakefield (1992) & Kukla (2014)	
Week 12 Nov 24	Thanksgiving	Schedule an individual consultation for term paper with Prof. Dyke before or after the break	
Week 13 Dec 1	Collective Responsibility and the Environment	Read Wringe (2019) & Jamieson (2015) Final Paper Proposal/Outline	Due before start of class
Week 14 Dec 8	Final Topic TBD Based on Student Interest		

	In-Class Debate		
		Final Paper	Due 11:59 pm on Wednesday, December 15

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

GPH DIVERSITY, EQUITY, and INCLUSION (DEI) STATEMENT:

The NYU School of Global Public Health (GPH) is committed to maintaining and celebrating a diverse, just, and inclusive environment for our students, faculty, and staff around the world. To foster this atmosphere and ideals of Diversity, Equity, and Inclusion (DEI), GPH promotes a welcoming learning environment that embraces cultural humility, and respects and values differences. These differences can include race, ethnicity, religion, gender identity, sexual orientation, physical, mental and emotional abilities, socioeconomic status, and other aspects of human diversity. In this course, we encourage students to share and discuss different perspectives, beliefs, and experiences while treating all with dignity and respect.

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 are expected to familiarize themselves with the SGPH and University's policy on academic integrity as they will be expected to adhere to such policies at all times – as a student and an alumni of New York University.

Plagiarism

Plagiarism, whether intended or not, is not tolerated in the SGPH. Plagiarism involves presenting ideas and/or words without acknowledging the source and includes any of the following acts:

- Using a phrase, sentence, or passage from another writer's work without using quotation marks
- Paraphrasing a passage from another writer's work without attribution
- Presenting facts, ideas, or written text gathered or downloaded from the Internet as your own
- Submitting another student's work with your name on it
- Submitting your own work toward requirements in more than one course without prior approval from the instructor
- Purchasing a paper or "research" from a term paper mill.

Students in the SGPH and SGPH courses are responsible for understanding what constitutes plagiarism. Students are encouraged to discuss specific questions with faculty instructors and to utilize the many resources available at New York University.

Disciplinary Sanctions

When a professor suspects cheating, plagiarism, and/or other forms of academic dishonesty, appropriate disciplinary action is as follows:

- The Professor will meet with the student to discuss, and present evidence for the particular violation, giving the student opportunity to refute or deny the charge(s).
- If the Professor confirms that violation(s), he/she, in consultation with the Chairperson or Program Director may take any of the following actions:
 - Allow the student to redo the assignment
 - Lower the grade for the work in question
 - Assign a grade of F for the work in question
 - Assign a grade of F for the course
 - Recommend dismissal

Once an action(s) is taken, the Professor will inform the Chairperson or Program Director and inform the student in writing, instructing the student to schedule an appointment with the Senior Associate Dean for Academic Affairs, as a final step. The student has the right to appeal the action taken in accordance with the GPH Student Complaint Procedure.

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.



GPH-GU 1230
Advanced Introduction to Public Health Ethics⁷
(3 credits)

Class Schedule: Tuesdays 6:45-8:45 pm
Class Location: 60 5th Avenue, Room C14
(Email assistant for the Zoom code if needed)
Semester and Year: Spring 2022

Professor: Michelle M. Dyke
Office: 708 Broadway, Office 634
Email: michelle.dyke@nyu.edu
Office Phone: 212-998-3867
(email is preferred)
Office Hours: Fridays 1-3 pm (choice of in person or Zoom, sign up for a slot using the link below)
<https://docs.google.com/spreadsheets/d/1PpeeVcqra7InTdnH7O-nhtOaCgA5MYQHwTIOdpgTGDw/edit#gid=0>

Course assistant: Shannon Brick
Course assistant email: tba

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.

COURSE LEARNING OBJECTIVES AND RELATED COMPONENTS:

Learning Objective	Course component (lesson # & topic, assignment, etc.)
1. Develop an awareness of how the study of ethics can help to inform public health decision-making.	Week 1, all subsequent lessons

⁷ Note: NYU GPH policy requires detailed specification of learning objectives and grading procedures on the syllabus. Skip to p. 62 for an outline of the course readings.

<p>2. Develop a richer understanding of some of the ongoing debates in Public Health Ethics:</p> <p>What kinds of aims and principles might guide policy-making for public health?</p> <p>Just how broad are the goals of public health?</p> <p>What justifies public health interventions? How should public health policies protect individual autonomy?</p> <p>How can public health workers protect individual privacy while gathering valuable data? Do covid-19 contact tracing apps violate privacy?</p> <p>Are we obligated to help improve health elsewhere around the world? What do we owe to research subjects in developing countries?</p> <p>How is global climate change a public health problem?</p> <p>How does systemic racism affect public health?</p> <p>How do individual attitudes toward health care and health institutions, like lack of trust or stigmatization, affect the utilization of health care and public health resources?</p>	<p>All sessions</p> <p>Weeks 1-3</p> <p>Week 2</p> <p>Weeks 3-6</p> <p>Week 7</p> <p>Weeks 8-10</p> <p>Week 11</p> <p>Weeks 12-14</p> <p>Week 14</p>
<p>3. Gain a deeper understanding of foundational ethical concepts (including justice and just distribution of resources, individual rights, privacy, autonomy, paternalism, duties and collective obligations, trust, and structural injustice) and of the relevance of appeals to these concepts as part of key arguments and viewpoints in current debates in public health ethics.</p>	<p>Week 1 (Just distribution of resources)</p> <p>Weeks 3-7 (Rights)</p> <p>Week 7 (Privacy)</p> <p>Weeks 4-6 (Autonomy and Paternalism)</p> <p>Weeks 8-11 (Duties and Collective Obligations)</p> <p>Weeks 12-14 (Structural Injustice)</p> <p>Week 14 (Trust)</p> <p>Assignments: 4 Response Papers</p>
<p>4. Apply these foundational ethical concepts to discussion of recent real-world Case Studies.</p>	<p>Week 1 (vaccine distribution)</p> <p>Week 4 (real and proposed regulations for sale of tobacco products, unhealthy foods)</p> <p>Week 7 (covid-19 tracing apps and privacy)</p> <p>Week 9 (AZT Trials, Standard of Care debate)</p> <p>Week 10 (Havrix and Surfaxin Trials)</p>

	<p>Week 11 (climate change as a public health challenge)</p> <p>Week 14 (vaccine hesitancy in minority communities)</p> <p>Assignment: In-Class Presentation/Discussion Leading Assignment</p>
5. Strengthen skills for respectful and collaborative debate of difficult questions in public health ethics.	<p>All class sessions</p> <p>Assignments: Participation Grade, In-Class Presentation</p>
6. Strengthen skills in critical thinking, ethical argument, and persuasive writing for public health ethics. Be able to critically and succinctly evaluate bioethical arguments, while raising original objections, and evaluating potential replies to those objections.	<p>All class sessions</p> <p>Assignments: 4 Response Papers</p>

PRE-REQUISITES:

- No Pre-requisites. Students must either be enrolled in the MA in Bioethics at NYU or have written (emailed) permission from the instructor to take this class. MPH students welcome.

COURSE REQUIREMENTS AND EXPECTATIONS:

- Students are expected to complete assignments on time and at a standard appropriate for 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 (whether attending in person or online). For more detail on classroom policies, see the following sections.

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, Shannon, via email** (ideally at least twelve hours before the beginning of class). If permission is granted, the absence counts as excused. (Note that religious holidays always 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:

Rubric for Class Participation Grades:

An A for participation indicates: This student has no unexcused absences and has commented during all classes attended. Comments will reflect a careful reading of course texts and will be of very high quality – clear, well-reasoned and well-supported, on-topic, and respectful of others.

*Note: We'll have two in-class debates. An 'A' for Participation will require participation in these debates (except in case of excused absence).

An A- for participation indicates: This student has no more than one unexcused absence and has commented during most of the classes attended. Comments are of generally good quality – usually clear, well-reasoned and well-supported, on-topic, and respectful of others.

A B+ for participation indicates: This student has no more than two unexcused absences and has commented during the majority of the class sessions. Comments are of acceptable quality – respectful of others and not involving large departures from the topics under discussion.

A B for participation indicates: This student has no more than three unexcused absences and has commented during at least several class sessions. Comments are usually of the quality described under B+, but may be less relevant, or more often unsupported.

Participation grades below a B: This student has not met the standards described above (under A, A-, B+, and B), either by not joining the discussion or making inappropriate or disruptive comments. Because these situations are often unique, participation grades below a B will be at the instructor's discretion.

In-Class Presentation/Discussion Leading Assignment (10%):

During the first week of the term, students will sign up to serve as “presenter/discussion leader” for the final 15 minutes of one of our subsequent class meetings. You can sign up on this GoogleDoc:

<https://docs.google.com/spreadsheets/d/1oJ6dNG2pLHwRN9lhKXdiAID3ER6NIrrks8BOUkwKcdc/edit#gid=0>

- Depending upon final enrollment numbers, students may need to double up in one or two of our class meetings, so that the last 30 minutes of that class will be dedicated to two different student presentations. The googledoc has more than enough slots to accommodate this; it also indicates which of two or more readings for the week each student should discuss.
- This oral presentation will be graded on the basis of participation/engagement with the readings. No additional media (e.g. PowerPoint, handout) is required, although you are welcome to use and distribute additional materials to the class if you'd like. You're in charge of the class for that 15 minutes. The point of this exercise is for you to get a chance to take control and focus the discussion on some of the issues that came up in our reading that you find most interesting and worthy of further discussion.
- Think of yourself as a “commentator” on our readings. You should point out some of the claims made by our authors that you found interesting or provocative and want to examine further. Maybe you strongly agree, or maybe you strongly disagree, with something you read that week! Or maybe there's an idea that stuck with you that you're still chewing over.
- You should also pose discussion questions to your fellow students. After opening with some of your own thoughts, your job is to lead our discussion in a way that will be interesting and constructive for your classmates.

- You're also highly encouraged to find a real-world example/case study to illustrate some of the more abstract ethical claims made by our authors in the readings. Perhaps our readings led you to reflect on an example with which you're familiar from other coursework in public health, or from your own research experience. You can always discuss current responses to covid-19 in light of our readings.
- **I will grade your presentation by asking myself, "1. Did this student think deeply about the assigned reading this week, as demonstrated by their expression of an original opinion about the authors' claims, or by their posing interesting and provocative new questions about that reading? 2. Was this student able to engage their fellow students in further discussion of the readings? 3. Was the student able to apply more abstract ideas from the reading to a concrete real-world example?"**
 - Students who do all of these three things will earn an A for the presentation.
 - Students who do 2 of these 3 things successfully will earn an A-.
 - Students who accomplish 1 will earn a B+.
 - Students who offer a presentation that does not meet any of these goals will earn a B.
 - Students who do not present at all will earn a 0 for this portion of the grade. (We'll make sure this doesn't happen!)
- If you need to reschedule your presentation in case of emergency, send me an email and we'll work something out. In-person presentation is preferred, but students will be able to present over Zoom if needed without penalty.

Four Response Papers (20% of term grade, x4):

This is a relatively short paper of ~5 pages that should engage critically with one or more of our assigned course readings. No outside research is necessary to complete the assignment successfully. (But you're welcome to draw connections to previous readings or relevant public health/research experience if you like.) What is important is that you clearly advance, and defend, your own original *opinion* in response to the ethical views or arguments of one or more of the authors we've read.

I'll upload an Assignment Sheet for the first response paper during the first week of class (two weeks before the first paper is due.) There will be a few suggested topics, but you're welcome to write your response paper on any issue you like regarding the readings for the first three weeks of the course. (For papers #2-4, there will also be new suggested topics, or students can choose any topic regarding reading assigned *since the last paper deadline.*)

- Each paper should be 4-6 pages long, double-spaced, Times New Roman 12-pt, with 1" margins. (The point of standardizing this is to minimize potential bias in grading. The paper should be no shorter than 4 pages and no longer than 6 for maximum credit.)
- This is an argumentative paper. Your thesis statement (which should appear by the end of the first page) should 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 ethical 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. While it is important to demonstrate that you have understood our readings, and the issues at hand, please remember that you don't need to (and should not!) summarize the whole paper(s) to which you are responding. Aim to present as much background information as is necessary for the rest of your paper (with a focus 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? (This will be more important for papers #2-4. Nobody will be marked down on the first paper for failing to consider potential objections to their views.)
- 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. **This means you should cite our course readings.** One full footnote-style citation is adequate if you only have one course reading to cite. Or you can include a (very short) References list/Bibliography at the end. Direct quotations, and paraphrased material, in the body of the text should have

parenthetical page-number citations with references to the author. See Purdue University's OWL website for help with citation in MLA, APA, or Chicago style: https://owl.purdue.edu/owl/research_and_citation/resources.html

- The assignment will be submitted online via NYUBrightspace.
- These assignments will receive letter grades in accordance with the standards described below under "Grading Scale." Written comments will also be provided. We will be looking above all for accuracy, originality, and clarity, in addition to proper citation of source material.
- If you do not already have much experience writing argumentative philosophy or ethics 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.

GRADING COMPONENTS:

Item:	Percentage or Points:
General Seminar Participation	10%
In-Class Oral Presentation/Discussion Leading Assignment	10%
Four Opinionated Response Papers (~5 pages each)	20% x4

GRADING SCALE:

A:	94-100	C+:	77-79
A-:	90-93	C:	73-76
B+:	87-89	C-:	70-72
B:	83-86	D+:	67-69
B-:	80-82	D:	60-66
		F:	<60

A grade in the 'A' range demonstrates an impressive mastery of, and insightful engagement with, the course material. In written work, the student is able to reconstruct philosophical arguments with precision and accuracy and to articulate criticisms that are original, persuasive, and well-developed. The student attends all or almost all classes having completed the readings, and always or almost always makes exceptionally thoughtful and respectful contributions to class discussions.

A grade in the 'B' range denotes competent mastery of and reasonable insight into the course material. The student is able to reconstruct philosophical arguments accurately and to articulate criticisms that are reasonably persuasive and well-developed. The student attends all or almost all classes, typically completes the readings, and often makes thoughtful and respectful contributions to class discussions.

A grade in the 'C' range denotes adequate comprehension and engagement with the course material. The student is able to reconstruct philosophical arguments, with some errors, and to develop criticisms that are generally relevant to the course material, if not convincing. The student attends the majority of classes, regularly does the readings, and sometimes makes thoughtful and respectful contributions to class discussions.

A grade in the 'D' range denotes a lack of comprehension of and engagement with the course material. The student is unable to accurately reconstruct philosophical positions or to develop critiques relevant to the course material. The student

struggles with attendance, shows little evidence of having completed the readings, and rarely makes thoughtful and respectful contributions to class discussions.

A grade of 'F' may be awarded to students who fail to meet basic course requirements or who engage in plagiarism as outlined below.

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. **(Please email our course assistant, Shannon, in case of emergency to request an extension.)** 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 BRIGHTSPACE:

NYU Learning Management System (Brightspace) is our online course site platform, which will be used extensively throughout the semester. This where students will access the syllabus, assignment instruction sheets, and course readings (in pdf form) as well as submit their assignments. Brightspace will also be used to send announcements via email. Students should expect to check their NYU email accounts regularly. Past announcements from the whole term are always visible on the course site. Brightspace is accessible at <https://home.nyu.edu/academics>

TECHNOLOGY POLICY:

We currently expect to hold this semester's class entirely in person. (Those who need to attend class via Zoom on an emergency case-by-case basis should email for the classroom Zoom code.) Students are permitted to bring laptops/tablets to class for note-taking and in order to reference their copies of the readings. Students should always expect to attend class with access to their own copies of the readings, whether they're printed on paper or digital. Students are expected not to text, use social media, or browse the internet for non-academic reasons during class. Those who do so regularly may lose credit for their class participation. Please silence ringers and notifications during class. And please remember to turn off your audio and microphone in order to avoid interference with the classroom Zoom setup!

COVID POLICIES:

Our classroom policies are set by New York University and the School of Global Public Health. Currently, these include the requirement that students (and instructors) wear masks inside the classroom at all times. As I hope you understand, covid response is an ongoing challenge; changes to course formats and policies may need to be made during the course of the term. If this happens, you will be notified by email as soon as possible. This course will be offered in person. Those who need to attend class via Zoom on a case-by-case basis at any point during the semester will be able to do so. (Attendance via Zoom counts as full attendance for the purposes of the participation grade.) **Please email our course assistant, Shannon, for the classroom Zoom meeting code.** (We'll have this available beginning the day before our first class meeting.) Since this is a discussion-based seminar, our meetings will not be recorded. Those who miss a class (whether the absence counts as excused or unexcused) are encouraged, though not required, to make an appointment during my office hours to discuss the week's material.

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 Jan 25	<p>Introduction: Moral Theory & The Social Goals of Public Health</p> <p>Vaccination “thought experiment” - The ethics of public health interventions</p> <p>Comparison: Current Covid-19 vaccine availability worldwide</p>	<p>Bognar & Hirose (2014), from <i>The Ethics of Health Care Rationing</i>, Introduction & Chapter 1</p> <p>Schuklenk (2021), “Vaccine nationalism – at this point in the COVID-19 pandemic: Unjustifiable” (very short)</p> <p><i>Optional*</i> Background reading: Childress et al. (2002), “Public Health Ethics: Mapping the Terrain”</p>	
Week 2 Feb 1	<p>1. Just How <i>Broad</i> are the Goals (and Proper Scope) of Public Health?</p>	<p>Rothstein (2002), “Rethinking the Meaning of Public Health”</p> <p>Goldberg (2009), “In Support of a Broad Model of Public Health”</p>	
Week 3 Feb 8	<p>2. What is the Relationship Between <i>Justice</i> and Public Health?</p>	<p>Persad (2019), “Justice and Public Health” with volume “Introduction” for <i>The Oxford Handbook of Public Health Ethics</i></p> <p>Excerpts from Daniels (2008), <i>Just Health</i>, Ch. 2, “What is the Special Moral Importance of Health?”</p> <p>1st Response Paper</p>	<p>Due on Brightspace before start of class</p>
Week 4 Feb 15	<p>Autonomy & Paternalism in Public Health Policy</p> <p>1. Are “paternalistic” policies justified?</p>	<p>Conly (2014), “Against autonomy: justifying coercive paternalism” (very short, 1 page)</p>	

	(Focus on regulation of alcohol, unhealthy food, cigarettes)	<p>Wilkinson (2021), "Smokers' regrets and the case for public health paternalism"</p> <p>Faden, Powers & Saghai (2012), "Liberty, Mill and the Framework of Public Health Ethics"</p> <p><i>Optional*</i> further reading: Conly's (2012) book of same name</p>	
Week 5 Feb 22	2. How exactly should we understand the value of <i>autonomy</i> in public health?	<p>Buchanan (2015), "Promoting Justice and Autonomy in Public Policies to Reduce the Health Consequences of Obesity"</p> <p>Buchanan (2008), "Autonomy, Paternalism, and Justice: Ethical Priorities in Public Health"</p>	
Week 6 Mar 1	<p>Justice & Public Health, Special Topics and Case Studies</p> <p>1. Health Risks (and Individual Choice) in the Workplace, Connection to Disability Rights</p>	Daniels (2008), Ch. 7, "Consent to Workplace Risk and Health Protection"	
Week 7 Mar 8	<p>2. Public Health Data and Individual <i>Privacy</i></p> <p>COVID-19 Contact Tracing Apps</p>	<p>Gostin (2001), "Health Information: Reconciling Personal Privacy with the Public Good of Human Health"</p> <p>Miller & Smith (2021), "Ethics, public health and technology responses to COVID-19"</p> <p>2nd Response Paper</p>	Due on Brightspace before start of class
<p>SPRING BREAK (Mar 15)</p> <p>Week 8 Mar 22</p>	<p>Global Health Interventions</p> <p>1. Are we obligated to help improve health elsewhere around the world?</p>	<p>Wolff (2012), "The Basis of the Global Health Duty"</p> <p>Sreenivasan (2002), "International justice and health: a proposal"</p>	

<p>Week 9 Mar 29</p>	<p>2. The ‘Standard of Care’ Debate: What do We Owe to Research Subjects in Developing Countries?</p> <p>Case Study: AZT Trials</p>	<p>Ezekiel Emanuel (2012), “Global Justice and the ‘Standard of Care’ Debates”</p> <p>Lignou (2011), “The ‘standard of care’ debate and global justice in research”</p> <p><i>Optional*</i> further reading: MacKay (2015)</p>	
<p>Week 10 Apr 5</p>	<p>3. Research and <i>Exploitation</i>, cont’d</p> <p>Additional Case Studies</p>	<p>“Case Studies: The Havrix Trial and the Surfaxin Trial” and</p> <p>Wertheimer, “Exploitation in Clinical Research” from <i>Exploitation and Developing Countries: The Ethics of Clinical Research</i> (2008), Ed. Jennifer Hawkins and Ezekiel Emanuel</p> <p>3rd Response Paper</p>	<p>Due on Brightspace before start of class</p>
<p>Week 11 Apr 12</p>	<p>4. How is Global Climate Change a Public Health Problem?</p>	<p>Three very short pieces from the journal <i>Bioethics</i>:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. MacPherson (2013), “Climate Change is a Bioethics Problem” 2. Valles (2015), “Bioethics and the Framing of Climate Change’s Health Risks” 3. Resnik (2016), “Bioethics and Climate Change: A Response to MacPherson and Valles” <p>Lookadoo & Bell (2020), “Public Health Policy Actions to Address Health Issues Associated with Drought in a Changing Climate”</p>	
<p>Week 12 Apr 19</p>	<p>Race, Public Health, and Structural Injustice</p> <p>1. How Should We Approach Health Disparities?</p>	<p>Thomas (2019), “Racial and Ethnic Disparities as a Public Health Ethics Issue”</p> <p>Daniels (2019), “Reconciling Two Ethics Goals of Public Health: Reducing Health Disparities and Improving Population Health”</p>	

		<i>Optional*</i> background reading: Lillie-Blanton (2008)	
Week 13 Apr 26	2. How should we understand the relationship between addressing social determinants of health vs. providing universal access to health care for resolving health inequities?	Engster (2014), "The social determinants of health, care ethics and just health care" Sreenivasan (2007), "Health Care and Equality of Opportunity"	
Week 14 May 3	3. Community Relationships and Attitudes re Healthcare Institutions The Importance of Trust Covid-19 vaccine hesitancy Stigma & Seeking Care	Mcgary (2015), "Racial Groups, Distrust, and the Distribution of Health Care" Sreedhar and Gopal (3 Dec 2021), opinion for <i>The New York Times</i> Courtwright (2009), "Justice, Stigma, and the new Epidemiology of Health Disparities" 4th Response Paper	Due on Brightspace before start of class

READING LIST (INCLUDING OPTIONAL FURTHER READING):

- Bognar, Greg and Iwao Hirose. (2014). *The Ethics of Health Care Rationing: An Introduction*. Routledge. (only the "Introduction" and "Chapter 1" are required)
- 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.
- Childress et al. (2002), "Public Health Ethics: Mapping the Terrain," *Journal of Law, Medicine & Ethics*, 30, 170-78. (*optional)
- Conly, Sarah. (2012). *Against autonomy: justifying coercive paternalism*. Cambridge University Press. (*optional)
- 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.

- Daniels, Norman. (2008). *Just Health: Meeting Health Needs Fairly*. Cambridge University Press. (Only Chapters 2 and 7 are required)
- Daniels, Norman. (2019) "Reconciling Two Ethics Goals of Public Health: Reducing Health Disparities and Improving Population Health" in *The Oxford Handbook of Public Health Ethics*. Ed. Anna C. Mastroianni, Jeffrey P. Kahn and Nancy E. Kass. Oxford University Press.
- 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.
- Engster, Daniel. (2014), "The social determinants of health, care ethics and just health care," *Contemporary Political Theory*, 13(2), 149-167.
- 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.
- Gostin, Lawrence. (2001). "Health information: reconciling personal privacy with the public good of human health," *Health Care Analysis*, 9, 321-335.
- Hawkins, Jennifer and Emanuel, Ezekiel (eds.), *Exploitation and Developing Countries: The Ethics of Clinical Research*. (2008). Princeton University Press. (only "Case Studies" and Chapter 3 by Alan Wertheimer are required)
- 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. (*optional)
- Lookadoo, Rachel and Jesse Bell. (2020). "Public Health Policy Actions to Address Health Issues Associated with Drought in a Changing Climate," *The Journal of Law, Medicine & Ethics*, 48, 653-663.
- MacKay, Douglas. (2015). "Standard of Care, Institutional Obligations, and Distributive Justice," *Bioethics*, 29(4): 262-273. (*optional)
- MacPherson, Cheryl Cox. (2013). "Climate Change is a Bioethics Problem," *Bioethics*, 27(6), 305-8.
- 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.
- Miller, Seumas and Marcus Smith. (2021). "Ethics, public health and technology responses to COVID-19," *Bioethics*, 35, 364-371.
- 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.
- Resnik, David B. (2016). "Bioethics and Climate Change: A Response to MacPherson and Valles," *Bioethics*, 30(8), 649-652.
- Rothstein, Mark. (2002). "Rethinking the Meaning of Public Health," *The Journal of Law, Medicine & Ethics*, 30, 144-149.
- Schuklenk, Udo. (2021). "Vaccine nationalism – at this point in the COVID-19 pandemic: Unjustifiable," *Developing World Bioethics*, 21(3), 99.
- Sreedhar, Anita and Anand Gopool. (3 Dec 2021). "Behind Low Vaccination Rates Lurks a More Profound Social Weakness," guest opinion essay for *The New York Times*.

- Sreenivasan, Gopal. (2007) "Health Care and Equality of Opportunity," *The Hastings Center Report*, 37(2), 21-31.
- Sreenivasan, Gopool. (2002). "International justice and health: a proposal," *Ethics & International Affairs*, 16(2), 81-86.
- Thomas, Stephen B. (2019). "Racial and Ethnic Disparities as a Public Health Ethics Issue" in *The Oxford Handbook of Public Health Ethics*. Ed. Anna C. Mastroianni, Jeffrey P. Kahn and Nancy E. Kass. Oxford University Press.
- 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
- Valles, Sean. (2015). "Bioethics and the Framing of Climate Change's Health Risks," *Bioethics*, 29(5), 334-341.
- Wilkinson, T. M. (2021), "Smokers' regrets and the case for public health paternalism," *Public Health Ethics*, 14(1), 90-99.
- Wolff, Jonathan. (2012). "The Basis of the Global Health Duty." In Joseph Millum and Ezekiel Emanuel (eds.), *Global Justice and Bioethics*. Oxford University Press.

GPH DIVERSITY, EQUITY, and INCLUSION (DEI) STATEMENT:

The NYU School of Global Public Health (GPH) is committed to maintaining and celebrating a diverse, just, and inclusive environment for our students, faculty, and staff around the world. To foster this atmosphere and ideals of Diversity, Equity, and Inclusion (DEI), GPH promotes a welcoming learning environment that embraces cultural humility, and respects and values differences. These differences can include race, ethnicity, religion, gender identity, sexual orientation, physical, mental and emotional abilities, socioeconomic status, and other aspects of human diversity. In this course, we encourage students to share and discuss different perspectives, beliefs, and experiences while treating all with dignity and respect.

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 are expected to familiarize themselves with the SGPH and University's policy on academic integrity as they will be expected to adhere to such policies at all times – as a student and an alumni of New York University.

Plagiarism

Plagiarism, whether intended or not, is not tolerated in the SGPH. Plagiarism involves presenting ideas and/or words without acknowledging the source and includes any of the following acts:

- Using a phrase, sentence, or passage from another writer's work without using quotation marks
- Paraphrasing a passage from another writer's work without attribution
- Presenting facts, ideas, or written text gathered or downloaded from the Internet as your own

- Submitting another student's work with your name on it
- Submitting your own work toward requirements in more than one course without prior approval from the instructor
- Purchasing a paper or "research" from a term paper mill.

Students in the SGPH and SGPH courses are responsible for understanding what constitutes plagiarism. Students are encouraged to discuss specific questions with faculty instructors and to utilize the many resources available at New York University.

Disciplinary Sanctions

When a professor suspects cheating, plagiarism, and/or other forms of academic dishonesty, appropriate disciplinary action is as follows:

- The Professor will meet with the student to discuss, and present evidence for the particular violation, giving the student opportunity to refute or deny the charge(s).
- If the Professor confirms that violation(s), he/she, in consultation with the Chairperson or Program Director may take any of the following actions:
 - Allow the student to redo the assignment
 - Lower the grade for the work in question
 - Assign a grade of F for the work in question
 - Assign a grade of F for the course
 - Recommend dismissal

Once an action(s) is taken, the Professor will inform the Chairperson or Program Director and inform the student in writing, instructing the student to schedule an appointment with the Senior Associate Dean for Academic Affairs, as a final step. The student has the right to appeal the action taken in accordance with the GPH Student Complaint Procedure.

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.



GPH-GU 1008
Topics in Bioethics: Controversies & Politics⁸
(4 credits)

Class Schedule: Thursdays 6:45-8:45 pm
Class Location: 708 Broadway, Room 1001
(Email for the Zoom classroom code if needed)
Semester and Year: Spring 2022

Professor: Michelle M. Dyke
Office: 708 Broadway, Office 634
Email: michelle.dyke@nyu.edu
Office Phone: 212-998-3867
(email is preferred)
Office Hours: Fridays 1-3 pm (choice of in person or Zoom, sign up for a slot using the link below)
<https://docs.google.com/spreadsheets/d/1PpeeVcqra7InTdnH7O-nhtOaCgA5MYQHwTIOdpgTGDw/edit#gid=0>

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.

COURSE OVERVIEW:

Given the nature of this course, in addition to the general topics mentioned in the Course Description, we’ll also discuss timely topics including ethical issues raised by responses to COVID-19 and the relationship between race & public health in the US. Recent case studies will be included as well as more theoretical readings in ethics.

COURSE LEARNING OBJECTIVES AND RELATED COMPONENTS:

Learning Objective	Course component (lesson # & topic, assignment, etc.)
1. Develop an awareness of how the practice of medicine is inevitably shaped by subjective human goals and values.	Week 1

⁸ Note: NYU GPH policy requires detailed specification of learning objectives and grading procedures on the syllabus. Skip to p. 76 for an outline of the course readings.

<p>2. Develop an awareness, and richer understanding, of some of the major current controversies and ongoing debates at the intersection of bioethics, politics and public policy, including:</p> <p>Whether there is a <i>right</i> to healthcare and what, more precisely, that might entail</p> <p>Whether doctors (and patients) should be able to exempt themselves from having to provide certain services (or receive them) on the basis of personal and especially religious reasons</p> <p>How the public health response to COVID-19 ought to proceed</p> <p>Whether there is anything ethically objectionable about using human embryos for stem cell research</p> <p>Whether certain practices in psychiatry, such as the diagnosis of personality disorders, are less objective and/or scientifically sound than other medical practices</p> <p>How to address problems related to substance addiction in the US (and also the extent to which individuals suffering from addiction are, or are not, ethically responsible for their choices)</p> <p>Whether racism is a public <i>health</i> problem</p>	<p>All sessions</p> <p>Weeks 2-3</p> <p>Weeks 4-6</p> <p>Week 7</p> <p>Weeks 8-9</p> <p>Week 10</p> <p>Weeks 11-12</p> <p>Week 13</p>
<p>3. Gain a deeper understanding of foundational ethical concepts (including rights, obligations and duty-bearers, autonomy, conscience, general welfare, the value of human life, a right to life, moral agency & responsibility, and structural injustice) and of the relevance of appeals to these concepts as part of key arguments and viewpoints in current bioethical debates.</p>	<p>Weeks 2-3 (Rights)</p> <p>Weeks 2-7 (Obligations and Duty-Bearers)</p> <p>Weeks 4-6 (Autonomy, Conscience)</p> <p>Weeks 6-7 (General Welfare)</p> <p>Weeks 8-9 (Value of Human Life/Right to Life)</p> <p>Weeks 10-12 (Moral Agency & Responsibility)</p> <p>Week 13 (Structural Injustice)</p> <p>Assignments: Midterm Paper, Final Research Paper</p>
<p>4. Apply these foundational ethical concepts to discussion of recent real-world Case Studies.</p>	<p>Week 1 (Case Study on groundbreaking xenotransplant into a live human recipient)</p> <p>Week 3 (Case Study on Insurance Coverage of Facial Feminization Surgery for Trans Individuals)</p>

	<p>Week 6 (Case Study on the 2019 Measles Outbreak in Brooklyn, NY)</p> <p>Week 7 (Case Study on ongoing COVID-19 response)</p> <p>Week 14 (final case study tbd based on current events)</p>
5. Examine non-Western & non-Christian perspectives on classic bioethical questions.	Week 9 (Non-Christian Perspectives on the Ethics of Stem Cell Research)
6. Strengthen skills for respectful and collaborative debate of difficult and sensitive bioethical questions.	<p>Sessions: All, Especially Class Debates During Weeks 7, 14</p> <p>Assignments: Participation Grade</p>
7. Strengthen skills in critical thinking, ethical argument, and persuasive writing for Bioethics. Be able to critically and succinctly evaluate bioethical arguments, while raising original objections, and evaluating potential replies to those objections.	Assignments: Midterm Paper, Final Research Paper
8. Integrate central arguments and themes from this course into a self-directed research project, and identify appropriate secondary sources for that project.	<p>Assignments: Final Paper Proposal with Outline Final Paper Final Draft</p>

PRE-REQUISITES:

- No Pre-requisites. Students must either be enrolled in the MA in Bioethics at NYU or have written (emailed) permission from the instructor to take this class. MPH students welcome.

COURSE REQUIREMENTS AND EXPECTATIONS:

- Students are expected to complete assignments on time and at a standard appropriate for 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 (whether attending in person or online). For more detail on classroom policies, see the following sections.

ASSIGNMENTS:

Attendance and Participation (15%):

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 via email** (ideally at least twelve hours before the beginning of class). If permission is granted, the absence counts as excused. (Note that religious holidays always 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:

Rubric for Class Participation Grades:

An A for participation indicates: This student has no unexcused absences and has commented during all classes attended. Comments will reflect a careful reading of course texts and will be of very high quality – clear, well-reasoned and well-supported, on-topic, and respectful of others.

*Note: We'll have two in-class debates. An 'A' for Participation will require participation in these debates (except in case of excused absence).

An A- for participation indicates: This student has no more than one unexcused absence and has commented during most of the classes attended. Comments are of generally good quality – usually clear, well-reasoned and well-supported, on-topic, and respectful of others.

A B+ for participation indicates: This student has no more than two unexcused absences and has commented during the majority of the class sessions. Comments are of acceptable quality – respectful of others and not involving large departures from the topics under discussion.

A B for participation indicates: This student has no more than three unexcused absences and has commented during at least several class sessions. Comments are usually of the quality described under B+, but may be less relevant, or more often unsupported.

Participation grades below a B: This student has not met the standards described above (under A, A-, B+, and B), either by not joining the discussion or making inappropriate or disruptive comments. Because these situations are often unique, participation grades below a B will be at the instructor's discretion.

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 long (before References), double-spaced, Times New Roman 12-pt, with 1" margins. (The point of standardizing this is to minimize potential bias in grading.)
- This is an argumentative paper; your thesis statement (which should appear by the end of the first page) should 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 ethical 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. While it is important to demonstrate that you have understood our readings, and the issues at hand, please remember that you don’t need to (and should not!) summarize the whole paper(s) to which you are responding. Aim to present as much background information as is necessary for the rest of your paper (with a focus 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 argumentative 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 NYUBrightspace at least two weeks in advance of the due date. Your topic should be directly related to the course readings we have already discussed in class.
- The assignment will be submitted online via NYUBrightspace.
- These assignments will receive letter grades in accordance with the standards described below under “Grading Scale.” I will also provide written comments.

Final Paper (50% total):

Submission of each component will be online via Brightspace. An Assignment Sheet with more detailed instructions for both components will be uploaded to NYUBrightspace at least two weeks before the proposal is due.

Topic Proposal with Outline—5%

- **Note: This assignment will be graded A (100) or F (0) for completion (subject also to late penalties).**
- Write a short summary of the topic upon which you plan to write your final paper. Think about the debate or question you’re addressing. What side will you take? What opinion will you defend?
- Note that you will be expected to take a stance on the relevant issue in your final paper and defend your view; it is not sufficient to simply describe an existing bioethical debate.
- **Please include a draft of your thesis statement. This should be clearly marked.**
- The topic summary portion of this assignment does not need to be any more than two pages, double-spaced in length (and can, in fact, be shorter), but it must give me an idea of both the ethical question that you plan to answer as well as the considerations that you plan to use to respond to it. After a description of your topic in complete sentences, please include an outline of your paper in 2-3 pages, summarizing some of the key views, arguments, and potential objections you anticipate addressing.
- **The outline should also include a draft of your References list.**
- 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.
- **The topic is entirely up to you, so long as it engages directly and in detail with one of the topics or themes covered explicitly in this course. The final paper should cite, at minimum, two of the required course readings from the syllabus. This is also your chance to delve into further detail and make the topic your own; some additional outside research will also be required. At a minimum, you’ll be asked to cite two additional academic sources from your own independent research.**
- Note that your final paper *can* be written as a further exploration of the same general topic you wrote about for the midterm paper, so long as substantial new work (including new outside research) is involved.
- If your proposed topic is not appropriate for this course and assignment, you will be required to write another proposal. (Apart from checking to verify that the topic is relevant to our course, I’ll be looking for an ethical question of the right size/scope to address in ~15 pages.) 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 office hours to talk about paper ideas. This meeting is not required, but highly recommended.

Final Paper, Final Draft—45%

- Write a final paper based on your outline, of approximately 15 pages. Your paper must be between 13 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.
- The paper must engage directly and in detail with some of the views advanced in assigned readings from this course.
- If you do not already 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, including debates	15%
Midterm paper	35%
Final Paper Proposal with Outline	5%
Final Paper	45%

GRADING SCALE:

A:	94-100	C+:	77-79
A-:	90-93	C:	73-76
B+:	87-89	C-:	70-72
B:	83-86	D+:	67-69
B-:	80-82	D:	60-66
		F:	<60

A grade in the 'A' range demonstrates an impressive mastery of, and insightful engagement with, the course material. In written work, the student is able to reconstruct philosophical arguments with precision and accuracy and to articulate criticisms that are original, persuasive, and well-developed. The student attends all or almost all classes having completed the readings, and always or almost always makes exceptionally thoughtful and respectful contributions to class discussions.

A grade in the 'B' range denotes competent mastery of and reasonable insight into the course material. The student is able to reconstruct philosophical arguments accurately and to articulate criticisms that are reasonably persuasive and well-developed. The student attends all or almost all classes, typically completes the readings, and often makes thoughtful and respectful contributions to class discussions.

A grade in the 'C' range denotes adequate comprehension and engagement with the course material. The student is able to reconstruct philosophical arguments, with some errors, and to develop criticisms that are generally relevant to the course material, if not convincing. The student attends the majority of classes, regularly does the readings, and sometimes makes thoughtful and respectful contributions to class discussions.

A grade in the 'D' range denotes a lack of comprehension of and engagement with the course material. The student is unable to accurately reconstruct philosophical positions or to develop critiques relevant to the course material. The student struggles with attendance, shows little evidence of having completed the readings, and rarely makes thoughtful and respectful contributions to class discussions.

A grade of 'F' may be awarded to students who fail to meet basic course requirements or who engage in plagiarism as outlined below.

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 BRIGHTSPACE:

NYU Learning Management System (Brightspace) is our online course site platform, which will be used extensively throughout the semester. This where students will access the syllabus, assignment instruction sheets, and course readings (in pdf form) as well as submit their assignments. Brightspace will also be used to send announcements via email. Students should expect to check their NYU email accounts regularly. Past announcements from the whole term are always visible on the course site. Brightspace is accessible at <https://home.nyu.edu/academics>

TECHNOLOGY POLICY:

We currently expect to hold this semester's class entirely in person. (Those who need to attend class via Zoom on an emergency case-by-case basis should email for the classroom Zoom code.) Students are permitted to bring laptops/tablets to class for note-taking and in order to reference their copies of the readings. Students should always expect to attend class with access to their own copies of the readings, whether they're printed on paper or digital. Students are expected not to text, use social media, or browse the internet for non-academic reasons during class. Those who do so regularly may lose credit for their class participation. Please silence ringers and notifications during class. And please remember to turn off your audio and microphone in order to avoid interference with the classroom Zoom setup!

COVID POLICIES:

Our classroom policies are set by New York University and the School of Global Public Health. Currently, these include the requirement that students (and instructors) wear masks inside the classroom at all times. As I hope you understand, covid response is an ongoing challenge; changes to course formats and policies may need to be made during the course of the term. If this happens, you will be notified by email as soon as possible.

This course will be offered in person. Those who need to attend class via Zoom on a case-by-case basis at any point during the semester will be able to do so. (Attendance via Zoom counts as full attendance for the purposes of the participation grade.) Please email me for the classroom Zoom meeting code. (I'll have this available beginning the day before our first class meeting.) Since this is a discussion-based seminar, our meetings will not be recorded. Those who miss a class (whether the absence counts as excused or unexcused) are encouraged, though not required, to make an appointment during my office hours to discuss the week's material.

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 Jan 27	Introduction: Values, Objectivity, and the Practice of Medicine In the News, Case Study: Transplant of a Genetically Modified Pig Heart into a (Live) Human Patient	Please come to class having read Kelly et al. (2015), "The importance of values in evidence-based medicine" & Dillinger for CNN (2022) <i>*Optional</i> further reading: Howick (2011)	
Week 2 Feb 3	A Right to Healthcare? Philosophical Foundations: Human Rights and the Link to Healthcare	Daniels (2008), "5: What Do We Owe Each Other?" <i>Just Health</i> Liao (2016), "Health(care) and human rights: a fundamental conditions approach" Nickel (2016), "Can a right to health care be justified by linkage arguments?" <i>*Optional</i> further reading: Ram-Tiklin (2012)	
Week 3 Feb 10	Case Study: What Counts as "Healthcare?" Medical Insurance Coverage of FFS for Trans Patients	Dubov and Fraenkel (2018), "Facial Feminization Surgery: The Ethics of Gatekeeping in Transgender Health" Antommara (2018), "Accepting Things at Face Value: Insurance Coverage for Transgender Health Care" <i>*Optional</i> further reading: Ashley & Ells (2018)	
Week 4 Feb 17	Religious & Moral Objections (to Abortion, PAS)	Schuklenk (2019), "Conscience-based refusal of patient care in	

	from Healthcare Providers	<p>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>	
Week 5 Feb 24	Conscientious Objection cont’d	<p>Ancell & Sinnott-Armstrong (2017), “How to Allow Conscientious Objection in Medicine While Protecting Patient Rights”</p> <p>Maclure & Dumont (2017), “Selling conscience short...”</p>	
Week 6 Mar 3	Religious & Moral Objections (to Vaccination) from Patients Case Study: Measles in NYC	<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> <p>Bester (2018), “Not a matter of parental choice but of social justice obligation: Children are owed measles vaccination”</p>	
Week 7 Mar 10	In-Class Debate: COVID Case Study Based on Current Events & Student Interest (e.g. vaccination mandates - legal challenges, vulnerable populations)	<p>Readings TBD</p> <p>Midterm Paper</p>	Due on Brightspace before start of class
SPRING BREAK (Mar 17)			
Week 8 Mar 24	Controversies in Medical Research: The Ethics of Human Embryonic Stem Cell Research	Marquis (2007), “The Moral-Principle Objection to Human Embryonic Stem Cell Research”	

Week 9 Mar 31	Controversies in Medical Research: 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 7	Controversies in Psychiatry: Personality Disorders – Moral or Medical?	Pickard (2009), “Mental illness is indeed a myth” Charland (2006), “Moral Nature of the DSM-IV Cluster B Personality Disorders”	
Week 11 Apr 14	Controversies in Psychiatry: Substance Addiction & Moral Responsibility	Lewis (2017) “Addiction and the Brain” Pickard (2017) “Responsibility without Blame for Addiction”	
Week 12 Apr 21	Substance Addiction & Moral Responsibility cont’d	Burdman (2022), “A pluralistic account of degrees of control in addiction” <i>*Optional</i> background: P.F. Strawson (1962) Also <i>optional</i> : Pickard (2018), “The Puzzle of Addiction”	
Week 13 Apr 28	Race & Public Health Social determinants of health Is racism a public <i>health</i> problem? What is the relationship between racism and health disparities?	See the CDC web page on Social Determinants of Health: https://www.cdc.gov/ socialdeterminants/index.htm Lillie-Blanton et al. (2008), “Reducing Racial, Ethnic, and Socioeconomic Disparities in Health Care” Yearby (2021), “Structural Racism and Health Disparities” Final Paper Proposal/Outline	Due on Brightspace

			before start of class
Week 14 May 5	In-Class Debate Final Topic TBD Based on Current Events and Student Interest	Additional Reading TBD	
		Final Paper	Due via Brightspace at 11:59 pm on Wednesday, May 11

READING LIST:

- Ancell, Aaron and Walter Sinnott-Armstrong. (2017). "How to Allow Conscientious Objection in Medicine While Protecting Patient Rights," *Cambridge Quarterly of Healthcare Ethics*, 26, 120-131.
- 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. (*optional)
- Bester, Johan. (2018). "Not a matter of parental choice but of social justice obligation: Children are owed measles vaccination," *Bioethics*, 32, 611-619.
- Burdman, Federico. (2022). "A pluralistic account of degrees of control in addiction," *Philosophical Studies*, 179, 197-221.
- Charland, Louis C. (2006). "Moral Nature of the DSM-IV Cluster B Personality Disorders," *Journal of Personality Disorders*, 20(2), 116-125.
- CDC page on Social Determinants of Health: <https://www.cdc.gov/socialdeterminants/index.htm>
- Daniels, Norman. (2008). *Just Health: Meeting Health Needs Fairly*. Cambridge University Press.
- Dillinger, Kathrine. (10 Jan 2022). "In a medical first, a man with terminal heart disease gets a transplant of genetically modified pig heart," CNN. <https://www.cnn.com/2022/01/10/health/genetically-modified-pig-heart-transplant/index.html>
- 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.
- 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. (*optional)
- 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.
- Lewis, Marc. (2017). "Addiction and the Brain: Development, Not Disease," *Neuroethics*, 10, 7-18.

- Liao, S. Matthew. (2016). "Health(care) and human rights: a fundamental conditions approach," *Theoretical Medical Bioethics*, 37, 259-274.
- Lillie-Blanton, Marsha, Saqi Maleque, and Wilhelmine Miller. (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.
- 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.
- 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. (9 Apr 2019). "New York Declares Measles Emergency, Requiring Vaccinations in Parts of Brooklyn," *The New York Times*.
- 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.
- Pickard, Hannah. (2017). "Responsibility without Blame for Addiction," *Neuroethics*, Online First 07 January 2017.
- Pickard, Hannah. (2018). "The Puzzle of Addiction," In *The Routledge Handbook of Philosophy and Science of Addiction*, Ed. H. Pickard and S. Ahmed. 9-22. (*optional)
- 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. (*optional)
- Savulescu, Julian and Udo Schuklenk. (2018). "Conscientious objection and compromising the patient: Response to Hughes," *Bioethics*, 32, 473-476.
- Schuklenk, Udo. (2019). "Conscience-based refusal of patient care in medicine: a consequentialist analysis," *Theoretical Medicine and Bioethics*, 40, 523-538.
- 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.
- Strawson, P.F. (1962). "Freedom and Resentment," *Proceedings of the British Academy*, 48, 1-25. (*optional)
- Yearby, Ruqaiijah. (2021). "Structural Racism and Health Disparities," *The Journal of Law, Medicine & Ethics*, 48(3), 518-526.
- Additional Readings for debates TBD based on current events

GPH DIVERSITY, EQUITY, and INCLUSION (DEI) STATEMENT:

The NYU School of Global Public Health (GPH) is committed to maintaining and celebrating a diverse, just, and inclusive environment for our students, faculty, and staff around the world. To foster this atmosphere and ideals of Diversity, Equity, and Inclusion (DEI), GPH promotes a welcoming learning environment that embraces cultural humility, and respects and values differences. These differences can include race, ethnicity, religion, gender identity, sexual orientation, physical, mental and emotional abilities, socioeconomic status, and other aspects of human diversity. In this course, we encourage students to share and discuss different perspectives, beliefs, and experiences while treating all with dignity and respect.

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 are expected to familiarize themselves with the SGPH and University's policy on academic integrity as they will be expected to adhere to such policies at all times – as a student and an alumni of New York University.

Plagiarism

Plagiarism, whether intended or not, is not tolerated in the SGPH. Plagiarism involves presenting ideas and/or words without acknowledging the source and includes any of the following acts:

- Using a phrase, sentence, or passage from another writer's work without using quotation marks
- Paraphrasing a passage from another writer's work without attribution
- Presenting facts, ideas, or written text gathered or downloaded from the Internet as your own
- Submitting another student's work with your name on it
- Submitting your own work toward requirements in more than one course without prior approval from the instructor
- Purchasing a paper or "research" from a term paper mill.

Students in the SGPH and SGPH courses are responsible for understanding what constitutes plagiarism. Students are encouraged to discuss specific questions with faculty instructors and to utilize the many resources available at New York University.

Disciplinary Sanctions

When a professor suspects cheating, plagiarism, and/or other forms of academic dishonesty, appropriate disciplinary action is as follows:

- The Professor will meet with the student to discuss, and present evidence for the particular violation, giving the student opportunity to refute or deny the charge(s).
- If the Professor confirms that violation(s), he/she, in consultation with the Chairperson or Program Director may take any of the following actions:
 - Allow the student to redo the assignment
 - Lower the grade for the work in question
 - Assign a grade of F for the work in question
 - Assign a grade of F for the course
 - Recommend dismissal

Once an action(s) is taken, the Professor will inform the Chairperson or Program Director and inform the student in writing, instructing the student to schedule an appointment with the Senior Associate Dean for Academic Affairs, as a final step. The student has the right to appeal the action taken in accordance with the GPH Student Complaint Procedure.

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

Course Description

Metaethics, which investigates the nature and origins of moral norms, is a familiar branch of philosophy. By comparison, far less attention has been devoted to a “meta-epistemological” investigation of the norms of epistemic rationality. These norms govern what we ought to believe rather than how we ought to behave. In this course, we will discuss recent work at the intersection of epistemology, ethics, and metaethics that grapples with important questions about the extent to which epistemic norms, and reasons, display some of the classic features of moral ones. We’ll begin by discussing whether well-known objections to metaethical moral realism apply equally in the case of epistemic norms. Should we be “realists” about the requirements of epistemic rationality? We’ll also consider whether epistemic reasons are “categorical” in the sense that is often emphasized by moral realists to be a feature of moral reasons. (Are they genuinely authoritative for *everyone* in all circumstances?) We’ll then turn to a cluster of related questions regarding what conditions are necessary for epistemic responsibility. We’ll consider whether the familiar slogan from ethics that “ought implies can” holds in the epistemic case. We’ll also debate the extent to which our social practices of blame are analogous in the epistemic and moral cases. Next, we’ll investigate whether epistemic norms place demands upon our actions (such as those involved in inquiry) in addition to mental states like beliefs. We’ll conclude the course by considering some of the special ways in which moral and epistemic reasons may interact with each other. We’ll begin by discussing the phenomenon of moral “encroachment” on what counts as rational to believe. Finally, we’ll consider how it might be appropriate to weigh epistemic and other practical reasons for belief in contexts where they count in favor of conflicting beliefs.

Sample Reading List

(~2 weeks per unit)

I. Do metaethical 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>

*Optional background:

- J.L. Mackie. (1977). “Chapter 1: The Subjectivity of Values.” *Ethics: Inventing Right and Wrong*. New York: Penguin Books.

II. Are epistemic reasons *categorical*?

- Mantel, Susanne. (2019). “Do epistemic reasons bear on the ought simpliciter?” *Philosophical Issues*, 29(1), 214-227. <https://doi.org/10.1111/phis.12149>
- Kiesewetter, Benjamin. (2021). “Are epistemic reasons normative?” *Noûs*, forthcoming.
<https://doi.org/10.1111/nous.12379>
- Siegel, Harvey. (1990). “Laudan’s normative naturalism,” *Studies in History and Philosophy of Science, Part A*, 21(2), 295-313. [https://doi.org/10.1016/0039-3681\(90\)90028-7](https://doi.org/10.1016/0039-3681(90)90028-7)

- Wrenn, Chase B. (2004). "Hypothetical and Categorical Epistemic Normativity," *The Southern Journal of Philosophy*, 42(2), 273-290. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.2041-6962.2004.tb01000.x>

*Optional further reading on epistemic 'instrumentalism':

- Kelly, Thomas (2003). "Epistemic rationality as instrumental rationality: A critique." *Philosophy and Phenomenological Research*, 66(3), 612-640. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1933-1592.2003.tb00281.x>
- Dyke, Michelle M. (2020). "Could our epistemic reasons be *collective* practical reasons?" *Noûs*, forthcoming. <https://doi.org/10.1111/nous.12335>

III. 'Ought implies can,' doxastic voluntarism, and moral vs. epistemic agency

- Côté-Bouchard, Charles. (2019). "'Ought' implies 'can' against epistemic deontology: beyond doxastic involuntarism," *Synthese*, 196, 1641-1656, <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11229-017-1531-8>
- Weatherson, Brian. (2008). "Deontology and Descartes's Demon," *The Journal of Philosophy, Special Issue: Epistemic Norms*, 105(9), 540-569. <https://doi.org/10.5840/jphil2008105932>
- 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>

*Optional background:

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

IV. 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>
- 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.1933-1592.2011.00566.x>

*Optional 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.

V. Are there epistemic reasons for *actions* or just for doxastic states?

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

VI. Moral "*encroachment*" (into epistemic territory)

- Bolinger, Renée Jorgensen. (2020). "Varieties of Moral Encroachment," *Philosophical Perspectives*, <https://doi.org/10.1111/phpe.12124>

- Jackson, Elizabeth (2019) “How Belief-Credence Dualism Explains Away Pragmatic Encroachment,” *The Philosophical Quarterly*, 69(276), 511-33. <https://doi.org/10.1093/pq/pqz006>
- 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>
- Worsnip, Alex. (2020). “Can Pragmatists Be Moderate?” *Philosophy and Phenomenological Research*, <https://doi.org/10.1111/phpr.12673>

VII. Weighing 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 main 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 for the midterm; students may also propose their own topics. The final paper may involve either a development of the ideas from the midterm paper or an entirely new project. Students who elect to write their final papers on a new topic are highly encouraged to submit an informal draft/outline (2-4 double-spaced pages, including a thesis statement) for preliminary feedback at least two weeks before the end of the term. All students are encouraged to discuss their final papers with me, during office hours or by appointment, before the end of term.

There will also be **four informal short writing assignments** (max. 2 double-spaced pages each) due throughout the term. These will be graded A/B/C (for engagement with the texts) with written comments returned in response to students’ thoughts, suggestions, and questions. Each should present students’ reactions to course readings assigned *after* the due date for the last assignment. These assignments are intended to ensure that students are keeping up with, and continuing to engage thoughtfully with, the assigned readings throughout the semester.

Grades will be calculated as follows:

- 30% midterm paper
- 45% final paper
- 20% mini-papers at 5% each x4
- 5% seminar participation

Evidence of Teaching Effectiveness

Student Course Evaluation Results

The following pages include student evaluation results of all previous courses for which I was the sole or primary instructor. **In response to survey items, students submit scores between 1 and 5** (with higher numbers indicating a stronger 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. **See pp. 88-end for full results.**

Term (<i>instruction format</i>)	Course	Level	Average Course Rating (of 5)	Average Instructor Rating (of 5)
Spring 2022 (<i>hybrid format: in person & Zoom</i>)	Topics in Bioethics: Controversies & Politics	MA	5.0	5.0
Spring 2022 (<i>hybrid</i>)	Advanced Introduction to Public Health Ethics	MA	4.8	4.9
Fall 2021 (<i>hybrid</i>)	Advanced Introduction to Bioethics	MA	4.7	4.9
Spring 2021 (<i>all-virtual format</i>)	Topics in Bioethics: Controversies & Politics	MA	4.6	4.6
Spring 2021 (<i>hybrid</i>)	Ethics & Identity: Disability, Gender, and Race	UG	4.2	4.4
Fall 2020 (<i>hybrid</i>)	Advanced Introduction to Bioethics	MA	4.7	4.8
Summer 2020 (<i>all-virtual format</i>)	Advanced Introduction to Public Health Ethics	MA	5.0	5.0
Spring 2020 (<i>moved online</i>)	Topics in Bioethics: Controversies & Politics	MA	4.5	4.6
Spring 2020 (<i>moved online</i>)	Ethics & Identity: Disability, Gender, and Race	UG	4.3	4.5
Fall 2019	Advanced Introduction to Bioethics	MA	4.5	4.6
Spring 2019	Topics in M&E: Moral Epistemology and the Debate Over Moral Realism	UG	4.8	4.8
Fall 2018	Central Problems in Philosophy (lecture)	UG	4.3	4.4
Summer 2018	Central Problems in Philosophy (seminar)	UG	5.0	5.0
Summer 2017	Philosophy of Mind	UG	4.8	4.8
Summer 2017	History of Modern Philosophy	UG	4.5	4.7
Summer 2016	History of Modern Philosophy	UG	4.5	4.7

Summer 2015	History of Modern Philosophy	UG	4.07/4.75*	4.50/4.50*
-------------	------------------------------	----	------------	------------

*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.

Selected Feedback from Student Course Evaluations:

“There was always an atmosphere of openness, and Michelle was explicit in making sure that everyone who wished to participate had a chance and felt like their contribution was welcome.”

- Controversies & Politics in Bioethics (Spring 2022)

“She is so enthusiastic and kind. She wants her students to succeed and helps in whatever way she can.”

- Advanced Introduction to Public Health Ethics (Spring 2022)

“She is an excellent teacher, communicator, and motivator. Prof. Dyke is very passionate about every student contributing in class. Personally, she gave me a lot of confidence.”

- Advanced Introduction to Bioethics (Fall 2021)

“Dr. Dyke was exceptional in the way that she understood the trials and tribulations of students during this time. She made it very clear that a simple email went a long way in understanding what needed by the student. I felt heard and understood by her when I needed support and accommodations.”

“Professor Dyke picked some really interesting pieces throughout the semester and it was really easy to engage with them. She was always clear with her expectations for the class.”

- Ethics & Identity: Disability, Gender, and Race (Spring 2021)

“Like all the faculty here, Michelle is very accepting of others' thinking, ready to work with it and understand it and explain what might be incorrect or incomplete about it, rather than merely shooting it down. (And she's ready with praise for others' thinking, too, when praise is warranted!)”

“Professor Dyke did an excellent job not just calling on the same people every time, and giving all students an opportunity to speak when they wanted.”

- Advanced Introduction to Bioethics (Fall 2020)

“Professor Dyke did a great job facilitating conversation around central topics and discussed them analytically, free of her own bias. The class discussions were interesting and she encouraged people to share differing viewpoints.”

“The instructor's response to discussion was always constructive and oriented everyone to the topic at hand.”

- Controversies & Politics in Bioethics (Spring 2020)

“The thorough explanations of the readings and the handouts were very helpful as some readings were hard for me to understand since this is my first ethics class.”

- Ethics & Identity: Disability, Gender, and Race (Spring 2020)

“The professor’s teaching style was excellent. It was very obvious that she had thoroughly thought through how she was going to go about teaching each individual lesson, not to mention she is incredible articulate and a pleasure to listen to. I also loved that her background knowledge on every topic was robust, so that when we had relevant questions on related philosophical topics, she always had a way to provide us with information in the moment.”

“She was very engaging, very organized and managed the class well.”

- Advanced Introduction to Bioethics (Fall 2019)

“I like the way you conducted the mini-paper assignments. It gave me a chance to test my understanding in a fair (in terms of grading) manner without being too high-stakes. It facilitated a lot of learning on top of the regular class.”

- Topics in Metaphysics & Epistemology: Moral Epistemology and the Debate Over Moral Realism (Spring 2019)

“As someone who has never taken a philosophy course before, I found that Dr. Dyke did a wonderful job at making the course clear/easy to follow, interesting, intellectually stimulating, and also challenging. She is extremely articulate, concise, and it is very evident that she knows what she is talking about. The handouts she provided were very helpful and created a clear, organized way of following her lectures. Overall, I was extremely impressed by Dr. Dyke and would recommend her course to anyone.”

- Central Problems in Philosophy (Fall 2018)

Instructor Name: Dyke,Michelle Mary	Term: Spring 2022	Evaluation Type: Final	Class Description: GPH-GU 1008-001 (7564) - Topics in Bioethics: (Seminar)
---	-----------------------------	----------------------------------	--

9 out of 17 students completed the survey.

Survey Response Rate: 52.9%

Course Questions

Score range is 1 - 5

Question	Average	# of Students Who Answered the Question	Question Response Rate	# of Responses to the Answer		
				Answer	Answer	Answer %
Overall evaluation of the course.	5.0	9	100.0%	5 - Excellent	9	100.0%
				4 - Good	0	0.0%
				3 - Adequate	0	0.0%
				2 - Poor	0	0.0%
				1 - Very Poor	0	0.0%
The course objectives were clearly stated.	5.0	9	100.0%	5 - Strongly Agree	9	100.0%
				4 - Agree	0	0.0%
				3 - Neutral	0	0.0%
				2 - Disagree	0	0.0%
				1 - Strongly Disagree	0	0.0%
The course was well organized.	5.0	9	100.0%	5 - Strongly Agree	9	100.0%
				4 - Agree	0	0.0%
				3 - Neutral	0	0.0%
				2 - Disagree	0	0.0%
				1 - Strongly Disagree	0	0.0%
The course was intellectually stimulating.	5.0	9	100.0%	5 - Strongly Agree	9	100.0%
				4 - Agree	0	0.0%
				3 - Neutral	0	0.0%
				2 - Disagree	0	0.0%
				1 - Strongly Disagree	0	0.0%
The grading criteria for assignments were clear.	5.0	9	100.0%	5 - Strongly Agree	9	100.0%
				4 - Agree	0	0.0%
				3 - Neutral	0	0.0%
				2 - Disagree	0	0.0%
				1 - Strongly Disagree	0	0.0%
The assigned course readings and materials contributed to my learning.	5.0	9	100.0%	5 - Strongly Agree	9	100.0%
				4 - Agree	0	0.0%
				3 - Neutral	0	0.0%

Question	Average	# of Students Who Answered the Question	Question Response Rate	# of Responses to the Answer		
				Answer	Answer	Answer %
				2 - Disagree	0	0.0%
				1 - Strongly Disagree	0	0.0%
The course allowed me to connect with other students in the course.	5.0	9	100.0%	5 - Strongly Agree	9	100.0%
				4 - Agree	0	0.0%
				3 - Neutral	0	0.0%
				2 - Disagree	0	0.0%
				1 - Strongly Disagree	0	0.0%
The course followed the expectations outlined in the syllabus.	5.0	9	100.0%	5 - Strongly Agree	9	100.0%
				4 - Agree	0	0.0%
				3 - Neutral	0	0.0%
				2 - Disagree	0	0.0%
				1 - Strongly Disagree	0	0.0%

Instructor Questions

Score range is 1 - 5

Question	Average	# of Students Who Answered the Question	Question Response Rate	# of Responses to the Answer		
				Answer	Answer	Answer %
Overall evaluation of the instructor.	5.0	9	100.0%	5 - Excellent	9	100.0%
				4 - Good	0	0.0%
				3 - Adequate	0	0.0%
				2 - Poor	0	0.0%
				1 - Very Poor	0	0.0%
The instructor provided an environment that was conducive to learning.	5.0	9	100.0%	5 - Strongly Agree	9	100.0%
				4 - Agree	0	0.0%
				3 - Neutral	0	0.0%
				2 - Disagree	0	0.0%
				1 - Strongly Disagree	0	0.0%
The instructor provided helpful feedback on assessed class components (e.g., exams, papers).	5.0	9	100.0%	5 - Strongly Agree	9	100.0%
				4 - Agree	0	0.0%
				3 - Neutral	0	0.0%
				2 - Disagree	0	0.0%
				1 - Strongly Disagree	0	0.0%
I was able to communicate with my instructor when I needed to.	5.0	9	100.0%	5 - Strongly Agree	9	100.0%
				4 - Agree	0	0.0%
				3 - Neutral	0	0.0%
				2 - Disagree	0	0.0%
				1 - Strongly Disagree	0	0.0%

Course Comments

During the Coronavirus Pandemic, do you feel that the University provided the tools and support needed for you to successfully complete this course? Please explain.

- This course yes, insofar as zoom was an option and masks were required. NYU generally has not been that helpful at actually helping students in need who were affected by the pandemic but that's a different question maybe!
- Yes
- Yes. This was an in-person class.
- Yes
- zoom option was very helpful
- Yes
- Yes. However, the room where the class was held had some faulty zoom equipment.
- Yes, the option to zoom into class was always provided and the readings were posted on brightspace
- yes! learning materials are uploaded to Brightspace in time and our professor cares about online student's interaction.

What changes would you suggest to enhance the course? (Optional)

- I don't know if anything would! great class
- There is really nothing I would improve! The topics were thoughtfully chosen, the readings were appropriate, and the discussion was engaging.
- There was at least one week where the reading seemed pretty obscure (religious perspectives on embryonic stem cell research). I feel there could also have been a few more current cases and bit more study of the political factors that are at play in bioethics.
- Have the debates at times during the semester when students are less stressed

Instructor Comments

During the Coronavirus Pandemic, do you feel that your instructor provided the tools and support needed for you to successfully complete this course? Please explain.

- yes, Professor Dyke was very understanding and made me feel comfortable and able to do my best in this course
- Yes! Dr. Dyke was very understanding and always looking for creative ways to incorporate Zoom participants into the classroom discussion
- Yes.
- the zoom option was very helpful
- Yes
- Yes
- Yes Michelle has always been available for chats, and has expanded her office hours so that more of us would have a chance to meet with her.
- Yes, the professor always provided a student with a zoom link if needing to zoom in. Also, office hours were provided as a zoom format as well
- our professor is always so passionate and understanding. this relieves my pressure during the pandemic.

What did the instructor do well? (Optional)

- Balancing pace and depth, giving space for all students to speak, being clear about expectations and places to improve
- The readings for each class were very well curated so that we would be able to have a full discussion of the issues presented.
- Create stimulating conversation, appeal to and address topics pertinent today and of interest to the students

How well did the instructor create an environment in which differing ideas and experiences of diverse individuals could safely be shared and respected? (Optional)

- Encouraged different perspectives

How well did the instructor create an environment in which differing ideas and experiences of diverse individuals could safely be shared and respected? (Optional)

- Very well. There was always an atmosphere of openness, and Michelle was explicit in making sure that everyone who wished to participate had a chance and felt like their contribution was welcome.
- Very well

Instructor Name: Dyke,Michelle Mary	Term: Spring 2022	Evaluation Type: Final	Class Description: GPH-GU 1230-001 (24376) - Advanced Introduction to Public Health Ethics (Lecture)
---	-----------------------------	----------------------------------	--

9 out of 18 students completed the survey.

Survey Response Rate: 50.0%

Course Questions

Score range is 1 - 5

Question	Average	# of Students Who Answered the Question	Question Response Rate	# of Responses to the Answer	
				Answer	Answer %
Overall evaluation of the course.	4.8	9	100.0%	5 - Excellent	77.8%
				4 - Good	22.2%
				3 - Adequate	0.0%
				2 - Poor	0.0%
				1 - Very Poor	0.0%
The course objectives were clearly stated.	4.9	9	100.0%	5 - Strongly Agree	88.9%
				4 - Agree	11.1%
				3 - Neutral	0.0%
				2 - Disagree	0.0%
				1 - Strongly Disagree	0.0%
The course was well organized.	4.8	9	100.0%	5 - Strongly Agree	88.9%
				4 - Agree	0.0%
				3 - Neutral	11.1%
				2 - Disagree	0.0%
				1 - Strongly Disagree	0.0%
The course was intellectually stimulating.	5.0	9	100.0%	5 - Strongly Agree	100.0%
				4 - Agree	0.0%
				3 - Neutral	0.0%
				2 - Disagree	0.0%
				1 - Strongly Disagree	0.0%
The grading criteria for assignments were clear.	4.9	9	100.0%	5 - Strongly Agree	88.9%
				4 - Agree	11.1%
				3 - Neutral	0.0%
				2 - Disagree	0.0%
				1 - Strongly Disagree	0.0%
The assigned course readings and materials contributed to my learning.	4.9	9	100.0%	5 - Strongly Agree	88.9%
				4 - Agree	11.1%

Question	Average	# of Students Who Answered the Question	Question Response Rate	# of Responses to the Answer		
				Answer	Answer	Answer %
				3 - Neutral	0	0.0%
				2 - Disagree	0	0.0%
				1 - Strongly Disagree	0	0.0%
The course allowed me to connect with other students in the course.	4.8	9	100.0%	5 - Strongly Agree	7	77.8%
				4 - Agree	2	22.2%
				3 - Neutral	0	0.0%
				2 - Disagree	0	0.0%
				1 - Strongly Disagree	0	0.0%
The course followed the expectations outlined in the syllabus.	4.8	9	100.0%	5 - Strongly Agree	7	77.8%
				4 - Agree	2	22.2%
				3 - Neutral	0	0.0%
				2 - Disagree	0	0.0%
				1 - Strongly Disagree	0	0.0%

Instructor Questions

Score range is 1 - 5

Question	Average	# of Students Who Answered the Question	Question Response Rate	# of Responses to the Answer		
				Answer	Answer	Answer %
Overall evaluation of the instructor.	4.9	9	100.0%	5 - Excellent	8	88.9%
				4 - Good	1	11.1%
				3 - Adequate	0	0.0%
				2 - Poor	0	0.0%
				1 - Very Poor	0	0.0%
The instructor provided an environment that was conducive to learning.	4.9	9	100.0%	5 - Strongly Agree	8	88.9%
				4 - Agree	1	11.1%
				3 - Neutral	0	0.0%
				2 - Disagree	0	0.0%
				1 - Strongly Disagree	0	0.0%
The instructor provided helpful feedback on assessed class components (e.g., exams, papers).	5.0	9	100.0%	5 - Strongly Agree	9	100.0%
				4 - Agree	0	0.0%
				3 - Neutral	0	0.0%
				2 - Disagree	0	0.0%
				1 - Strongly Disagree	0	0.0%
I was able to communicate with my instructor when I needed to.	4.9	9	100.0%	5 - Strongly Agree	8	88.9%
				4 - Agree	1	11.1%
				3 - Neutral	0	0.0%
				2 - Disagree	0	0.0%
				1 - Strongly Disagree	0	0.0%

Course Comments

During the Coronavirus Pandemic, do you feel that the University provided the tools and support needed for you to successfully complete this course? Please explain.

- Yes, it was always possible to attend class, if not in person then through zoom.
- yup!
- Yes
- Yes, I think that NYU communicates very transparently and clearly about the covid-related issues.
- Yes
- Yes.
- Yes, although the camera for Zoom kept freezing during the second half of the course, so fixing it during class was distracting but not the fault of the teaching staff
- Yes
- Yes we were given a Zoom link if we were sick

Instructor Comments

During the Coronavirus Pandemic, do you feel that your instructor provided the tools and support needed for you to successfully complete this course? Please explain.

- Yes. I always felt that I could access the instructor when I needed.
- yes
- Yes! Michelle was very supportive and accommodating
- Yes
- Yes
- Yes
- Yes!
- Yes
- Yes she was so understanding of circumstances when we needed to take class on Zoom

What did the instructor do well? (Optional)

- The instructor did well in maintaining engaging discussion. There never felt like there was a long moment of awkward silence.
- Same as my answer for Topics in Bioethics
- Everything (as stated above). I also very appreciate the very detailed feedback on our assignments.
- She is so enthusiastic and kind. She wants her students to succeed and helps in whatever way she can.

Instructor Name: Dyke,Michelle Mary	Term: Fall 2021	Evaluation Type: Final	Class Description: GPH-GU 1005-001 (7595) - Advanced Introduction to Bioethics (Seminar)
---	---------------------------	----------------------------------	--

10 out of 15 students completed the survey.

Survey Response Rate: 66.7%

Course Questions

Score range is 1 - 5

Question	Average	# of Students Who Answered the Question	Question Response Rate	# of Responses to the Answer		
				Answer	Answer	Answer %
Overall evaluation of the course.	4.7	10	100.0%	5 - Excellent	7	70.0%
				4 - Good	3	30.0%
				3 - Adequate	0	0.0%
				2 - Poor	0	0.0%
				1 - Very Poor	0	0.0%
The course objectives were clearly stated.	5.0	10	100.0%	5 - Strongly Agree	10	100.0%
				4 - Agree	0	0.0%
				3 - Neutral	0	0.0%
				2 - Disagree	0	0.0%
				1 - Strongly Disagree	0	0.0%
The course was well organized.	4.9	10	100.0%	5 - Strongly Agree	9	90.0%
				4 - Agree	1	10.0%
				3 - Neutral	0	0.0%
				2 - Disagree	0	0.0%
				1 - Strongly Disagree	0	0.0%
The course was intellectually stimulating.	4.8	10	100.0%	5 - Strongly Agree	8	80.0%
				4 - Agree	2	20.0%
				3 - Neutral	0	0.0%
				2 - Disagree	0	0.0%
				1 - Strongly Disagree	0	0.0%
The grading criteria for assignments were clear.	4.8	10	100.0%	5 - Strongly Agree	8	80.0%
				4 - Agree	2	20.0%
				3 - Neutral	0	0.0%
				2 - Disagree	0	0.0%
				1 - Strongly Disagree	0	0.0%
The assigned course readings and materials contributed to my learning.	4.6	10	100.0%	5 - Strongly Agree	7	70.0%
				4 - Agree	2	20.0%
				3 - Neutral	1	10.0%

Question	Average	# of Students Who Answered the Question	Question Response Rate	# of Responses to the Answer		
				Answer	Answer	Answer %
				2 - Disagree	0	0.0%
				1 - Strongly Disagree	0	0.0%
The course allowed me to connect with other students in the course.	4.7	10	100.0%	5 - Strongly Agree	8	80.0%
				4 - Agree	1	10.0%
				3 - Neutral	1	10.0%
				2 - Disagree	0	0.0%
				1 - Strongly Disagree	0	0.0%
The course followed the expectations outlined in the syllabus.	5.0	10	100.0%	5 - Strongly Agree	10	100.0%
				4 - Agree	0	0.0%
				3 - Neutral	0	0.0%
				2 - Disagree	0	0.0%
				1 - Strongly Disagree	0	0.0%

Instructor Questions

Score range is 1 - 5

Question	Average	# of Students Who Answered the Question	Question Response Rate	# of Responses to the Answer		
				Answer	Answer	Answer %
Overall evaluation of the instructor.	4.9	10	100.0%	5 - Excellent	9	90.0%
				4 - Good	1	10.0%
				3 - Adequate	0	0.0%
				2 - Poor	0	0.0%
				1 - Very Poor	0	0.0%
The instructor provided an environment that was conducive to learning.	4.6	10	100.0%	5 - Strongly Agree	6	60.0%
				4 - Agree	4	40.0%
				3 - Neutral	0	0.0%
				2 - Disagree	0	0.0%
				1 - Strongly Disagree	0	0.0%
The instructor provided helpful feedback on assessed class components (e.g., exams, papers).	4.9	10	100.0%	5 - Strongly Agree	9	90.0%
				4 - Agree	1	10.0%
				3 - Neutral	0	0.0%
				2 - Disagree	0	0.0%
				1 - Strongly Disagree	0	0.0%
I was able to communicate with my instructor when I needed to.	4.8	10	100.0%	5 - Strongly Agree	8	80.0%
				4 - Agree	2	20.0%
				3 - Neutral	0	0.0%
				2 - Disagree	0	0.0%
				1 - Strongly Disagree	0	0.0%

Course Comments

During the Coronavirus Pandemic, do you feel that the University provided the tools and support needed for you to successfully complete this course? Please explain.

- Yes
- Yes, there was a lot of opportunity to take the class on Zoom if needed.
- Yes
- Yes, it was supportive of the many complications due to the corona virus.
- Yes, because the professor allowed for students to zoom into class as well as attend in person, it was covid friendly
- Yes. Joining via zoom was possible. The Zoom set-up was excellent
The course assistant facilitated the Zoom meetings very well
- Yes
- Yes
- Yes
- Yes

What changes would you suggest to enhance the course? (Optional)

- No more quizzes
- The quiz was not helpful.
- It'd be great to provide some background for the readings the week before they are assigned. Some of them were difficult to comprehend and then the reading becomes really cumbersome. It was sometimes difficult to see how the topics connected with each other and with the overall theme of the class: moral intuitions. Although there was a lot of discussion and that's very good, this discussion could be sometimes a little bit more restricted so that the professor has more time to express his knowledge and ideas, which are always awesome.
- I would suggest some flexibility and/or alternative options where the class participation rubric is concerned. Students come into the classroom with a variety of needs, experiences, (dis)abilities, etc. and the rigidity of the class participation requirements only enable a very particularly ables type of student to thrive. If there were additional ways to participate (discussion questions, writing reflections, etc.) it might give more students the opportunity to engage, learn, and flourish.
- Another debate, maybe halfway through the term?
- Nil

What additional comments would you like to make? (Optional)

- None
- Overall, I've really enjoyed the way that Dr. Dyke facilitates her class and the discussions.
- Great selection of readings

Instructor Comments

During the Coronavirus Pandemic, do you feel that your instructor provided the tools and support needed for you to successfully complete this course? Please explain.

- Yes
- The instructor allowed students to participate on Zoom if needed.
- Yes.
- Yes. The zoom meeting set-up and coordination was perfect
- Yes, Professor Dyke worked hard to accommodate students online and she was extremely responsive to student emails
- Yes, she was incredibly supportive.
- Yes
- Yes

During the Coronavirus Pandemic, do you feel that your instructor provided the tools and support needed for you to successfully complete this course? Please explain.

- Yes
- Yes

What did the instructor do well? (Optional)

- The instructor gave fast feedback and made time for students.
- The instructor made herself available and showed an eagerness to be helpful in my learning & performance.
- Her comments on our assigned work was thorough and helpful
- She was available to address student needs, and she allocated the class time well. She did an incredible job of managing and overseeing class discussion
- She is an excellent teacher, communicator, and motivator.
Prof. Dyke is very passionate about every student contributing in class. Personally, she gave me a lot of confidence

How well did the instructor create an environment in which differing ideas and experiences of diverse individuals could safely be shared and respected? (Optional)

- Somewhat well. The instructor gave some opportunity for many to participate but there were still some people who never spoke in class.
- She did a great job facilitating conversation and inviting a variety of perspectives.
- Extremely well
- She did that excellently.

Instructor Name: Dyke,Michelle Mary	Term: Spring 2021	Evaluation Type: Final	Class Description: GPH-GU 1008-001 (7370) - Topics in Bioethics: (Seminar)
---	-----------------------------	----------------------------------	--

5 out of 12 students completed the survey.

Survey Response Rate: 41.7%

Course Questions

Score range is 1 - 5

Question	Average	# of Students Who Answered the Question	Question Response Rate	# of Responses to the Answer		
				Answer	Answer	Answer %
Overall evaluation of the course.	4.6	5	100.0%	5 - Excellent	3	60.0%
				4 - Good	2	40.0%
				3 - Adequate	0	0.0%
				2 - Poor	0	0.0%
				1 - Very Poor	0	0.0%
The course objectives were clearly stated.	4.8	5	100.0%	5 - Strongly Agree	4	80.0%
				4 - Agree	1	20.0%
				3 - Neutral	0	0.0%
				2 - Disagree	0	0.0%
				1 - Strongly Disagree	0	0.0%
The course was well organized.	4.8	5	100.0%	5 - Strongly Agree	4	80.0%
				4 - Agree	1	20.0%
				3 - Neutral	0	0.0%
				2 - Disagree	0	0.0%
				1 - Strongly Disagree	0	0.0%
The course was intellectually stimulating.	4.6	5	100.0%	5 - Strongly Agree	3	60.0%
				4 - Agree	2	40.0%
				3 - Neutral	0	0.0%
				2 - Disagree	0	0.0%
				1 - Strongly Disagree	0	0.0%
The grading criteria for assignments were clear.	4.4	5	100.0%	5 - Strongly Agree	2	40.0%
				4 - Agree	3	60.0%
				3 - Neutral	0	0.0%
				2 - Disagree	0	0.0%
				1 - Strongly Disagree	0	0.0%
The assigned course readings and materials contributed to my learning.	4.8	5	100.0%	5 - Strongly Agree	4	80.0%
				4 - Agree	1	20.0%
				3 - Neutral	0	0.0%

Question	Average	# of Students Who Answered the Question	Question Response Rate	# of Responses to the Answer		
				Answer	Answer	Answer %
				2 - Disagree	0	0.0%
				1 - Strongly Disagree	0	0.0%
The course allowed me to connect with other students in the course.	4.4	5	100.0%	5 - Strongly Agree	3	60.0%
				4 - Agree	1	20.0%
				3 - Neutral	1	20.0%
				2 - Disagree	0	0.0%
				1 - Strongly Disagree	0	0.0%
The course followed the expectations outlined in the syllabus.	5.0	5	100.0%	5 - Strongly Agree	5	100.0%
				4 - Agree	0	0.0%
				3 - Neutral	0	0.0%
				2 - Disagree	0	0.0%
				1 - Strongly Disagree	0	0.0%

Instructor Questions

Score range is 1 - 5

Question	Average	# of Students Who Answered the Question	Question Response Rate	# of Responses to the Answer		
				Answer	Answer	Answer %
Overall evaluation of the instructor.	4.6	5	100.0%	5 - Excellent	3	60.0%
				4 - Good	2	40.0%
				3 - Adequate	0	0.0%
				2 - Poor	0	0.0%
				1 - Very Poor	0	0.0%
The instructor provided an environment that was conducive to learning.	4.8	5	100.0%	5 - Strongly Agree	4	80.0%
				4 - Agree	1	20.0%
				3 - Neutral	0	0.0%
				2 - Disagree	0	0.0%
				1 - Strongly Disagree	0	0.0%
The instructor provided helpful feedback on assessed class components (e.g., exams, papers).	4.6	5	100.0%	5 - Strongly Agree	3	60.0%
				4 - Agree	2	40.0%
				3 - Neutral	0	0.0%
				2 - Disagree	0	0.0%
				1 - Strongly Disagree	0	0.0%
I was able to communicate with my instructor when I needed to.	4.8	5	100.0%	5 - Strongly Agree	4	80.0%
				4 - Agree	1	20.0%
				3 - Neutral	0	0.0%
				2 - Disagree	0	0.0%
				1 - Strongly Disagree	0	0.0%

Course Comments

During the Coronavirus Pandemic, do you feel that the University provided the tools and support needed for you to successfully complete this course? Please explain.

- I didnt mind the zoom lecture.
- yes
- It worked. I don't think it was successful from the university but more so Professor Dyke. She organized the Classes page so it was very easy to navigate and was considerate when it came to the sound and technical issues.
- Yes
- Yes.

Instructor Comments

During the Coronavirus Pandemic, do you feel that your instructor provided the tools and support needed for you to successfully complete this course? Please explain.

- Everything was very clear and organized
- yes
- Yes, the classes page was set up very nicely.
- Yes
- Yes she did. Her reading materials were very clear and really brought out the controversies in politics and bioethics.

What did the instructor do well? (Optional)

- I appreciated the screenshares, those were useful
- Professor Dyke was very good at providing additional resources which I really appreciated.
- The debate was very great as well as the small group discussions

Instructor Name: Dyke,Michelle Mary	Term: Spring 2021	Evaluation Type: Final	Class Description: UGPH-GU 28-001 (17859) - Ethics and Identity: Disability, Gender, and Race (Lecture)
---	-----------------------------	----------------------------------	---

9 out of 25 students completed the survey.

Survey Response Rate: 36.0%

Course Questions

Score range is 1 - 5

Question	Average	# of Students Who Answered the Question	Question Response Rate	# of Responses to the Answer	
				Answer	Answer %
Overall evaluation of the course.	4.2	9	100.0%	5 - Excellent	55.6%
				4 - Good	11.1%
				3 - Adequate	33.3%
				2 - Poor	0.0%
				1 - Very Poor	0.0%
The course objectives were clearly stated.	4.6	9	100.0%	5 - Strongly Agree	55.6%
				4 - Agree	44.4%
				3 - Neutral	0.0%
				2 - Disagree	0.0%
				1 - Strongly Disagree	0.0%
The course was well organized.	4.7	9	100.0%	5 - Strongly Agree	66.7%
				4 - Agree	33.3%
				3 - Neutral	0.0%
				2 - Disagree	0.0%
				1 - Strongly Disagree	0.0%
The course was intellectually stimulating.	4.1	9	100.0%	5 - Strongly Agree	55.6%
				4 - Agree	11.1%
				3 - Neutral	22.2%
				2 - Disagree	11.1%
				1 - Strongly Disagree	0.0%
The grading criteria for assignments were clear.	4.4	9	100.0%	5 - Strongly Agree	55.6%
				4 - Agree	33.3%
				3 - Neutral	11.1%
				2 - Disagree	0.0%
				1 - Strongly Disagree	0.0%
The assigned course readings and materials contributed to my learning.	4.3	9	100.0%	5 - Strongly Agree	55.6%
				4 - Agree	22.2%

Question	Average	# of Students Who Answered the Question	Question Response Rate	# of Responses to the Answer		
				Answer	Answer	Answer %
				3 - Neutral	2	22.2%
				2 - Disagree	0	0.0%
				1 - Strongly Disagree	0	0.0%
The course allowed me to connect with other students in the course.	3.9	9	100.0%	5 - Strongly Agree	2	22.2%
				4 - Agree	4	44.4%
				3 - Neutral	3	33.3%
				2 - Disagree	0	0.0%
				1 - Strongly Disagree	0	0.0%
The course followed the expectations outlined in the syllabus.	4.7	9	100.0%	5 - Strongly Agree	6	66.7%
				4 - Agree	3	33.3%
				3 - Neutral	0	0.0%
				2 - Disagree	0	0.0%
				1 - Strongly Disagree	0	0.0%

Instructor Questions

Score range is 1 - 5

Question	Average	# of Students Who Answered the Question	Question Response Rate	# of Responses to the Answer		
				Answer	Answer	Answer %
Overall evaluation of the instructor.	4.4	9	100.0%	5 - Excellent	6	66.7%
				4 - Good	1	11.1%
				3 - Adequate	2	22.2%
				2 - Poor	0	0.0%
				1 - Very Poor	0	0.0%
The instructor provided an environment that was conducive to learning.	4.7	9	100.0%	5 - Strongly Agree	6	66.7%
				4 - Agree	3	33.3%
				3 - Neutral	0	0.0%
				2 - Disagree	0	0.0%
				1 - Strongly Disagree	0	0.0%
The instructor provided helpful feedback on assessed class components (e.g., exams, papers).	4.3	9	100.0%	5 - Strongly Agree	4	44.4%
				4 - Agree	4	44.4%
				3 - Neutral	1	11.1%
				2 - Disagree	0	0.0%
				1 - Strongly Disagree	0	0.0%
I was able to communicate with my instructor when I needed to.	4.7	9	100.0%	5 - Strongly Agree	6	66.7%
				4 - Agree	3	33.3%
				3 - Neutral	0	0.0%
				2 - Disagree	0	0.0%
				1 - Strongly Disagree	0	0.0%

Course Comments

During the Coronavirus Pandemic, do you feel that the University provided the tools and support needed for you to successfully complete this course? Please explain.

- Basically, but nothing tried in the pandemic will be as successful as normal learning
- Yes.
- I feel that my needs for this course were met by the university. Dr. Dyke's policies were adequately flexible for the stress that come with the pandemic.
- .
- Yes, I enjoyed being in person. Hybrid format was a little weird. Would've preferred fully in person.
- I did not rely very much of the University's resources and support to complete this course given that Professor Dyke did that all on her own.
- I do not think that the University promoted the resources as much as they should have during the coronavirus pandemic. For example, communication about the covid relief grant was not as clear as it should have been.
- The University, under the obvious fact that it was an unprecedented turn of events, did an adequate job to support the students to learn and successfully complete the course.
- In some ways, yes. However, in other ways, it felt as if we were "going back to normal" while still in the middle of a pandemic (and arguably one of the most difficult periods as we passed the one-year mark and everything ceased to feel real).

What changes would you suggest to enhance the course? (Optional)

- I felt that there could have been more readings exploring more progressive theories of disability and gender.
- Talk about race during Black History Month and acknowledge the current climate in correlation to the themes we are learning.
- In-person classes would be quite nice.
- Possibly more recent/inclusive readings and more, smaller assignments as opposed to two large papers

Instructor Comments

During the Coronavirus Pandemic, do you feel that your instructor provided the tools and support needed for you to successfully complete this course? Please explain.

- Yes, she did an excellent job of trying to make herself available and all the material accessible
- Yes.
- Yes, I felt that Dr. Dyke's attendance and assignment policies were flexible and that she was understanding when I communicated with her.
- Yes. Michelle was very helpful and understand to everyone. She made it very easy to follow along and to understand complex topics.
- .
- Yes, however, I did feel as though she was treating this course as if we weren't still in a pandemic and a little less accommodating
- Professor Dyke made herself available and it was very easy to reach out to her with questions and/or concerns. I felt that this course was very reasonable in the midst of the pandemic, based on its format and even the professor's level of organization and clarity.
- Yes. Dr. Dyke was exceptional in the way that she understood the trials and tribulations of students during this time. She made it very clear that a simple email went a long way in understanding what needed by the student. I felt heard and understood by her when I needed support and accommodations.
- Yes. She provided what I feel was a fine time for furthering knowledge on what was initially described on the course outline.

What did the instructor do well? (Optional)

- Professor Dyke picked some really interesting pieces throughout the semester and it was really easy to engage with them. She was always clear with her expectations for the class.
- Dr. Dyke was amazing in exhaustively explaining each theme. There was rarely a time where I felt

What did the instructor do well? (Optional)

lost in the class. I love the fact that she is able to answer a question then give an example then (this is what really sold me) explains why the example relates to the answer and the theme we are discussing at hand. It did a great job of integrating new topics into my mind and it got me to think about the way that these themes actively interact around me. I also enjoyed how eloquently she was able to manage lecturing to both zoom and in person students. She made it look so easy when I cannot imagine doing the same. In addition to that, the class discussions were incredible. Dr. Dyke did a great job not showing any favoritism to any particular theorists and to this day I have no clue where she stood on the themes we discussed and I am thoroughly equipped to explain those themes in a neutral standpoint now. In order to bring class to another level, I would recommend connecting with students more throughout class time. Although we covered an extensive amount of material and had the chance to elaborate on our thoughts about the course, it felt impersonal. I don't remember being asked how am I doing and that is a conversation that I would've valued especially during a time like now. For example a poll during lecture would've helped.

- Instructing; much of the facets of which could've been incorporated in a remote environment, she included or tried to include.

How well did the instructor create an environment in which differing ideas and experiences of diverse individuals could safely be shared and respected? (Optional)

- Professor Dyke always made it clear that the classroom was a safe space as she did not record group discussions because she wanted us to feel comfortable with sharing our ideas.
- Dr. Dyke did a phenomenal job. There were students that expressed sensitive sentiments around disability and from an outsider's standpoint I think she did a great job listening to the student and expressing care while connecting it to views that we saw in the course. The course was set up in a wonderful way where we had time to express our thoughts every week no matter how they ranged and it was awesome to see.
- She allowed for extensive discussions amongst different students on several potentially controversial topics, whilst not letting them get out of control.
- She did this well, although some of the readings (one in particular) felt as though they just completely shut down the idea that gender self-identity was valid and I can only imagine how invalidating that would have felt for a trans student to have to read and discuss that

Instructor Name: Dyke,Michelle Mary	Term: Fall 2020	Evaluation Type: Final	Class Description: GPH-GU 1005-001 (8106) - Advanced Introduction to Bioethics (Seminar)
---	---------------------------	----------------------------------	--

12 out of 21 students completed the survey.

Survey Response Rate: 57.1%

Course Questions

Score range is 1 - 5

Question	Average	# of Students Who Answered the Question	Question Response Rate	# of Responses to the Answer		
				Answer	Answer	Answer %
Overall evaluation of the course.	4.7	12	100.0%	5 - Excellent	9	75.0%
				4 - Good	2	16.7%
				3 - Adequate	1	8.3%
				2 - Poor	0	0.0%
				1 - Very Poor	0	0.0%
The course objectives were clearly stated.	5.0	12	100.0%	5 - Strongly Agree	12	100.0%
				4 - Agree	0	0.0%
				3 - Neutral	0	0.0%
				2 - Disagree	0	0.0%
				1 - Strongly Disagree	0	0.0%
The course was well organized.	4.9	12	100.0%	5 - Strongly Agree	11	91.7%
				4 - Agree	1	8.3%
				3 - Neutral	0	0.0%
				2 - Disagree	0	0.0%
				1 - Strongly Disagree	0	0.0%
The course was intellectually stimulating.	4.9	12	100.0%	5 - Strongly Agree	11	91.7%
				4 - Agree	1	8.3%
				3 - Neutral	0	0.0%
				2 - Disagree	0	0.0%
				1 - Strongly Disagree	0	0.0%
The grading criteria for assignments were clear.	4.8	12	100.0%	5 - Strongly Agree	10	83.3%
				4 - Agree	2	16.7%
				3 - Neutral	0	0.0%
				2 - Disagree	0	0.0%
				1 - Strongly Disagree	0	0.0%
The assigned course readings and materials contributed to my learning.	4.8	12	100.0%	5 - Strongly Agree	10	83.3%
				4 - Agree	2	16.7%
				3 - Neutral	0	0.0%

Question	Average	# of Students Who Answered the Question	Question Response Rate	# of Responses to the Answer		
				Answer	Answer	Answer %
				2 - Disagree	0	0.0%
				1 - Strongly Disagree	0	0.0%
The course allowed me to connect with other students in the course.	4.3	12	100.0%	5 - Strongly Agree	7	58.3%
				4 - Agree	3	25.0%
				3 - Neutral	1	8.3%
				2 - Disagree	1	8.3%
				1 - Strongly Disagree	0	0.0%
The course followed the expectations outlined in the syllabus.	5.0	12	100.0%	5 - Strongly Agree	12	100.0%
				4 - Agree	0	0.0%
				3 - Neutral	0	0.0%
				2 - Disagree	0	0.0%
				1 - Strongly Disagree	0	0.0%

Instructor Questions

Score range is 1 - 5

Question	Average	# of Students Who Answered the Question	Question Response Rate	# of Responses to the Answer		
				Answer	Answer	Answer %
Overall evaluation of the instructor.	4.8	12	100.0%	5 - Excellent	10	83.3%
				4 - Good	2	16.7%
				3 - Adequate	0	0.0%
				2 - Poor	0	0.0%
				1 - Very Poor	0	0.0%
The instructor provided an environment that was conducive to learning.	4.8	12	100.0%	5 - Strongly Agree	10	83.3%
				4 - Agree	1	8.3%
				3 - Neutral	1	8.3%
				2 - Disagree	0	0.0%
				1 - Strongly Disagree	0	0.0%
The instructor provided helpful feedback on assessed class components (e.g., exams, papers).	4.9	12	100.0%	5 - Strongly Agree	11	91.7%
				4 - Agree	1	8.3%
				3 - Neutral	0	0.0%
				2 - Disagree	0	0.0%
				1 - Strongly Disagree	0	0.0%
I was able to communicate with my instructor when I needed to.	4.9	12	100.0%	5 - Strongly Agree	11	91.7%
				4 - Agree	1	8.3%
				3 - Neutral	0	0.0%
				2 - Disagree	0	0.0%
				1 - Strongly Disagree	0	0.0%

Course Comments

During the Coronavirus Pandemic, do you feel that the University provided the tools and support needed for you to successfully complete this course? Please explain.

- I thought the Zoom classroom worked really well and allowed me to fit this class into my busy lifestyle. It was just as effective as being in class in person! The regular class sessions and the teacher's office hours were extremely accessible. After we ironed out the kinks in the first class or two, I was able to hear and see every person clearly. I actually prefer Zoom to in-person instruction.
- Yes. I didn't mind the online class. Due to many people, I did feel intimidated to raise my hand and participate more often.
- Yes. The course was well-facilitated online. Professor and TA were always available.
- I think the blended classroom was a really bad idea. Audio quality was inconsistent, it was hard to tell who was speaking, and frequently there were technology issues.
- Yes, but in part that's because Dr. Dyke is so *thoroughly* on-the-ball. Not all professors--brilliant though they may be--were able to deliver an experience quite as seamless as Michelle's (and even she experienced a hiccup or two). My own feeling (and I can't stress this enough) is that the hybrid format does not succeed at capturing the best of both worlds (i.e., the in-person and in-class worlds). In fact, I think it utterly fails to do that in most instances. If NYU insists on the hybrid format at any future time, the school should provide on-body mics for professors when they're in classrooms.
- The blended format was fine once the technical difficulties were overcome (although in person is better).
- n/a
- Yes. The course was online and well-integrated with regards to that.
- Yes
- Yes. All materials were readily available online
- Yes I do
- Yes. Reading materials were readily available, the online platform was fully functional as well as other support services like the library.

What changes would you suggest to enhance the course? (Optional)

- I think more students should be required to keep their cameras on.
- I liked the debate, but found it to be difficult and intense. Would have liked to have formed groups ahead of time, and had a planned out argument.
- none
- I would like to see more engagement encouraged via chat
- none

What additional comments would you like to make? (Optional)

- I would have liked to know more about the career aspirations of other people in my class and their purpose for taking the course.
- Found Michelle's comments to be more helpful than Ryan's on the short essay.
- Speaking of things I cannot stress enough: Michelle is a *prime asset* to NYU and the Bioethics department. DO NOT LET HER GET AWAY. She's smart as heck and she's pedagogically superb. She manages class time as well as anyone could, assigns just the right amount of reading and writing, provides insightful criticism (perhaps my only wish is that she'd provide a bit MORE feedback...but she turns papers around really pretty quickly, so that's the trade-off there), and goes the extra mile for students.
- None

Instructor Comments

During the Coronavirus Pandemic, do you feel that your instructor provided the tools and support needed for you to successfully complete this course? Please explain.

- Absolutely. The professor was fantastic.
- I liked the break out rooms to talk with others.
- Yes. Provided good feedback and was accomodating during the election/pandemic.
- Yes, she has been as accommodating as possible.
- Professor Dyke was available and responded quickly to emails.
- Yup. See my earlier remarks.
- n/a
- Yes. The professor made it easy to access classes and notes and was easy to contact throughout the semester.
- Yes
- Yes. They were available online. She also sent emails to update us when needed.
- Yes, providing options to join class given the difficulties I had with the time zone difference
- She was within reach through emails and zoom meetings. She cared so much about the negative impact of the pandemic and how I could navigate through to optimize my learning strategies.

What did the instructor do well? (Optional)

- She was great at letting everyone express their opinions. If you had something to say, you almost always were given the opportunity to speak.
- Michelle was great at explaining things. Appreciated that we had a short break instead of powering through.
- I think Michelle does most everything well.
- Both Michelle and Ryan were excellent in facilitating discussion and grading assignments at a reasonable pace, as well as providing helpful feedback.
- Everything, Michelle is a brilliant professor.
- She is very knowledgeable!
- Engaged students
- Organized varied interactive teaching sessions, adopted various assessment techniques and reached out to me personally on how I could optimize my learning strategies in the face of the pandemic
- Professor Dyke seems to be having fun with the class, which is nice.

How well did the instructor create an environment in which differing ideas and experiences of diverse individuals could safely be shared and respected? (Optional)

- Absolutely. Like all the faculty here, Michelle is very accepting of others' thinking, ready to work with it and understand it and explain what might be incorrect or incomplete about it, rather than merely shooting it down. (And she's ready with praise for others' thinking, too, when praise is warranted!)
- Extremely well. Good job.
- Very well.
- She did really well!
- She responded to general and individual students' questions with impartiality.
- Professor Dyke did an excellent job not just calling on the same people every time, and giving all students an opportunity to speak when they wanted.

Instructor Name: Dyke,Michelle Mary	Term: Summer 2020	Evaluation Type: Final	Class Description: GPH-GU 1230-001 (2240) - Advanced Introduction to Public Health Ethics (Lecture)
---	-----------------------------	----------------------------------	---

3 out of 6 students completed the survey.

Survey Response Rate: 50.0%

Course Questions

Score range is 1 - 5

Question	Average	# of Students Who Answered the Question	Question Response Rate	# of Responses to the Answer		
				Answer	Answer %	
Overall evaluation of the course.	5.0	3	100.0%	5 - Excellent	3	100.0%
				4 - Good	0	0.0%
				3 - Adequate	0	0.0%
				2 - Poor	0	0.0%
				1 - Very Poor	0	0.0%
The course objectives were clearly stated.	5.0	3	100.0%	5 - Strongly Agree	3	100.0%
				4 - Agree	0	0.0%
				3 - Neutral	0	0.0%
				2 - Disagree	0	0.0%
				1 - Strongly Disagree	0	0.0%
The course was well organized.	5.0	3	100.0%	5 - Strongly Agree	3	100.0%
				4 - Agree	0	0.0%
				3 - Neutral	0	0.0%
				2 - Disagree	0	0.0%
				1 - Strongly Disagree	0	0.0%
The course was intellectually stimulating.	5.0	3	100.0%	5 - Strongly Agree	3	100.0%
				4 - Agree	0	0.0%
				3 - Neutral	0	0.0%
				2 - Disagree	0	0.0%
				1 - Strongly Disagree	0	0.0%
The grading criteria for assignments were clear.	5.0	3	100.0%	5 - Strongly Agree	3	100.0%
				4 - Agree	0	0.0%
				3 - Neutral	0	0.0%
				2 - Disagree	0	0.0%
				1 - Strongly Disagree	0	0.0%
The assigned course readings and materials contributed to my learning.	5.0	3	100.0%	5 - Strongly Agree	3	100.0%
				4 - Agree	0	0.0%

Question	Average	# of Students Who Answered the Question	Question Response Rate	# of Responses to the		
				Answer	Answer	Answer %
				3 - Neutral	0	0.0%
				2 - Disagree	0	0.0%
				1 - Strongly Disagree	0	0.0%

Instructor Questions

Score range is 1 - 5

Question	Average	# of Students Who Answered the Question	Question Response Rate	# of Responses to the		
				Answer	Answer	Answer %
Overall evaluation of the instructor.	5.0	3	100.0%	5 - Excellent	3	100.0%
				4 - Good	0	0.0%
				3 - Adequate	0	0.0%
				2 - Poor	0	0.0%
				1 - Very Poor	0	0.0%
The instructor provided an environment that was conducive to learning.	5.0	3	100.0%	5 - Strongly Agree	3	100.0%
				4 - Agree	0	0.0%
				3 - Neutral	0	0.0%
				2 - Disagree	0	0.0%
				1 - Strongly Disagree	0	0.0%
The instructor provided helpful feedback on assessed class components (e.g., exams, papers).	5.0	3	100.0%	5 - Strongly Agree	3	100.0%
				4 - Agree	0	0.0%
				3 - Neutral	0	0.0%
				2 - Disagree	0	0.0%
				1 - Strongly Disagree	0	0.0%

Instructor Name: Dyke,Michelle Mary	Term: Spring 2020	Evaluation Type: Final	Class Description: GPH-GU 1008-001 (7413) - Topics in Bioethics: (Seminar)
---	-----------------------------	----------------------------------	--

10 out of 21 students completed the survey.

Survey Response Rate: 47.6%

Course Questions

Score range is 1 - 5

Question	Average	# of Students Who Answered the Question	Question Response Rate	# of Responses to the Answer		
				Answer	Answer	Answer %
Overall evaluation of the course.	4.5	10	100.0%	5 - Excellent	5	50.0%
				4 - Good	5	50.0%
				3 - Adequate	0	0.0%
				2 - Poor	0	0.0%
				1 - Very Poor	0	0.0%
The course objectives were clearly stated.	4.7	10	100.0%	5 - Strongly Agree	7	70.0%
				4 - Agree	3	30.0%
				3 - Neutral	0	0.0%
				2 - Disagree	0	0.0%
				1 - Strongly Disagree	0	0.0%
The course was well organized.	4.6	10	100.0%	5 - Strongly Agree	7	70.0%
				4 - Agree	2	20.0%
				3 - Neutral	1	10.0%
				2 - Disagree	0	0.0%
				1 - Strongly Disagree	0	0.0%
The course was intellectually stimulating.	4.5	10	100.0%	5 - Strongly Agree	5	50.0%
				4 - Agree	5	50.0%
				3 - Neutral	0	0.0%
				2 - Disagree	0	0.0%
				1 - Strongly Disagree	0	0.0%
The grading criteria for assignments were clear.	4.7	10	100.0%	5 - Strongly Agree	7	70.0%
				4 - Agree	3	30.0%
				3 - Neutral	0	0.0%
				2 - Disagree	0	0.0%
				1 - Strongly Disagree	0	0.0%
The assigned course readings and materials contributed to my learning.	4.4	10	100.0%	5 - Strongly Agree	5	50.0%
				4 - Agree	4	40.0%
				3 - Neutral	1	10.0%

Question	Average	# of Students Who Answered the Question	Question Response Rate	# of Responses to the		
				Answer	Answer	Answer %
				2 - Disagree	0	0.0%
				1 - Strongly Disagree	0	0.0%

Instructor Questions

Score range is 1 - 5

Question	Average	# of Students Who Answered the Question	Question Response Rate	# of Responses to the		
				Answer	Answer	Answer %
Overall evaluation of the instructor.	4.6	10	100.0%	5 - Excellent	6	60.0%
				4 - Good	4	40.0%
				3 - Adequate	0	0.0%
				2 - Poor	0	0.0%
				1 - Very Poor	0	0.0%
The instructor provided an environment that was conducive to learning.	4.7	10	100.0%	5 - Strongly Agree	7	70.0%
				4 - Agree	3	30.0%
				3 - Neutral	0	0.0%
				2 - Disagree	0	0.0%
				1 - Strongly Disagree	0	0.0%
The instructor provided helpful feedback on assessed class components (e.g., exams, papers).	4.6	10	100.0%	5 - Strongly Agree	6	60.0%
				4 - Agree	4	40.0%
				3 - Neutral	0	0.0%
				2 - Disagree	0	0.0%
				1 - Strongly Disagree	0	0.0%

Course Comments

What changes would you suggest to enhance the course? (Optional)

- The format was great. I think another debate about halfway through the semester could be useful. That was a cool format.
- Handouts would be helpful to structure the material and what exactly we're supposed to get out of the readings.
- Make clear where the concepts being discussed in course readings have come through previously in more well known philosophical literature. (See additional comments for further detail).
- Michelle has an pronounced aptitude for teaching, I think, and for running a seminar. Sometimes I wish there were more time for conversation; an occasional deeper dive into a single point of philosophical inquiry would also be nice. I.e., when professors solicit responses to questions, naturally the responses vary--and that's good! But I do wish, from time to time, that some issue could really be dug into, really examined deeply--from, say, a variety of moral-theoretical perspectives: "How, exactly, would, say, rule consequentialism apply here? How, exactly, would Kantian deontology? Who, in this scenario, would be the moral exemplar that (Aristotelian) virtue ethics relies upon? Under a moral pluralism, what would be the prima facie duties at play in this situation?" That sort of thing. Since the Bioethics MA program does not require students to take a class focused on moral theory (a bit surprising; perhaps the assumption is that students will arrive with a working knowledge of various moral theories? Still, it feels a bit limiting when the application of moral theory to in-class discussion topics rarely diverges from the basics of consequentialism,

What changes would you suggest to enhance the course? (Optional)

deontology and virtue ethics), this might be the best way (besides paper-writing, and even that doesn't require students to diligently apply this or that moral theory to some problem...not that it should!) to actually expand students' knowledge of and ability to handle the different moral frameworks philosophers have developed.

It would similarly be cool to work in brief readings by great philosophers from history, provided their thinking actually pertained, or could be connected to, to the very current events under discussion in the class, since current events are the class's true focus.

But of course, all of this is asking a lot from two hours, once a week; certainly there's always a ton to do, and there's never enough time. I don't blame any professor being unable to transmute a little time into more! (I do wonder why the once-weekly classes are only two hours long? That seems short.)

Michelle did an excellent job assigning just enough reading to fill up the time without our feeling rushed; of course, as mentioned, two hours seems about an hour too little for a once-weekly class, so part of me felt like we didn't do enough reading for this class. (Don't mistake me; I was grateful, in "Controversies and Politics," to land on the chill side of overloaded, given the oft-unworkable battery of reading assignments my other classes heaped on me.) That being said, Michelle did provide optional readings, so I suppose I can't really register this mere observation about the readings as any sort of complaint.

One general thought, applicable to all my classes: It would have been nice, I think, for the professors to, say, assign us one less reading each week, and instead to assign us the task of independently finding some additional piece of reading that seemed to us to fit the topic at hand, that way each member of the class would have some different thinker's perspective to draw from in discussion. At the very least, it would force us to practice our research skills. Perhaps professors who like to give frequent writing assignments could require students to submit very short summaries of their additional reading for that week.

- The final debate was very engaging. Maybe there would be a way to add similar types of activities?

What additional comments would you like to make? (Optional)

- Got a lot out of this class, interesting readings.
- Sometimes I got the sense that we were focusing on whether someone was making a valid argument rather than if their argument was actually sound, when the truth of their statements made for more interesting discussion material.
- Some students have given arguments to each other how the Controversies in Politics course was not engaging in philosophical discourse through the readings. I disagree with the more historical lens they look at what counts as philosophy. These sorts of bickering arguments can be dismissed by mentioning how the main topic appears previously in other more historically famous works. Hence (see previous answer).
- The requirement to include at least two course readings in our final papers was challenging because all of the topics we discussed did not necessarily have at least two readings, so perhaps this requirement could be re-evaluated.

Instructor Comments

What did the instructor do well? (Optional)

- Appreciate how receptive Professor Dyke was to our feedback, shaped the course to our interests and integrated current events well.
- Kept discussion open for everyone.
- Prof. Dyke is always incredible organized and prepared. Class with her is such a pleasure!
- Michelle is very knowledgeable and presents the material very well. She helps to keep a neutral environment when discussing very controversial material. She covers all material in an orderly fashion. She is also very organized and clear in all expectations of assignments.
- I loved how well-organized and meticulous Michelle was. It was quite inspiring. She was very sensitive towards hearing me out whenever I approached her and provided valuable guidance and feedback.

How well did the instructor create an environment in which differing ideas and experiences of diverse individuals could safely be shared and respected? (Optional)

- Professor Dyke did a great job facilitating conversation around central topics and discussed them analytically, free of her own bias. The class discussions were interesting and she encouraged people to share differing viewpoints.
- No religion-bashing--thank you!
- The instructor's response to discussion was always constructive and oriented everyone to the topic at hand.
- Very well!
- I felt that prof. Dyke did this very well!
- Very well! Although the reluctance towards the continental perspective was a bit uncalled for, I think.

Instructor Name: Dyke,Michelle Mary	Term: Spring 2020	Evaluation Type: Final	Class Description: UGPH-GU 28-001 (17562) - Ethics and Identity: Disability, Gender, and Race (Lecture)
---	-----------------------------	----------------------------------	---

10 out of 25 students completed the survey.

Survey Response Rate: 40.0%

Course Questions

Score range is 1 - 5

Question	Average	# of Students Who Answered the Question	Question Response Rate	# of Responses to the Answer	
				Answer	Answer %
Overall evaluation of the course.	4.3	10	100.0%	5 - Excellent	60.0%
				4 - Good	20.0%
				3 - Adequate	10.0%
				2 - Poor	10.0%
				1 - Very Poor	0.0%
The course objectives were clearly stated.	4.5	10	100.0%	5 - Strongly Agree	60.0%
				4 - Agree	30.0%
				3 - Neutral	10.0%
				2 - Disagree	0.0%
				1 - Strongly Disagree	0.0%
The course was well organized.	4.7	10	100.0%	5 - Strongly Agree	70.0%
				4 - Agree	30.0%
				3 - Neutral	0.0%
				2 - Disagree	0.0%
				1 - Strongly Disagree	0.0%
The course was intellectually stimulating.	4.5	10	100.0%	5 - Strongly Agree	60.0%
				4 - Agree	30.0%
				3 - Neutral	10.0%
				2 - Disagree	0.0%
				1 - Strongly Disagree	0.0%
The grading criteria for assignments were clear.	4.5	10	100.0%	5 - Strongly Agree	60.0%
				4 - Agree	30.0%
				3 - Neutral	10.0%
				2 - Disagree	0.0%
				1 - Strongly Disagree	0.0%
The assigned course readings and materials contributed to my learning.	4.5	10	100.0%	5 - Strongly Agree	70.0%
				4 - Agree	20.0%

Question	Average	# of Students Who Answered the Question	Question Response Rate	# of Responses to the		
				Answer	Answer	Answer %
				3 - Neutral	0	0.0%
				2 - Disagree	1	10.0%
				1 - Strongly Disagree	0	0.0%

Instructor Questions

Score range is 1 - 5

Question	Average	# of Students Who Answered the Question	Question Response Rate	# of Responses to the		
				Answer	Answer	Answer %
Overall evaluation of the instructor.	4.5	10	100.0%	5 - Excellent	6	60.0%
				4 - Good	3	30.0%
				3 - Adequate	1	10.0%
				2 - Poor	0	0.0%
				1 - Very Poor	0	0.0%
The instructor provided an environment that was conducive to learning.	4.7	10	100.0%	5 - Strongly Agree	7	70.0%
				4 - Agree	3	30.0%
				3 - Neutral	0	0.0%
				2 - Disagree	0	0.0%
				1 - Strongly Disagree	0	0.0%
The instructor provided helpful feedback on assessed class components (e.g., exams, papers).	4.7	10	100.0%	5 - Strongly Agree	7	70.0%
				4 - Agree	3	30.0%
				3 - Neutral	0	0.0%
				2 - Disagree	0	0.0%
				1 - Strongly Disagree	0	0.0%

Course Comments

What changes would you suggest to enhance the course? (Optional)

- The readings were too long and the discussions in class didn't help me understand the readings. I would recommend cutting down the readings to the most important 20 pages with really elaborate, structured reading guides that help break down the text
- I would perhaps include more background on the types of philosophies we were studying, and more about how the concepts are applied in real-world examples.
- Instead of starting a new topic with an author's argument, I would have preferred to have a more "neutral" general discussion about the topic first, especially for disability.

Instructor Comments

What did the instructor do well? (Optional)

- Took the time to explain tests and essays and go over work
- - Made learning very easy as her lectures were extremely clear
- - Was always open to answering questions and hearing and acknowledging students' opinions
- The thorough explanations of the readings and the handouts were very helpful as some readings were hard for me to understand since this is my first ethics class.

How well did the instructor create an environment in which differing ideas and experiences of diverse individuals

could safely be shared and respected? (Optional)

- Welcomed every answer that was given without judgement, and respected everyone's opinions. she was great!
- Very well
- She did this extremely well. I would not change anything.

Instructor Name: Dyke,Michelle Mary	Term: Fall 2019	Evaluation Type: Final	Class Description: GPH-GU 1005-001 (7735) - Advanced Introduction to Bioethics (Seminar)
---	---------------------------	----------------------------------	--

20 out of 23 students completed the survey.

Survey Response Rate: 87.0%

Course Questions

Score range is 1 - 5

Question	Average	# of Students Who Answered the Question	Question Response Rate	# of Responses to the Answer		
				Answer	Answer	Answer %
Overall evaluation of the course.	4.5	20	100.0%	5 - Excellent	11	55.0%
				4 - Good	8	40.0%
				3 - Adequate	0	0.0%
				2 - Poor	1	5.0%
				1 - Very Poor	0	0.0%
The course objectives were clearly stated.	4.9	20	100.0%	5 - Strongly Agree	17	85.0%
				4 - Agree	3	15.0%
				3 - Neutral	0	0.0%
				2 - Disagree	0	0.0%
				1 - Strongly Disagree	0	0.0%
The course was well organized.	4.9	20	100.0%	5 - Strongly Agree	18	90.0%
				4 - Agree	2	10.0%
				3 - Neutral	0	0.0%
				2 - Disagree	0	0.0%
				1 - Strongly Disagree	0	0.0%
The course was intellectually stimulating.	4.7	20	100.0%	5 - Strongly Agree	14	70.0%
				4 - Agree	6	30.0%
				3 - Neutral	0	0.0%
				2 - Disagree	0	0.0%
				1 - Strongly Disagree	0	0.0%
The grading criteria for assignments were clear.	4.3	20	100.0%	5 - Strongly Agree	11	55.0%
				4 - Agree	5	25.0%
				3 - Neutral	3	15.0%
				2 - Disagree	1	5.0%
				1 - Strongly Disagree	0	0.0%
The assigned course readings and materials contributed to my learning.	4.7	20	100.0%	5 - Strongly Agree	13	65.0%
				4 - Agree	7	35.0%
				3 - Neutral	0	0.0%

Question	Average	# of Students Who Answered the Question	Question Response Rate	# of Responses to the Answer		
				Answer	Answer	Answer %
				2 - Disagree	0	0.0%
				1 - Strongly Disagree	0	0.0%

Instructor Questions

Score range is 1 - 5

Question	Average	# of Students Who Answered the Question	Question Response Rate	# of Responses to the Answer		
				Answer	Answer	Answer %
Overall evaluation of the instructor.	4.6	20	100.0%	5 - Excellent	13	65.0%
				4 - Good	5	25.0%
				3 - Adequate	2	10.0%
				2 - Poor	0	0.0%
				1 - Very Poor	0	0.0%
The instructor provided an environment that was conducive to learning.	4.7	20	100.0%	5 - Strongly Agree	13	65.0%
				4 - Agree	7	35.0%
				3 - Neutral	0	0.0%
				2 - Disagree	0	0.0%
				1 - Strongly Disagree	0	0.0%
The instructor provided helpful feedback on assessed class components (e.g., exams, papers).	4.7	20	100.0%	5 - Strongly Agree	15	75.0%
				4 - Agree	4	20.0%
				3 - Neutral	1	5.0%
				2 - Disagree	0	0.0%
				1 - Strongly Disagree	0	0.0%

Course Comments

What changes would you suggest to enhance the course? (Optional)

- -
- I think it would've been helpful to have more discussion of objections and replies during class.
- Honestly I loved this course. It was great and I learned a lot.
- I don't really have any - I thought that the course was very well organized. If I would change anything, it would perhaps be to focus less on some of the broad theories of deontology and utilitarianism, because those discussions are embedded through all of the other readings anyways.
- I really enjoyed the group dynamics beyond the general hole class group discussion. Formalizing arguments from the reading or discussion particular objection with classmates was really stimulating.
- More interactive discussion there was plenty but more is always appreciated
- The grading criteria for the short papers could have been clearer and more consistent from one to the next. I would have also liked more discussion between students, changing the room set up might help with that.
- Email the syllabus to students before the first day of class, preferably a week, to begin performing readings prior to class.

What additional comments would you like to make? (Optional)

- Dr. Dyke is a wonderful professor!
- -
- Please stop interrupting students before they get to finish their comments in class. It feels dismissive and it wastes time when they have to repeat themselves or correct what you think they said, and that would have been avoided if you just let them finish.
- -
- The small essays were really really helpful in forcing me to hone in very concisely my analytical ideas and were great practice for the final essay
- NA
- Maybe trying to establish more connections among the topics discussed in different classes would improve the general experience of the course.
- Both the instructor and the TA were excellent; highest marks for them both.

Instructor Comments**What did the instructor do well? (Optional)**

- -
- Yes, I really liked Michelle's teaching style!
- Asked really great questions during class provided feedback to our discussions that was helpful
- She was very engaging, very organized and managed the class well.
- Facilitate discussion and organize the course in a clear and concise fashion.
- Instruct
- Drawing attention to the central arguments and claims of the reading. Explaining the more general context of the paper in the philosophical debate the authors is interested in.
- The professor's teaching style was excellent. It was very obvious that she had thoroughly thought through how she was going to go about teaching each individual lesson, not to mention she is incredible articulate and a pleasure to listen to. I also loved that her background knowledge on every topic was robust, so that when we had relevant questions on related philosophical topics, she always had a way to provide us with information in the moment.

How well did the instructor create an environment in which differing ideas and experiences of diverse individuals could safely be shared and respected? (Optional)

- Good
- Michelle balanced overviews of central concepts from the readings with facilitating a robust class discussion while also creating an environment where differing opinions were all given a fair hearing
- Super well
- She was great and making everyone feel valued, included and part of the class.
- Quite well, more sharing and respecting than I had initially thought would be permitted.
- She did a pretty good job at it.
- Incredibly well! There was never a moment where she or any student was targeted for any specific view, and all comments were taken seriously.
- Yes.

Instructor Name:	Term:	Evaluation Type:	Class Description:
Michelle Mary Dyke	Spring 2019	Final	PHIL-UA 103-001 (19770) - Topics in Metaphysics & Episte (Seminar)

12 out of 16 students eligible to evaluate completed the survey.

Survey Response Rate: 75.0%

Question	Average	Standard Deviation	Response % of 2 Highest Ratings	# of Students Who Answered the Question	Question Response Rate	Answer	# of Responses to the Answer	Answer %
Overall evaluation of the course.	4.8	0.6	91.7%	12	100.0%	Very Poor	0	0.0%
						Poor	0	0.0%
						Adequate	1	8.3%
						Good	1	8.3%
						Excellent	10	83.3%
The course objectives were clearly stated.	4.9	0.3	100.0%	12	100.0%	Strongly Disagree	0	0.0%
						Disagree	0	0.0%
						Neutral	0	0.0%
						Agree	1	8.3%
						Strongly Agree	11	91.7%
The course was well organized.	4.7	0.7	91.7%	12	100.0%	Strongly Disagree	0	0.0%
						Disagree	0	0.0%
						Neutral	1	8.3%
						Agree	2	16.7%
						Strongly Agree	9	75.0%
The course was intellectually stimulating.	4.7	0.7	91.7%	12	100.0%	Strongly Disagree	0	0.0%
						Disagree	0	0.0%
						Neutral	1	8.3%
						Agree	2	16.7%
						Strongly Agree	9	75.0%

1 of 5

Question	Average	Standard Deviation	Response % of 2 Highest Ratings	# of Students Who Answered the Question	Question Response Rate	Answer	# of Responses to the Answer	Answer %
The course was effective at helping me learn.	4.5	1.0	83.3%	12	100.0%	Strongly Disagree	0	0.0%
						Disagree	1	8.3%
						Neutral	1	8.3%
						Agree	1	8.3%
						Strongly Agree	9	75.0%
The classes were informative.	4.8	0.5	100.0%	12	100.0%	Strongly Disagree	0	0.0%
						Disagree	0	0.0%
						Neutral	0	0.0%
						Agree	3	25.0%
						Strongly Agree	9	75.0%
The course was challenging.	4.0	1.2	75.0%	12	100.0%	Strongly Disagree	1	8.3%
						Disagree	0	0.0%
						Neutral	2	16.7%
						Agree	4	33.3%
						Strongly Agree	5	41.7%
The course increased my knowledge of the subject.	4.9	0.3	100.0%	12	100.0%	Strongly Disagree	0	0.0%
						Disagree	0	0.0%
						Neutral	0	0.0%
						Agree	1	8.3%
						Strongly Agree	11	91.7%
The instructor created an environment that promoted the success of students with diverse backgr	4.7	0.9	91.7%	12	100.0%	Strongly Disagree	0	0.0%
						Disagree	1	8.3%
						Neutral	0	0.0%
						Agree	1	8.3%
						Strongly Agree	10	83.3%
Overall evaluation of the instructor.	4.8	0.6	91.7%	12	100.0%	Very Poor	0	0.0%
						Poor	0	0.0%
						Adequate	1	8.3%
						Good	1	8.3%
						Excellent	10	83.3%

2 of 5

Question	Average	Standard Deviation	Response % of 2 Highest Ratings	# of Students Who Answered the Question	Question Response Rate	Answer	# of Responses to the Answer	Answer %
The instructor provided an environment that was conducive to learning.	4.7	0.9	91.7%	12	100.0%	Strongly Disagree	0	0.0%
						Disagree	1	8.3%
						Neutral	0	0.0%
						Agree	1	8.3%
						Strongly Agree	10	83.3%
The instructor provided helpful feedback on assessed class components (e.g., exams, papers).	4.7	0.9	91.7%	12	100.0%	Strongly Disagree	0	0.0%
						Disagree	1	8.3%
						Neutral	0	0.0%
						Agree	1	8.3%
						Strongly Agree	10	83.3%
The instructor was effective at helping me learn.	4.6	1.2	91.7%	12	100.0%	Strongly Disagree	1	8.3%
						Disagree	0	0.0%
						Neutral	0	0.0%
						Agree	1	8.3%
						Strongly Agree	10	83.3%
The instructor encouraged student participation.	4.5	1.0	83.3%	12	100.0%	Strongly Disagree	0	0.0%
						Disagree	1	8.3%
						Neutral	1	8.3%
						Agree	1	8.3%
						Strongly Agree	9	75.0%
The instructor was effective at facilitating class discussion.	4.7	0.7	91.7%	12	100.0%	Strongly Disagree	0	0.0%
						Disagree	0	0.0%
						Neutral	1	8.3%
						Agree	2	16.7%
						Strongly Agree	9	75.0%
The instructor was open to students' questions and multiple points of view.	4.7	0.9	91.7%	12	100.0%	Strongly Disagree	0	0.0%
						Disagree	1	8.3%
						Neutral	0	0.0%
						Agree	1	8.3%
						Strongly Agree	10	83.3%

3 of 5

Question	Average	Standard Deviation	Response % of 2 Highest Ratings	# of Students Who Answered the Question	Question Response Rate	Answer	# of Responses to the Answer	Answer %
The instructor was accessible to students (e.g., via e-mail and office hours).	4.8	0.6	91.7%	12	100.0%	Strongly Disagree	0	0.0%
						Disagree	0	0.0%
						Neutral	1	8.3%
						Agree	1	8.3%
						Strongly Agree	10	83.3%

Course Comments

Instructor Comments

Describe the best thing about the course/instructor that was effective in helping you learn.

- The instructor was extremely easy to understand and summarized the readings very well. She brought up unique questions and great points that allowed me to fully engage with the material. If I could suggest one critique - I'd say she should make attendance required. A lot of people did not show up to class and I think they were really missing out on a great course. It also took away from what could have been a larger, greater class discussion, especially because it was already such a small class size.
- I like the way you conducted the mini-paper assignments. It gave me a chance to test my understanding in a fair (in terms of grading) manner without being too high-stakes. It facilitated a lot of learning on top of the regular class.
- I liked the round table discussions. I think offering your students a question they should be asking themselves while reading that day's assigned reading is always good.
- The weekly summaries of certain, more complex readings.
- Michelle is the best instructor I've had in my four years at NYU. She does everything I expect the ideal teacher to do. For example, she is realistic about the amount of reading students can really read in depth on a weekly basis and provides guidelines on the important sections to read, and leaves some other readings as optional. She explains everything with the utmost clarity and enthusiasm, making use of the whiteboard. She summarises past readings at the start of each class and posts summary notes at the end of each week. She provides extremely detailed and thoughtful instructions and feedback on papers. The 4 mini papers, midterm paper, and final paper exam structure works perfectly. She asks sharp questions that guide class discussions and does not just lead with a vague "what do you think?" I am hard pressed to really find anything to suggest as improvements. The only thing is that even in this class, which has a focus on meta-ethics, I would've liked more of a systematic introduction to some of the foundational concepts in epistemology for

4 of 5

students without a background in that area. This could mean dedicating one or two seminars to explain, in greater depth and structure, JTB or the Gettier Problem, instead of simply bringing it up as we go along.

- The instructor was able to take us more into depth on the readings and seemed to understand the works she assigned. To improve the course I would recommend she be more open to differing points of views. Often times she seemed closed, and even downright hostile, to differing viewpoints within the class.
- Good class discussions. Liked the uploaded handouts
Improvements - more discussions
- The discussions were fruitful and enlightening
- She provided prompt feedbacks to the papers that I handed in.
- Excellent lecturer
- At the end of the course we are to sit in a circle facing each other. I feel like this is a very good way to facilitate classroom discussions, since it is a seminar course after all. I feel like we could have benefited if we do this for the entirety of the semester.
- The instructor was great at reviewing course reading materials in a way that was interesting and clear. Class discussion could be improved even more by adopting a circular seminar seating arrangement (which we recently did at the end of this course).

Instructor Name:	Term:	Evaluation Type:	Class Description:
Michelle Mary Dyke	Fall 2018	Final	PHIL-UA 1-001 (9755) - Central Problems in Philosophy (Lecture)

28 out of 79 students eligible to evaluate completed the survey.

Survey Response Rate: 35.4%

Question	Average	Standard Deviation	Response % of 2 Highest Ratings	# of Students Who Answered the Question	Question Response Rate	Answer	# of Responses to the Answer	Answer %
Overall evaluation of the course.	4.3	0.9	75.0%	28	100.0%	Very Poor	0	0.0%
						Poor	1	3.6%
						Adequate	6	21.4%
						Good	6	21.4%
						Excellent	15	53.6%
The course objectives were clearly stated.	4.6	0.6	96.4%	28	100.0%	Strongly Disagree	0	0.0%
						Disagree	0	0.0%
						Neutral	1	3.6%
						Agree	8	28.6%
						Strongly Agree	19	67.9%
The course was well organized.	4.7	0.7	96.4%	28	100.0%	Strongly Disagree	0	0.0%
						Disagree	1	3.6%
						Neutral	0	0.0%
						Agree	6	21.4%
						Strongly Agree	21	75.0%
The course was intellectually stimulating.	4.4	0.8	82.1%	28	100.0%	Strongly Disagree	0	0.0%
						Disagree	0	0.0%
						Neutral	5	17.9%
						Agree	6	21.4%
						Strongly Agree	17	60.7%

1 of 6

Question	Average	Standard Deviation	Response % of 2 Highest Ratings	# of Students Who Answered the Question	Question Response Rate	Answer	# of Responses to the Answer	Answer %
The course was effective at helping me learn.	4.4	0.9	82.1%	28	100.0%	Strongly Disagree	0	0.0%
						Disagree	1	3.6%
						Neutral	4	14.3%
						Agree	7	25.0%
						Strongly Agree	16	57.1%
The classes were informative.	4.5	0.8	82.1%	28	100.0%	Strongly Disagree	0	0.0%
						Disagree	0	0.0%
						Neutral	5	17.9%
						Agree	5	17.9%
						Strongly Agree	18	64.3%
The course was challenging.	4.5	0.5	100.0%	28	100.0%	Strongly Disagree	0	0.0%
						Disagree	0	0.0%
						Neutral	0	0.0%
						Agree	15	53.6%
						Strongly Agree	13	46.4%
The course increased my knowledge of the subject.	4.6	0.6	92.9%	28	100.0%	Strongly Disagree	0	0.0%
						Disagree	0	0.0%
						Neutral	2	7.1%
						Agree	7	25.0%
						Strongly Agree	19	67.9%
The instructor created an environment that promoted the success of students with diverse backgr	4.6	0.6	96.4%	28	100.0%	Strongly Disagree	0	0.0%
						Disagree	0	0.0%
						Neutral	1	3.6%
						Agree	10	35.7%
						Strongly Agree	17	60.7%
Overall evaluation of the instructor.	4.4	0.8	89.3%	28	100.0%	Very Poor	0	0.0%
						Poor	1	3.6%
						Adequate	2	7.1%
						Good	10	35.7%
						Excellent	15	53.6%

2 of 6

Question	Average	Standard Deviation	Response % of 2 Highest Ratings	# of Students Who Answered the Question	Question Response Rate	Answer	# of Responses to the Answer	Answer %
The instructor provided an environment that was conducive to learning.	4.4	0.9	89.3%	28	100.0%	Strongly Disagree	0	0.0%
						Disagree	2	7.1%
						Neutral	1	3.6%
						Agree	10	35.7%
						Strongly Agree	15	53.6%
The instructor provided helpful feedback on assessed class components (e.g., exams, papers).	3.9	1.2	60.7%	28	100.0%	Strongly Disagree	0	0.0%
						Disagree	4	14.3%
						Neutral	7	25.0%
						Agree	4	14.3%
						Strongly Agree	13	46.4%
The instructor was effective at helping me learn.	4.3	0.8	89.3%	28	100.0%	Strongly Disagree	0	0.0%
						Disagree	1	3.6%
						Neutral	2	7.1%
						Agree	13	46.4%
						Strongly Agree	12	42.9%
The instructor encouraged student participation.	3.5	1.2	46.4%	28	100.0%	Strongly Disagree	1	3.6%
						Disagree	5	17.9%
						Neutral	9	32.1%
						Agree	6	21.4%
						Strongly Agree	7	25.0%
The instructor was effective at facilitating class discussion.	3.3	1.1	39.3%	28	100.0%	Strongly Disagree	1	3.6%
						Disagree	6	21.4%
						Neutral	10	35.7%
						Agree	6	21.4%
						Strongly Agree	5	17.9%
The instructor was open to students' questions and multiple points of view.	4.3	0.7	85.7%	28	100.0%	Strongly Disagree	0	0.0%
						Disagree	0	0.0%
						Neutral	4	14.3%
						Agree	11	39.3%
						Strongly Agree	13	46.4%

3 of 6

Question	Average	Standard Deviation	Response % of 2 Highest Ratings	# of Students Who Answered the Question	Question Response Rate	Answer	# of Responses to the Answer	Answer %
The instructor was accessible to students (e.g., via e-mail and office hours).	4.5	0.7	89.3%	28	100.0%	Strongly Disagree	0	0.0%
						Disagree	0	0.0%
						Neutral	3	10.7%
						Agree	8	28.6%
						Strongly Agree	17	60.7%

Course Comments

Instructor Comments

Describe the best thing about the course/instructor that was effective in helping you learn.

- Dr. Dyke is a very smart and straight forward woman, which was really helpful in a philosophy course. I think the lectures could be a bit more engaging and visual, though.
- I loved how Dr. Dyke restated the same thing in multiple ways throughout her lectures, so if I didn't understand it the first time or needed the information again, I just needed to keep listening instead of feeling like I was falling behind. However, I think that the papers were graded unnecessarily harshly-- especially for an intro class, and an intro class that dealt with a large range of particularly difficult topics, at that.
- I wish that we could have better feedback on papers
- It would definitely be helpful to get the answer to the handout after each lecture. I often find my notes unclear/lack accuracy.
- A list of important philosophical concepts/lexicon.
- As someone who has never taken a philosophy course before, I found that Dr. Dyke did a wonderful job at making the course clear/easy to follow, interesting, intellectually stimulating, and also challenging. She is extremely articulate, concise, and it is very evident that she knows what she is talking about. The handouts she provided were very helpful and created a clear, organized way of following her lectures. Overall, I was extremely impressed by Dr. Dyke and would recommend her course to anyone.

4 of 6

- The handouts were useful in clarifying the subjects we were studying and organizing the class time
- The course materials are really interesting and organized. No suggestion.
- The course was very intellectually stimulating and clearly organized. I would've liked there to have been slightly more engagement with student questions during lecture; instructor tended to jump quickly from subject to subject, only occasionally stopping for a question or two before moving on.
- The worksheets she made were super helpful, especially in a lecture class where it can be easy to get lost. I think one thing to improve the course would be to hold up more direct quotations from the readings in order to understand the context for the material a bit more. Honestly though this is not a big complaint and I don't think there's much I would suggest to improve the course.
- Clear explanations of course material that made complicated subjects more accessible
- Dr. Dyke is a wonderful lecturer, and easily one of the most knowledgeable professors I've had. The layout of her class is exactly what a philosophy course should look like, however, my only complaint is that there wasn't much of an invitation for discussion beyond recitation (maybe this is best in a 9:30, though).
- I thought the lectures you gave were phenomenal. There was a lot of value in coming to class, and I truly felt that you were well prepared at all times. Although, attending lecture was often a passive experience. There wasn't a lot of room for questions or participation,
- I really appreciated the lecture handouts and found them very helpful when reviewing. The biggest thing I would suggest changing about the course would be trying to find more interesting material to cover because it's an introductory course but most of the content we studied was very dry and technical which discouraged me from pursuing philosophy further
- The in-class worksheets were helpful in studying and retaining the course materials.
- The one best thing was the range of philosophers we studied. Doctor Dyke definitely provided us with many perspectives and let us decide which one we agree with ourselves. One thing to improve the course would be more diversity in the way lectures are taught. I felt lectures were a bit monotonous at times, but maybe that's just me.
- The lecture would be better if professor could go slower, and the lecture handouts can be made more specific, sometimes the lecture is hard to follow.

5 of 6

- It was well organized with handouts and appropriate questions to the reading. The professor could have been more passionate and enthusiastic about the subject matters.
- More discussion and less lectures. Philosophy is a dense subject, sitting still for lecture after lecture was way less productive than the smaller discussion sessions, where we could really question and debate.
- The lectures by the professor were great, but I feel like my recitations could have been a better learning experience, if my preceptor was more prepared and made it more structured.
- It's hard to find "one" best thing about this course since there are too many.
- I enjoyed the lectures, and I felt like you were able to explain complicated ideas in multiple different ways which made them much easier to understand. No real suggestions for improvement.
- Dr. Dyke is a brilliant professor. Some of the lectures were a little bit dry, but given the content of the course, she did a great job at lecturing. The energy in the room was always good and she consistently stopped to answer questions. My recommendation for the future is to spend more lecture time discussing the papers, asking if we have questions, and giving examples of where to 'start', as many of the recitations (which is when these were intended to be addressed) felt wasted and not spent productively addressing paper things. Later in the semester, however, the recitation did facilitate productive essay conversation.
- N/A
- Dr. Dyke is a wonderfully supportive instructor, but it's hard to keep a massive lecture hall engaged. Perhaps, every now and then, we can do a short turn and discuss activity in order to practice being able to use what we learn.

6 of 6

Instructor Name:	Term:	Evaluation Type:	Class Description:
Michelle Mary Dyke	Summer 2018	Final	PHIL-UA 1-001 (5697) - Central Problems in Philosophy (Lecture)

1 out of 12 students eligible to evaluate completed the survey.

Survey Response Rate: 8.3%

Question	Average	Standard Deviation	Response % of 2 Highest Ratings	# of Students Who Answered the Question	Question Response Rate	Answer	# of Responses to the Answer	Answer %
Overall evaluation of the course.	5.0		100.0%	1	100.0%	Very Poor	0	0.0%
						Poor	0	0.0%
						Adequate	0	0.0%
						Good	0	0.0%
						Excellent	1	100.0%
The course objectives were clearly stated.	5.0		100.0%	1	100.0%	Strongly Disagree	0	0.0%
						Disagree	0	0.0%
						Neutral	0	0.0%
						Agree	0	0.0%
						Strongly Agree	1	100.0%
The course was well organized.	5.0		100.0%	1	100.0%	Strongly Disagree	0	0.0%
						Disagree	0	0.0%
						Neutral	0	0.0%
						Agree	0	0.0%
						Strongly Agree	1	100.0%
The course was intellectually stimulating.	5.0		100.0%	1	100.0%	Strongly Disagree	0	0.0%
						Disagree	0	0.0%
						Neutral	0	0.0%
						Agree	0	0.0%
						Strongly Agree	1	100.0%

1 of 4

Question	Average	Standard Deviation	Response % of 2 Highest Ratings	# of Students Who Answered the Question	Question Response Rate	Answer	# of Responses to the Answer	Answer %
The course was effective at helping me learn.	5.0		100.0%	1	100.0%	Strongly Disagree	0	0.0%
						Disagree	0	0.0%
						Neutral	0	0.0%
						Agree	0	0.0%
						Strongly Agree	1	100.0%
The classes were informative.	5.0		100.0%	1	100.0%	Strongly Disagree	0	0.0%
						Disagree	0	0.0%
						Neutral	0	0.0%
						Agree	0	0.0%
						Strongly Agree	1	100.0%
The course was challenging.	5.0		100.0%	1	100.0%	Strongly Disagree	0	0.0%
						Disagree	0	0.0%
						Neutral	0	0.0%
						Agree	0	0.0%
						Strongly Agree	1	100.0%
The course increased my knowledge of the subject.	5.0		100.0%	1	100.0%	Strongly Disagree	0	0.0%
						Disagree	0	0.0%
						Neutral	0	0.0%
						Agree	0	0.0%
						Strongly Agree	1	100.0%
The instructor created an environment that promoted the success of students with diverse backgr	5.0		100.0%	1	100.0%	Strongly Disagree	0	0.0%
						Disagree	0	0.0%
						Neutral	0	0.0%
						Agree	0	0.0%
						Strongly Agree	1	100.0%
Overall evaluation of the instructor.	5.0		100.0%	1	100.0%	Very Poor	0	0.0%
						Poor	0	0.0%
						Adequate	0	0.0%
						Good	0	0.0%
						Excellent	1	100.0%

2 of 4

Question	Average	Standard Deviation	Response % of 2 Highest Ratings	# of Students Who Answered the Question	Question Response Rate	Answer	# of Responses to the Answer	Answer %
The instructor provided an environment that was conducive to learning.	5.0		100.0%	1	100.0%	Strongly Disagree	0	0.0%
						Disagree	0	0.0%
						Neutral	0	0.0%
						Agree	0	0.0%
						Strongly Agree	1	100.0%
The instructor provided helpful feedback on assessed class components (e.g., exams, papers).	5.0		100.0%	1	100.0%	Strongly Disagree	0	0.0%
						Disagree	0	0.0%
						Neutral	0	0.0%
						Agree	0	0.0%
						Strongly Agree	1	100.0%
The instructor was effective at helping me learn.	5.0		100.0%	1	100.0%	Strongly Disagree	0	0.0%
						Disagree	0	0.0%
						Neutral	0	0.0%
						Agree	0	0.0%
						Strongly Agree	1	100.0%
The instructor encouraged student participation.	5.0		100.0%	1	100.0%	Strongly Disagree	0	0.0%
						Disagree	0	0.0%
						Neutral	0	0.0%
						Agree	0	0.0%
						Strongly Agree	1	100.0%
The instructor was effective at facilitating class discussion.	5.0		100.0%	1	100.0%	Strongly Disagree	0	0.0%
						Disagree	0	0.0%
						Neutral	0	0.0%
						Agree	0	0.0%
						Strongly Agree	1	100.0%
The instructor was open to students' questions and multiple points of view.	5.0		100.0%	1	100.0%	Strongly Disagree	0	0.0%
						Disagree	0	0.0%
						Neutral	0	0.0%
						Agree	0	0.0%
						Strongly Agree	1	100.0%

3 of 4

Question	Average	Standard Deviation	Response % of 2 Highest Ratings	# of Students Who Answered the Question	Question Response Rate	Answer	# of Responses to the Answer	Answer %
The instructor was accessible to students (e.g., via e-mail and office hours).	5.0		100.0%	1	100.0%	Strongly Disagree	0	0.0%
						Disagree	0	0.0%
						Neutral	0	0.0%
						Agree	0	0.0%
						Strongly Agree	1	100.0%

Course Comments

Instructor Comments

Describe the best thing about the course/instructor that was effective in helping you learn.

- The best thing was how clear she was in answering student's questions. The thing that could be improved is the amount of time we have to write the papers. I would have been lovely to have all prompts from the beginning of the semester

Instructor Name:	Term:	Evaluation Type:	Class Description:
Michelle Mary Dyke	Summer 2017	Final	PHIL-UA 80-001 (5208) - Philosophy of Mind (Lecture)

4 out of 9 students eligible to evaluate completed the survey.

Survey Response Rate: 44.4%

Question	Average	Standard Deviation	Response % of 2 Highest Ratings	# of Students Who Answered the Question	Question Response Rate	Answer	# of Responses to the Answer	Answer %
Overall evaluation of the instructor(s).	4.8	0.5	100.0%	4	100.0%	Very Poor	0	0.0%
						Poor	0	0.0%
						Adequate	0	0.0%
						Good	1	25.0%
						Excellent	3	75.0%
Overall evaluation of the course.	4.8	0.5	100.0%	4	100.0%	Very Poor	0	0.0%
						Poor	0	0.0%
						Adequate	0	0.0%
						Good	1	25.0%
						Excellent	3	75.0%
The instructor(s) provided an environment that was conducive to learning.	5.0		100.0%	4	100.0%	Strongly Disagree	0	0.0%
						Disagree	0	0.0%
						Neutral	0	0.0%
						Agree	0	0.0%
						Strongly Agree	4	100.0%
The instructor(s) provided helpful feedback on assessed class components (e.g., exams, papers).	4.8	0.5	100.0%	4	100.0%	Strongly Disagree	0	0.0%
						Disagree	0	0.0%
						Neutral	0	0.0%
						Agree	1	25.0%
						Strongly Agree	3	75.0%

1 of 4

Question	Average	Standard Deviation	Response % of 2 Highest Ratings	# of Students Who Answered the Question	Question Response Rate	Answer	# of Responses to the Answer	Answer %
The course objectives were clearly stated.	4.8	0.5	100.0%	4	100.0%	Strongly Disagree	0	0.0%
						Disagree	0	0.0%
						Neutral	0	0.0%
						Agree	1	25.0%
						Strongly Agree	3	75.0%
The course was well organized.	4.8	0.5	100.0%	4	100.0%	Strongly Disagree	0	0.0%
						Disagree	0	0.0%
						Neutral	0	0.0%
						Agree	1	25.0%
						Strongly Agree	3	75.0%
The course was intellectually stimulating.	4.8	0.5	100.0%	4	100.0%	Strongly Disagree	0	0.0%
						Disagree	0	0.0%
						Neutral	0	0.0%
						Agree	1	25.0%
						Strongly Agree	3	75.0%
The course was effective at helping me learn.	4.8	0.5	100.0%	4	100.0%	Strongly Disagree	0	0.0%
						Disagree	0	0.0%
						Neutral	0	0.0%
						Agree	1	25.0%
						Strongly Agree	3	75.0%
The classes were informative.	4.8	0.5	100.0%	4	100.0%	Strongly Disagree	0	0.0%
						Disagree	0	0.0%
						Neutral	0	0.0%
						Agree	1	25.0%
						Strongly Agree	3	75.0%
The course was challenging.	4.5	1.0	75.0%	4	100.0%	Strongly Disagree	0	0.0%
						Disagree	0	0.0%
						Neutral	1	25.0%
						Agree	0	0.0%
						Strongly Agree	3	75.0%

2 of 4

Question	Average	Standard Deviation	Response % of 2 Highest Ratings	# of Students Who Answered the Question	Question Response Rate	Answer	# of Responses to the Answer	Answer %
The course increased my knowledge of the subject.	4.8	0.5	100.0%	4	100.0%	Strongly Disagree	0	0.0%
						Disagree	0	0.0%
						Neutral	0	0.0%
						Agree	1	25.0%
						Strongly Agree	3	75.0%
The instructor was effective at helping me learn.	4.8	0.5	100.0%	4	100.0%	Strongly Disagree	0	0.0%
						Disagree	0	0.0%
						Neutral	0	0.0%
						Agree	1	25.0%
						Strongly Agree	3	75.0%
The instructor encouraged student participation.	5.0		100.0%	4	100.0%	Strongly Disagree	0	0.0%
						Disagree	0	0.0%
						Neutral	0	0.0%
						Agree	0	0.0%
						Strongly Agree	4	100.0%
The instructor was effective at facilitating class discussion.	5.0		100.0%	4	100.0%	Strongly Disagree	0	0.0%
						Disagree	0	0.0%
						Neutral	0	0.0%
						Agree	0	0.0%
						Strongly Agree	4	100.0%
The instructor was open to students' questions and multiple points of view.	5.0		100.0%	4	100.0%	Strongly Disagree	0	0.0%
						Disagree	0	0.0%
						Neutral	0	0.0%
						Agree	0	0.0%
						Strongly Agree	4	100.0%
The instructor was accessible to students (e.g., via e-mail and office hours).	4.8	0.5	100.0%	4	100.0%	Strongly Disagree	0	0.0%
						Disagree	0	0.0%
						Neutral	0	0.0%
						Agree	1	25.0%
						Strongly Agree	3	75.0%

3 of 4

Question	Average	Standard Deviation	Response % of 2 Highest Ratings	# of Students Who Answered the Question	Question Response Rate	Answer	# of Responses to the Answer	Answer %
The instructor created an environment that promoted the success of students with diverse backgr	4.8	0.5	100.0%	4	100.0%	Strongly Disagree	0	0.0%
						Disagree	0	0.0%
						Neutral	0	0.0%
						Agree	1	25.0%
						Strongly Agree	3	75.0%

Course Comments

Instructor Comments

Describe the best thing about the course/instructor that was effective in helping you learn.

- Good conversation maintaining. Class was hard for me personally.
- Best thing was the way things were organized--everything from the readings, to the assignments, to class discussions were very well organized. One thing that could be improved is perhaps the time we spend on things. Sometimes some students took discussions off on tangents and it was hard to get back on track. But this also just happens in philosophy classes.
- Professor Dyke is a wonderful person and professor. She is very knowledgeable, and her use of repetition allows us to remember important concepts of Philosophy. She keeps the class engaged and wants people to stay engaged to make the essay much easier to write and to understand Philosophy.
- The class was incredible! Not only was the whole semester organized (one topic per week, 1 article per day), but even the class time itself was so organized. Half of it was dedicated to reviewing yesterday's material (which is probably the most helpful thing a teacher has done) and the second half was dedicated to new material. Nothing to improve on!

4 of 4

Instructor Name:	Term:	Evaluation Type:	Class Description:
Michelle Mary Dyke	Summer 2017	Final	PHIL-UA 21-001 (2618) - History of Modern Philosophy (Lecture) PHIL-UA 21-060 (2766) - History of Modern Philosophy (Lecture)

6 out of 9 students eligible to evaluate completed the survey.

Survey Response Rate: 66.7%

Question	Average	Standard Deviation	Response % of 2 Highest Ratings	# of Students Who Answered the Question	Question Response Rate	Answer	# of Responses to the Answer	Answer %
Overall evaluation of the instructor(s).	4.7	0.8	83.3%	6	100.0%	Very Poor	0	0.0%
						Poor	0	0.0%
						Adequate	1	16.7%
						Good	0	0.0%
						Excellent	5	83.3%
Overall evaluation of the course.	4.5	0.8	83.3%	6	100.0%	Very Poor	0	0.0%
						Poor	0	0.0%
						Adequate	1	16.7%
						Good	1	16.7%
						Excellent	4	66.7%
The instructor(s) provided an environment that was conducive to learning.	4.7	0.5	100.0%	6	100.0%	Strongly Disagree	0	0.0%
						Disagree	0	0.0%
						Neutral	0	0.0%
						Agree	2	33.3%
						Strongly Agree	4	66.7%
The instructor(s) provided helpful feedback on assessed class components (e.g., exams, papers).	4.8	0.4	100.0%	6	100.0%	Strongly Disagree	0	0.0%
						Disagree	0	0.0%
						Neutral	0	0.0%
						Agree	1	16.7%
						Strongly Agree	5	83.3%

1 of 4

Question	Average	Standard Deviation	Response % of 2 Highest Ratings	# of Students Who Answered the Question	Question Response Rate	Answer	# of Responses to the Answer	Answer %
The course objectives were clearly stated.	4.8	0.4	100.0%	6	100.0%	Strongly Disagree	0	0.0%
						Disagree	0	0.0%
						Neutral	0	0.0%
						Agree	1	16.7%
						Strongly Agree	5	83.3%
The course was well organized.	4.7	0.8	83.3%	6	100.0%	Strongly Disagree	0	0.0%
						Disagree	0	0.0%
						Neutral	1	16.7%
						Agree	0	0.0%
						Strongly Agree	5	83.3%
The course was intellectually stimulating.	4.7	0.5	100.0%	6	100.0%	Strongly Disagree	0	0.0%
						Disagree	0	0.0%
						Neutral	0	0.0%
						Agree	2	33.3%
						Strongly Agree	4	66.7%
The course was effective at helping me learn.	4.7	0.5	100.0%	6	100.0%	Strongly Disagree	0	0.0%
						Disagree	0	0.0%
						Neutral	0	0.0%
						Agree	2	33.3%
						Strongly Agree	4	66.7%
The classes were informative.	4.8	0.4	100.0%	6	100.0%	Strongly Disagree	0	0.0%
						Disagree	0	0.0%
						Neutral	0	0.0%
						Agree	1	16.7%
						Strongly Agree	5	83.3%
The course was challenging.	3.8	1.5	83.3%	6	100.0%	Strongly Disagree	1	16.7%
						Disagree	0	0.0%
						Neutral	0	0.0%
						Agree	3	50.0%
						Strongly Agree	2	33.3%

2 of 4

Question	Average	Standard Deviation	Response % of 2 Highest Ratings	# of Students Who Answered the Question	Question Response Rate	Answer	# of Responses to the Answer	Answer %
The course increased my knowledge of the subject.	4.8	0.4	100.0%	6	100.0%	Strongly Disagree	0	0.0%
						Disagree	0	0.0%
						Neutral	0	0.0%
						Agree	1	16.7%
						Strongly Agree	5	83.3%
The instructor was effective at helping me learn.	4.8	0.4	100.0%	6	100.0%	Strongly Disagree	0	0.0%
						Disagree	0	0.0%
						Neutral	0	0.0%
						Agree	1	16.7%
						Strongly Agree	5	83.3%
The instructor encouraged student participation.	4.5	0.8	83.3%	6	100.0%	Strongly Disagree	0	0.0%
						Disagree	0	0.0%
						Neutral	1	16.7%
						Agree	1	16.7%
						Strongly Agree	4	66.7%
The instructor was effective at facilitating class discussion.	4.5	0.8	83.3%	6	100.0%	Strongly Disagree	0	0.0%
						Disagree	0	0.0%
						Neutral	1	16.7%
						Agree	1	16.7%
						Strongly Agree	4	66.7%
The instructor was open to students' questions and multiple points of view.	4.8	0.4	100.0%	6	100.0%	Strongly Disagree	0	0.0%
						Disagree	0	0.0%
						Neutral	0	0.0%
						Agree	1	16.7%
						Strongly Agree	5	83.3%
The instructor was accessible to students (e.g., via e-mail and office hours).	5.0		100.0%	6	100.0%	Strongly Disagree	0	0.0%
						Disagree	0	0.0%
						Neutral	0	0.0%
						Agree	0	0.0%
						Strongly Agree	6	100.0%

3 of 4

Question	Average	Standard Deviation	Response % of 2 Highest Ratings	# of Students Who Answered the Question	Question Response Rate	Answer	# of Responses to the Answer	Answer %
The instructor created an environment that promoted the success of students with diverse background	4.7	0.5	100.0%	6	100.0%	Strongly Disagree	0	0.0%
						Disagree	0	0.0%
						Neutral	0	0.0%
						Agree	2	33.3%
						Strongly Agree	4	66.7%

Course Comments

Instructor Comments

Describe the best thing about the course/instructor that was effective in helping you learn.

- Michelle is very well prepared and explains things really clearly.
- Explained everything great!
- Michelle is a very good lecturer. She makes the course materials very clear and accessible. Handouts are very useful and clear, which I liked very much. Her class is as good as one can expect.
- I liked how the class discussion goes that helps clear out many question that one might have in mind after reading the materials.
- Getting feedback on rough draft essays.
- The paper prompts given is very clear and organised

4 of 4

The scale is from 1 (strongly disagree) to 5 (strongly agree).

History of Modern Philosophy; Michelle Mary Dyke; Summer 2016

Overall, the course was effective at helping me learn.

4.5

The objectives of the course were achieved.

4.7

The classes were well organized.

4.8

The classes were informative.

4.2

The course was intellectually challenging.

3.8

The course increased my knowledge of the subject.

4.2

The course stimulated my interest in this subject.

4.0

Michelle Mary Dyke

[Download to Excel](#)

Overall, Michelle Mary Dyke was effective at helping me learn.

4.7

Michelle Mary Dyke created a supportive learning environment.

4.7

Michelle Mary Dyke encouraged student participation.

4.2

Michelle Mary Dyke was effective at facilitating class discussion.

4.2

Michelle Mary Dyke was open to students' questions and points of view.

4.5

Michelle Mary Dyke provided helpful feedback on assignments (e.g., exams, papers, homework).

4.0

Michelle Mary Dyke was accessible to students (e.g., via e-mail and office hours).

5.0

Feedback and suggestions for Michelle Mary Dyke

Describe the *one* best thing about the course or Michelle Mary Dyke that was effective in helping you learn. If you could suggest *one* thing to improve the course, what would it be?

- I appreciated how Michelle reviewed material at the beginning of class and tied in previous topics discussed in class with current ones. 3-5 minute breaks midway through class were also helpful in keeping my attention.
- Michelle is a great philosophy teacher; she is very structured and clear in her explanations of the topics. When a topic would have been unclear due to complex concepts, she offered examples that helped me grasp the material. I believe that there can be more/more in-depth feedback on graded assignments; although I did fairly well on the "midterm" assignment, I wish that I had received more written feedback on my work. Other than this suggestion, Michelle's passion, availability, and great ability to communicate information well to a class, encouraged both my understanding and passion for the field.
- more class discussion would have been nice, please in the future reduce the number of books we have to buy and provide more online options as not everyone can afford to buy like 7 books

The Course Evaluation Guide is compiled from anonymous CAS student surveys, searchable by Course ID, Instructor, or Subject.

Get Favorites

Instructor ▾ Dyke Go

History of Modern Philosophy

Michelle Mary Dyke

Philosophy (Summer 2015)
PHIL-UA 2100001

4 of 6 (67%) students responded

Course

	Average Result (5=Excellent, 1=Poor)
The course was effective at helping me learn.	3.75
The objectives of the course were achieved.	4.25
The classes were well organized.	4.25
The classes were informative.	4.50
The course was intellectually challenging.	4.00
The course was increased my knowledge of the subject.	4.00
The course was stimulated my interest in this subject.	3.75
<i>Overall rating:</i>	4.07

Instructor: Michelle Mary Dyke

	Average Result (5=Excellent, 1=Poor)
Overall, the instructor was effective at helping me learn.	4.50
The instructor created a supportive learning environment.	4.50
The instructor encouraged student participation.	4.75
The instructor was effective at facilitating class discussion.	4.25
The instructor was open to student's questions and points of view.	4.75
The instructor provided helpful feedback on assignments (e.g. exams, papers, homework)	4.75
The instructor was accessible to students (e.g. via email and office hours)	4.75

The Course Evaluation Guide is compiled from anonymous CAS student surveys, searchable by Course ID, Instructor, or Subject.

Get Favorites

Instructor ▾ Dyke Go

History of Modern Philosophy

Michelle Mary Dyke

Philosophy (Summer 2015)
PHIL-UA 2100060

4 of 4 (100%) students responded

Course

	Average Result (5=Excellent, 1=Poor)
The course was effective at helping me learn.	4.75
The objectives of the course were achieved.	4.75
The classes were well organized.	4.50
The classes were informative.	4.75
The course was intellectually challenging.	5.00
The course was increased my knowledge of the subject.	5.00
The course was stimulated my interest in this subject.	4.50
<i>Overall rating:</i>	4.75

Instructor: Michelle Mary Dyke

	Average Result (5=Excellent, 1=Poor)
Overall, the instructor was effective at helping me learn.	4.50
The instructor created a supportive learning environment.	4.50
The instructor encouraged student participation.	4.75
The instructor was effective at facilitating class discussion.	4.50
The instructor was open to student's questions and points of view.	5.00
The instructor provided helpful feedback on assignments (e.g. exams, papers, homework)	4.50
The instructor was accessible to students (e.g. via email and office hours)	4.75

