

# Teaching Portfolio

September 2021

## **Michelle M. Dyke**

Assistant Professor/Faculty Fellow (fixed term)

NYU Center for Bioethics

[michelle.dyke@nyu.edu](mailto:michelle.dyke@nyu.edu)

## **Table of Contents**

**Courses Taught (2)**

**Additional Training & Experience (3-4)**

**Statement on Teaching & Advising (5-7)**

### **Previous Syllabi:**

Topics in Metaphysics & Epistemology:

“Moral Epistemology and the Debate Over Moral Realism” (8-15)

Central Problems in Philosophy (16-20)

Philosophy of Mind (21-24)

History of Modern Philosophy (25-28)

Advanced Introduction to Bioethics (29-39)

Topics in Bioethics: Controversies & Politics (40-51)

Advanced Introduction to Public Health Ethics (52-62)

Ethics & Identity: Disability, Gender, and Race (63-76)

### **Sample Syllabus/Course Proposal:**

Comparing Moral & Epistemic Normativity (77-80)

**Student Course Evaluations (81-end)**

See pp. 81-83 for a chart of summarized results and selected student comments

## Courses Taught

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

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

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

- Central Problems in Philosophy (Fall 2018)

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

\*Switched to online instruction halfway through the term

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

\*\*\*Offered in a hybrid format, with some students attending in person and others attending live over Zoom

All others were offered in a traditional format on campus.

## **Additional Training & Experience**

### **MA Thesis Advising**

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

### **Experience Supervising Teaching Assistants**

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

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

### **Teacher Training Workshops Completed**

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

### **Public Outreach and Volunteer Teaching at the High School Level**

I am dedicated to doing my part to make academia a more diverse and inclusive place. I believe that one of the most promising ways to achieve this goal is to reach groups of underrepresented students before they make decisions regarding their university plans and to make clear by example that the pursuit of advanced degrees is an attractive and attainable option for them. During my time at NYU, I have been involved as a volunteer in the teaching of elective and extracurricular programs in Philosophy for high school students in New York City public schools. In the fall of 2018, and again in 2019, I led small-group discussions of issues in Applied Ethics at NYC's High School for Environmental Studies as part of a team of four visiting volunteers from NYU. In spring 2019, I participated in the team-teaching of an elective course in

Philosophy for students at East Side Community High School as part of the “Corrupt the Youth” program directed by Briana Toole.<sup>1</sup> Each year, I also volunteer as a judge for New York City’s High School Ethics Bowl.<sup>2</sup> My hope has been to get high school students excited about the study of Philosophy, as well as to help normalize the idea of an academic career path in any discipline.

---

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

<sup>2</sup> <https://highschoolethicsbowl.com>

## Statement on Teaching & Advising

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. But in this short document, I will take the opportunity to highlight a few 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 relatively minor and specific pieces of advice that students can implement right away in completing their next assignment in order to most efficiently strengthen their writing. 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 change and 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 improving 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 new to philosophy to develop an awareness of whether they are tracking important subtleties in the views endorsed by our assigned authors and in the structure of their arguments for those views. 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 put in 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. While I was admittedly not thrilled at the time with the small bit of extra

work required, 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 stay 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 and allowing 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, including those who are most eager and willing to speak.

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 enormously helpful opportunity to teach a single lecture, or a portion of a lecture, for the course at some point during the semester in addition to the smaller discussion section that I was expected to lead each week. 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, who were similarly glad to gain practice leading our course.

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 big names in Philosophy. This gives students a sense of the direction in which major philosophical debates are currently moving, and carries the added 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 & Epistemic Normativity," which I have included with my application, provides one example of this practice of citing work by junior faculty as well as by familiar names within the discipline.

**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](mailto: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*, 2<sup>nd</sup> 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"

**SECOND MINI PAPER DUE MARCH 1, 5 PM**

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

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

Further reading on the epistemology of moral disagreement:

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

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

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

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

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

Further reading on evolutionary debunking arguments:

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

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

**THIRD MINI-PAPER DUE MARCH 15, 5 PM**

SPRING BREAK

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

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

Further reading on the power of Street's argument:

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

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

Another defense of Subjectivism about normative reasons:

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

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

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

For an objection to this approach, see

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

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

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

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

Further reading on "third factor replies":

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

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

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

### **MIDTERM PAPER DUE APRIL 5, 5PM**

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

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

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

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

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

See also:

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

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

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

Further reading:

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

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

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

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

Further reading, another proponent of ethical intuitionism:

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

### **FOURTH MINI PAPER DUE APRIL 26, 5 PM**

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

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

Further reading. Railton's version of moral realism:

- Peter Railton, "Moral Realism" (1986)

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

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

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

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

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

### **Course Requirements**

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

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

**Grades will be calculated as follows:**

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

25% midterm paper

40% final paper

15% participation in class

**Mini-papers will be graded as follows:**

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

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

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

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

The penalty will only be waived for medical, mental health or family emergencies (please provide documentation). This is an issue of fairness to your fellow students.

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

**Plagiarism (whether using published sources without citation or passing off another student's work as your own) merits an automatic 0 for the assignment and risks failure for the course.** Students are welcome to discuss the assignments with each other, but all submitted written documents should be the original work of the student submitting them. **Again, it's an issue of fairness.**

### Other Course Policies

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

Please note that students who have *unexcused* absences totaling >40% of our total class time may receive an F as their final *course grade* in accordance with NYU college policy:

<http://cas.nyu.edu/content/nyu-as/cas/academic-programs/bulletin/policies/academic-policies.html>

### **Moses Center**

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

# Phil-UA 1 : Central Problems in Philosophy

NYU Fall 2018

Course Syllabus as of 9/4/2018

Michelle M. Dyke

[michelle.dyke@nyu.edu](mailto: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]

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

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

@ room # TBA

\*tentative – contact Rob

Alex Rigas

[email]

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

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

@Irving Farm coffee, Thompson & W 3rd

\*tentative – contact Alex

## Course Description

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

## Schedule of Readings and Assignments

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

### Unit 1. What is Knowledge?

Tuesday, September 4

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

Thursday, Sep. 6

- no new reading: review Meditation I

- Tuesday, Sep. 11 - Descartes, Meditation II  
 Thursday, Sep. 13 - Edmund Gettier, "Is Justified True Belief Knowledge?" (1963)
- Tuesday, Sep. 18 - Alvin Goldman, "A Causal Theory of Knowing" (1967)  
*(Read pages 357-362 and 369-370 of Goldman)*
- Thursday, Sep. 20 - Timothy Williamson, *Knowledge and its Limits* (2002)  
*(read Introduction: Sec. 2 and Chapter 2: Secs. 1 & 4)*

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

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

- Tuesday, Sep. 25 - Descartes and Princess Elisabeth, correspondence  
 \*In Class: David Hume's "bundle theory" of mind
- Thursday, Sep. 27 - no new reading
- Tuesday, October 2 - Frank Jackson, "Epiphenomenal Qualia" (1982) *(stop before Section II)* and "What Mary Didn't Know" (1986)
- Thursday, Oct. 4 - Excerpt from David Chalmers, *The Conscious Mind* (1996)
- Tuesday, Oct. 9 Legislative Monday – Our Class Will NOT Meet**  
 Thursday, Oct. 11 - John Heil textbook chapter on "Functionalism"
- Tuesday, Oct. 16 - Hilary Putnam, "The nature of mental states" (1969), *Sec II-V*  
 Thursday, Oct. 18 - Sydney Shoemaker, "The Inverted Spectrum" (1982)  
*(Stop at Sec. IV on pg. 368)*

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

- Tuesday, Oct. 23 - Peter van Inwagen, "The Incompatibility of Free Will and Determinism" (1974)  
 \*In Class: LaPlace's Demon
- Thursday, Oct. 25 - Short Excerpt from Cicero on the swerve of the atom  
 \*In class: BBC Youtube video on Benjamin Libet's experiments

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

- Tuesday, Oct. 30 - Roderick Chisholm, "Human Freedom and the Self" (1964)
- Thursday, November 1 - Excerpt from Ned Markosian, "A Compatibilist Version of the Theory of Agent Causation" (1999)

- Tuesday, Nov. 6 - Harry Frankfurt, "Alternate Possibilities and Moral Responsibility" (1969)  
 Thursday, Nov. 8 - no new reading, Discussion of Writing Assignments

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

- Tuesday, Nov. 13 - P.F. Strawson, "Freedom and Resentment" (1962)  
 Thursday, Nov. 15 - Selection from David Hume's *Enquiry* (1748) on enduring character traits and moral responsibility

Tuesday, Nov. 20 - no new reading  
**Wednesday, November 21 – Friday Nov. 23 Thanksgiving Break – No Classes**

- Tuesday, November 27 - Heather Battaly, from *Current Controversies in Virtue Theory* (2015)  
 Thursday, Nov. 29 - Short selection from Aristotle on virtues  
 Tuesday, December 4 - Kant, *Groundwork* (1785) (selections)  
 Thursday, Dec. 6 - review Kant

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

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

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

**Course Requirements**

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

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

**Grades will be calculated as follows:**

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

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

The penalty will only be waived for medical, mental health or family emergencies (please provide documentation to your preceptor). This is an issue of fairness to your fellow students.

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

**Plagiarism (whether using published sources without citation or passing off another student's work as your own) merits an automatic 0 for the assignment and risks failure for the course.** Students are welcome to discuss the assignments with each other, but all submitted written documents should be the original work of the student submitting them. **Again, it's an issue of fairness.**

**Other Course Policies**

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

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

### **Moses Center**

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

### **(No) Textbooks**

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

**Phil-UA 8o : Philosophy of Mind**  
**Syllabus as of May 16, 2017**  
NYU Summer Session I 2017  
Instructor Michelle Dyke  
[michelle.dyke@nyu.edu](mailto: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 <i>The View from Nowhere</i>            |
| for Thursday       | - Excerpts from David Chalmers' <i>The Conscious Mind</i><br>- 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 <i>Philosophy of Mind</i>
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: <i>Analysis</i> 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 <i>Philosophy of Mind</i>

**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 <i>Perception and the Physical World</i> and Fred Dretske's "Phenomenal Externalism"
Thursday	No new reading

## Week VI (Personal Identity & Special Topics: Mental Determination & Creativity)

Monday, June 26	- Selection from John Locke's <i>An Essay Concerning Human Understanding</i>
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 3<sup>rd</sup> floor, near the elevator).

**Phil-UA 21 : History of Modern Philosophy**  
**Syllabus as of July 1, 2017**  
NYU Summer Session II 2017  
Instructor Michelle Dyke  
[michelle.dyke@nyu.edu](mailto: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 17<sup>th</sup> and 18<sup>th</sup> 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*)**

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*)**

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)**

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)**

Monday, July 24 (Leibniz)

- Excerpts from *Discourse on Metaphysics*\*
- In class: Letter excerpt\* (Lady Masham)

Tuesday (Leibniz)

- Excerpt from *The Monadology*\*

For fun: Short excerpt from Voltaire's *Candide*\*

Wednesday (Leibniz)

- *New Essays*\*: Preface (through pg 10 only) and Book I: Chapters i & iii (skip ch ii)

Thursday (Berkeley)

- Excerpt from Berkeley's *Treatise*\*

**Week V (Berkeley and Hume)**

Monday, July 31 (Berkeley)

- Review Berkeley's *Treatise*

Tuesday (Hume)

- *Enquiry* Sections 2, 4 (online or paper text)

Wednesday (Hume)

- *Enquiry* Sections 5, 9

Thursday (Hume)

- *Enquiry* Sections 6, 10

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

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

**Week VI (Kant)**

Monday, August 7

- 2<sup>nd</sup> ed. Preface to the *Critique of Pure Reason*\*

Tuesday

- *Prolegomena*: Sec 1-3, 14-22, 27-30\*

Wednesday (Review session in class)

- Bring your study guides and plan on working with your classmates

**On Thursday, August 10: Final Exam in class**

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

## Course Requirements

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

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

### **Grades will be calculated as follows:**

25% short paper

30% medium paper

30% final exam

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

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

**Plagiarism (whether using published sources without citation or passing off another student's work as your own) merits an automatic o for the assignment and risks failure for the course.** Students are welcome to discuss the assignments with each other, but all submitted written documents should be the original work of the student submitting them. Again, it's an issue of fairness.

## Other Course Policies

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

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

### **Moses Center**

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

### **Textbooks**

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

**1. An Essay Concerning Human Understanding**

John Locke, ed. Nidditch  
Oxford University Press

These two are very small, inexpensive paperbacks:

**2. Discourse on Method and Meditations on First Philosophy (4<sup>th</sup> 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](http://www.davidhume.org). (The readings will be required, though purchasing a paper version of the text is not.)



**NYU**

**SCHOOL OF GLOBAL  
PUBLIC HEALTH**

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

---

**\*Note: This syllabus, and all others for Bioethics courses, follows the required SGPH template. Certain sections (e.g. course objectives, grading point scale) have been cut here for length.**

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](mailto: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.

**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:

### ***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:**

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

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.

<b>Date</b>	<b>Topics</b>	<b>Readings/Materials Due</b>	<b>Assignments Due</b>
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)  <b>First Mini-Quiz</b>	<b>First 15 min. of class</b>
Week 4 Sep 29	Patient Rights & Informed Consent	Wells and Kaptchuk (2012) & Ackerman (1982)  <b>First Short Writing Assignment</b>	<b>Due before start of class</b>

Week 5 Oct 6	Well-Being	Read Bradley (2009 book, selections) & Hawkins (2014)	
Week 6 Oct 13	Abortion	Read Thomson (1971) & Marquis (1989)  <b>Second Mini-Quiz</b>	<b>First 15 min. of class</b>
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)  <b>Second Short Writing Assignment</b>	<b>Due before start of class</b>
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)  <b>Third Short Writing Assignment</b>	<b>Due before start of class</b>
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)  <b>Final Paper Proposal/Outline</b>	<b>Due before start of class</b>
Week 14 Dec 8	Final Topic TBD Based on Student Interest		

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

**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.
- Wringe, 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.



**NYU**

**SCHOOL OF GLOBAL  
PUBLIC HEALTH**

***GPH-GU 1008***

***Topics in Bioethics: Current Controversies & Politics<sup>3</sup>***  
*(4 credits)*

---

Class Schedule: Wed 6:00-8:00 pm EST  
**Live (“synchronous” instruction) in hybrid format**

Details depending upon final total enrollment,

See Announcements on NYUClasses site

NYU Campus Class Location: TISC LC5

Simultaneously over Zoom for virtual students

Semester and Year: Spring 2021

Professor: Michelle M. Dyke

Contact:

I will not be on campus daily. Please use

Email: [michelle.dyke@nyu.edu](mailto:michelle.dyke@nyu.edu)

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)

**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:**

In addition to the usual topics mentioned in the Course Description, given the nature of this course (“current controversies & politics” in Bioethics) we’ll discuss timely topics including ethical issues raised by COVID-19 vaccination and the relationship between race & public health in the US. Recent case studies will be included as well as more abstract philosophical material.

---

<sup>3</sup> \*Note: This syllabus, and all others for Bioethics courses, follows the required SGPH template. Certain sections (e.g. course objectives, grading point scale) have been cut here for length.

## PRE-REQUISITES:

- No Pre-requisites. Students must be enrolled in the MA in Bioethics at NYU, or have permission from the instructor (via email) to take this class. MPH students are welcome!

## 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 (whether attending in person or online). For more detail on classroom policies, see the sections below.

## 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 absence, no questions asked, before the participation grade is affected. (Note our course only meets once a week.) 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 the student's circumstances warrant an excused absence, that student 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.
- 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!) Participation grades will be determined as follows:

### **Midterm Paper (35% of term grade):**

This is a relatively short paper that should engage critically with one or more of our assigned course readings.

- It should be 5-7 pages long (before References), double-spaced, Times New Roman 12-pt, with 1" margins.
- This is an argumentative paper; your thesis statement (which should appear by the end of the first page) 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 NYUClasses 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 NYUClasses.
- 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 via NYUClasses. One Assignment Sheet with more detailed instructions for both components will be uploaded to NYUClasses 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. Which 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 should 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 that 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.
- 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 see 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 would probably take place over Zoom, or immediately after class in person.) This meeting is not required, but highly recommended.

### **Final Paper—45%**

- Write a final paper based on your outline. Your paper must be between 14 and 17 pages in length (before References), double-spaced, 1" margins, in Times New Roman font, 12-point. (The point of standardizing this is to minimize bias in grading.)
- This paper must be an argumentative piece of philosophical writing. It must have a thesis statement (to appear by the end of the first page), to which the rest of the paper is dedicated to proving. You must advance and defend an argument, and raise and respond to objections.
- 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, clarity, ethical engagement, and originality, in addition to proper citation of source material.

### **GRADING COMPONENTS:**

<b>Item:</b>	<b>Percentage or Points:</b>
Participation	<b>15%</b>
Midterm Paper	<b>35%</b>
Final Paper Proposal with Outline	<b>5%</b>
Final Paper	<b>45%</b>

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. Please also note that my final grades for the spring term are due before Commencement, so I can only give a maximum of a few days' extension on the final paper. 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. Please come to class having read the articles listed to the right of the date.

Date	Topics	Readings/Materials Due	Assignments Due
Week 1 Feb 3	Introduction: Values, Objectivity, and the Practice of Medicine	Please come to class having read Kelly et al. (2015)  <i>*Optional</i> further reading: Howick (2011)	
Week 2 Feb 10	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-Tiktin (2012)	
Week 3 Feb 17	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 24	Religious & Moral Objections (to Abortion, PAS) from Healthcare Providers	Schuklenk (2019), "Conscience-based refusal of patient care in medicine: a consequentialist analysis"  Hughes (2017), "Conscientious objection, professional duty and compromise:"	

		<p>A response to Savulescu and Schuklenk”</p> <p>Savulescu &amp; Schuklenk (2018), “Conscientious objection and compromising the patient: Response to Hughes”</p> <p><i>*Optional</i> further reading: Maclure &amp; Dumont (2017) (and more from same journal issue)</p>	
Week 5 Mar 3	<p>Religious &amp; Moral Objections (to Vaccination) from Patients Case Study: Measles in NYC</p>	<p>Pager &amp; 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 6 Mar 10	<p>Case Study: Ongoing COVID Vaccination in NYC</p> <p>Trust in the Vaccine, Priority for Vaccination</p>	<p>Additional Readings TBA Based on Current Events</p> <p><b>Midterm Paper</b></p>	<p><b>Due on NYUClasses by start of class at 6:00</b></p>
Week 7 Mar 17	<p>Controversies in Medical Research: The Ethics of Human Embryonic Stem Cell Research</p>	<p>Marquis (2007), “The Moral-Principle Objection to Human Embryonic Stem Cell Research”</p>	
Week 8 Mar 24	<p>Controversies in Medical Research: Non-Christian Perspectives on Embryonic Stem Cell Research</p>	<p>Sivaraman &amp; Noor (2016), “Human Embryonic Stem Cell Research: Ethical Views of Buddhist, Hindu and Catholic Leaders in Malaysia”</p> <p>Fadel (2012), “Developments in Stem Cell Research and Therapeutic Cloning: Islamic Ethical Positions, A Review”</p>	

Week 9 Mar 31	Bioethical Controversies in Psychiatry: Personality Disorders – Moral or Medical?	Pickard (2009), “Mental illness is indeed a myth”  Background (required): Charland (2006), “Moral Nature of the DSM-IV Cluster B Personality Disorders”	
Week 10 Apr 7	Controversies in Psychiatry: Substance Addiction & Moral Responsibility	Lewis (2017) “Addiction and the Brain” & Pickard (2017) “Responsibility without Blame for Addiction”  <i>*Optional</i> background: Pickard (2018) “The Puzzle of Addiction” & Philosophical background on ethical responsibility: P.F. Strawson (1962)	
Week 11 Apr 14	Case Study: The US Opioid Epidemic  In-Class Debate (expectations to be discussed in prior class session)	CDC web page on Opioid Epidemic: <a href="https://www.cdc.gov/drugoverdose/epidemic/index.html">https://www.cdc.gov/drugoverdose/epidemic/index.html</a>  Travis Rieder (2018), “There’s Never Just One Side to the Story” &  Rieder (2020), “Solving the Opioid Crisis Isn’t Just a Public Health Challenge – It’s a Bioethics Challenge”	(Debate counts toward participation grade)
Week 12 Apr 21	Race & Public Health I Social determinants of health Is racism a public <i>health</i> problem? What is the relationship between racism and racial health disparities?	CDC web page on Social Determinants of Health: <a href="https://www.cdc.gov/socialdeterminants/about.html">https://www.cdc.gov/socialdeterminants/about.html</a>  Lillie-Blanton et al. (2008), “Reducing Racial, Ethnic, and Socioeconomic Disparities in Health Care”  Yearby (2021), “Structural Racism and Health Disparities”  Gina Kolata, NYTimes, 12/9/2020, “Social Inequalities Explain Racial Gaps in Pandemic, Studies Find”	

		<b>Final Paper Outline</b>	<b>Due on NYUClasses by start of class</b>
Week 13 Apr 28	Race & Public Health II Community Trust in Healthcare Services	McGary (2015), "Racial Groups, Distrust, and the Distribution of Health Care"  Gina Kolata, NYTimes, 12/31/2020, "In Minority Communities, Doctors Are Changing Minds About Vaccination"	
Week 14 May 5	Final Topic TBD Based on Student Interest and Current Events in Public Health  In-Class Debate or Mock Academic Conference depending upon final total enrollment	Additional reading TBD	(Participation counts toward course Participation grade)
		<b>Final Paper</b>	<b>Due on NYUClasses at 11:59 pm on Friday, May 7</b>

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

- 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.
- 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 US Opioid Epidemic:  
<https://www.cdc.gov/drugoverdose/epidemic/index.html>
- CDC page on Social Determinants of Health:  
<https://www.cdc.gov/socialdeterminants/about.html>

- Daniels, Norman. (2008). *Just Health: Meeting Health Needs Fairly*. Cambridge University Press.
- Dubov, Alex and Liana Fraenkel. (2018). "Facial Feminization Surgery: The Ethics of Gatekeeping in Transgender Health," *The American Journal of Bioethics*, 18(12), 3-9.
- 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.
- Kolata, Gina. (31 Dec 2020). "In Minority Communities, Doctors Are Changing Minds About Vaccination," *The New York Times*.
- Kolata, Gina. (9 Dec 2020). "Social Inequalities Explain Racial Gaps in Pandemic, Studies Find," *The New York Times*.
- 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. (\*optional)
- Marquis, Don. (2007). "The Moral-Principle Objection to Human Embryonic Stem Cell Research," *Metaphilosophy*, 38(2-3), 190-206.
- 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.

- 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-Tiklin, Efrat. (2012). "The Right to Health Care as a Right to Basic Human Functional Capacities," *Ethical Theory and Moral Practice*, 15, 337-351. (\*optional)
- Rieder, Travis. (2018). "There's Never Just One Side to the Story: Why America Must Stop Swinging the Opioid Pendulum," *Narrative Inquiry in Bioethics*, 8(3), 225-231.
- Rieder, Travis. (2020). "Solving the Opioid Crisis Isn't Just a Public Health Challenge – It's a Bioethics Challenge," *Hastings Center Report*, 50(4), 24-32.
- 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 TBD based on current events in public health



**NYU**

**COLLEGE OF GLOBAL  
PUBLIC HEALTH**

***GPH-GU 1230***  
***Advanced Introduction to Public Health Ethics<sup>4</sup>***  
*Summer Session II 2020*  
*(3 credits)*

---

Class Schedule: Tu Th 6:00-8:30 PM  
Class Location: Virtually on Zoom,  
link accessible from NYUClasses  
Semester and Year: Summer II 2020

Professor: Michelle M. Dyke  
Office: Room 1226 at 719 Broadway  
Office Phone: ~~+1 212 998 3867~~ (extension ~~83867~~)

Office Hours: Mon 4-5 PM or by appointment  
Email: [michelle.dyke@nyu.edu](mailto:michelle.dyke@nyu.edu)

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

**COURSE DESCRIPTION:**

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

**PRE-REQUISITES:**

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

**COURSE REQUIREMENTS AND EXPECTATIONS:**

- Students are expected to complete assignments on time and at a standard appropriate to a graduate level course. See below for policies on grading and late work.
- Students are expected to come to class having read the assigned readings for that session. **Note that the assignment of an article does *not* indicate that the course**

---

<sup>4</sup> \*Note: This syllabus, and all others for Bioethics courses, follows the required SGPH template. Certain sections (e.g. course objectives, grading point scale) have been cut here for length.

**instructor agrees with everything the author has written. The purpose of our discussions and writing assignments will be to engage critically with the views and arguments we encounter.**

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

## **ASSIGNMENTS:**

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

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

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

- It should be 5-7 pages (before References), double-spaced, Times New Roman 12-pt, with 1" margins. (The point of standardizing this is to minimize bias in grading.)
- This is an argumentative paper. Your thesis statement (which should appear by the end of the first page) must take an opinionated ethical stance. (This means that the thesis should not be obviously true. Nor should it be the kind of straightforwardly factual claim that would be apparent to anyone who has done adequate empirical research.) The rest of your paper will be dedicated to proving your thesis true, using arguments and examples of your own. Walk your reader slowly through your process of reasoning. This is your chance to make clear, and to defend, your own opinion on the issues we have been discussing in class.
- As a guideline, "mere summary" of the views and arguments of our assigned course authors should take up no more than half of the paper. Remember you don't need to (and should not!) summarize the whole

paper(s) to which you are responding. Ideally, you want to present just as much background information as is necessary in order for the rest of your paper (that is, your arguments for your own view) to make sense. Think of yourself as setting the stage for in-depth discussion of a particular issue.

- Towards the end of the paper, you should raise and respond to (at least) one potential objection to your thesis. Imagine: What would some smart friends or colleagues of yours say if they weren't fully convinced yet by your case for your thesis? What could you say in reply? How devastating do you find this objection in the end?
- Additional outside research is not necessary for this paper. (It will be required for the longer term paper.) This shorter assignment is intended to provide practice with philosophical writing for the term paper.
- You will be given some prompts/topic ideas for this paper, though you're also welcome to pick your own topic. I will post an Assignment Sheet with more details on NYUClasses in advance of the due date. Your topic should be obviously and directed related to the course readings we have already discussed in class.
- The assignment will be submitted online via NYUClasses.
- These assignments will receive letter grades in accordance with the standards described below under "Grading Scale." I will also provide written comments, with an eye to helping students strengthen their writing in preparation for the final paper.

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

**Proposal with Outline—5%**

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

regarding a topic that came up in our seminar that was of special interest to you. You will be defending your own view, which should be informed by additional outside research of your own.

- An Assignment Sheet that describes expectations for the final paper project will be uploaded to NYUClasses before the due date of the outline.
- Submission of the outline will be online via NYUClasses.

#### **Final Research Paper—45%**

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

#### **GRADING COMPONENTS:**

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

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 to discuss your situation.

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

### **NYU CLASSES:**

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

### **TECHNOLOGY POLICY:**

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

A Zoom class meeting is still a university class meeting. Please do remember to silence unnecessary features on other electronic devices nearby (e.g. text message alerts on cell

phones) and silence your audio temporarily in case of background noise that would distract other students. Your video should be enabled during class. Please come to class fully dressed and ready to participate.

Our class meetings will not be recorded.

**COURSE OUTLINE:**

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

Date	Topics	Readings for Session	Assignments Due
<p><b>Week 1</b></p> <p>July 7</p>	<p><b>Introduction: Moral Theory &amp; The Social Goals of Public Health</b></p> <p>1. What Kinds of Aims and Principles Might Guide Decision-Making for Public Health?</p>	<p>Bognar &amp; Hirose (2014), Chapter 1</p> <p>Volume Intro &amp; Persad (2019), “Justice and Public Health”</p> <p><i>Optional</i> further reading: Martha Nussbaum (2003); Mark Timmons (2013)</p>	
<p>July 9</p>	<p>2. Just How Broad are the Goals of <i>Public Health</i>?</p>	<p>Rothstein (2002), “Rethinking the Meaning of Public Health”</p> <p>Goldberg (2009), “In Support of a Broad Model of Public Health”</p>	
<p><b>Week 2</b></p> <p>July 14</p>	<p><b>Individual Rights, Autonomy &amp; Public Health Policy</b></p> <p>1. What Justifies Public Health Interventions? Powers &amp; Faden’s Social Justice Model</p>	<p>Faden &amp; Powers (2011), “A Social Justice Framework for Health and Science Policy”</p> <p>Powers, Faden &amp; Saghai (2012), “Liberty, Mill and the Framework of Public Health Ethics”</p> <p><i>Optional</i> further reading: John Stuart Mill, <i>On Liberty</i>; John Rawls (1971), <i>A Theory of Justice</i></p>	

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

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

		(2006), <i>Public Health, Ethics, and Equity</i>	
August 6	<p>2. How Can (Rational) <i>Distrust</i> of Institutions Affect Health Care in Minority Communities?</p> <p>How is the phenomenon of “epistemic injustice” relevant for public health?</p>	<p>McGary (2015), “Racial Groups, Distrust, and the Distribution of Health Care”</p> <p>Miranda Fricker (2013), “Epistemic justice as a condition of political freedom?” excerpts</p> <p><i>Optional</i> (Hurricane Katrina, Race and Public Health): Quinn (2006); Johns Hopkins (2005)</p>	<p><b>Final Paper Proposal with Outline due via Classes by start of class on August 6</b></p>
<p><b>Week 6</b> August 11</p>	<p><b>COVID-19 Case Study</b>, TBA based on current events and student input Possible topics: Decision-Making for “Reopening,” Distribution of Scarce Resources (e.g. ventilators, PPE), Ethics of Human Trials of Vaccines (e.g. permissibility of ‘challenge’ trials)</p>	<p><i>Optional</i>: Hastings Center Webinar recording, 21 April 2020: “Re-Opening the Nation: Which Values Should Guide Us?”</p> <p><i>Optional</i>: “When to Reopen the Nation is an Ethics Question-Not Only a Scientific One” by Travis Rieder, Anne Barnhill, Justin Bernstein and Brian Hutler for the Hastings Center (2020), see also linked paper “An Ethics Framework for the COVID-19 Reopening Process” (2020), Johns Hopkins Berman Institute of Bioethics</p>	
August 13	<p><b>Mock Academic Conference:</b> Student Presentations of Their Research Papers with Collaborative Q&amp;A</p>		
			<p><b>Final Paper Due via Classes by 11:59pm on Friday, August 14</b></p>

			Final grades due to Registrar on August 16
--	--	--	--

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

- Alfano, Mark and Nicole Huijts. (forth. pre-print) "Trust and distrust in institutions and governance" In Judith Simon (ed.), *Handbook of Trust and Philosophy*. Routledge.
- Anand, Sudhir, Fabienne Peter and Amartya Sen (eds.) (2006). *Public Health, Ethics, and Equity*. Oxford University Press.
- Justin Bernstein, Brain Hutler, Travis N. Rieder, Ruth Faden, Hahrie Han, and Anne Barnhill. (2020). "An Ethics Framework for the COVID-19 Reopening Process," working paper from the Johns Hopkins Berman Institute of Bioethics & the SNF Agora Institute, last updated 27 May 2020, <https://bioethics.jhu.edu/research-and-outreach/covid-19-bioethics-expert-insights/resources-for-addressing-key-ethical-areas/grappling-with-the-ethics-of-social-distancing/>
- Bognar, Greg and Iwao Hirose. (2014). *The Ethics of Health Care Rationing: An Introduction*. Routledge. (electronic whole text available online via NYU Library search)
- Buchanan, David R. (2008). "Autonomy, Paternalism, and Justice: Ethical Priorities in Public Health," *Health Policy and Ethics*, 98(1): 15-21.
- Buchanan, David R. (2015). "Promoting Justice and Autonomy in Public Policies to Reduce the Health Consequencs of Obesity," *Kennedy Institute of Ethics Journal*, 25(4): 395-417.
- Conly, Sarah. (2012). *Against autonomy: justifying coercive paternalism*. Cambridge University Press.
- Conly, Sarah. (2014). "Against autonomy: justifying coercive paternalism," Author meets critics: precis, *Journal of Medical Ethics*, 40(5): 349.
- Courtwright, Andrew. (2009). "Justice, Stigma, and the New Epidemiology of Health Disparities," *Bioethics*, 23(2): 90-96.
- Emanuel, Ezekiel J. (2012). "Global Justice and the 'Standard of Care' Debates." In Joseph Millum and Ezekil J. Emanul (eds.), *Global Justice and Bioethics*. Oxford University Press.
- Faden, Ruth and Madison Powers. (2011). "A Social Justice Framework for Health and Science Policy," *Cambridge Quarterly of Healthcare Ethics*, 20, 596-604.
- Fricker, Miranda. (2013). "Epistemic justice as a condition of political freedom?" *Synthese*, 190: 1317-1332.

- Goldberg, Daniel. (2009). "In Support of a Broad Model of Public Health: Disparities, Social Epidemiology and Public Health Causation," *Public Health Ethics*, 2(1): 70-83.
- Gopichandran, Vijayaprasad et. al. (2020). "COVID-19 Pandemic: a Litmus Test of Trust in the Health System," *Asian Bioethics Review*, 12: 213-221.
- Hawley, Katherine. (2014). "Trust, Distrust, and Commitment," *Noûs*, 48(1): 1-20.
- "Katrina's Aftermath: Public Health Concerns." (6 September 2005). News Release, Johns Hopkins Bloomberg School of Public Health: [https://www.jhsph.edu/news/news-releases/2005/katrina/katrina\\_health.html](https://www.jhsph.edu/news/news-releases/2005/katrina/katrina_health.html)
- Liao, Matthew S. (2019). "Human Rights and Public Health Ethics." *The Oxford Handbook of Public Health Ethics*, Ed. Mastroianni, Kahn and Kass. Oxford University Press.
- Lignou, Sapfo. (2011). "The 'standard of care' debate and global justice in research," *Research Ethics*, 7(1): 5-12.
- Lillie-Blanton, Marsha et al. (2008). "Reducing Racial, Ethnic, and Socioeconomic Disparities in Health Care: Opportunities in National Health Reform," *Journal of Law, Medicine & Ethics*, Health Care Symposium Winter 2008, 693-702.
- MacKay, Douglas. (2015). "Standard of Care, Institutional Obligations, and Distributive Justice," *Bioethics*, 29(4): 262-273.
- McGary, Howard. (2015). "Racial Groups, Distrust, and the Distribution of Health Care." In Rhodes, Battin and Silvers (eds.), *Medicine and Social Justice: Essays on the Distribution of Health Care*. Oxford University Press.
- Mill, J.S. (2007). In Stefan, Collini (ed.), *On Liberty and Other Writings*. Cambridge University Press.
- Morley, Jessica et al. (4 June 2020). "Ethical guidelines for COVID-19 tracing apps," *Nature*, Comment, 582, 29-31.
- Nguyen, C. Thi. (forth. pre-print) "Trust as an Unquestioning Attitude" In *Oxford Studies in Epistemology*
- Nussbaum, Martha. (2003). "Capabilities as Fundamental Entitlements: Sen and Social Justice." *Feminist Economics*, 9(23): 33-59.
- Persad, Govind. (2019). "Justice and Public Health." *The Oxford Handbook of Public Health Ethics*, Ed. Mastroianni, Kahn and Kass. Oxford University Press.
- Powers, Madison, Ruth Faden and Yashar Saghai. (2012). "Liberty, Mill and the Framework of Public Health Ethics," *Public Health Ethics*, 5(1): 6-15.
- Quinn, Sandra Crouse. (2006). "Hurricane Katrina: A Social and Public Health Disaster," *American Journal of Public Health*, 96(2): 204.
- Rawls, J. (1971). *A Theory of Justice*. Harvard University Press.

- “Re-Opening the Nation: Privacy, Surveillance, and Digital Tools for Contact Tracing” with Mildred Solomon, Ed Felton and Ryan Calo, The Hastings Center webinar recording, 18 May 2020, <https://www.thehastingscenter.org/re-opening-the-nation/>
- “Re-Opening the Nation: What Values Should Guide Us?” with Mildred Solomon, Danielle Allen, and Ezekiel Emanuel, Hastings Center webinar recording, 21 April 2020, [https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=ahjo9oQ4lk8&feature=emb\\_title](https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=ahjo9oQ4lk8&feature=emb_title)
- Rothstein, Mark. (2002). “Rethinking the Meaning of Public Health,” *The Journal of Law, Medicine & Ethics*, 30, 144-149.
- Travis R. Rieder, Anne Barnhill, Justin Bernstein and Brian Hutler. (28 April 2020). “When to Reopen the Nation is an Ethics Question-Not Only a Scientific One,” The Hastings Center, Bioethics Forum Essay, <https://www.thehastingscenter.org/when-to-reopen-the-nation-is-an-ethics-question-not-only-a-scientific-one/>
- Ashkan Soltani, Ryan Calo and Carl Bergstrom. (27 April 2020). “Contact-tracing apps are not a solution to the COVID-19 crisis,” Brookings
- Timmons, Mark. (2013). *Moral Theory: An Introduction*. 2<sup>nd</sup> Ed. Rowman & Littlefield. (electronic whole text available online via NYU Library search)
- Valles, Sean. (2019). “A pluralistic and socially responsible philosophy of epidemiology field should actively engage with social determinants of health and health disparities,” *Synthese*, Online first 05 March 2019, doi.org/10.1007/s11229-019-02161-5
- Wolff, Jonathan. (2012). “The Basis of the Global Health Duty.” In Joseph Millum and Ezekiel Emanuel (eds.), *Global Justice and Bioethics*. Oxford University Press.
- Wringe, Bill. (2018). “Global Obligations and the Human Right to Health.” In Kendy Hss, Violetta Igneski and Tracy Isaacs (eds.), *Collectivity: Ontology, Ethics, and Social Justice*. Rowman and Littlefield.
- Additional reading TBA based on current events



**UGPH-GU 28**

***Ethics & Identity: Disability, Gender, and Race***

**\*Note: This syllabus, and all others for Bioethics courses, follows the required SGPH template.**

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](mailto: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. Identify the importance of identities, and especially minority group identities (whether chosen or socially imposed) for contemporary Ethics.	Week 1, All Subsequent Sessions

<p>2. Examine the views of some leading scholars in Philosophy &amp; 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 &amp; 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 <i>Bioethical</i> 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 &amp; Reproductive Ethics), Week 8 (Gender &amp; Representation in Research Trials), &amp; 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:**

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

## 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 <b>Feb 15: NO NYU CLASSES</b>  Feb 17  <b>Thurs Feb 18: CLASS HELD "Legislative Monday"</b>	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	Disability IV: Disability and Reproductive Ethics	Erik Parens and Adrienne Asch (1999), "The Disability Rights Critique of Prenatal Genetic Testing"	

Mar 3	Case Study: Choosing Deafness	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  <b>Fri Mar 19: NYU BREAK</b>	Gender II: Genderqueer Identity	Robin Dembroff (forth.), "Beyond Binary: Genderqueer as Critical Gender Kind"  *Optional: Dembroff (2019), "'Yep, I'm Gay': Understanding Agential Identity"	<b>PAPER 1 DUE On NYUClasses by 11:59 pm on Tuesday, Mar 16</b>
Week 8 Mar 22  Mar 24	Gender III: Case Study: Representation of Women in Medical Research Trials	Van der Zande et al. (2017), "Vulnerability of pregnant women in clinical research"  Mara Gordon (22 Dec. 2020), NYTimes, "I'm a Pregnant Doctor. Should I get the Covid Vaccine?"  In class: Carleigh Krubiner and Ruth Faden (2017), "Pregnant women should not be categorized as a 'vulnerable population'..." (very short)	
Week 9 Mar 29  Mar 31	Transition/Race I: Social Constructionist Views of Gender vs. Race	Sally Haslanger and Jennifer Saul (2006), "Philosophical Analysis and Social Kinds," excerpts  Chike Jeffers (2019), "Cultural Constructionism," in <i>What is Race?: Four Philosophical Views</i>	

<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><b>PAPER 2 DUE On NYUClasses by 11:59 pm on Thursday, Apr 15</b></p>
<p>Week 12 <b>Apr 19: NO CLASSES NYU BREAK</b></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>	

		<b>Study guide to be distributed after Wednesday's class</b>	
Week 15 May 10	In-Class Essay Exam		<b>Essay Exam to be Submitted on NYUClasses by end of class block</b>

**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.

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

**Course Description**

Meta-ethics, the study of the origins and fundamental nature of moral norms, is a familiar branch of Philosophy. By comparison, less attention has been devoted to a “meta-epistemological” investigation of the norms of epistemic rationality that govern what we ought to believe. In this course, we’ll discuss recent work at the intersection of Epistemology, Ethics, and Metaethics that tackles important debates about the extent to which epistemic norms & reasons display some of the classic features of moral norms & reasons. We’ll begin by discussing whether well-known objections to meta-ethical 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 often attributed to 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, and whether the familiar slogan from ethics that “ought implies can” holds in the epistemic case. We’ll also debate the extent to which attributions of epistemic blame are analogous to attributions of moral blame when others fail to abide by the relevant norms. Next, we’ll investigate whether epistemic norms place demands upon our actions (such as those involved in inquiry) in addition to our 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 vs. other practical reasons for belief in contexts where they count in favor of conflicting beliefs.

**Sample Reading List**

(~2 weeks per unit)

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

- Cuneo, Terence. (2007). *The Normative Web*, OUP, excerpts from Chapters 1-3 including 1: Moral Realism of a Paradigmatic Sort, 2: Defending the Parallel, and 3: The Parity Premise <https://doi.org/10.1093/acprof:oso/9780199218837.001.0001>
- Côté-Bouchard, Charles and Clayton Littlejohn. (2018). “Knowledge, Reasons, and Errors About Error Theory.” in *Metaepistemology: Realism and Anti-Realism*. Eds. Christos Kyriacou and Robin McKenna. (pp. 147-171). Palgrave Macmillan. [https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-319-93369-6\\_7](https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-319-93369-6_7)
- 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/a0aaa010>

*\*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/](http://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

## Student Course Evaluations

This packet includes the results of student evaluations for all courses I have taught as the sole or primary instructor. Evaluations were conducted online by New York University.

**A selection of students' comments appears on pages 2-3** (pdf pp. 82-83 of the full portfolio).

**The table below summarizes the key numerical results for each course**, including the average student response for “overall evaluation of the course” and “overall evaluation of the instructor.” In response to survey items, students submit scores between 1 and 5 (with higher numbers indicating a better evaluation).

Term	Course	Level	Course Rating (of 5)	Instructor Rating (of 5)	See pdf p. for full results
Spring 2021	Topics in Bioethics: Controversies & Politics <i>(virtual format)</i>	MA	4.6	4.6	84-85
Spring 2021	Ethics & Identity: Disability, Gender, and Race <i>(hybrid format)</i>	UG	4.2	4.4	85-87
Fall 2020	Advanced Introduction to Bioethics <i>(hybrid format)</i>	MA	4.7	4.8	87-89
Summer 2020	Advanced Introduction to Public Health Ethics <i>(virtual format)</i>	MA	5.0	5.0	89-90
Spring 2020	Topics in Bioethics: Controversies & Politics <i>(moved online)</i>	MA	4.5	4.6	90-92
Spring 2020	Ethics & Identity: Disability, Gender, and Race <i>(moved online)</i>	UG	4.3	4.5	92-93
Fall 2019	Advanced Introduction to Bioethics	MA	4.5	4.6	94-95
Spring 2019	Topics in M&E: Moral Epistemology and the Debate Over Moral Realism	UG	4.8	4.8	96-98

Fall 2018	Central Problems in Philosophy (lecture)	UG	4.3	4.4	99-101
Summer 2018	Central Problems in Philosophy (seminar)	UG	5.0	5.0	102-103
Summer 2017	Philosophy of Mind	UG	4.8	4.8	104-105
Summer 2017	History of Modern Philosophy	UG	4.5	4.7	106-107
Summer 2016	History of Modern Philosophy	UG	4.5	4.7	108
Summer 2015	History of Modern Philosophy	UG	4.07/4.75*	4.50/4.50*	109-110

\*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**

#### **Ethics & Identity: Disability, Gender, and Race (Spring 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.”
- “Dr. Dyke was amazing in exhaustively explaining each theme... I also enjoyed how eloquently she was able to manage lecturing to both zoom and in person students. She made it look easy when I cannot imagine doing the same. In addition to that, the class discussions were incredible.”

#### **Advanced Introduction to Bioethics (Fall 2020):**

- “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.”
- “Professor Dyke seems to be having fun with the class, which is nice.”

**Controversies & Politics in Bioethics (Spring 2020):**

- “Michelle has a pronounced aptitude for teaching, I think, and for running a seminar.”
- “I loved how well-organized and meticulous Michelle was. It was quite inspiring.”
- “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.”

**Ethics & Identity: Disability, Gender, and Race (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.”

**Advanced Introduction to Bioethics (Fall 2019):**

- “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.”

**Topics in M&E: Moral Epistemology and the Debate Over Moral Realism (Spring 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.”
- “The discussions were fruitful and enlightening.”
- “Michelle is the best instructor I’ve had in my four years at NYU.”

**Central Problems in Philosophy (Fall 2018):**

- “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.”