

# IMT 550

## Policy and Ethics: Information in Social Context

Winter 2016

Dr. Megan Finn, Assistant Professor

---

Section A	Tuesday	8:30-10:30	MGH 241
Section AA	Wednesday	8:30-10:20	Dempsey 124
Section AB	Wednesday	1:30-3:30	MGH 254
Section AC	Thursday	8:30-10:20	MGH 295

### Teaching Team

		<i>Contact Info</i>	<i>Office Hours</i>
<i>Instructor</i>	Megan Finn	<a href="mailto:megfinn@uw.edu">megfinn@uw.edu</a>	Thursdays, 12-2pm, MGH 330D
<i>Teaching Assistant</i>	Chris Heaney	<a href="mailto:chubbles@uw.edu">chubbles@uw.edu</a>	By appointment
<i>Grader</i>	Robin DeCook	<a href="mailto:rdecook@uw.edu">rdecook@uw.edu</a>	By appointment

### Course Description, Logistics, and Expectations

#### *Course Description*

This course examines policy and ethical issues affecting information use and production, with an emphasis on the social and cultural aspects. We will discuss policy issues including privacy and intellectual property, ethical issues including freedom of expression and social justice, and explore ways in which they are relevant to information management professionals.

By the end of this course, students will be able to understand social and cultural dimensions of ethical choices in information management. We will do this through examining information issues as sociotechnical controversies, focusing on information access and control, intellectual property, governance, the material dimensions of information, speech, surveillance, and privacy. On successful completion of the course, students will be able to analyze information issues, perform stakeholder analysis, and propose policy alternatives.

## Course Expectations

There are a total of twenty classes, each one hour and fifty minutes long, with a ten-minute break midway through the class.

- Once a week all of the sections will meet together in a large lecture. Some of the lecture classes will include times with a guest speaker. Students will be attentive and prepared to ask guest speakers thoughtful questions.
- Once a week each section will meet for lecture plus discussion. Students are expected to be fully engaged in our discussions, giving fellow students your full attention.

This course requires that you do readings each week. Doing the reading is essential, or you will not be able to participate easily in class discussions. In the workplace, ethical conduct, policy deliberations and the impact of new laws are usually only discussed obliquely, even though they may be at the heart of daily professional choices you make -- or that your bosses make. If you take the time to understand and articulate the issues and options here, your value in the workplace rises exponentially.

Instructors and students are expected to come to class having read all of the readings and ready to engage in lively conversation. In order to encourage learning, the use of any electronic devices during class (including laptops, tablets and phones) is not permitted. Studies have shown that taking notes on your laptop is not nearly as effective as taking notes by hand.

For an explanation of the reasoning behind this rule, see:

- Shirky, C. (2014, Sept 8). [Why I just asked my students to put their laptops away](#). Medium.
- Muller, P. A., and Oppenheimer, D. M. (2014). [The pen is mightier than the keyboard: Advantages of longhand over laptop note taking](#). *Psychological Science* 26(6), 1159-1168.
- Association for Psychological Science. (2014, Apr 24). [Take notes by hand for better long-term comprehension](#). *ScienceDaily*.
- Turkle, S. (2015, Sept 26). [Stop Googling. Let's talk](#). *The New York Times*.

Please be sure to read through the entire course website to ensure that you understand the course assignments and readings.

## Online Discussions

Please post all questions that are not of a personal nature to the Canvas discussion page. You know the old adage: if you have a question, many other people probably have the same one!

## ***Assignments and Grading***

**Assignments will not be accepted late.** Assignments turned in after the deadline get a 0.

**If any portion of any assignment is plagiarized, the assignment will receive a 0.** If it is a group assignment, all of the members of the group will receive a 0. Issues of academic dishonesty will also be reported to the Dean, and may result in suspension or expulsion from University of Washington.

Grading will be based on the following point distribution:

1. Class participation: 20 points
2. Weekly writing: 20 points
3. Final Paper: 40 points
4. Group presentation: 10 points
5. Peer review: 5 points
6. Debate: 5 points

## ***Course Policies***

Please review the [iSchool Academic Policies](#), which cover:

- Students with Disabilities
- TA Concerns
- Grading Criteria
- Academic Conduct
  - Academic Integrity
  - Copyright
  - Privacy
  - Student Code of Conduct
  - Evaluation of Student Work

## ***Writing Resources***

Students are encouraged to take drafts of their writing assignments to the [Odegaard Writing & Research Center](#) for assistance with using citations ethically and effectively.

For larger papers, the Allen Research Commons offers [drop-in writing consultations for graduate students](#) on Tuesdays from 10:30am-12pm.

Additional online writing resources:

- [Library and Technology Tips](#)
- [Purdue Online Writing Lab Citation Resources](#)
- [UW Libraries Citations Styles & Tools guide](#)

## Readings and Lectures Topics

### Week 1: Introduction to the class

#### Lecture-referenced articles

- Kramer, A. D. I., Guillory, J. E., & Hancock, J. T. (2014). [Experimental evidence of massive-scale emotional contagion through social networks](#). *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences of the United States of America*, 111(24), 8788–8790.
- Verma, I. M. (2014). [Editorial Expression of Concern: Experimental evidence of massive-scale emotional contagion through social networks](#). *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences of the United States of America*, 111(29), 10779.

#### Required Readings

- Braman, S. (2006). An introduction to information policy. In *Change of state: information, policy, and power* (pp. 1-8) Cambridge, MA: The MIT Press.
- Ensmenger, N. (2007). Computers as ethical artifacts. *IEEE Annals of the History of Computing*, 29(3), 88–87.
- Gillespie, T. (2007). Chapter 3: The speed bump. In *Wired shut: copyright and the shape of digital culture* (pp. 66–103). Cambridge, Mass: MIT Press.
- Cech, E. A. (2014). Culture of disengagement in engineering education? *Science, Technology & Human Values*, 39(1), 42–72.

#### Optional Readings

- Grimmelmann, J. (2005). Regulation by software. *Yale Law Journal*, 7(114), 1719–1758.
- Braman, S. (2011). Defining information policy. *Journal of Information Policy*, 1, 1–5.

Look at the following examples of codes of ethics:

- [ACM Code of Ethics and Professional Conduct](#)
- [ACM/IEEE-CS Software Engineering Code of Ethics and Professional Practice](#)
- [IEEE Code of Ethics](#)
- [ALA Code of Ethics](#)
- [Data Science Association Code of Professional Conduct](#)

Baase, S. (2013). Chapter 9: Professional ethics and responsibilities. In *A gift of fire: social, legal and ethical issues for computing and the internet* (4th ed., pp. 403-436). Upper Saddle River, NJ: Pearson.

## Week 2: Privacy in social context

### Lecture-referenced links

[Google's Privacy Policy](#)

Shore, J., & Steinman, J. (2015). [Did you really agree to that? The evolution of Facebook's privacy policy](#). *Technology Science*, 2015081102.

### Required Readings

Ess, C. (2005). “Lost in translation”?: Intercultural dialogues on privacy and information ethics. *Ethics and Information Technology*, 7(1), 1–6.

Kumaraguru, P., & Cranor, L. (2006). Privacy in India: Attitudes and awareness. In *Privacy Enhancing Technologies: 5th International Workshop, Revised Selected Papers* (pp. 243–258). Berlin: Springer Berlin Heidelberg.

Allen, A. L. (2011). Chapter 1: Privacies not wanted. In *Unpopular privacy: what must we hide?* (pp. 3–26). New York: Oxford University Press.

Moore, A. (2010). Chapters 1: Introduction. In *Privacy rights: Moral and legal foundations* (pp. 1–10). University Park, PA: Pennsylvania State University Press.

**Skim:** Madden, M. (2014). [Public perceptions of privacy and security in the post-Snowden era](#). Pew Research Center.

### Optional Readings

Warren, S. D., & Brandeis, L. D. (1890). The Right to Privacy. *Harvard Law Review*, 4(5), 193–220.

Nissenbaum, H. F. (2010). Part III: The framework of contextual integrity. In *Privacy in context: Technology, policy, and the integrity of social life* (pp. 127–243). Stanford, CA: Stanford Law Books.

Yao-Huai, L. (2005). Privacy and data privacy issues in contemporary China. *Ethics and Information Technology*, 7(1), 7–15.

Allen, A. L. (1988). *Uneasy access: privacy for women in a free society*. Totowa, NJ: Rowman & Littlefield.

## Week 3: Surveillance

### Lecture-referenced links

Sweeney, L. (2013). Discrimination in online ad delivery. *Communications of the ACM*, 56(5), 44–54.

- Zang, J., Dummit, K., Graves, J., Lisker, P., & Sweeney, L. (2015). [Who knows what about me? A survey of behind the scenes personal data sharing to third parties by mobile app](#). *Technology Science*, 2015103001.
- Federal Trade Commission. (2013). [Marketing your mobile app: Get it right from the start](#). Washington, D.C.

## Required Readings

[U.S. Constitution, amend. IV](#).

- Etzioni, A. (2012). The Privacy Merchants: What is to be done? *University of Pennsylvania Journal of Constitutional Law*, 14(4), 929–951.
- Solove, D. J. (2013). Privacy self-management and the consent dilemma. *Harvard Law Review*, 126, 1880–1903.

### Listen/watch one Intelligence Squared debate:

- [Mass Collection of US Phone Records Violates the Fourth Amendment](#). (2014, October 7). *Intelligence Squared U.S.*
- [Snowden was Justified](#). (2014, February 13). *Intelligence Squared U.S.*
- [Spy On Me, I'd Rather Be Safe](#). (2013, November 20). *Intelligence Squared U.S.*

## Optional Readings

- Kirk, M. (2014). [United States of Secrets](#). FRONTLINE.
- Crump, C. (2013). [You are being tracked: How license plate readers are being used to record Americans' movements](#). New York: American Civil Liberties Union.
- Stanley, J. (2015). [Police body-mounted cameras: With right policies in place, a win for all](#) (version 2.0). New York: American Civil Liberties Union.

## Week 4: Freedom of speech in the U.S.

### Required Readings

[U.S. Declaration of Independence](#).

- Allen, D. S. (2014). Chapters 11-13. In *Our Declaration: a reading of the Declaration of Independence in defense of equality* (pp. 89–104). New York: Liveright Publishing Corporation.
- Citron, D. K. (2014). Chapter 1: Introduction. In *Hate crimes in cyberspace*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- To Skim:** Balkin, J. M. (2004). Digital speech and democratic culture: A theory of freedom of expression for the information society. *New York University Law Review*, 79(1), 1–58.

### Optional Readings

- Administrative Office of the U.S. Courts. (n.d.). [What does free speech mean?](#)

- Morozov, E. (2013). Chapter 3: So open it hurts. In *To save everything, click here: The folly of technological solutionism* (pp. 63–99). New York: PublicAffairs.
- Lessig, L. (2006). Chapters 12: Free Speech. In [Code \(Version 2.0, pp. 233-275\)](#). New York: Basic Books.
- Grimmelmann, J. (2013). [Speech Engines](#) (University of Maryland Legal Studies Research Paper No. 2014-11). University of Maryland School of Law.
- Citron, D. K. (2010). Civil rights in our Information Age. In S. Levmore & M. C. Nussbaum (Eds.), *The Offensive Internet* (pp. 31–49). Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

## Week 5: Intellectual property – Copyright

### Lecture-referenced links

- U.S. Department of Commerce Internet Policy Task Force. (2016). [White paper on remixes, first sale, and statutory damages: Copyright policy, creativity, and innovation in the digital economy](#). Washington, D.C.
- Breznitz, D., & Murphree, M. (2016). [What the U.S. should be doing to protect intellectual property](#). *Harvard Business Review*.

### Required Readings

- Healy, K. (2002). Digital technology and cultural goods. *Journal of Political Philosophy*, 10(4), 478–500.
- Hesse, C. (2002). The rise of intellectual property, 700 B.C.-A.D. 2000: An idea in the balance. *Daedalus*, 131(2), 26–45.
- Moore, A., & Himma, K. E. (2014). [Intellectual Property](#). In E. N. Zalta (Ed.), *The Stanford Encyclopedia of Philosophy* (Winter 2014 edition).

### Optional Readings

- Lessig, L. (2004). Chapter 10: “Property.” In [Free culture: How big media uses technology and the law to lock down culture and control creativity](#) (pp. 116–173). New York: Penguin Press.
- Broussard, S. L. (2007). The copyleft movement: Creative Commons licensing. *Communication Research Trends*, 26(3), 3–14.
- Johns, A. (2009). *Piracy: The intellectual property wars from Gutenberg to Gates*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Litwak, M. (2013, March 12). [Sherlock Holmes and the Case of the Public Domain](#). *Independent Filmmaker Project* blog.
- Burkhart, P. (2014). *Pirate politics: The new information policy contests*. Cambridge, MA: The MIT Press.
- Brown, I., & Marsden, C. T. (2013). Introduction & Chapter 4. In *Regulating Code: Good Governance and Better Regulation in the Information Age* (pp. ix–xix, 69–91). Cambridge, MA: The MIT Press.

## Week 6: Ethical frameworks

### Required Readings

- Shilton, K., & Greene, D. (2016). [Because privacy: Defining and legitimating privacy in iOS development](#). In *iConference 2016 Proceedings*. iSchools.
- Ess, C. (2009). Chapter 6: Digital Media Ethics: Overview, Frameworks, Resources. In *Digital Media Ethics* (pp. 167-225). Cambridge, UK: Polity Press.
- Nussbaum, M. C. (2011). Chapter 2: The central capabilities. In *Creating capabilities* (pp. 17-45). Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- Watch:** Horowitz, D. (2011). [We need a “moral operating system.”](#) TEDxSiliconValley.

### Optional Readings

- Nussbaum, M. C. (2011). Chapter 3: A necessary counter-theory. In *Creating capabilities* (pp. 46-68). Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- Tavani, H. (2011). Chapters 1-2. In *Ethics and technology: Controversies, questions, and strategies for ethical computing* (3rd ed., pp. 1-74). Boston: John Wiley and Sons.
- Collins, W. R., & Miller, K. W. (1992). Paramedic ethics for computer professionals. *Journal of Systems and Software*, 17(1), 23–38. doi:10.1016/0164-1212(92)90077-W
- Regan, T. (2005). Introduction to moral reasoning. In A. D. Moore (Ed.), *Information Ethics: Privacy, Property and Power* (pp. 30–46). Seattle, WA: University of Washington Press.
- Unsworth, K., & Moore, A. D. (2005). [Introduction](#). In A. D. Moore (Ed.), *Information Ethics: Privacy, Property and Power* (pp. 11–28). Seattle, WA: University of Washington Press.
- Richardson, H. S. (2013). [Moral reasoning](#). In E. N. Zalta (Ed.), *The Stanford Encyclopedia of Philosophy* (Winter 2014 edition).
- Quinn, M. J. (2011). Chapter 2: Introduction to Ethics. In *Ethics for the Information Age* (4th ed., pp. 53–99). Boston, MA: Pearson.
- Watch:** Johnson, D. G. (2006). [Corporate Excellence, Ethics, and the Role of IT](#). Presented at the Center for Business Ethics at Bentley College, WGBH Forum Network.
- Watch:** Du, Y. (2015). [The ethical dilemma of self-driving cars](#). TEDEd.

## Week 7: Social justice and the future of work

### Required Readings

- Brynjolfsson, E., & McAfee, A. (2014). Chapter 13: Policy recommendations. In *The Second Machine Age: Work, Progress, and Prosperity in a Time of Brilliant Technologies*. New York: W. W. Norton & Company.
- Head, S. (2014). Chapters 1-2. In *Mindless: Why Smarter Machines are Making Dumber Humans* (pp. 15-46). New York: Basic Books.

- Skim:** Garrido, M., Rissola, G., Rastrelli, M., Diaz, A., & Ruiz, J. (2009). *Immigrant women, e-skills, and employability in Europe: The case of Hungary, Italy, the Netherlands, Romania, and Spain*. Seattle: Technology & Social Change Group, University of Washington.
- Gray, M. L. (2016, January 8). [Your job is about to get “taskified.”](#) *Los Angeles Times*.

## Optional Readings

- Heeks, R. (2014). *From the MDGs to the Post-2015 Agenda: Analysing Changing Development Priorities* (Development Informatics Working Paper Series No. 56). Manchester, United Kingdom: Global Development Institute, University of Manchester.
- Pasquale, F. (2015). *The Black Box Society: The Secret Algorithms That Control Money and Information*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- Sey, A., & Castells, M. (2004). From media politics to networked politics: The Internet and the political process. In M. Castells (Ed.), *The Network Society: A Cross-Cultural Perspective* (pp. 363–381). Northampton, MA: Edward Elgar Publishing.
- van Dijk, J. A. G. M. (2005). Chapters 1-2. In *The deepening divide: Inequality in the information society* (pp. 1–26). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.
- Sandoval-Almazan, R., & Gil-Garcia, J. R. (2013). Cyberactivism through Social Media: Twitter, YouTube, and the Mexican Political Movement “I’m Number 132.” In *2013 46th Hawaii International Conference on System Sciences* (pp. 1704–1713). IEEE. doi:10.1109/HICSS.2013.161
- Lotan, G., Graeff, E., Ananny, M., Gaffney, D., Pearce, I., & boyd, d. (2011). The revolutions were tweeted: Information flows during the 2011 Tunisian and Egyptian revolutions. *International Journal of Communication*, 5, 1375–1405.
- Krikorian, G. (2010). Access to knowledge as a field of activism. In A. Kapczynski & G. Krikorian (Eds.), *Access to Knowledge in the Age of Intellectual Property* (pp. 57–95). New York: Zone Books.
- Juris, J. S. (2004). Networked social movements: global movements for global justice. In M. Castells (Ed.), *The Network Society: A Cross-Cultural Perspective* (pp. 341–362). Northampton, MA: Edward Elgar Publishing.

## Week 8: The materiality of the web

### Required Readings

- Ensmenger, N. (2015). *Dirty Bits*. [draft article]
- Williams, E., Kahhat, R., Allenby, B., Kavazanjian, E., Kim, J., & Xu, M. (2008). Environmental, social, and economic implications of global reuse and recycling of personal computers. *Environmental Science & Technology*, 42(17), 6446–6454. doi:10.1021/es702255z

### Optional Readings

- Glanz, J. (2012, September 22). [Power, pollution and the Internet](#). *The New York Times*.

**Watch a movie about e-waste:**

- [Ghana: Digital Dumping Ground](#). (2009). FRONTLINE. [~20 min]
- Fedele, D. (2012). *e-wasteland*. [~20 min]
- Basel Action Network. (2002). *Exporting Harm: The High-Tech Trashing of Asia*. [~23 min]

**Week 9: Internet governance I: Net neutrality**

**Required Readings**

- Bauer, J. M., & Obar, J. A. (2014). Reconciling political and economic goals in the net neutrality debate. *The Information Society: An International Journal*, 30(1), 1–19. doi:10.1080/01972243.2013.856362
- McChesney, R. W. (2013). The Internet and Capitalism I: Where Dinosaurs Roam? In *Digital Disconnect: How Capitalism is Turning the Internet Against Democracy* (pp. 96–129). New York: The New Press.
- Daniels, J., & Gray, M. L. (2014). *Vision for Inclusion: An LGBT Broadband Future*. LGBT Technology Partnership & Institute.
- Watch:** [Net Neutrality](#). *Last Week Tonight with John Oliver*. (2014, June 1). HBO.
- Watch:** Obama, B. (2014, November 10). [President Obama's Statement on Keeping the Internet Open and Free](#).

**Optional Readings**

- Russell, A. L. (2014). *Open Standards and the Digital Age: History, Ideology, and Networks*. New York, NY: Cambridge University Press.
- Mathew, A. J., & Cheshire, C. (2010). [The New Cartographers: Trust and Social Order within the Internet Infrastructure](#). Presented at the 2010 TPRC: The 38th Research Conference on Communication, Information and Internet Policy.
- Denardis, L. (2010). The global politics of interoperability. In A. Kapczynski & G. Krikorian (Eds.), *Access to Knowledge in the Age of Intellectual Property* (pp. 497–515). New York: Zone Books.
- Listen:** [Google Violates its Don't Be Evil Motto](#). (2008, October 18). *Intelligence Squared U.S.*

**Week 10: Internet governance II: The right to be forgotten**

**Optional Readings**

- Rosen, J. (2012). [The right to be forgotten](#). *Stanford Law Review*, 64(88), 88–92.
- Ambrose, M. L., & Ausloos, J. (2013). The Right to Be Forgotten Across the Pond. *Journal of Information Policy*, 3, 1–23. doi:10.5325/jinfopoli.3.2013.0001

- Listen:** [The U.S. Should Adopt the “Right to Be Forgotten” Online](#). (2015, March 11). *Intelligence Squared U.S.*
- Carbone, C. E. (2015). [To be or not to be forgotten: Balancing the right to know with the right to privacy in the digital age](#). *Virginia Journal of Social Policy & the Law*, 22(3), 525–560.
- Google. [European privacy requests for search removals](#).
- Google Spain v AEPD and Mario Costeja González court case:  
[Official court documents](#)  
[Advocate General’s Opinion](#). (2013, June 25). [press release].  
[Judgement in Case C-131/12 Google Spain SL, Google Inc. v Agencia Española de Protección de Datos, Mario Costeja González](#). (2014, May 13). [press release].
- European Commission Directorate-General for Justice and Consumers. (2014). [Factsheet on the “Right to be Forgotten” ruling \(C-131/12\)](#).
- Goldman, E. (2014, August 21). [Primer on European Union’s Right To Be Forgotten](#). [blog post].

## Assignments

### *Participation*

This is a lecture and discussion-based course. Clearly, you need to attend class to participate in the discussions. In order to benefit from the class meetings, you must both be prepared, present and paying attention, which includes refraining from being distracted by your laptop and electronic mobile devices (no laptops, tablets or mobile phone can be used in class). Students are welcome to take notes with old-fashioned information technology (pen and paper) and collaboratively share notes with friends. I will give students the opportunity to sign in at the beginning of class to indicate that they are willing to participate that day. In order to assess your participation, I will also periodically ask you to participate in activities during class time. These will not be announced in advance and each one will carry a point value. If you do not attend a class, you will get a 0 on the in-class activity.

### *Debate*

Each student will be randomly assigned to a debate team during week 9. The statements to be debated will be voted on prior to the debate and can cover anything from the entire course. The teams will know which statement they will debate in advance, but not whether they will be debating the negative or affirmative case until the day of debate itself. Thus, students will need to brief both sides of the case in preparation for the debates. We will have class debates on the last day of class. We expect everyone to have prepared with his or her teams and to be willing to participate. The debates will follow a modified Lincoln-Douglas debate structure, as outlined below.

### Modified Lincoln-Douglas Debate Structure

Time	Speech	Description
3 min.	Affirmative Constructive	The Affirmative reads a pre-written case.
4 min.	Cross Examination	The Negative asks the Affirmative questions about the Affirmative case.
4 min.	Negative Constructive (and first negative Rebuttal)	The Negative (almost always) reads a pre-written case and (almost always) moves on to address the Affirmative's case.
4 min.	Cross Examination	The Affirmative asks the Negative questions.
3 min.	First Affirmative Rebuttal	The Affirmative addresses both his/her opponent's case and his/her own. This speech is considered by many debaters to be the most difficult.
3 min.	The Negative Rebuttal	The Negative addresses the arguments of the previous speech and summarizes the round for the judge.
1 min.	The Second Affirmative Rebuttal	The Affirmative addresses the arguments of the previous speech and summarizes the round for the judge.
22 min.		

### *Weekly writing assignments*

#### Overview

There will be weekly writing assignments throughout the quarter. Your responses should grapple with the questions in the prompt and they should use and cite the readings. Each writing assignment is due on Tuesday at 8am with the exception of the first and last week of the class. Assignments must be submitted on Canvas. **No late assignments will be accepted.**

Papers should be stand-alone essays of about 250 words not including citations of the readings. The readings and articles that you reference should use some citation standard (we suggest APA or Chicago Citation Style).

**Assignments that are plagiarized will automatically receive a 0.** If you have questions about how to properly cite others ideas or words, consult with the teaching team. Note that all submitted essays will be run through Turnitin. Please review the rules about plagiarism and academic dishonesty on the syllabus. If you need assistance with your writing, please consider going to the [Research and Writing Center](#) on campus.

There will be 10 assignments throughout the quarter, each worth 2 points. Students who complete all 10 writing assignments will receive a 3-point bonus.

All papers will be graded according to the following criteria:

<b>Response Content</b>  <b>(1 point)</b>	Demonstrates significant mastery of core concepts*** Advances a clear and convincing line of argument Shows comprehension of the readings Presents original analysis
<b>Presentation</b>  <b>(1 point)</b>	Organizes argument logically with clear and well-considered structure Uses correct grammar and punctuation Writes in clear, concise sentences Deploys appropriate professional vocabulary Properly cites reading

## *Final paper*

### Overview

You will have to identify an information issue and analyze it over the course of the quarter. There will be many sub-paper deadlines. Your final paper will be about 3000-4000 words and will explain your information issue, some recommendations about how to deal with it and it will justify your conclusions.

There are a range of milestones due throughout the quarter -- we will not give feedback to papers that are submitted after the given deadline. These are ungraded opportunities to get feedback from the teaching team. Note that a complete first draft will be due in week 8!

You will be assigned groups of 3-4 people. If there is someone that you don't want to work with for any reason, please email the TA the first day of class. Your requests will be kept anonymous. Students will be randomly assigned to groups. These will be your groups for the entire semester. Students will be given the opportunity to privately evaluate the contributions of their group members at the end of the semester. This feedback will contribute to each student's grade.

Once you and your group have decided upon a topic, find reputable readings related to the case. You should read as much as it is necessary for you to gain an understanding of the topic. I will give you access to a Zotero group, which has resources from last year when students were asked to research "information policy and ethics in the news."

As we will discuss in the first weeks of class, *an information issue* is "a disagreement about how information should be produced, shared, distributed, consumed (accessed), etc." In other words, it is a disagreement among groups of stakeholders about *who* can produce (or share, or distribute, or consume) certain information, *for what purposes*, *under what circumstances*, etc.

One of the central aims of this course is to teach you how to investigate and resolve information issues as they arise in the kinds of institutions within which you will eventually work. This assignment is meant to give you practice studying an information issue *concretely* as it manifests in a real institution. More specifically, you will be asked to study an *information policy* within an organization (a policy being an institution’s resolution of a particular issue).

Here are some examples of information issues that arise in organizations:

- What is the data retention policy for your flashlight app?
- What digital devices may employees at the US State Department carry and use for work?
- Is it fair for T-Mobile to offer “fast lanes” for certain services such as Binge On?
- What kind of publication policy should UW Daily have when it comes to religious iconography that is offensive to some people?
- What kind of consent or opt out options are data brokers such as Epision required to get in order to store personal data?
- Is Wikipedia allowed to host the “monkey selfie”?
- What personal correspondence of university professors should be subject to RTI requests?
- How does Google decide what gets deleted with “right to be forgotten requests”?

Institutions regularly create policies, whether official or unofficial, to answer such questions.

You may find some other ideas about information issues [here](#). Also check out the [Zotero bibliography](#) that contains references from projects that students completed last year.

### **Milestone 1: Select final paper topic (due 1/15, 8pm)**

Your first task will be to identify the information issue/policy you want to study and the context within which you intend to study it. Consider whether the issue is appropriately documented – will you have enough material to understand the issue? Or, is the issue too broad? Is there too much written about the information issue you are interested in? It is very important for you to find an issue that has a scope that is appropriate for the class. Because legal frameworks might come into play, consider what region of the world you will be dealing with.

Write a paragraph describing the information issue/policy your group will be researching and the institution within which you will be researching it. *Be very clear and specific about the nature of the issue and policy, and the scope of your project. Characterize your issue in a single sentence, such as “Who is permitted to take photographs of . . .?” or “Under what conditions may students . . .?” Do the same for your policy: “The policy establishes under what conditions . . . .”*

### **Milestone 2: Bibliography of research and overview of the information issue and institution (due 1/29, 8pm)**

Assemble some evidence about your problem and present a 500 word summary of the institution that you are researching including its history and a 1000 word summary of the information issue. You will also include a bibliography of 15-20 sources. Consider what the sources say and why they are believable or not. You will need enough source material to claim some sort of mastery over your topic. Your research should explore:

1. The nature and history of the organizations involved in the information issue: What is its mission? What is the relevant context and history?
2. The nature (including the history) of the issue and policy in its context. Why has the issue arisen at just this time and in just this way (or is it a longstanding issue that has gone through multiple transformations)? In what ways have changing circumstances (e.g. technological change) either created or transformed the issue?

Strategies for doing this research include: finding documents related to the organization's policy, obtaining news accounts or other external reports, examine the relevant laws. Also consider whether there are relevant academic articles about your topic. Please consult university librarians for help and recall the sage advice of our guest speaker!

You might also explore collecting some data about your information issue: What other kind of data can you bring to bear on this information issue? Things to consider might be to interview people at this organization, publicly available sources of data, or to conduct non-intrusive mini online experiments (see [technologyscience.org](http://technologyscience.org) for inspiration).

### **Milestone 3: Identify stakeholders and describe interests (due 2/5, 8pm)**

Using all of the data that you have gathered, identify all of the possible stakeholders in this information issue. Please turn in a write-up that identifies the different stakeholders and explore their differential roles and statuses, as determined by affiliation with specific institutions, location within those institutions, cultural identity, history, etc.

Explore at least three of the stakeholders' positions (about 300 words each) on the issue and the factors that have contributed to it. How (and why) are they aligned with or against other actors? What is the nature of their rhetorical arguments (and how might these differ from their "true" positions)? To what extent do their different positions reflect different ethical frameworks (and to what extent do they argue from different understandings, values, positions)? If the issue has a strong technological element, to what extent do the various stakeholders view the function and significance of the technology in different ways?

### **Milestone 4: Policy alternatives and recommendations (due 2/12, 8pm)**

Lay out a range of possible policy solutions for the issue, for each solution specifying: its strengths and weaknesses, who (which of the stakeholders) stands to gain and who to lose, and what stands to

be gained or lost. After you construct various alternative policies, select criteria with which to evaluate the possible policy alternatives. Assess how your policy proposals will affect the information issue, for better and for worse! Using your criteria, project the outcomes of the different policy alternatives, confront the trade-offs and decide on what you are going to recommend. Make your own recommendations based on the above analysis. Your write up of this should be about 1000 words.

### **Milestone 5: First draft for peer review (due 2/26, 8pm)**

Your draft of your report should cover the following topics. We suggest word counts and section titles, but you do not need to adhere to these exactly. Please put the total document word count after the title.

- Executive summary/abstract. (about 300 words)
- Introduction. (about 300 words)
- Overview of the institution: its mission, location, etc. (about 500 words)
- The information issue and policy: Frame the information issue in relation to important conceptual/historical developments. Clearly and carefully describe the information issue and the policy that is meant to resolve the issue. (about 1000 words)
- Description of the stakeholders and their positions. Describe at least 3 stakeholders. (each stakeholder description should be about 300 words)
- Possible solutions (different policy options), including an assessment of their strengths and weaknesses. (1000 words)
- Your proposed solution and its justification. (If you are exploring a policy the organization has already established, you should evaluate the decision; you may also offer an alternative, if you choose.) (500 words)
- References. (the word count is not included in the document total)

The report should be about 4,000 words long.

### **Peer review (due 3/2, 8am)**

You will be randomly assigned the paper of one other group in the class. You must provide feedback for that group.

Giving helpful feedback will make you an indispensable colleague. Peer review is a skill that can be practiced and honed. Our assignment asks you to write 250 words for each peer review, but you may want to write more. Please see the grading rubric for the final assignment and use this to guide your comments.

Suggestions:

- Restate the main points of the paper so the writer understands what you (the reader) got out of the substance of the paper.
- Tell the writer what the highlight of the paper was for you as a reader.
- Are you convinced by the recommendations offered and the analysis that leads to this conclusion? Help the writer understand what could be improved for the final paper, not what you don't like. Think about concepts, theories, or examples that could extend or challenge the conclusions that the writer has come to.
- Consider the structure and presentation of the paper. What was clear to you as a reader, and where might the writer need to do a bit more explaining? Is the flow of reasoning logical? Note if there are sentences or paragraphs that seem out of order. Tell the authors which sentences you found awkward or if you notice grammatical errors.
- Give the writer concrete suggestions and be realistic about what can be achieved.
- Be organized in how you present your comments.

**Final paper (due 3/8, 8pm)**

Your paper will be graded based on creativity and evidence of critical thinking, appropriateness, clarity of writing, and adherence to assignment requirements:

<b>Response Content</b>	Responds to Peer Review and expands on previous paper	3 pts
	Demonstrates mastery of the information issue	10 pts
	Advances a clear and convincing line of argument	5 pts
	Backs conclusions with evidence	3 pts
	Presents original ideas	3 pts
<b>Presentation</b>	Organizes argument logically with clear and well-considered structure	4 pts
	Uses correct grammar and punctuation	3 pts
	Writes in clear, concise sentences	3 pts
	Deploys appropriate professional vocabulary	3 pts
	Properly cites evidence	3 pts
	<b>Total</b>	<b>40 pts</b>

**Paper requirements:**

You should incorporate the relevant feedback you received from your peers and/or instructors.

This paper should be at least 3000 words, but no longer than 4000 words not including a “works cited” section.

You will conduct original research and to cite materials from outside the readings on the course schedule. Please cite the readings and articles that you reference using some citation standard (we suggest Chicago citation style). If you have questions about how to properly cite others ideas or

words, consult with the TA or Professor. Note that all submitted essays will be run through Turnitin. Please review the rules about plagiarism and academic dishonesty on the syllabus.

If you need assistance with your writing, please consider going to the [Research and Writing Center](#) on campus:

### ***Presentation of final paper topic***

Your group will be assigned a day during the quarter where you will present your information issue to the class. This is an opportunity for you to share what you have learned with your classmates and get feedback from them.

Tackling the questions and issues we will talk about in this class is difficult and requires independent thinking and leadership. Everyone will be assigned to a group and one class day where the group is responsible for part of the class experience.

Some questions that your presentation might address:

- Why is it relevant to a class on information policy and ethics?
- Why is this information issue important?
- What questions does it raise about existing information policies?
- How might the problem be thought about using different ethical frameworks?
- Who are the key stakeholders regarding the issue and their stances on the issue?
- What is the potential impact of the case on individuals, information institutions, and society at large?
- How does this case relate to the readings?
- How do the readings help us understand the case and vice versa?

You can use any kind of audio/visual media, involve the rest of the class in your discussion of the topic. Use this presentation as an opportunity to raise questions you think are important, whether they are things you'd like to discuss further, things that need clarification, or questions that help continue the conversation started by the reading materials. You will have exactly 15 minutes for your presentation.