

IMT 550: Policy and Ethics in Information Management

Instructor: Megan Finn

Email: megfinn@uw.edu

Office: MGH 330W

TA: Justin Petelka

Winter 2019

Course Description

This course examines policy and ethical issues affecting information use and production, with an emphasis on the social and cultural dimensions. 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

Intellectual knowledge is often subjective. Much of it is historically built on a small subset of privileged voices and has excluded people from marginalized groups. In this class, we will make an effort to read papers from a diverse group of scholars. Still, there may be both overt and covert biases in the material due to the lens with which it was written – we will talk about these biases and I encourage you to bring them up in class. Integrating a diverse set of experiences is important for a comprehensive understanding of information policy and ethics. Please contact me (in person or electronically) or anyone on the teaching team if you have any suggestions to improve the quality of the course materials.

Furthermore, I would like to create a learning environment where everyone feels respected. I strive to foster a classroom which supports a diversity of perspectives and experiences and honors your identities and backgrounds. To help accomplish this, please let me know if there is something that I need to know about you or your experience in my class. If you feel like your performance in the class is being impacted by your experiences outside of class, please don't hesitate to come and talk with me. I want to be a resource for you.

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. Weekly writing assignments – 21 points (3 points each; highest 7 out of 10)
2. Final paper – 20 points (5 points for online presentations; 15 points for final write up)
3. In class and online participation – 20 points
4. Weekly in class assignments – 18 points (2 points each; highest 9 out of 10)
5. Individual final paper – 15 points
6. Debate – 5 points
7. Self-evaluation – 1 point

There are a total of 100 points available in this class. This course uses the iSchool Standard Grading Scheme, which converts to 4.0 grades.

Course Schedule

Week 1: Professional Ethics

Welcome! This week we will talk about the class from a high level - why are we all here? What are we going to be talking about? What is the structure of the class? What are the expectations of you? And what can you expect of your teaching team? Then we will begin a conversation about professional ethics that will continue throughout the quarter.

Readings

Cech, E. A. (2014). Culture of Disengagement in Engineering Education? *Science, Technology, & Human Values*, 39(1), 42–72. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0162243913504305>

Ensmenger, N. (2007). Computers as Ethical Artifacts. *IEEE Annals of the History of Computing*, 29(3), 88–87. <https://doi.org/10.1109/MAHC.2007.4338449>

Barocas, S., & boyd, danah. (2017). Engaging the ethics of data science in practice. *Communications of the ACM*, 60(11), 23–25. <https://doi.org/10.1145/3144172>

If you want a refresher on argumentative writing:

Graff, G., & Birkenstein, C. (2014). *They say/I say*. New York, NY: WW Norton and Company. (Selections)

This is an article on how to read an academic paper:

Ananny, M. (2017). Tips for Reading an Academic Paper. Retrieved from <http://mike.ananny.org/ananny-tipsForReadingAcademicPaper.pdf>

Browse

- [ACM Code of Ethics and Professional Conduct](#)
- [IEEE Code of Ethics](#)
- [ALA Code of Ethics](#)
- [Data Science Association Code of Professional Conduct](#)
- [Data Ethics Decision Aid](#)
- [ICCP Code of Ethics](#)
- [UK Data Ethics Framework](#)
- [Society of Professional Journalists](#)
- [Loukides, M. K., Mason, H., & Patil, D. \(2018\). *Ethics and data science*. Sebastopol, CA: O'Reilly Media.](#)

Optional Readings

Baase, S. (2013). Professional Ethics and Responsibilities. In *A gift of fire: social, legal, and ethical issues for computing and the Internet* (4th edition, pp. 403–436). Upper Saddle River, NJ: Pearson.

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*, 111(24), 8788–8790.
<https://doi.org/10.1073/pnas.1320040111>

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.
<https://doi.org/10.1073/pnas.1412469111>

Panger, G. (2015). Reassessing the Facebook experiment: critical thinking about the validity of Big Data research. *Information, Communication & Society*, 19(8), 1108–26.
<https://doi.org/10.1080/1369118X.2015.1093525>

Metcalfe, J. (2019). Ethics Codes: History, Context, and Challenges. Retrieved from Council for Big Data, Ethics, and Society website: <https://bdes.datasociety.net/council-output/ethics-codes-history-context-and-challenges/>

Kaptein, M., & Wempe, J. (1998). Twelve Gordian Knots When Developing an Organizational Code of Ethics. *Journal of Business Ethics*, 17(8), 853–869.

Assignments

Week 1 Writing Assignment

Each one of you is preparing to become an information professional for a variety of reasons. Some of these reasons, most likely, have to do with your ethical commitments to other people

and to the world. Why do the values and ethics of people who work on or with information technology matter or not? Please refer to the readings in your response and properly cite the readings. If you need a refresher on citation, I have included some tips below. Your response should be between 200 and 250 words. If you need tips on how to do basic argumentative writing, I have included some selections by Graff and Birkstein in the readings for this week.

Week 1 In Class Activity

Compose a code of ethics for information managers. What needs to be included in a professional code of ethics for our field?

Week 2: Sociotechnical Approaches to Information Policy

In this week we will continue to lay the groundwork for foundational ideas that will last throughout the quarter. We will discuss sociotechnical thinking in information policy. That is, we will discuss how the interaction of material technology, laws and governance, and sociocultural practices create opportunities and limitations for information technologies.

Readings

Braman, S. (2006). An Introduction to Information Policy. In *Change of state: information, policy, and power* (pp. 1–8). Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.

Gillespie, T. (2007). The Speed Bump. In *Wired shut: copyright and the shape of digital culture* (pp. 66–103). Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.

Shilton, K. (2013). Values Levers: Building Ethics into Design. *Science, Technology, & Human Values*, 38(3), 374–397. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0162243912436985>

Oliver, J. (2014, June 1). Net Neutrality. In *Last Week Tonight* (HBO). Retrieved from <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=fpbOEoRrHyU>

Oliver, J. (2017, May 7). Net Neutrality II. In *Last Week Tonight* (HBO). Retrieved from <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=92vuuZt7wak>

Optional Readings

Jasanoff, S. (2016). The Power of Technology. In *The ethics of invention: technology and the human future* (pp. 1–30). New York, NY: WW Norton and Company.

Shilton, K. (2015). Anticipatory Ethics for a Future Internet: Analyzing Values During the Design of an Internet Infrastructure. *Science and Engineering Ethics*, 21(1), 1–18. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11948-013-9510-z>

Grimmelmann, J. (2005). Regulation by Software. *Yale Law Journal*, 114(7), 1719–1758.

Braman, S. (2011). Defining Information Policy. *Journal of Information Policy*, 1, 1-5.

Net Neutrality

Daniels, J., & Gray, M. (2014). A Vision for Inclusion: An LGBT Broadband Future. Publications and Research. Retrieved from https://academicworks.cuny.edu/gc_pubs/209

Wu, T. (2003). Network neutrality, broadband discrimination. *Journal on Telecommunications & High Technology Law*, 2(1), 141.

Bauer, J. M., & Obar, J. A. (2014). Reconciling Political and Economic Goals in the Net Neutrality Debate. *The Information Society*, 30(1), 1–19.
<https://doi.org/10.1080/01972243.2013.856362>

Carrillo, A. J. (2016). Having your cake and eating it too? Zero-Rating, Net Neutrality, and International Law. *Stanford Technology Law Review*, 19, 364–429.

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, NY: The New Press.

Newman, R. (2016). The Debate Nobody Knows: Network Neutrality's Neoliberal Roots and a Conundrum for Media Reform. *International Journal of Communication*, 10, 5969–5988.

Obar, J. A. (2016). Closing the technocratic divide? Activist intermediaries, digital form letters, and public involvement in FCC policy making. *International Journal of Communication*, 10, 5865–5888.

Subramanian, R. (2016). Information Policy Interactions: Net Neutrality and Access to Information in US and India. *Journal of Comparative International Management*, 19(1).

Saltzer, J., Reed, D., & Clark, D. (1984). End-to-end arguments in system design. *ACM Transactions on Computer Systems (TOCS)*, 2(4), 277–288.
<https://doi.org/10.1145/357401.357402>

Assignments

Week 2 Writing Assignment

Consider Gillespie's analysis of the speed bump as a sociotechnical object, Braman's discussion of government, governance and governmentality, and Shilton's exploration of value levers. Examine net neutrality using two theoretical concepts introduced by the different authors Gillespie, Braman and Shilton (you may also want to consult Jasanoff's chapter from the optional readings). If you want more background on net neutrality, see the "Other resources" in the syllabus. Your response should be between 200 and 250 words. Please correctly cite the readings where appropriate.

Week 2 In Class Activity

Sociotechnical analysis: practice how to think about data problems. Recall from Week 1:

- Data problems arise when there are disagreements about the right to create, disseminate, manipulate, organize, access and use information and data. Disputes arise around questions such as:
 - Who has what rights?
 - For what purposes?
 - Under what circumstances?
- Information policies are the resolution of data problems within a particular institutional context
 - “Information policy is comprised of laws, regulations and doctrinal positions – and other decision making and practices with society-wide constitutive effects – involving information processing, flows, access and use.”

Consider the problem of Net Neutrality -- show how it is a sociotechnical problem.

Week 3: Privacy

This week we will start to talk about privacy. What is privacy? What does it mean in an informational context? Why is it important? And what should we do about it? The reading by Anita Allen explains what privacy is, why privacy is important and why privacy should be valued. Solove discusses the dominant paradigm for privacy management in the online world, and its foibles. Our class discussions will address the evolving legal frameworks for privacy protections in the US, EU and India. In assignments, we will examine what privacy looks like in practice -- on the websites that we produce and interact with every day.

Readings

Cohen, J. E. (2013). What privacy is for. *Harvard Law Review*, 126(7), 1904–1933.

Solove, D. J. (2013). Privacy Self-Management and the Consent Dilemma. *Harvard Law Review*, 126(7), 1880–1903.

Allen, A. L. (2005). Privacy. In H. LaFollette (Ed.), *The Oxford handbook of practical ethics*. New York, NY: Oxford University Press.

Optional Readings

Law and Policy Approaches to Privacy

U.S. Constitution, Amendment IV.

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

Bhatia, G. (2017, September 10). The Supreme Court's Right to Privacy Judgment: Round-up. Retrieved June 12, 2019, from *Indian Constitutional Law and Philosophy* website: <https://indconlawphil.wordpress.com/2017/09/10/the-supreme-courts-right-to-privacy-judgment-round-up/>

Other Optional Readings

Allen, A. (2011). Privacies not wanted. In *Unpopular Privacy: What Must We Hide?* (pp. 3–26). New York, NY: Oxford University Press.

Moore, A. D. (2010). The value of privacy. In *Privacy rights: moral and legal foundations* (pp. 33–56). University Park, PA: Pennsylvania State University Press.

Shilton, K., & Greene, D. (2016). Because privacy: defining and legitimating privacy in iOS development. <https://doi.org/10.9776/16229>

Ess, C. (2005). "Lost in Translation"?: Intercultural Dialogues on Privacy and Information Ethics. *Ethics and Information Technology*, 7(1), 1–6. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10676-005-0454-0>

Kumaraguru, P., & Cranor, L. (2006). Privacy in India: Attitudes and awareness. In *Privacy Enhancing Technologies: 5th International Workshop, Revised Selected Papers* (pp. 243–258). https://doi.org/10.1007/11767831_16

Madden, M. (2014). *Public Perceptions of Privacy and Security in the Post-Snowden Era*. Pew Research Center.

Nissenbaum, H. F. (2010). 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. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10676-005-0456-y>

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

Sweeney, L. (2013). Discrimination in online ad delivery. *Communications of the ACM*, 56(5), 44–54. <https://doi.org/10.1145/2447976.2447990>

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 Apps. *Technology Science*. Retrieved from <https://techscience.org/a/2015103001/>

Federal Trade Commission. (2013). *Marketing your mobile app: Get it right from the start*. Washington, D.C.

Assignments

Week 3 Writing Assignment

Pick one instance in which a third party recorded information about you today. For example, the instance could be a credit card transaction, texting a friend, browsing the internet, or swiping your Husky Card.

Now consider: What information about you was recorded? Who recorded this information? Where are they keeping the data? What are they doing with the data? Who are they sharing it with? And how do you know the answers to these questions? Please describe what you learned in a short paragraph (~100 words).

Using the readings, please explain what informational privacy is, and why we might want it or not want it. In the instance that you studied (described above), what agreements mediate transactions involving your data and how does this relate to notions of privacy? You may have to examine data sharing policies to be able to answer these questions. (~150 words)

Please include links to the empirical material that you discuss in your reference list (does not count towards your word count).

Week 3 In Class Activity

What would a general data protection policy look like? This week we take Solove's idea about creating a single policy seriously. The class will be broken up into groups, each representing an organization and we will attempt to negotiate a general privacy policy.

Week 4: Surveillance and Tracking

In this week, we turn to discuss the other side of privacy -- that is, what institutions do with the massive amount of data that they collect about you. Surveillance (in the most malicious formation) and tracking (in a more anodyne sense) both involve complex apparatus of technologies, policies, and institutions which facilitate mass accounting of people in a number of different settings. We will examine how private corporations and by governments keep track of people and why. After examining the sociotechnical means for tracking people, we then will consider the impacts of these projects.

Readings

Vaidhyanathan, S. (2018). The Surveillance Machine. In *Antisocial media: how Facebook disconnects us and undermines democracy* (pp. 52–76). New York, NY: Oxford University Press.

Srinivasan, J., Bailur, S., Schoemaker, E., & Seshagiri, S. (2018). The Poverty of Privacy: Understanding Privacy Trade-Offs from Identity Infrastructure Users in India. *International Journal of Communication*, 12, 1228–1247.

Igo, S. E. (2018). Documents of Identity. In *The known citizen: a history of privacy in modern America* (pp. 57–71). Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press. (Sections “Visible Citizens” and “Numbering the People”)

Dai, X. (2018). Toward a Reputation State: The Social Credit System Project of China (SSRN Scholarly Paper No. ID 3193577). Retrieved from Social Science Research Network website: <https://papers.ssrn.com/abstract=3193577> (Sections II and III)

Optional Readings

Ohlberg, M., Ahmed, S., & Lang, B. (2017). Central Planning, local experiments: The complex implementation of China’s Social Credit System. Retrieved from Mercator Institute for China Studies website: <https://www.merics.org/en/microsite/china-monitor/central-planning-local-experiments>

Zuboff, S. (2015). Big other: surveillance capitalism and the prospects of an information civilization. *Journal of Information Technology*, 30(1), 75–89.
<https://doi.org/10.1057/jit.2015.5>

Etzioni, A. (2012). The privacy merchants: what is to be done? *University of Pennsylvania Journal of Constitutional Law*, 14(4), 929–951.

Kirk, M. (2014). United States of Secrets. In *Frontline*. Retrieved from <https://www.pbs.org/wgbh/frontline/film/united-states-of-secrets/>

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.*
- [The U.S. Should Adopt the “Right to Be Forgotten” Online](#). (2015, March 11). *Intelligence Squared U.S.*

Crump, C. (2013). You Are Being Tracked: How License Plate Readers Are Being Used to Record Americans’ Movements. Retrieved from American Civil Liberties Union website: <https://www.aclu.org/other/you-are-being-tracked-how-license-plate-readers-are-being-used-record-americans-movements>

Stanley, J. (2015). Police Body-Mounted Cameras: With Right Policies in Place, a Win For All. Retrieved from American Civil Liberties Union website: <https://www.aclu.org/other/police-body-mounted-cameras-right-policies-place-win-all>

EFF (2014). [Big Data in Private Sector and Public Sector Surveillance](#)

Assignments

Week 4 Writing Assignment

In this week's readings, you have examples of how government entities in USA, China and India, as well as Facebook (which sometimes like to think of itself as sovereign) record and have recorded information about their constituents for different purposes. Compare and contrast these different systems: What values are embedded in these different projects? What ends do they serve ideally and practically? Who benefits and who doesn't benefit from these projects. Please respond in 250 words and properly cite the readings to which you refer.

Week 4 In Class Activity

Using the readings on the information collection practices of various governments, this week we will consider the information activities of the state. With a guest from the City of Seattle, we will examine the implementation of Seattle's Surveillance Ordinance.

Week 5: Online Speech

In our week on speech how the conditions for online speech have created new challenges for regulating the limits of speech. Balkin considers the value of speech, the affordances of technology from the perspective of speech. Though aspects of this argument are outdated since the rise of privately-owned platforms, it provides an important backdrop for understanding early conceptions of online speech. Gillespie examines the platforms on which much online speech occurs. In particular, we examine government rules about speech and platform's management of online speech. We will also look at the regulatory and governance mechanisms that address online harassment in the work by Marwick and Miller (I highly recommend the Citron optional readings if this topic is interesting to you).

Readings

Gillespie, T. (2018a). The Myth of the Neutral Platform. In *Custodians of the Internet: platforms, content moderation, and the hidden decisions that shape social media* (pp. 24–44). New Haven, CT: Yale University Press.

Gillespie, T. (2018b). Community Guidelines, or the Sound of No. In *Custodians of the Internet: platforms, content moderation, and the hidden decisions that shape social media* (pp. 45–73). New Haven, CT: Yale University Press.

Marwick, A., & Miller, R. (2014). Online Harassment, Defamation, and Hateful Speech: A Primer of the Legal Landscape. Center on Law and Information Policy. Retrieved from <https://ir.lawnet.fordham.edu/clip/3>

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.
<https://doi.org/10.2139/ssrn.470842>

Optional Readings

Jacoby, J., Bourg, A., & Priest, D. (2018). The Facebook Dilemma. In *Frontline*.

Citron, D. K. (2014). Introduction. In *Hate crimes in cyberspace* (pp. 1–31). Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

Lenhart, A., Ybarra, M., Zickuhr, K., & Price-Feeney, M. (2016). Online Harassment, Digital Abuse, and Cyberstalking in America. Retrieved from Data & Society Research Institute website: https://www.datasociety.net/pubs/oh/Online_Harassment_2016.pdf

Morozov, E. (2013). So open it hurts. In *To save everything, click here: the folly of technological solutionism* (pp. 63–99). New York, NY: PublicAffairs.

Cohen, J. E. (2015). The Zombie First Amendment. *William and Mary Law Review*, 56(4), 1119.

Lessig, L. (2006). Free Speech. In *Code* (Version 2.0., pp. 233–275).

Petersen, J. (2015). Is code speech? Law and the expressivity of machine language. *New Media & Society*, 17(3), 415–431. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1461444813504276>

Grimmelmann, J. (2014). Speech Engines. *Minnesota Law Review*, 98(3), 868–952.

Petersen, J. (2015). Is code speech? Law and the expressivity of machine language. *New Media & Society*, 17(3), 415–431. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1461444813504276>

Citron, D. K. (2010). The Internet’s anonymity problem. In S. Levmore & M. C. Nussbaum (Eds.), *The offensive Internet: speech, privacy, and reputation*. Cambridge, MA.: Harvard University Press.

Assignments

Week 5 Writing Assignment

Please read: [Patreon Bars Anti-Feminist for Racist Speech, Inciting Revolt](#) and consider the following questions: How should speech be managed in online platforms? Who should manage it? What is the role of the government? What is the role of private companies? Please discuss your ideas in approximately 250 words in relation to this week’s readings and make sure that you cite the readings.

Week 5 In Class Activity

In this class, we will examine a supreme court opinion and consider the limits of what constitutes speech. We will examine *Universal v. Corley* and ask basic questions such as "What are the facts of the case?" and "What does the judge say about speech?"

Week 6: Intellectual Property

During this week, we will consider how to balance intellectual property regimes with a number of different interests. For example, we will consider Balkin's important arguments from last week about the promotion of democratic culture in light of intellectual property. Moore and Himma help us understand the many moral justifications for intellectual property rights while Jasanoff examines whether intellectual property laws are just. And Hesse examines how to weigh different values in historical context -- that is individual personality and effort against the public good. Lastly, we examine how to balance political and economic interests protecting old copyright laws against political and economic interests in the interest of new innovation.

Readings

Hesse, C. (2002). The Rise of Intellectual Property, 700 B.C.-A.D. 2000: An Idea in the Balance. *Daedalus*, 131(2), 26–45.

Jasanoff, S. (2016). Whose Knowledge? Whose Power? In *The ethics of invention: technology and the human future* (pp. 177–210). New York, NY: WW Norton & Company.

Moore, A., & Himma, K. (2011). Intellectual Property. In E. N. Zalta (Ed.), *The Stanford Encyclopedia of Philosophy*.

Aoki, K., Boyle, J., & Jenkins, J. (2006). *Bound by law?: tales from the public domain*. Durham, N.C.: Duke Center for the Study of the Public Domain. (skim)

Optional Readings

GNU. (2007). General Public License 3.0. <https://www.gnu.org/licenses/gpl-3.0.en.html>

Merges, R. P. (2011). Main Themes. In *Justifying intellectual property* (pp. 1–28). Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

Lessig, L. (2004). Property. In *Free culture: how big media uses technology and the law to lock down culture and control creativity* (pp. 116–173). New York, NY: Penguin Press.

Healy, K. (2002). Digital Technology and Cultural Goods. *Journal of Political Philosophy*, 10(4), 478–500. <https://doi.org/10.1111/1467-9760.00162>

Broussard, S. L. (2007). The copyleft movement: creative commons licensing. *Communication Research Trends*, 26(3), 3.

Johns, A. (2009). A General History of Pirates. In *Piracy: the intellectual property wars from Gutenberg to Gates* (pp. 1–16). Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press.

Litwak, M. (2013, March 12). Sherlock Holmes and the Case of the Public Domain. Retrieved from IFP website: <https://www.ifp.org/resources/sherlock-holmes-and-the-case-of-the-public-domain/>

Burkart, P. (2014). *Pirate politics: the new information policy contests*. Cambridge, MA.: The MIT Press.

Brown, I., & Marsden, C. T. (2013a). Introduction: Regulating the Information Giants. In *Information Revolution & Global Politics. Regulating code: good governance and better regulation in the information age* (pp. ix–xix). Cambridge, MA: The MIT Press.

Brown, I., & Marsden, C. T. (2013b). Copyrights. In *Information Revolution & Global Politics. Regulating code: good governance and better regulation in the information age* (pp. 69–91). Cambridge, MA: The MIT Press.

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. <https://www.uspto.gov/learning-and-resources/ip-policy/copyright/white-paper-remixes-first-sale-and-statutory-damages>

Breznitz, D., & Murphree, M. (2016). What the U.S. Should Be Doing to Protect Intellectual Property. *Harvard Business Review*.

Burk, D. L., & Lemley, M. A. (2009). *The patent crisis and how the courts can solve it*. Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press.

Assignments

Week 6 Writing Assignment

The management of intellectual property affects everything from the cost of medicines to the availability of textbooks. The USA just got to celebrate vast numbers of important works coming into the public domain for the first time in 21 years on Public Domain Day, while China is intensifying its IP laws and enforcement. When is it fair to assign and enforce intellectual property rights? And when is it not fair? Please use examples and arguments from the readings to justify your positions in 250 words.

Week 6 In Class Activity

What is fair use? When is it protected? Design a workflow for identifying and dealing with copyrighted content that protects copyright holders and fair use.

Week 7: Ethical Frameworks (Deontological and Utilitarian) and AI

This week introduces ethical frameworks which we will spend the next four weeks focusing on. First we address meta-ethical frameworks which help us think about how different moral outlooks coexist (or don't) with each other. Then we will consider two major traditions in Western normative ethics: deontological ethics and utilitarian ethics. We will also touch on several other ethical traditions discussed in the Ess reading. There are a number of alternative readings for people who need to supplement the Ess reading with more background.

Readings

Ess, C. (2014). Digital Media Ethics: Overview, Frameworks, Resources. In *Digital media ethics* (pp. 167–225). Cambridge, UK: Polity Press.

Horowitz, D. (2011). We need a “moral operating system.” *TEDxSiliconValley*.

AINOW Report 2018 (2018). AI Now Institute.

https://ainowinstitute.org/AI_Now_2018_Report.pdf (Skim introduction and part 1)

Optional Readings

Overview of ethics approaches (alternatives to the Ess reading):

Quinn, M. J. (2011). Introduction to Ethics. In *Ethics for the information age* (4th ed., pp. 53–99). Boston, MA: Pearson.

Collins, W. R., & Miller, K. W. (1992). Paramedic ethics for computer professionals. *The Journal of Systems & Software*, 17(1), 23–38. [https://doi.org/10.1016/0164-1212\(92\)90077-W](https://doi.org/10.1016/0164-1212(92)90077-W)

Tavani, H. T. (2011a). Introduction to Cyberethics: Concepts, Perspectives, and Methodological Frameworks. In *Ethics and technology: controversies, questions, and strategies for ethical computing* (3rd ed., pp. 1–34). Boston, MA: John Wiley & Sons.

Tavani, H. T. (2011b). Ethical Concepts and Ethical Theories: Establishing and Justifying a Moral System. In *Ethics and technology: controversies, questions, and strategies for ethical computing* (3rd ed., pp. 34–74). Boston, MA: John Wiley & Sons.

For more depth on Deontology:

Kant, I. (2005). The Metaphysics of Morals (selections). In A. D. Moore (Ed.), & T. Kingsmill (Trans.), *Information Ethics: Privacy, Property, and Power* (pp. 66–84). Seattle, WA: University of Washington Press.

For more depth on Utilitarianism:

Mill, J. S. (2005). Utilitarian (selections). In A. D. Moore (Ed.), *Information Ethics: Privacy, Property, and Power* (pp. 47–65). Seattle, WA: University of Washington Press.

Additional optional readings:

Moore, A. D., & Unsworth, K. (2005). Introduction. In *Information Ethics: Privacy, Property, and Power* (pp. 11–28). Seattle, WA: University of Washington Press.

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.

Richardson, H. S. (2013). Moral Reasoning. In E. N. Zalta (Ed.), *The Stanford Encyclopedia of Philosophy* (Winter 2014).

Bilimoria, P. (1991). Indian Ethics. In P. Singer (Ed.), *A Companion to ethics*. Oxford, UK: Blackwell.

Lin, P. (2015). The ethical dilemma of self-driving cars. *TED-Ed*.
<https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=ixloDYVfKA0>

Rahwan, I. (2017). The Social Dilemma of Driverless Cars. *TEDxCambridge*.
<https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=ixloDYVfKA0>

Pasquale, F. (2015). *The Black Box Society: The Secret Algorithms That Control Money and Information*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

Ananny, M. (2016). Toward an Ethics of Algorithms: Convening, Observation, Probability, and Timeliness. *Science, Technology, & Human Values*, 41(1), 93–117.
<https://doi.org/10.1177/0162243915606523>

Assignments

Week 7 Writing Assignment

Is AI justified from a deontological perspective? What about from a utilitarian perspective? Select a domain/example of Artificial Intelligence that referred to in the AI Now report. Examine this AI from the perspective of utilitarianism and deontological normative ethics and argue what the "moral operating system" for AI should be. (You may also consider another one of the ethical frameworks introduced in Ess, but please make sure that it is not one of the meta-ethical frameworks.) Your response should be 250 words and properly cite the readings.

Week 7 In Class Activity

What is a deontological ethical argument? What is a utilitarian perspective? We will generate statements that argues an action is ethical or unethical from a deontological and utilitarian perspective, and then justify it. We will share these statements and refine our understandings of these frameworks.

Week 8: The Future of Information Work and the Capabilities Framework
Nobel economist Amartya Sen introduced the Capabilities approach as an alternative approach to economic development. Philosopher Nussbaum formulated a normative account of the capabilities with the capabilities framework. During this week we are going to examine the past and future of work from the perspectives of ghost work, automation, and relational labor. We will ask whether new modes of working live up to the capabilities that are specified by Sen and Nussbaum.

Readings

Nussbaum, M. (2003). Capabilities as Fundamental Entitlements: Sen and Social Justice. *Feminist Economics*, 9(2–3), 33–59. <https://doi.org/10.1080/1354570022000077926>

Gray, M. L., & Suri, S. (2019). *Ghost work: how to stop Silicon Valley from building a new global underclass*. Boston, MA: Houghton Mifflin Harcourt. (Part 1)

Nye, D. E. (2006). Work: More or Less? Better or Worse? In *Technology matters: questions to live with*. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.

Baym, N. K. (2018). Introduction. In *Playing to the crowd*. New York, NY: NYU Press. (optional)

Optional Readings

Nussbaum, M. C. (2011). The Central Capabilities. In *Creating capabilities: the human development approach* (pp. 17–45). Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

Sen, A. (2011). *Development as freedom*. New York, NY: Knopf.

Anand, P., Hunter, G., & Smith, R. (2005). Capabilities and Well-Being: Evidence Based on the Sen–Nussbaum Approach to Welfare. *Social Indicators Research*, 74(1), 9–55. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11205-005-6518-z>

Ticona, J., Mateescu, A., & Rosenblat, A. (2018). *How Tech Shapes Labor Across Domestic Work & Ridehailing*. Data & Society Research Institute.

Gray, M. L., & Suri, S. (2017, January 9). The Humans Working Behind the AI Curtain. Harvard Business Review.

Head, S. (2013). Walmart and Amazon. In *Mindless: why smarter machines are making dumber humans*. New York, NY: Basic Books.

Garrido, M., & Fellows, M. (2017). Access to Information and the Sustainable Development Goals. Retrieved from Technology & Social Change Group, University of Washington website: <https://da2i.ifla.org>

- Gray, M. L., Suri, S., Ali, S. S., & Kulkarni, D. (2016). The Crowd is a Collaborative Network. *Proceedings of the 19th ACM Conference on Computer-Supported Cooperative Work & Social Computing*, 134–147. <https://doi.org/10.1145/2818048.2819942>
- Brynjolfsson, E., & McAfee, A. (2014). Policy Recommendations. In *The second machine age: work, progress, and prosperity in a time of brilliant technologies*. New York, NY: WW Norton & Company.
- Cherry, M. A., & Poster, W. R. (2016). Crowdwork, Corporate Social Responsibility, and Fair Labor Practices (SSRN Scholarly Paper No. ID 2777201). Retrieved from Social Science Research Network website: <https://papers.ssrn.com/abstract=2777201>
- Cefkin, M., Anya, O., & Moore, R. (2014). A Perfect Storm? Reimagining Work in the Era of the End of the Job. *Ethnographic Praxis in Industry Conference Proceedings*, 2014(1), 3–19. <https://doi.org/10.1111/1559-8918.01002>
- De Stefano, V. (2015). The Rise of the “Just-in-Time Workforce”: On-Demand Work, Crowd Work and Labour Protection in the “Gig-Economy” (SSRN Scholarly Paper No. ID 2682602). Retrieved from Social Science Research Network website: <https://papers.ssrn.com/abstract=2682602>
- Finkin, M. W. (2016). Beclouded work, beclouded workers in historical perspective. *Comparative Labor Law & Policy Journal*, 37(3), 603–618.
- Glöss, M., Mcgregor, M., & Brown, B. (2016). Designing for Labour: Uber and the On-Demand Mobile Workforce. 1632–1643. <https://doi.org/10.1145/2858036.2858476>
- Irani, L., & Sengul-Jones, M. (2015). Difference Work: A Conversation with Lilly Irani. *Catalyst: Feminism, Theory, Technoscience*, 1(1), 1–14. <https://doi.org/10.28968/cftt.v1i1.28816>
- Rosenblat, A., & Stark, L. (2016). Algorithmic Labor and Information Asymmetries: A Case Study of Uber’s Drivers. *International Journal of Communication*, 10, 3758–3784.

Assignments

Week 8 Writing Assignment

Use the normative capabilities framework as a lens to analyze the "ghost work" (described by Gray and Suri) and the history of labor and automation (that Gray and Suri and Nye) highlight. How does "ghost work" (specifically) and workplace automation (broadly) support the capabilities? How do they not support the capabilities? Please cite your sources.

Week 8 In Class Activity

Design a platform for fair labor platform for crowdwork. Use the capabilities approach to guide your design. Specify what kinds of laws, governance, and technical approaches you can use.

Week 9: Information Security and Care Ethics

This week will feature a discussion of some of the particular issues in the ethics of computer security work. We will discuss how cybersecurity is governed and how people become security practitioners and then delve into the ethical conundrums that arise in the process of doing security research. We will focus this week on the Menlo Report, a document that describes ethical principles for ethical security research and consider how these might apply to information management professionals more broadly.

Readings

Whyte, K. P., & Cuomo, C. (2017). Ethics of Caring in Environmental Ethics. *The Oxford Handbook of Environmental Ethics*.

<https://doi.org/10.1093/oxfordhb/9780199941339.013.22>

Bailey, M. et al (2012). The Menlo Report: Ethical Principles Guiding Information and Communication Technology Research. *Department of Homeland Security*.

Fidler, B. (2017). Cybersecurity governance: a prehistory and its implications. *Digital Policy, Regulation and Governance*, 19(6), 449–465. <https://doi.org/10.1108/DPRG-05-2017-0026>

Mathew, A., & Cheshire, C. (2018). A Fragmented Whole: Cooperation and Learning in the Practice of Information Security. Center for Long-Term Cybersecurity, UC Berkeley and Packet Clearing House. (Skim)

Optional Readings

Hoffmann, A. L. (2017). Beyond distributions and primary goods: Assessing applications of Rawls in information science and technology literature since 1990. *Journal of the Association for Information Science and Technology*, 68(7), 1601–1618.

<https://doi.org/10.1002/asi.23747>

Assignments

Week 9 Writing Assignment

Analyze the Menlo report and the four ethical principles that it espouses. Do you think that following these principles would make for ethical information security professionals? How would you change or not change these principles for an information management professional? How do the principles in the Menlo report support an ethics of care or not? Please cite the readings properly. Your response should be 250 words (not including references).

Week 9 In Class Activity

We will discuss how you would you redesign Canvas (or another website) in order enact the Menlo principles and embrace a feminist or indigenous ethic of care.

Week 10: Environmental Impact of Technology

This week we break down technology/nature dualisms and investigate the ways in which the Internet and digital technology is intertwined with the earth. We will consider the impact of digital technology from the perspective of eWaste, data center energy usage, and the extraction of conflict metals for computing products. And, we will look at materiality of computing from the perspective of care ethics and consider how this perspective can help us think about other information issues that we encounter in this course.

Readings

Edwards, P. N. (2016). Knowledge infrastructures for the Anthropocene: The Anthropocene Review. <https://doi.org/10.1177/2053019616679854>

Hogan, M. (2015). Data flows and water woes: The Utah Data Center. *Big Data & Society*, 2(2), 2053951715592429. <https://doi.org/10.1177/2053951715592429>

Lepawsky, J. (2015). The changing geography of global trade in electronic discards: time to rethink the e-waste problem. *Geographical Journal*, 181(2), 147–159. <https://doi.org/10.1111/geoj.12077>

Optional Readings

Ensmenger, N. (2015). Dirty Bits. (Handout)

Lepawsky, J., Araujo, E., Davis, J.-M., & Kahhat, R. (2017). Best of two worlds? Towards ethical electronics repair, reuse, repurposing and recycling. *Geoforum*, 81, 87–99. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.geoforum.2017.02.007>

Lepawsky, J., & Billah, M. (2011). Making Chains That (un)make Things: Waste–Value Relations and the Bangladeshi Rubbish Electronics Industry. *Geografiska Annaler: Series B, Human Geography*, 93(2), 121–139. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1468-0467.2011.00365.x>

Gabrys, J. (2011). Introduction: A Natural History of Electronics. In *Digital Rubbish: A Natural History of Electronics* (pp. 1–19). Ann Arbor, MI: University of Michigan Press.

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. <https://doi.org/10.1021/es702255z>

Diamond, M. (2017). The Story of Toxic Chemicals in Computing Systems. *Proceedings of the 2017 Workshop on Computing Within Limits*, 1–1. <https://doi.org/10.1145/3080556.3080570>

Assignments

Overview – writing assignments

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 Monday at 7pm with the exception of the first week of the class. Assignments must be submitted on Canvas. No late assignments will be accepted and there will be no regrades.

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).

Weekly Writing Assignment: Grading Rubric

<u>Criteria</u>	<u>Pts</u>
Uses correct grammar and punctuation; Writes in clear, concise sentences; Deploys appropriate professional vocabulary	1 pt
Argument Advances a clear and convincing line of arguments; Presents original analysis; Organizes argument logically with clear and well-constructed structure.	1 pt
Content Demonstrates comprehension of readings; properly cites readings; shows mastery of core concepts.	1 pt

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 Vericite. 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 3 points. We will take the 7 assignments with the highest grades.

Classroom Engagement (10 points)

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 keep a daily engagement journal and here is what I look for when assessing this portion of your grade:

- Preparation - First, and foremost, attend class having done the readings. Come to class prepared with questions and comments about our topics of the day.
- Attendance – while I cannot require you to attend class, not attending will limit your ability to engage in our graded class activities. Missing class could result in a significant reduction in your engagement grade.
- General Attitude/Professionalism – arriving on time for class, keeping a positive attitude, making constructive comments, being attentive, exercising mobile IT etiquette and doing your best to learn something every class session, are the keys to his aspect of engagement.
- Classroom work - Participation in your team’s discussions during our breakout/team activities, I will be floating around the class and monitoring engagement.
- Contribution to class discussions – make it a goal to offer input to our discussions every class session. When there are guest lecturers, always formulate a question for them.

Online Engagement (10 points)

This class also requires that you engage with each other online. There will be a few weeks throughout the quarter where your colleagues will be posting policy analyses. To score this portion of your grade, I will look to see that you have read all of your colleagues' policy analyses and posted helpful comments for them. Giving helpful feedback will make you an indispensable colleague, and it is a skill that can be practiced and honed. This is what your weekly reviews should include:

- 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 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.

In Class Activities

Periodically, I will ask you to engage in a classroom activity that will draw on your knowledge of the readings, analyses of the topics we cover, and collaborative skills. Each of the in class activities will be worth 1-2 points. They will occur every week, at least once -- either during the large lecture session or during the break out discussion sessions. Most of the activities will be done in groups and will generally require something that is turned in with the group member's name on them.

Debate

Each group will be assigned a debate time in weeks 3, 4, 5, 6, or 7. Debates will be about the topic of the week. The instructors will propose debate topics one week in advance of the debate. 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 expect everyone to have prepared with his or her teams and to be willing to participate. Students must be present to get credit for debates. 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.		

Debate Resources

Here is an example to give you a sense of how the debate might typically proceed:

<https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=2O3ppc-UC2s>

[The Illustrated Book of Bad Arguments](#) is a book on critical thinking written by Ali Almosawi and illustrated by Alejandro Giraldo. The book describes 19 logical fallacies using a set of illustrations, in which various cartoon characters participate.

Debate Rubric

Criteria	Pts
<p>Winning Class Vote At the end of the debate, the entire class will vote on a winner. The group that receives the most votes will receive awarded 1 point.</p>	1.0 pts
<p>Effective Use of Time The time during the debate is important. Make sure you stick to the debate timelines provided and that you use your time in the debate to make and support your arguments.</p>	1.0 pts
<p>Mastery of the Subject Your arguments and their support should demonstrate that you are familiar with the debate topic.</p>	1.0 pts
<p>Quality Arguments You present the strongest arguments for your side supported by the readings and other examples.</p>	1.0 pts
<p>Respond to opposition You demonstrate that you understand the opposition's best arguments and respond to them with evidence of your own.</p>	1.0 pts

Final Project Overview

As we will discuss in the first few weeks of class, a data problem 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.

Many of you will work for information organizations. One of the central aims of this course is to learn how to investigate and resolve data problems as they arise in these kinds of institutions. This assignment is meant to give you practice studying a data problem and how it connects to an information policy. The result of your analysis will be a 2000-2500 word paper, podcast or website.

Within groups, you will have to identify a data problem and analyze it over the course of the quarter. You will be assigned groups of 3-4 people. Students will be randomly assigned to groups. These will be your groups for the entire quarter. If for some reason you would like to be randomly reassigned, please let us know no later than Friday, January 11th.

Starting in Week 2, you and your group have to decide on a data problem. Then, you will need to find reputable readings related to the data problem. You should read as much as necessary to gain a deep understanding of the topic. Creating a Zotero group to collaboratively maintain your research database will save you a lot of work.

Pts

- [How to install Zotero](#)
- [Creating groups in Zotero](#)
- [Zotero's browser add-on lets you one-click save webpage and \(limitedly\) auto-populates the references to your research database](#)

From Week 2 to Week 5, the project will have various milestones. Each milestone is an ungraded opportunity for the instructors to provide you with feedback and for you to ask questions. All milestones are due at 7pm on Canvas unless otherwise noted.

We will not give feedback to papers that are submitted after the deadline.

- Final Paper Milestone 1: (Due Jan 18, Week 2) Select Final Paper Topic
- Final Paper Milestone 2: (Due Jan 25, Week 3) Bibliography of research and overview of data problem
- Final Paper Milestone 3: (Due Feb 1, Week 4) Identify information policy and stakeholders
- Final Paper Milestone 4: (Due Feb 8, Week 5) Policy alternatives and recommendations

From Week 6 to Week 8, each group will "present" their report via the Canvas discussion board. During each of these weeks, all groups are expected to provide

feedback to the presenters (see **Online Presentation** and **Online Response** sections below). Each group will analyze and incorporate the feedback from their classmates into a final paper.

Your final paper will be about 2000-2500 words (not including references and footnotes) and will explain your data problem broadly, describe an information policy, make some recommendations about how to adjust the information policy, and justify your conclusions.

Final Paper Milestone 1: Select final paper topic (Week 2)

Your first task will be to identify the data problem you want to study and the specific context within which you intend to study it. You will write a description of the broad data problem that you want to study and the specific information policy that will be the subject of your paper. For example, you might be interested in the topic of privacy in the home. Voice activated devices such as Google Home provide a specific example of this data problem, allowing you to narrow your study. In this situation, the specific policy that you might want to look at is “Data security & privacy on Google Home” and the Google Home Terms of Service. Formulating research questions also helps to specify the project and narrow the scope of analysis to something do-able in a short quarter. Though your paper will focus on a single data problem, by exploring a specific issue you gain insight into the complex dynamics underpinning broader challenges.

Here are some examples of research questions about data problems and their related policies:

- What is the best data retention policy for your favorite app? (data problem: privacy and data minimization; information policy: Firefox Privacy Notice)
- Is it fair for T-Mobile to offer “fast lanes” for certain services? (data problem: online speech and net neutrality; information policy: T-Mobile Binge on rules)
- What kind of consent options should data brokers such as Epsilon be required to get in order to operate in the EU? (data problem: privacy and third party data exchange; information policy: GDPR and Epsilon ToS)
- Should Wikipedia be allowed to host the “monkey selfie”? (data problem: can animals own copyrights and information policy: specific court cases about the monkey selfie and copyright law)
- What kinds of university employee correspondence should be subject to Right to Information (RTI) requests? (data problem: transparency and workplace surveillance; information policy: Washington state Public Records Act)
- How should Google decide what gets deleted with “right to be forgotten requests”? (data problem: speech, privacy and the right to be forgotten; information policy: GDPR and Google’s EU Privacy Removal policy)
- How should online platforms like Facebook deal with the problem of misinformation? (data problem: speech and misinformation; information policy: Facebook’s policies)

- What kinds of spaces should drones be allowed in and when should they be banned? (data problem: privacy in the home; information policy: FAA regulations)
- In what ways can governments ethically use machine learning in border security? (data problem: ethics of AI, surveillance; information policy: TSA Screening of Passengers by Observation Techniques)

Here are some news and other organization websites that might stimulate some interest (with the caveat that all of these sites have their biases: they have political slants, are in people's pockets, have axes to grind, ignore vulnerable populations, etc):

- Electronic Frontier Foundation (EFF) - <https://www.eff.org/>
- Center for Democracy and Technology (CDT) - <https://cdt.org/>
- Bits blog - <http://bits.blogs.nytimes.com>
- Communications of the ACM (CACM) — Particularly check out articles under 'legal aspects' <http://cacm.acm.org/>
- Data and Society - <http://www.datasociety.net>
- Ars Technica, Law & Disorder section <http://arstechnica.com/tech-policy/>
- Note to Self on Public Radio <https://www.npr.org/podcasts/452538677/note-to-self>
- Tech@FTC (Federal Trade Commission) <https://www.ftc.gov/news-events/blogs/>

As you consider different data problems that your group may want to investigate, ask whether the issue is appropriately documented – will you have enough material to understand the issue? Also consider the opposite problem -- is the data problem too broad? Is there too much written about the data problem 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.

For this milestone, write a paragraph that include your research question, a description of the data problem and the specific information policy/policies your group will be researching. Please include a short summary of what topics you will cover, and what topics you consider to be in-scope and out-of-scope. Discuss resources that you will use to do your project. We recommend contacting our information management librarian, [Alyssa Deutchler](#), with questions about research. She is awesome!

Final Paper Milestone 2: Bibliography of research and overview of data problem (Week 3)

Assemble some evidence about your problem and present a ~500 word summary of the data problem and corresponding information policy. You will also include a bibliography of 5-10 peer-reviewed scholarly sources. You will need enough source material to claim some sort of mastery over your topic. Your research should explore the nature (including the history) of the data problem and policy in its context. Also explain the specific geographic and temporal context in which you are studying this data problem.

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, and academic articles about your topic. Consider what the sources say and why they are believable or not. You might also explore collecting some data about your data problem: What other kinds of data can you bring to bear on this data problem? Things to consider might be to interview people at a given organization, publicly available data repositories, or to conduct non-intrusive mini online experiments (see techscience.org for inspiration).

Please consult [university librarians for help!](#)

*In the past, students have asked about whether they can use X new organization or report as a reference (e.g. Medium, Wikipedia). Good news articles and reports will link to other references, such as mainstream news articles, data sets, legal proceedings, and financial documents. If you have questions about whether a given article can be used, we recommend that you first look at what evidence the article provides (and perhaps use that evidence instead). If you still have questions, feel free to ask the instructors.

Milestone 3: Identify stakeholders (Week 4)

Using all of the data that you have gathered so far, identify all of the possible stakeholders in this data problem. Please turn in a write-up that identifies the different stakeholders and explores their different roles in relation to each other. Explore different stakeholders' positions (about 100-150 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 kinds of power do the different actors have to influence this information policy? Are their divisions within stakeholder groups that are important? How do different actors relate to the information policy under discussion?

Final Paper Milestone 4: Policy recommendations (Week 5)

Identify ways in which the current information policy could be improved. Formulate several alternative information policies. Select criteria with which to evaluate the

possible policy alternatives. Be explicit about the underlying values which you are using to judge this policy. Explain what each of your criteria is and justify why you have chosen these alternatives. Using the criteria that you have developed, assess how your policy proposals will affect the data problem, **for better and for worse**. Using your criteria, project the outcomes of the different policy alternatives. Make your own recommendations based on the above analysis and explain your reasoning!

Online Presentation

Your group will be assigned a day during the quarter where you will present your data problem to the class. **You can present your analysis as a traditional paper, as an interactive website, or as a podcast.** Regardless of the format, the analysis should be about 2000 words. This is an opportunity for you to share what you have learned with your classmates and get feedback from them. 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 post your paper as a discussion thread on Canvas by Friday, 7pm the week you are assigned. Please clearly label your Canvas discussion thread <SECTION-GROUPNUMBER-PROJECT TITLE> (e.g. "AA-2-Alexa Data Retention Policy"). Your classmates will have a week to respond to your paper. Your classmates will interrogate your recommendations, and you will incorporate their feedback into your final report.

Please see the "Online Presentation and Response Schedule" below for more details about when you are presenting and which group you are supposed to provide peer reviews for.

After you have read all of the comments and feedback from your classmates, please summarize the comments and describe a plan for what you are going to address in your final paper.

Online Response

In addition to your online presentation, you will be responsible for constructively critiquing presentations from other groups. Each group will be assigned a presentation to review during the presentation weeks. Everyone in your group will respond to the same paper, but your response should be done individually. Your work in this area will contribute to your online engagement grade. These weekly reviews should be at least 250 words and should include:

- Restate the main points of the paper so the writers understand what you (the reader) got out of the substance of the paper.
- Tell the writers what the highlight of the paper was for you as a reader.
- Are you convinced by the analysis that leads to this recommendation? Is there information that would make this conclusion more convincing? Or, do you feel that the data problem presented would benefit from another policy?

- 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 writers have 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.
- While the online presentation does not require any ethical analysis, the final paper will require this. Do you have suggestions about how different ethical lenses could improve this analysis?
- Be organized in how you present your comments.

Online Presentation and Response Schedule:

Here's the presentation schedule. Please have your presentations submitted on Canvas by 7pm of the due date.

Responses are due a week later at 7pm. Please respond directly to the Presentation Group's Canvas thread individually, and include your group number at the top.

Final Paper

- Your final paper will incorporate all of the useful feedback that you have received from your classmates and it will also incorporate an ethics analysis. During the later half of the course, you will be introduced to a variety of ethical approaches to addressing various data problems. In the final paper, you should include what you have learned from at least one of these approaches in your analysis. One way to do this is to use ethics approaches to explain why different policy alternatives that you developed might need to be improved.
- Grading Rubric:
- Your paper will be graded based on creativity and evidence of critical thinking, appropriateness, clarity of writing, and adherence to assignment requirements using the rubric.
- Paper requirements:
- You should incorporate the relevant feedback you received from your peers and/or instructors.
- This paper should be about 2000-2500 words not including a "works cited" section.
- You will conduct original research and 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 VeriCite. 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: <http://depts.washington.edu/owrc/>
- No late papers will be accepted. Late papers get a 0 for all group members.

FAQ: Tips for the final paper

Here are a few things to look out for as you revise your milestones for the final paper.

- Make sure your bibliography is consistently formatted and includes all relevant information (e.g., for journals, author(s), title, journal title, volume, year, page numbers). If you have very few peer-reviewed sources, you may want to delve into the literature once more. Zotero is very helpful for this.
- Ensure that you are citing trustworthy sources. News aggregators, market research websites, Wikipedia, self-published blogs and news sites, etc. should be closely scrutinized. Use library resources to help you resolve questions about the quality of your sources. Empirical facts need to be correct and questions about the veracity of an assertion should be discussed.
- It's not necessary to come out of the gate swinging in favor of your chosen ethical standard or policy. You can offer a neutral, descriptive assessment to start and wait until later to establish and defend a moral position. It's often stronger to start this way, because wary readers notice when they are being led by rhetoric to a potentially biased conclusion.
- Stitching the pieces of this assignment together will probably take more than merely copying and pasting them into one document. You may need to excise or rework portions so that they flow together logically and coherently.
- Make sure you not only enumerate, but also justify your evaluative criteria; why did you choose these, specifically, over other possibilities? If you are making assertions about a set of rights, why do we have these rights? How do we/did we identify them? If you are using a utilitarian or consequentialist framework to evaluate positive or negative impact, what determines positive or negative? What standard do we use to determine whether an act or a rule is good or bad? For virtue ethics, why do the virtues chosen make sense in the context of the issue at hand? What values do they speak to?
- Don't forget to consider possible drawbacks as well as benefits for each policy you propose. Be honest in your assessment; even your preferred outcome is likely to have noteworthy tradeoffs and will probably hurt some stakeholders more than others.
- Check that you have properly cited all of the evidence that you used in constructing your argument. If there are questions about academic honesty, we will follow university protocol: we will not grade the paper and it will be immediately referred to the proper channels.

- In general, most papers need a light copyedit; some need much more. Problems with grammar, punctuation, spelling, and sentence structure often contribute to poor comprehension. If we can't understand what you mean, we can't assess the quality of your recommendations. Clearly articulating your ideas is a crucial skill that is necessary in all jobs.
- Read through the grading rubric. It may help you structure and organize your sections and content.
- Papers should not be significantly longer than about 2000 words. That may mean restructuring or being selective about your best points. The word count target is part of the assignment design; the ability to explain things succinctly is a valuable skill. Don't repeat yourself unnecessarily.

Criteria

Advances a clear and convincing line of argument	2.0 pts
Outcome Backs conclusions with evidence	2.0 pts
Presents original ideas	2.0 pts
Demonstrates mastery of ethical dimensions of the information issue	2.0 pts
Uses correct grammar and punctuation	1.0 pts
Writes in clear, concise sentences	1.0 pts
Deploys appropriate professional vocabulary	1.0 pts
Uses citations effectively	
Demonstrates an ability to weigh different kinds of evidence and properly cites evidence	2.0 pts
Cites relevant scholarly sources from the syllabus	1.0 pts
Paper cites relevant peer-reviewed research that is not in the syllabus.	1.0 pts