

Guidelines for Paper 1

Choose **one** of the options below to write a paper on **one** of the following readings in Unit 1 and 2: Cronon, Guha, hooks, Bunch, Goodpaster, Sebo, Diamond, Norcross, Adams, and Rolston.

Option 1: Puzzlement

Choose **one** key claim made by the author that you find genuinely puzzling. You will:

- (1) Explain why you find this claim genuinely puzzling;
- (2) Explain why it is important to try to resolve or clarify this puzzlement for the author's project;
- (3) Provide **one** plausible interpretation of this claim, and explain why you find it plausible;
- (4) Provide **one** strong reason that someone (including you) might find this interpretation unsatisfactory;
- (5) (*Optional*—if you have space left) Provide a brief reply to your interlocutor's objection in (4).

Option 2: Critical Evaluation

Choose **one** argument made by the author. You will:

- (1) Explain the author's argument in your own words;
 - (2) Take an evaluative stance on the author's argument and provide **maximum two** strong reasons in defense of your evaluation;
 - (3) Consider **one** strong reason that someone might disagree with your evaluation in (2);
 - (4) Provide **one** response that directly addresses your interlocutor's objection raised in (3) in defense of your evaluation in (2);
 - (5) (*Optional*—if you have space left) Briefly assess your reply in (4). To what extent was it successful in alleviating the objection raised in (3)?
-

Expectation for Outline

Outline should include a (tentative) plan for **what** you're going to say and **how** you're going to argue for it in your paper. It should include your (tentative) response to the **first three** parts of the prompt breakdown—(1) through (3).

Feel free to also include your response to (4) or (5), but it's not required.

Due Dates:

Outline is due at **11:59 pm, Monday, February 12**. (While you can use your “late days,” failing to submit your outline before the paper writing workshop will deduct points from your outline grade.)

Paper 1 is due at **11:59 pm, Friday, February 23**. (Feel free to use your “late days”!)

Page Limit:

Outline should be roughly **1 double-spaced page**; it is **not** subject to the Page Limit Policy.

Paper 1 itself is **2-3 double-spaced pages** in length, **not** including bibliography; it is **strictly** subject to the Page Limit Policy. As it states on the Course Syllabus, I will dock 1/3 of a letter grade (3 points) for each half of a page you are over or under the required page range.

How to Submit:

Paper 1 and **Outline** will be graded anonymously. You will upload an anonymized file to the corresponding Assignment tabs on Canvas in a **Word (.docx)** format.

You should put your 9-digit UID number (**just** the number—drop the “G”) in **both** the body of your paper **and** in the file name. Your file name must be your UID number (e.g., 000000000 or 000000000 Paper 1).

Do not put any identifying information. Use a **standardized font** (Times New Roman, 12 ft, double-spaced), for a distinctive style might threaten the anonymity of your submission. As it states on the Course Syllabus, I will dock 1/3 of a letter grade (3 points) for a submission that either contains identifying information or has a non-standardized formatting.

Grading for Outline

Outline will be graded based on successful completion. You will get **25%** for directly addressing each required part of the prompt breakdown (1) through (3). You will get **25%** for presenting your outline and giving feedback to your peers' outlines at the in-class Paper Writing Workshop 1.

For instance, given that you fully participated in the Paper Writing Workshop 1, if your outline directly responds to all three parts of the prompt breakdown (1) through (3), you will receive 100.

Given that you fully participated in the Paper Writing Workshop 1, if your outline fails to directly respond to one part of the prompt breakdown (1) through (3), while still directly responding to the two remaining parts, you will receive 75.

Given that you fully participated in the Paper Writing Workshop 1, if your outline fails to directly respond to two or more parts of the prompt breakdown (1) through (3), you will receive 50.

Your outline submission and participation in the Paper Writing Workshop 1 is together worth **1%** of your overall grade. (If you cannot attend the workshop, you can choose to do a make-up assignment of providing written reviews for your peers' outlines.)

Grading for Paper 1

Paper 1 will be graded based on the following five criteria:

- **Organization:**
 - Your paper should advance a clear thesis; it should be clear to the reader what you are arguing for in your paper.
 - It should be well-organized, and its structure should be apparent to the reader.
 - It should directly address all four required parts of the given prompt without digressions or irrelevancies; there should be an easy-to-follow line of thought throughout the paper.
- **Understanding:**
 - Your paper should demonstrate a strong command and charitable understanding of the text, arguments, and positions under discussion.
 - Where necessary, it should provide proper and efficient textual evidence in support of your understanding of the text.
- **Argument:**

- Your paper should contain your own thoughtful and original perspectives, instead of simply reciting the thoughts of others raised in class or in the readings.
 - It should provide reasoned arguments in support of your claims, instead of stating controversial claims without providing support.
 - It should make proper qualifications for your claims and avoid unnecessarily strong or exaggerated claims.

 - **Engagement with Objection:**
 - Your paper should develop a relevant and important objection that can potentially undermine your thesis/claim, instead of considering one that is obviously wrong.
 - **For Option 2:** Instead of simply stating where you disagree with the objector, you should directly engage with the objection and explain how your response directly addresses the worry posed by the objector.

 - **Writing:**
 - Your paper should be clear and grammatical. It should avoid vague, ungrammatical, or overly colloquial language. It should explain any jargon or complicated concepts.
-

Honor System

As with any assignment, it is subject to Georgetown's Honor System. You're **not** expected to use any outside resources other than the assigned readings. If you do make use of **any** sources outside the assigned readings, make sure to cite them in a way that clearly identifies the sources in question.

Just as you are bound by the Honor Pledge, I am bound by it to report **any** suspected cases of academic dishonesty to the Honor Council. If any part of this guideline is unclear, please ask for a clarification immediately.

Note on AI tools: **Do not** use ChatGPT or other generative AI tools at any stage of producing this paper. In addition to their tendency to provide false, biased, and overall low-quality answers, these tools generate outputs from a variety of sources, including the writings of other people, without citing the original sources. Using these tools to generate ideas for your paper or to write it, you are taking someone else's ideas or writings without giving them proper credit (i.e., committing plagiarism). Submitting ideas or texts generated by these AI tools as your own will be considered a violation of academic integrity and result in receiving a grade of zero in this assignment.

Guidelines for Paper 2

Choose **one** of the following options to write Paper 2. You **can** choose the same option that you've chosen for Paper 1, but you **cannot** choose the same reading on which you've written Paper 1.

Option 1: Puzzlement

Choose **one** key claim made by the author that you find genuinely puzzling. You will:

- (1) Explain the author's claim, and explain why you find this claim genuinely puzzling (i.e., open to more than one plausible interpretation);
- (2) Explain why it is important to try to resolve or clarify this puzzlement for the author's project;
- (3) Provide **one** plausible interpretation of this claim, and explain why you find it plausible;
- (4) Provide **one** strong reason that someone (including you) might find this interpretation unsatisfactory;
- (5) Provide a response to your interlocutor's objection in (4) in defense of your proposed interpretation in (3). (Feel free to qualify your defense of your proposed interpretation.)

Option 2: Critical Evaluation

Choose **one** key argument made by the author. You will:

- (1) Explain the author's argument in your own words;
- (2) Take an evaluative stance on the author's argument and provide **maximum two** strong reasons in defense of your evaluation;
- (3) Consider **one** strong reason that someone might disagree with your evaluation in (2);
- (4) Provide **one** response that directly addresses your interlocutor's objection raised in (3) in defense of your evaluation in (2);
- (5) Evaluate your response provided in (4). To what extent were you successful in alleviating the concern/problem raised by your interlocutor in (3)?

Option 3: Application

Apply **one** key concept, claim, or argument from **one** of the readings to address an ethically pressing and complex contemporary issue or question (see the note in the following page). You will:

- (1) Explain this concept, claim, or argument in your own words;
- (2) Describe **one** ethically pressing and complex contemporary environmental issue or question, and explain why this issue or question is pressing (i.e., it is important to promptly address it) and why it is complex (i.e., why there isn't a straightforward solution or an answer);
- (3) Explain how the concept, claim, or argument explained in (1) can help navigate the complexities of the issue or question described in (2);
- (4) Discuss **one** limitation or challenge in applying this concept, claim, or argument to navigate the complexities of this issue or question;
- (5) Explain why, despite this limitation or challenge discussed in (4), this concept, claim, or argument might still be useful in addressing this issue or question. (Feel free to qualify this claim as much as you want.)

Option 4: Connection

Draw what you find to be a relevant and significant connection between a key claim or argument in **one** of the readings with a key claim or argument in **another** reading. You will:

- (1) Explain **one** key claim or argument from the first reading in your own words;
- (2) Explain **one** key claim or argument from the second reading in your own words;
- (3) Draw a connection between the two claims or arguments described in (1) and (2), and explain how this connection sheds light on a key claim or argument on **one** of these readings by comparison with another (for instance, this connection helps us better understand the issue at stake, or better understand, appreciate, or critically evaluate this claim or argument);
- (4) Discuss **one** limitation or challenge of drawing this connection between these claims or arguments;
- (5) Explain why, despite this limitation or challenge discussed in (4), drawing this connection might still be useful (again, for instance, in understanding the issue at stake, or understanding, appreciating, or evaluating at least one of these claims or arguments).

Note on Option 3: Application

Your description of a pressing and complex contemporary ethical issue or a question should be based on *reliable and reputable sources*—not personal opinions, personal blogs, or social media. Limit yourself to *strictly necessary and relevant* information about the topic, and focus on evaluating how a key concept or an argument from the reading helps to navigate this issue or question.

Expectation for Outline

Outline should include a (tentative) plan for **what** you're going to say and **how** you're going to argue for it in your paper. For any of these options, it should include your (tentative) response to the **first three** parts of the prompt breakdown—(1) through (3).

Feel free to also include your response to (4) or (5), but it's **not** required.

Due Dates:

Outline is due at **11:59 pm, Wednesday, March 20**. (While you may use your “late days,” failing to submit your outline before the paper writing workshop will deduct points from your outline grade.)

Paper 1 is due at **11:59 pm, Friday, April 5**. (Feel free to use your “late days”!)

Page Limit:

Outline should be roughly **1 double-spaced page**; it is **not** subject to the Page Limit Policy.

Paper 2 itself is **4-5 double-spaced pages** in length, **not** including bibliography; it is **strictly** subject to the Page Limit Policy. As it states on the Course Syllabus, I will dock 1/3 of a letter grade (3 points) for each half of a page you are over or under the required page range.

How to Submit:

Paper 2 and **Outline** will be graded anonymously. You will upload an anonymized file to the corresponding Assignment tabs on Canvas in a **Word (.docx)** format.

You should put your 9-digit UID number (**just** the number—drop the “G”) in **both** the body of your paper **and** in the file name. Your file name must be your UID number (e.g., 000000000 or 000000000 Paper 1).

Do not put any identifying information. Use a **standardized font** (Times New Roman, 12 ft, double-spaced), for a distinctive style might threaten the anonymity of your submission. As it states on the Course Syllabus, I will dock 1/3 of a letter grade (3 points) for a submission that either contains identifying information or has a non-standardized formatting.

Grading for Outline

Outline will be graded based on successful completion. You will get **25%** for directly addressing each required part of the prompt breakdown (1) through (3). You will get **25%** for presenting your outline and giving feedback to your peers’ outlines at the in-class Paper Writing Workshop 2.

For instance, if you fully participated in the Paper Writing Workshop 2 and your outline directly responds to all three parts of the prompt breakdown (1) through (3), you will receive 100. If you fully participated in the Paper Writing Workshop 2 but if your outline fails to directly respond to one part of the prompt breakdown (1) through (3), you will receive 75.

Your outline submission and participation in the Paper Writing Workshop 2 is together worth **1%** of your overall grade. (If you cannot attend the workshop, you can choose to do a make-up assignment of providing written reviews for your peers’ outlines.)

Grading for Paper 2

Paper 2 will be graded based on the following five criteria.

- **Organization:**
 - Your paper should advance a clear thesis; it should be clear to the reader what you are arguing for in your paper.
 - It should be well-organized, and its structure should be apparent to the reader.
 - It should directly address **all five** required parts of the given prompt without digressions or irrelevancies; there should be an easy-to-follow line of thought throughout the paper.

- **Understanding:**
 - Your paper should demonstrate a strong command and charitable understanding of the text, arguments, and positions under discussion.

- Where necessary, it should provide proper and efficient textual evidence in support of your understanding of the text.
- **Argument:**
 - Your paper should contain your own thoughtful and original perspectives, instead of simply reciting the thoughts of others raised in class or in the readings.
 - It should provide reasoned arguments in support of your claims, instead of stating controversial claims without providing support.
 - It should make proper qualifications for your claims and avoid unnecessarily strong or exaggerated claims.
- **Engagement with Objection:**
 - Your paper should develop a relevant and important objection that can potentially undermine your thesis/claim, instead of considering one that is obviously wrong.
 - Instead of simply stating where you disagree with the objector, you should directly engage with the objection and explain how your response directly addresses the worry posed by the objector.
- **Writing:**
 - Your paper should be clear and grammatical. It should avoid vague, ungrammatical, or overly colloquial language. It should explain any jargon or complicated concepts.

Honor System

As with any assignment, it is subject to Georgetown's Honor System. You're **not** expected to use any outside resources other than the assigned readings. If you do make use of **any** sources outside the assigned readings, make sure to cite them in a way that clearly identifies the sources in question.

Just as you are bound by the Honor Pledge, I am bound by it to report **any** suspected cases of academic dishonesty to the Honor Council. If any part of this guideline is unclear, please ask for a clarification immediately.

Note on AI tools: **Do not** use ChatGPT or other generative AI tools at any stage of producing this paper. In addition to their tendency to provide false, biased, and overall low-quality answers, these tools generate outputs from a variety of sources, including the writings of other people, without citing the original sources. Using these tools to generate ideas for your paper or to write it, you are taking someone else's ideas or writings without giving them proper credit (i.e., committing plagiarism). Submitting ideas or texts generated by these AI tools as your own will be considered a violation of academic integrity and result in receiving a grade of zero in this assignment.

Guidelines for Reading Reactions

On a week where there is a new reading, you will submit a brief reaction (roughly 150-200 words) to **one** of the readings assigned for either Tuesday's or Thursday's class.

How to Write:

Your reaction will: (i) briefly explain **one** of the main ideas, concepts, claims, or arguments in the reading (do not summarize the whole article!) and (ii) present a question or a comment about it.

For instance, for (ii), you can:

- pose a **clarificatory question** and explain why such clarification might be helpful for understanding/evaluating the idea/concept/claim/argument;
- suggest an **interpretation** of the idea/concept/claim/argument and explain why your interpretation might be plausible;
- consider an **objection** or a **counterexample** to the claim/argument and explain how it might challenge it;
- offer an **aiding argument** or an **example** that will strengthen the claim/argument and explain how it might help it; or
- add a question or a comment that is not meant to achieve these particular goals, but you think is still **directly responding** to the reading and explain why you think it is relevant.

How to Submit:

You will submit your reactions by directly messaging me on Canvas Inbox. Your subject line should be: RR Last Name Class Date (e.g. RR Jang 1/11). Please include your reaction in the body of your message, not as an attachment.

Due Dates:

Reading reactions are due at **5:00 pm** the day before the class on which we will discuss the reading. For instance, if you are writing a reaction to a Tuesday's reading, your reaction is due at 5:00 pm on Monday. If you are writing a reaction to a Thursday's reading, it is due at 5:00 pm on Wednesday.

Grading:

Each reading reaction will be graded *pass/fail*. You will *pass* the reading reaction if it clearly shows that you have carefully done the reading and made a serious attempt to engage with it. You will *fail* the reading reaction if it does not clearly show this attempt. Each passed reading reaction will be worth **1%** of your grade.

You **cannot** use "late days" or ask for an extension for this assignment, as the whole point of this assignment is to get your thoughts on a reading before class discussion. You may ask for alternative make-up assignments in extenuating circumstances.

Introduction to Environmental Ethics: Guidelines for Final Project

“Bridging the Gap between Ethics and Science: Creating an Embedded Ethics Module for an Environmental Science and Sustainability Course”

Grade: 30% (10% Presentation + 20% Report)

Dates:

Project Workshop #1	Tuesday, April 2
Project Workshop #2	Tuesday, April 9
Check-in Meeting <u>Due</u>	Friday, April 19
Project Workshop #3	Tuesday, April 23
Presentation Day	Thursday, April 25
Written Report <u>Due</u>	Friday, May 3

Overview:

In our ongoing effort to deepen the connection between the two disciplines, you will make a proposal for integrating ethical and scientific discourse within a textbook module designed for an environmental science course. The goal is to construct a shared resource for an interdisciplinary audience—primarily educators, students, scholars of various backgrounds, including philosophy, design, and science—and to foster a more holistic, integrated conversation on this topic. In your presentation and report, you will articulate *what* you’re proposing to include in this interdisciplinary conversation, *how* you’re proposing to make a connection between ethics and science, as well as *why* you think this is an important connection to be made.

Poster Presentation

On Thursday, April 25, you will give a poster presentation of your final project. The goal is for you to solicit feedback from guest critics from different disciplines (philosophy, design, and science), including faculty members from the Ethics Lab and the Earth Commons Institute and your classmates. You will incorporate the feedback that you received on this day into your written report.

Each group will participate in two rounds of presentation. Each round is **roughly 12 minutes**. You will give a short presentation of your proposal (**roughly 4 minutes**) and engage in a Q&A and discussion with your audience for the remaining time (**roughly 8 minutes**). In the first round, two

members of the group will take a lead in presentation, and other two members should take diligent notes of feedback exchange and conversation. In the second round, you will switch the roles. (For a group with five members, feel free to assign three members to take a lead in either the first round or the second round.)

Each group will have one black board (48”W x 9”H or 4’ x 8’) for arranging their slides for the poster presentation. There **isn’t** a fixed format for how you design individual slides or how you arrange your slides on the board. There also **isn’t** a limit to the number of slides you may put on the board. While you should have a clear idea of which slides you’ll focus on during your 4-minute presentation, you can freely add slides with images, graphs, or quotes on the board for you to refer to during the QnA or simply for reference.

Prompts:

Your presentation should:

- Briefly explain the module (What is it about? What are the key scientific ideas/topics or take-aways in the module?);
- Identify the two topics that you want to focus on;
 - Thesis: These are the two strands/themes/topics for ethical discourse and conversation that we propose to infuse into this module;
- Introduce the key questions/issues, concepts, and stakeholder narratives that you want to include in each of your proposed topics.
 - For the stakeholder narratives, you’ll want to identify specific individuals/groups whom you think should be involved in the conversation and add their first-person voice (e.g., quotes or summaries of their perspectives/experiences).

Expectations:

It should be clear from your presentation and slides **what** you’re proposing to include (i.e., two topics for discussion, as well as the questions/issues, concepts, and narratives under each topic), and **how** your proposal is connected to the existing content from the module—for instance, how it *extends, adds new components, or reframes/modifies* the existing discussion in the module.

While you need not contain explicit answers to this question in your presentation or your slides, you should also be ready to answer **why** you want to make this proposal—in other words, *why* you think your proposed topics are important topics for ethical discourse in connection with this module, as well as *why* your proposed questions/issues, concepts, and narratives are relevant and important.

Tips:

- In your slides, your audience should be able to easily distinguish (i) the parts you pulled from the module and (ii) your own additions/contributions;
- Clearly highlight (e.g., bold or color) the specific parts of the slides you want to focus on during the presentation & you want the audience to focus on during the QnA;

- It might be helpful to have an introduction slide where you briefly map out or explain the connection between your topic and your suggestions for the questions, issues, concepts, and narratives;
- Here are the [sample slides & presentation layouts](#). Let me emphasize again that these are just examples—there isn't a fixed format or a template for your layout.

QnA:

Regarding your two topics and the suggestions for questions, issues, concepts, and narratives under each topic, you should be ready to answer the questions regarding **what**, **how**, and **why**:

- **What** are you proposing?
- **How** is your proposal connected to the existing content and key take-aways in the module?
- **Why** are you proposing this? Why is your proposal relevant and important?

Feel free to add slides where you directly add answers to some of these questions.

Grading:

Your poster presentation, including all steps for preparation, is worth **10%** of your course grade (**1/3** of the final project grade). While this is a group work, all steps will be graded *individually*.

Here is a breakdown:

Homework 1 (Module Annotation)	1%
Homework 2 (Draft slides)	1%
Participation / Contribution	3%
Poster Presentation	5%

Note on Participation/Contribution:

After the presentation day on Thursday, April 25, you will individually write a *contribution page* (roughly 1-2 paragraphs) identifying and explaining your contribution to this project until this day, including (i) your attendance/participation in the three in-class project workshops, check-in meeting(s) with the instructor, and any group meetings outside the class, and (ii) your contribution to the slides (for instance, ones that you primarily drafted, helped editing, and so on—if your group made all slides together, feel free to say so!).

Note on Poster Presentation:

This will include the completion of your poster for the presentation day as well as your diligent participation in both rounds of presentation and the QnA.

Introduction to Environmental Ethics: Guidelines for Final Project

“Bridging the Gap between Ethics and Science: Creating an Embedded Ethics Module for an Environmental Science and Sustainability Course”

Grade: 30% (10% Poster Presentation + 20% Written Report)

Dates:

Project Workshop #1	Tuesday, April 2
Project Workshop #2	Tuesday, April 9
Check-in Meeting <u>Due</u>	Friday, April 19
Project Workshop #3	Tuesday, April 23
Presentation Day	Thursday, April 25
<u>Written Report Due</u>	Friday, May 3

Project Overview:

In our ongoing effort to deepen the connection between the two disciplines, you will make a proposal for integrating ethical and scientific discourse within a textbook module designed for an environmental science course. The goal is to construct a shared resource for an interdisciplinary audience—primarily educators, students, scholars of various backgrounds, including philosophy, design, and science—and to foster a more holistic, integrated conversation on this topic. In your presentation and report, you will articulate *what* you’re proposing to include in this interdisciplinary conversation, *how* you’re proposing to make a connection between ethics and science, as well as *why* you think this is an important connection to be made.

Written Report

In addition to the poster presentation, you will submit an individual written report. Your report is worth **20%** of your course grade (**2/3** of the final project grade) and due **Friday, May 3**. A modest (maximum 48 hours) extension is available upon request made *at least 24 hours* before the due date.

Prompts:

You may use this [template](#) to directly add responses to each part of the prompt below. (If you decide not to use this template, make sure to directly respond to **all** parts of the prompt below.)

I have a suggested length for each part of the prompt below, but it's a mere suggestion, not a rigid requirement. I strongly encourage you to write *at least 3.5 pages* for (2) and (3), combined.

- (1) **Summary** (roughly 1 paragraph): Give a brief summary / overview of your proposal in this report. I encourage you to write this section last.
- (2) **Module Introduction** (roughly 1-2 paragraph): Briefly tell us about your module from the science textbook. What is this module about? What are the key scientific ideas/topics, objectives, or take-aways from this module?
- (3) **Proposal for Topic 1** (roughly 2 pages): Explain your proposal for the **first** topic, answering *what, how, and why*.
 - (a) **What:**
 - (i) Introduce and explain the first **topic** of your choice;
 - (ii) Introduce and explain at least one **ethical or normative question or issue** that you want to include in an integrated ethical and scientific discourse on this topic;
 - (iii) Introduce and explain at least one **ethical or normative concept** that you want to include in an integrated ethical and scientific discourse on this topic;
 - (iv) Introduce and explain at least one **stakeholder narrative** that you want to include in an integrated ethical and scientific discourse on this topic;
 - Make it extra clear *how* these questions/issues, concepts, and narratives fall under the topic of your choice. Use explicit signposting, where needed, to explain the connection.
 - Feel free to include the ones you did not include in your group poster presentation (e.g., ones from your individual module annotation).
 - (b) **How:**
 - (i) Explain *how* this topic (and the questions/issues, concepts, and narratives under this topic) is **connected to** the existing content from the module;
 - Make it extra clear *whether* and *how* your proposal aims to **extend, reframe, or add new components to** the existing content.
 - (c) **Why:**
 - (i) Explain *why* you think drawing this connection in a way you suggested (i.e., *what* you want to include, and *how* you want to connect what you want to

include with the existing content from the module) will allow us to have an integrated ethical and scientific discourse on this topic.

- (4) **Proposal for Topic 2** (roughly 2 pages): Explain your proposal for the **second** topic, answering *what*, *how*, and *why*—see the expectations for these three questions above.
- (5) **Responses to Feedback** (roughly 1 page): Identify **two** feedback from the guest critics you think are most important / helpful, and explain how you might incorporate their feedback into your proposal—i.e., your responses to (3) and (4).
- (6) **Connection** (roughly 1-2 paragraphs): Identify **one** observation you had about your peer group(s)'s presentation (e.g., about *what* they want to include, *how* they want to make a connection, or *why* they think it is relevant / important) that influenced the way you think about your own proposal, and explain how it influenced your way of thinking.
- (7) **Reflection** (roughly 1-2 paragraphs): Briefly reflect on the value of an integrated ethical and scientific dialogue enabled by your proposal and the potential challenges you have faced in the process of crafting this proposal.
- (8) **Reference**: Cite **any and all** sources you've used in this report. Use any citation style, so long as you use them consistently.

Logistics

Length:

Your report should be **1800 (+/- 200) words** in length, **not** including the reference page. I will dock 1/3 of a letter grade (3 points) for every 150 words you are over or under the word count limit.

Format:

Make sure your report has a standard format (12 fonts, double-spaced, Times New Roman). Put your GUID in the file name

Your report will be *anonymously* graded. **Do not** put any identifying information. Use a **standardized format** (Times New Roman, 12 ft, double-spaced), for a distinctive style might threaten the anonymity of your submission. Put your 9-digit UID number (**just** the number—drop the “G”) in **both** the body of your paper **and** in the file name.

I will dock 1/3 of a letter grade (3 points) for a submission that either contains identifying information or has a non-standardized formatting.

Grading

Your written report will be graded based on the following six criteria.

- **Completeness:**
 - Your report should directly and clearly address **all** parts of the prompt above.
- **Organization:**
 - Your report should include a **summary** in the beginning, including a thesis statement that clearly outlines the two topics in your proposal and a brief overview;
 - It should be **well-organized**, and its structure should be apparent to the reader;
 - There should be an **easy-to-follow-line of thought** throughout your report;
 - For instance, it should be clear (i) *how* each part of your proposal (e.g., questions/issues, concepts, or narratives) is tied to the two topics you presented in the summary, (ii) *how* your proposal is connected with the existing content in the module, and (iii) *how* it aims to extend, reframes, or add new components to this content in the module;
 - Use explicit and sufficient **signposting** throughout your report.
- **Understanding:**
 - Your report should **effectively make use of** the text (i.e., readings), concepts, ideas, arguments, or issues, and positions, discussed in class;
 - It should demonstrate a **clear and charitable understanding** of the text, concepts, ideas, arguments, issues, and positions under discussion;
 - Where necessary, it should provide **proper and efficient textual evidence** (e.g., quotations or citations) in support of your understanding of the text.
- **Originality and Persuasiveness of Proposal:**
 - Your report should contain your own **thoughtful and original ideas**, instead of simply reciting what was discussed in class or in the readings;
 - It should **persuasively explain *what, how, and why* questions** above—*what* you want to include, *how* you want to connect it with the existing content in the module, as well as *why* you think it is relevant and important;
 - Where applicable, it should make **properly qualified claims** and avoid unnecessarily strong or exaggerated claims without providing support.
- **Responses to Feedback:**

- Your report should address **relevant and important feedback** from the guest critics. It should be clearly explained *what* those feedback are, *why* they are relevant and important, and *how* you're responding to or integrating them into your proposal.
 - **Writing:**
 - Your report should be **clear and grammatical**. It should avoid vague, ungrammatical, or overly colloquial language.
 - It should explain any jargon or complicated concepts (or avoid using them).
-

Honor System

As with any assignment, it is subject to Georgetown's Honor System. If you make use of any sources outside the assigned readings, make sure to cite them in a way that clearly identifies the sources in question.

Just as you are bound by the Honor Pledge, I am bound by it to report **any** suspected cases of academic dishonesty to the Honor Council. If any part of this guideline is unclear, please ask for a clarification immediately.

Note on Plagiarism: This report is an **individual** assignment. **Do not** write this report together with your groupmates or other classmates. If you want to exchange ideas with your group, share them **only** in bullet points—**do not** share full sentences, paragraphs, or a whole draft of your report. If there is an uncanny resemblance between your report and the submissions of your peer(s), I may have reason to consider it as a breach of this expectation and a violation of academic integrity.

Note on AI tools: **Do not** use ChatGPT or other generative AI tools at any stage of producing this report. In addition to their tendency to provide false, biased, and overall low-quality answers, these tools generate outputs from a variety of sources, including the writings of other people, without citing the original sources. Using these tools to generate ideas for your report or to write it, you are taking someone else's ideas or writings without giving them proper credit (i.e., committing plagiarism). Submitting ideas or texts generated by these AI tools as your own will be considered a violation of academic integrity.