IMT 550 A: Policy and Ethics in Information Management
Winter 2017
Instructor: Megan Finn, megfinn@uw.edu
TA: Beth Patin, bethp@uw.edu
Grader: Divya Kothari, kotharid@uw.edu.

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 Schedule

Week 1: Ethics, Technology and Society

    Required Readings:

        Cech, E.A (2014). Culture of disengagement in the engineering education? *Science, Technology &Human Values, 39(1):* 42-72.

        ACM Code of Ethics and Professional Conduct

        ACM/IEEE-CS Software Engineering Code of Ethics and Professional Practice

        IEEE Code of Ethics

        ALA Code of Ethics

        Data Science Association Code of Professional Conduct

        Ensmenger, N (2007). Computers as Ethical Artifacts *IIE Annals of the History of Computing, 29(3),* 87-88.

        Gillespie, T. (2007). Wired Shut. Chapter 3: The speed bump. *In Wired shut: Copyright and the shape of digital culture (pp. 66-103)*. Cambridge, MA: The MIT Press.

    Lecture Referenced Articles:

        Kramer, A.D.I, Guillory, J. E., & Hancock, J. T. (2014). Experimental evidence of massive-scale emotional contagion through social networks. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences of the United States of America, 111(24),* 8788-8790.

Verma, I. M. (2014). Editorial Expression of Concern: Experimental evidence of massive-scale emotional contagion through social networks. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences of the United States of America, 111(29)*, 10779.

Optional Readings:

Katie Shilton (2015) "Anticipatory ethics for a future Internet: Analyzing values during the design of an Internet infrastructure" *Science and Engineering Ethics*

Grimmelmann, J. (2005). Regulation by Software. *Yale Law Journal*, 1719–58.

Braman, Sandra. 2011. Defining Information Policy. *Journal of Information Policy* 1: 1–5

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

Shilton, K. (2013) "Values Levers: Building Ethics Into Design," *Science, Technology & Human Values* 38(3): 374-397.

Week 2: Information issues and the US legal context

Required Readings:

U.S. Declaration of Independence.

Allen, D. S. (2014). Chapters 11-13. *In Our Declaration: a reading of the Declaration of Independence in defense of equality* (pp. 89–104). New York: Liveright Publishing Corporation.

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

Bauer, J. M., & Obar, J. A. (2014). Reconciling political and economic goals in the net neutrality debate. *The Information Society: An International Journal, 30(1),* 1–19. doi:10.1080/01972243.2013.856362

Carbone, C. E. (2015). To be or not to be forgotten: Balancing the right to know with the right to privacy in the digital age. *Virginia Journal of Social Policy & the Law, 22(3)*, 525–560.

Optional Readings:

Ambrose, M. L., & Ausloos, J. (2013). The Right to Be Forgotten Across the Pond. *Journal of Information Policy, 3*, 1–23. doi:10.5325/jinfopoli.3.2013.0001

Rosen, J. (2012). The right to be forgotten. *Stanford Law Review, 64(88)*, 88–92.

Report on RTBF requests: Google.

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

Google Transparency Report. European privacy requests for search removals.

Google Spain v AEPD and Mario Costeja González court case:

- Official court documents
- Advocate General's Opinion (Links to an external site.). (2013, June 25). [press release].
- Judgement in Case C-131/12 Google Spain SL, Google Inc. v Agencia Española de Protección de Datos, Mario Costeja González. (2014, May 13). [press release].
- European Commission Directorate-General for Justice and Consumers. (2014). *Factsheet on the "Right to be Forgotten" ruling (C-131/12).*
- Goldman, E. (2014, August 21). Primer on European Union's Right To Be Forgotten. [blog post].

McChesney,R. W. (2013). The Internet and Capitalism I: Where Dinosaurs Roam? In Digital Disconnect: *How Capitalism is Turning the Internet Against Democracy (pp. 96–129)*. New York: The New Press.

Daniels, J., & Gray, M. L. (2014). *Vision for Inclusion: An LGBT Broadband Future*. LGBT Technology Partnership & Institute.

Week 3: Privacy and Surveillance

Required Readings:

U.S. Constitution, amend. IV.

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

Skim: Kumaraguru, P., & Cranor, L. (2006). Privacy in India: Attitudes and Awareness. In Privacy Enhancing Technologies: 5th International Workshop, Revised Selected Papers (pp. 243–58). Berlin: Springer.

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

Moore, A. (2010). Chapter 3: The value of privacy. In Privacy rights: Moral and legal foundations. University Park, PA: Pennsylvania State University Press.

Solove, D. J. (2013). Privacy self-management and the consent dilemma. Harvard Law Review, 126, 1880–1903.

Listen/watch one Intelligence Squared debate:

- Mass Collection of US Phone Records Violates the Fourth Amendment. (2014, October 7). Intelligence Squared U.S.
- Snowden was Justified. (2014, February 13). Intelligence Squared U.S.
- Spy On Me, I'd Rather Be Safe. (2013, November 20). Intelligence Squared U.S.
- The U.S. Should Adopt the "Right to Be Forgotten" Online. (2015, March 11). Intelligence Squared U.S.

Optional Readings:

Shilton, K., & Greene, D. (2016). Because privacy: Defining and legitimating privacy in iOS development. *In iConference 2016 Proceedings. iSchools.*

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

Cohen, Julie E. "What Privacy Is for." *Harvard Law Review* 126 (2012): 1904–33.

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

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

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

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

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

Kirk, M. (2014). United States of Secrets. *FRONTLINE*.

Crump, C. (2013). *You are being tracked: How license plate readers are being used to record Americans' movements*. New York: American Civil Liberties Union.

Stanley, J. (2015). *Police body-mounted cameras: With right policies in place, a win for all* (version 2.0). New York: American Civil Liberties Union.

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

Zang, J., Dummit, K., Graves, J., Lisker, P., & Sweeney, L. (2015). Who knows what about me? A survey of behind the scenes personal data sharing to third parties by mobile app. *Technology Science, 2015103001*.

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

Week 4: Freedom of speech

Required Readings:

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. (2014). Chapter 1: Introduction. In *Hate crimes in cyberspace*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

Balkin,J. M. (2004). Digital speech and democratic culture: A theory of freedom of expression for the information society*. New York University Law Review, 79(1)*, 1–58.

Optional Readings

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

Morozov,E. (2013). Chapter 3: So open it hurts. In *To save everything, click here: The folly of technological solutionism* (pp. 63–99). New York: PublicAffairs.

Cohen, Julie E. "Zombie First Amendment, The." *Wm. & Mary L. Rev. 56* (2014): 1119.

Marwick, Alice E., and Ross W. Miller. "Online Harassment, Defamation, and Hateful Speech: A Primer of the Legal Landscape." *Fordham Center on Law and Information Policy Reports. Fordham Center on Law and Information Policy*, June 10, 2014. http://papers.ssrn.com/sol3/papers.cfm?abstract_id=2447904.

Lessig, L. (2006). Chapters 12: *Free Speech. In Co*de (Version 2.0, pp. 233-275). New York: Basic Books.

Grimmelmann, J. (2013). *Speech Engines (University of Maryland Legal Studies Research Paper No. 2014-11)*. University of Maryland School of Law.

Citron, D. K. (2010). Civil rights in our Information Age. In S. Levmore & M. C. Nussbaum (Eds.), *The Offensive Internet* (pp. 31–49). Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

Week 5: Intellectual Property

Required Readings:

Healy, K. (2002). Digital technology and cultural goods. *Journal of Political Philosophy*, 10(4), 478–500.

Hesse, C. (2002). The rise of intellectual property, 700 B.C.-A.D. 2000: An idea in the balance. *Dædalus*, 131(2), 26–45.

Moore, A., & Himma, K. E. (2014). Intellectual Property. In E. N. Zalta (Ed.), *The Stanford Encyclopedia of Philosophy (Winter 2014 edition).*

Optional Readings

GNU. (2007). General Public License 3.0.

Lessig, L. (2004). Chapter 10: "Property." In *Free culture : How big media uses technology and the law to lock down culture and control creativity* (pp. 116–173). New York: Penguin Press.

Broussard, S. L. (2007). The copyleft movement: Creative Commons licensing. In *Communication Research Trends, 26(3)*, 3–14.

Johns, A. (2009). Piracy: *The intellectual property wars from Gutenberg to Gates*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Litwak, M. (2013, March 12). Sherlock Holmes and the Case of the Public Domain. *Independent Filmmaker Project blog*.

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

Brown, I., & Marsden, C. T. (2013). Introduction & Chapter 4. In *Regulating Code: Good Governance and Better Regulation in the Information Age* (pp. ix–xix, 69–91). Cambridge, MA: The MIT Press

U.S. Department of Commerce Internet Policy Task Force. (2016*). White paper on remixes, first sale, and statutory damages: Copyright policy, creativity, and innovation in the digital economy*. Washington, D.C.

Breznitz, D., & Murphree, M. (2016). What the U.S. should be doing to protect intellectual property. *Harvard Business Review*.

Burk, Dan L., and Mark A. Lemley. The Patent Crisis and How the Courts Can Solve It. Chicago: *University of Chicago Press*, 2009.

Week 6: Intellectual Property

Required Readings:

Ess, C. (2009). Chapter 6: Digital Media Ethics: Overview, Frameworks, Resources. In *Digital Media Ethics* (pp. 167-225). Cambridge, UK: Polity Press.

Nussbaum, M. C. (2011). Chapter 2: The central capabilities. In *Creating capabilities* (pp. 17-45). Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

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

Tavani, H. (2011). Chapter 2. In *Ethics and technology: Controversies, questions, and strategies for ethical computing* (3rd ed., pp. 34-74). Boston: John Wiley and Sons.

Watch: Horowitz, D. (2011). We need a "moral operating system." *TEDxSiliconValley.*

Optional Readings:

Nussbaum, M. C. (2011). Chapter 3: A necessary counter-theory. window In Creating capabilities (pp. 46-68). Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

Tavani, H. (2011). Chapter 1 In *Ethics and technology: Controversies, questions, and strategies for ethical computing* (3rd ed., pp. 1-74). Boston: John Wiley and Sons.

Bilimoria, Purusottama. (1991) Indian Ethics. In A Companion to Ethics, edited by Peter Singer, 43–57. Oxford, UK: Blackwell.

Kant, Immanuel. (2005). *Selections from The Metaphysics of Morals*. Translated by Thomas Kingsmill Abbott. In Information Ethics, edited by Adam Moore, 66-84. Seattle: 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.

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

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

Quinn, M. J. (2011). Chapter 2: Introduction to Ethics.In Ethics for the Information Age (4th ed., pp. 53–99). Boston, MA: Pearson

Week 7: The Future of Work

Required Readings:

Gray, M. L. (2016, January 8). Your job is about to get "taskified." *Los Angeles Times*.

Gray, Mary L., and Siddharth Suri. "The Humans Working Behind the AI Curtain." *Harvard Business Review*, January 9, 2017.

Head, S. (2014). Chapters 1-2. In *Mindless: Why Smarter Machines are Making Dumber Humans* (pp. 15-46). New York: Basic Books.

David Nye, "Work: More or Less? Better or Worse?" *Technology Matters*

Brynjolfsson, E., & McAfee, A. (2014). Chapter 13: Policy recommendations. In *The Second Machine Age: Work, Progress, and Prosperity in a Time of Brilliant Technologies*. New York: W. W. Norton & Company.

Optional Readings:

Cherry, M. and Poster, W. "Crowdwork, Corporate Social Responsibility, and Fair Labor Practices" 2016.

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

Cefkin, Melissa, Obinna Anya, and Robert Moore. "A Perfect Storm? Reimagining Work in the Era of the End of the Job." In *Ethnographic Praxis in Industry Conference Proceedings*, 2014:3–19. Wiley Online Library, 2014.

De Stefano, Valerio. (2015) "The Rise of the 'Just-in-Time Workforce': On-Demand Work, Crowd Work and Labour Protection in the' Gig-Economy'" SSRN.

Finkin, Matthew W. (2015) "Beclouded Work, Beclouded Workers in Historical Perspective." *Comp. Lab. L. & Pol'y J*. 37: 603.

Glöss, Mareike, Moira McGregor, and Barry Brown. (2016) "Designing for Labour: Uber and the On-Demand Mobile Workforce," 1632–43. ACM Press. doi:10.1145/2858036.2858476.

Irani, Lilly, and Monika Sengul-Jones. (2015) "Difference Work: A Conversation with Lilly Irani." *Catalyst: Feminism, Theory, Technoscience 1, no. 1*.

Rosenblat, Alex, and Luke Stark. (2016) "Algorithmic Labor and Information Asymmetries: A Case Study of Uber's Drivers."

Week 8: Robots and Drones

Required Readings:

Calo, R. (2015). Robotics and the Lessons of Cyberlaw. *Cal. L. Rev*., 103, 513.

Calo, R. (2016). Robots in American Law. *University of Washington School of Law Research Paper, (99)*. Retrieved from http://papers.ssrn.com/sol3/papers.cfm?abstract_id=2737598

Optional Readings:

Association for Unmanned Vehicle Systems International. (n.d.). Retrieved February 7, 2016, from http://www.auvsi.org/home

Bever, L. (2014, June 14). Seattle woman spots drone outside her 26th-floor apartment window, feels "violated." *The Washington Post.*

Center for the Study of the Drone. (n.d.). Retrieved February 7, 2016, from http://dronecenter.bard.edu

Clarke, R. (2014). Understanding the drone epidemic. *Computer Law & Security Review*, 30(3), 230 – 246.

Cook, K. L. B. (2007). The Silent Force Multiplier: The History and Role of UAVs in Warfare. In *2007 IEEE Aerospace Conference* (pp. 1–7).

DRONELIFE. (n.d.). Retrieved February 7, 2016, from http://dronelife.com

Jansen, B. (2016, February 8). FAA: Drone registration eclipses that of regular planes. *USA Today*. Retrieved from

Hightower, D., Lumsden, E., Prince, B., & Watson, S. (n.d.). House Study Committee on the Use of Drones. Georgia House of Representatives.

Newman, L. H. (2015, February 10). Here's How to Set Up a No-Fly Drone Zone Over Your House. *Wired*.

Power, M. (2013). Confessions of a Drone Warrior. GQ.

Presidential Memoranda. (2015, February 15). Presidential Memorandum: Promoting Economic Competitiveness While Safeguarding Privacy, Civil Rights, and Civil Liberties in Domestic Use of Unmanned Aircraft Systems.

Schmidt, M. S. (2015). Secret Service Arrests Man After Drone Flies Near White House. *New York Times*.

Shaw, I. (2012). The Rise of the Predator Empire: Tracing the History of U.S. Drones.

Shear, M., D., & Schmidt, M., S. (2015). White House Drone Crash Described as a U.S. Worker's Drunken Lark. *New York Times*.

Vogel, R. J. (2011). Drone Warfare and the Law of Armed Conflict. *Denver Journal of International Law and Policy, 39(1)*.

Wingfield, N. (2015, October 19). Regulators Propose a Drone Registration System. New York Times.

Week 9: Social and Economic Divides in the Information Economy

Required Readings:

Massive Open Online courses and Development: An examination of MOOC usage for professional workforce development outcomes in Colombia, the Philippines, & South Africa:

https://digital.lib.washington.edu/researchworks/bitstream/handle/1773/35647/Advancing_MOOCs_for_Development_Final_Report_Summary_2016_Final.pdf?sequence=5&isAllowed=y

The Impact and Reach of MOOCs: A Developing Countries' Perspective:

https://www.openeducationeuropa.eu/sites/default/files/legacy_files/asset/In-depth_33_1.pdf

Poorest countries hit hardest as world lags behind on global education goals:

https://www.theguardian.com/global-development/2016/sep/06/poorest-countries-hit-hardest-world-lags-behind-global-education-goals-unesco-report

Optional Readings:

Garrido, M., Rissola, G., Rastrelli, M., Diaz, A., & Ruiz, J. (2009). Immigrant women, e-skills, and employability in Europe: *The case of Hungary, Italy, the Netherlands, Romania, and Spain*. Seattle: Technology & Social Change Group, University of Washington.

Heeks, R. (2014). From the MDGs to the Post-2015 Agenda: Analysing Changing Development Priorities (Development Informatics Working Paper Series No. 56). Manchester, United Kingdom: Global Development Institute, University of Manchester.

Sey, A., & Castells, M. (2004). From media politics to networked politics: The Internet and the political process. In M. Castells (Ed.), *The Network Society: A Cross-Cultural Perspective* (pp. 363–381). Northampton, MA: Edward Elgar Publishing.

van Dijk, J. A. G. M. (2005). Chapters 1-2. In *The deepening divide: Inequality in the information society* (pp. 1–26). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.

Sandoval-Almazan, R., & Gil-Garcia, J. R. (2013). Cyberactivism through Social Media: Twitter, YouTube, and the Mexican Political Movement "I'm Number 132." In *2013 46th Hawaii International Conference on System Sciences* (pp. 1704–1713). IEEE. doi:10.1109/HICSS.2013.161

Lotan, G., Graeff, E., Ananny, M., Gaffney, D., Pearce, I., & boyd, d. (2011). The revolutions were tweeted: Information flows during the 2011 Tunisian and Egyptian revolutions. I*nternational Journal of Communication, 5*, 1375–1405.

Krikorian, G. (2010). Access to knowledge as a field of activism. In A. Kapczynski & G. Krikorian (Eds.), *Access to Knowledge in the Age of Intellectual Property* (pp. 57–95). New York: Zone Books.

Juris, J. S. (2004). Networked social movements: global movements for global justice. In M. Castells (Ed.), *The Network Society: A Cross-Cultural Perspective* (pp. 341–362). Northampton, MA: Edward Elgar Publishing.

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

Montiel-Overall, P. "Cultural Competence: a conceptual framework for Library and Information Science Professionals." *Library Quarterly, vol. 79, no. 2,* pp. 175–204. (2009)

Sweeney, L. (2013). Discrimination in Online Ad Delivery. *Commun. ACM, 56(5)*, 44–54. https://doi.org/10.1145/2447976.2447990

Week 10: Environmental Impact of IT

Optional Readings:

Ensmenger, N. (2015). Dirty Bits.

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

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

Course Expectations:

There are a total of twenty classes:

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

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

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

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

Online Discussions

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

Assignments and Grading

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

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

1. Classroom activities: 20 points
2. Weekly writing: 20 points
3. Final Paper: 30 points
4. Group presentation: 10 points
5. Debate: 5 points
6. Peer Review: 5 points
7. Classroom engagement: 10 points

Final Paper

Your group will have to identify an information issue and analyze it over the course of the quarter. There are several components of this assignment with various deadlines. Your final paper will be about 4000 words and will explain your information issue, some recommendations about how to deal with it, and it will justify your conclusions.

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

You will be assigned groups of 3-4 people. Students will be randomly assigned to groups. These will be your groups for the entire semester.

Once you and your group have decided upon a topic, find reputable readings related to the case. You should read as much as it is necessary for you to gain an understanding of the topic. I recommend that your group create a Zotero group to collaboratively maintain your research database.

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

One of the central aims of this course is to teach you how to investigate and resolve information issues as they arise in the kinds of institutions within which you will eventually work. This

assignment is meant to give you practice studying an information issue *concretely* as it manifests in a real institution. More specifically, you will be asked to study and evaluate an *information policy* within an organization (a policy being an institution's resolution of a particular issue).

Final Paper Milestones:

Milestone 1: Select Final Paper Topic (Due Week 2)

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

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

Milestone 2: Bibliography of research and overview of the information issue and institution (Due Week 4)

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

1. The nature (including the history) of the issue and policy in its context.
2. What is the specific context in which you are studying this information issue, including the place and specific parties involved?
3. Why has the issue arisen at just this time and in just this way?
4. In what ways have changing circumstances either created or transformed the issue?

Strategies for doing this research include: finding documents related to the organization's policy, obtaining news accounts or other external reports, examine the relevant laws, and academic articles about your topic. Please consult university librarians for help!

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

Milestone 3: Identify stakeholders and describe interests (Due Week 6)

Using all of the data that you have gathered, identify all of the possible stakeholders in this information issue. Please turn in a write-up that:

1) identifies the different stakeholders and explore their differential roles and statuses, as determined by affiliation with specific institutions, location within those institutions, cultural

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

2) Lays out a range of possible policy solutions for the issue, for each solution specifying: its strengths and weaknesses, who (which of the stakeholders) stands to gain and who to lose, and what stands to be gained or lost. Your write up of the possible policy solutions should be about 1000 words.

Milestone 4: Ethical analysis and recommendations (Due Week 8)

Taking the analysis that you performed in Milestone 3, select criteria with which to evaluate the possible policy alternatives. At least one of the criteria should have their basis in at least one of the ethical frameworks that we have been discussing in class, or from the readings. Using the criteria that you have developed, assess how your policy proposals will affect the information issue, for better and for worse! Using your criteria, project the outcomes of the different policy alternatives. Make your own recommendations based on the above analysis and explain in 1000 words.

Milestone 5: First Draft for Peer Review (Due Week 8)

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

- Executive summary/abstract. (about 100 words)
- The information issue and policy: Frame the information issue in relation to important conceptual/historical developments. Clearly and carefully describe the information issue, the context of the case that you are studying, and the policy that is meant to resolve the issue. (about 1000 words)
- Description of the stakeholders and their positions. Describe at least 3 stakeholders. (each stakeholder description should be about 300 words)
- Possible solutions (different policy options), including an assessment of their strengths and weaknesses. (1000 words)
- Your proposed solution and its justification. (Please make sure that you incorporate a discussion of one the ethical frameworks we discussed in class.) (1000 words)

The report should be about 4,000 words long

Peer Review (Due Week 10)

Giving helpful feedback will make you an indispensable colleague. Peer review is a skill that can be practiced and honed. Our assignment asks you to give feedback to your colleagues for each peer review, but you may want to write more. Please see the grading rubric for the final assignment and use this to guide your comments. You (individually) will be assigned the paper of another group in the class.

This is what your peer review 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 recommendations offered and the analysis that leads to this conclusion? Help the writer understand <u>what could be improved</u> 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 your present your comments.

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.

Classroom Engagement

This is a lecture and discussion-based course. Clearly, you need to attend class to participate in the discussions. In order to benefit from the class meetings, you must both be prepared, present and paying attention, which includes refraining from being distracted by your laptop and electronic mobile devices (no laptops, tablets or mobile phone can be used in class). Students are welcome to take notes with old-fashioned information technology (pen and paper) and collaboratively share notes with friends. I will give students the opportunity to sign in at the beginning of class to indicate that they are willing to participate that day. I keep a daily engagement journal and here is what I look for when assessing this portion of your grade:

- Attendance – while I cannot require you to attend class, not attending will limit your ability to engage in our graded class activities. Thus, 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.
- Coming to class prepared with questions and comments about our topics of the day.
- 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.