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## Thursday, October 2, 2014

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Time</th>
<th>Event</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>7:00 am – 8:00 am</td>
<td>Breakfast</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8:00 am – 5:00 pm</td>
<td>Registration</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8:00 am – 12:00 pm</td>
<td>Tour of Desert Botanical Garden, Heard Museum, or local golf.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12:00 pm – 1:00 pm</td>
<td>Lunch</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| 1:00 pm – 2:15 pm | **Keynote Plenary - SoHo I**                                         
|                | Chair: Karin Ellison - Welcome: Jason Robert                        |
|                | Ethics for Developing Technologies - Deborah Johnson                 |
| 2:15 pm – 3:15 pm | Break                                                               |
| 3:15 pm – 5:00 pm | **SoHo I**                                                            
|                | Session A1 - Enlivening Engineering Ethics through Historical and Theoretical Contexts |
|                | Chair: Wade Robison                                                   |
|                | • Illustrating Social Change Through Engineering Ethics and History of Technology (Or: How I learned to stop worrying and teach The Bomb)  |
|                | Christina Matta                                                       |
|                | • How much should Legal Counsel Constrain an Engineer’s Understanding of Ethics and Social Responsibility? The GM Case and the Problem of Unanticipated Consequences |
|                | Laura Grossenbacher                                                    |
|                | • Ethical Theory and Teaching Engineering Ethics                      |
|                | Elaine Englehardt and Michael Pritchard                              |
|                | **SoHo II**                                                           
|                | Session A2 - Philosophers Across the Curriculum?                     |
|                | Chair: Steven Scales                                                  |
|                | • EAC At Tecnológico de Monterrey, against all ODDS                   |
|                | Norma Velasco                                                         |
|                | • A Seat at the Table                                                 |
|                | Phyllis Vandenbergen                                                  |
|                | • On Philosophical Beliefs in Science and Academia                    |
|                | Brian Zaharatos                                                       |
|                | • Is Ethics Across the Curriculum Ruining Ethics                      |
|                | Erik Wingrove-Haugland                                                |
|                | **Valley Ho I**                                                       
|                | Session A3 - Future Scenarios and Anticipation                       |
|                | Chair: Gillian Crozier                                                |
|                | • Preparing for Catastrophe: A Case Study in Anticipatory Ethics      |
|                | Courtney Campbell                                                    |
|                | • Scenario Planning for Sustainability: Are Diverse Voices Heard?     |
|                | Sandra Rodegher and Cynthia Salin                                    |
|                | • Heatwave: Relatable Narrative Scenarios for Climate Futures in Phoenix |
|                | Michael Burnam-Fink                                                  |
|                | • A Comparison and Assessment of 3 versions of Anticipatory Ethics    |
|                | Richard Wilson                                                       |
|                | **Valley Ho II**                                                      
|                | Session A4 - Sustainable Development and Global Issues                |
|                | Chair: Justin Hess                                                    |
|                | William Frey                                                         |
|                | • Civics, global citizenship, community service, international volunteering and ethics: It’s still moral education to me! |
|                | Joanne Lalonde                                                       |
|                | • Exploring the Ethics of Sustainable Development via Study Abroad   |
|                | Mary Jane Parmentier and Sharlissa Moore                             |
|                | • Global Ecotourism: The Dilemma of Irresponsibility                  |
|                | Elizabeth A. Hoppe                                                   |
| 5:00 pm – 6:00 pm | Cocktail Reception - Skyline Rooftop (weather permitting) or Tropicana |
| 6:00 pm – 8:00 pm | Dinner on your own - Scottsdale First Thursdays Art Walk begins at 7:00 pm |
## 2014 SEAC Conference Agenda

**Friday, October 3, 2014**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Time</th>
<th>Event</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>8:00 am – 9:00 am</td>
<td>Breakfast - Main Place Courtyard</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8:00 am – 5:00 pm</td>
<td>Registration</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9:00 am – 10:15 am</td>
<td>Plenary II - SoHo I</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Presidential Bioethics Commission &amp; Ethics Integration at All Levels of Education - Misti Ault Anderson</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10:15 am – 10:45 am</td>
<td>Break - Main Place Courtyard</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10:45 am – 12:15 pm</td>
<td>SoHo I</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>SoHo II</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Valley Ho I</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Valley Ho II</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12:15 pm – 1:15 pm</td>
<td>Lunch - Main Place Courtyard</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1:15 pm – 2:45 pm</td>
<td>Session C1 - Panel: Human Rights, &quot;Illegals&quot; and Immigration</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Session C2 - Ethics Across the Graduate Curriculum</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Session C3 - Life in the Panopticon</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Session C4 - Ethics and the Professions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2:45 pm – 3:15 pm</td>
<td>Afternoon Break - Main Place Courtyard</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
3:15 pm—5:00 pm

**SoHo I**

Session D1 - Research on Ethics Education and Research Integrity  
Chair: Heather Canary  
- Problem-based learning: Exploratory studies on the effects on moral development levels, learning and development of social work ethics
  - Joan Groessl  
- Exploration of University Members’ Perceptions of Institutional Research Integrity Practices
  - Markie Blumer, Elizabeth Buchanan and Jenny Klucarich  
- Teaching and Learning Ethics at the University: What’s the Meaning for Faculty and Students?
  - Juny Montoya, Mónica Almanza and Angela Salas

**SoHo II**

Session D2 - When Narratives and Argument Diagramming are better than Lectures: Methods for Teaching Ethics  
Chair: Elaine Englehardt  
- Narratives in the Teaching of Biomedical Ethics
  - Kate Swenson and Courtney Campbell  
- Teaching Ethics, Morality, and Values in an Undergraduate Human Sexuality Course
  - Robert Salt  
- Getting to “Ought” David Biddle  
- Using Argument Diagramming to Improve Students’ Critical Thinking About Ethical Issues
  - Allison Cohen

**Valley Ho I**

Session D3 - “The Future Ain’t What It Used To Be”  
Chair: Carl Mitcham  
- The Ethics of Rapid Technological Change
  - Adam Potthast  
- The Humanity of Data
  - Douglas Jordan  
- Energy Transition for the Good Life
  - Robert Jan Geerts  
- An Ethical analysis of the MQ-9 UAV
  - Richard Wilson

**Valley Ho II**

Session D4 - Business, Government, and Good Works  
Chair: Glenn Sinclair  
- Public Engagement; Roundtables on Ethics, Transparency, and Accountability
  - Linda Johnston  
- Raising the Stakeholder’s: Moral Imagination, Self-cultivation, and Leadership Excellence
  - Alan Preti  
- On the Systemic Necessity of Harming Innocent People
  - John Alexander  
- Ethical Diversity, Ethical Government, and the Kingdom of Ends
  - Dean Geuras

5:00 pm—6:00 pm  
Networking/cocktails on your own

6:00 pm—8:00 pm  
Banquet – Sands  
Chair: Joseph Herkert  
SEAC Presidential Address - Deborah Mower
# 2014 SEAC Conference Agenda

Saturday, October 4, 2014

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Time</th>
<th>Event</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>7:00 am – 8:30 am</td>
<td>Continental Breakfast</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8:00 am – 11:00 am</td>
<td>Registration</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| 7:30 am – 8:45 am | SEAC Membership Meeting - SoHo I  
Chair: Deborah Mower |
| 9:00 am – 10:30 am | SoHo I  
**Session E1 - Panel: Ethics pedagogy informed by the DIT:** At the intersection of research and practice  
Chair: Joanne Lalonde, Jane Stoneman McNichol and Glenn Sinclair  
- Developing a Social Media Platform to Define & Strengthen Shared Values (Joanne Lalonde, Jane Stoneman McNichol and Glenn Sinclair)  
- Ethical Dimensions of Scientific Research with a Sustainability Focus: Building Open-Source, Interactive Online Modules at the Graduate Level (Stephanie Vasko, Tess Crossen, Tom Richard and Nancy Tuana)  
- Censorship of Pornography: Is the battle over? (Kim Skoog)  
- Valley Ho I  
**Session E3 - Nothing is Certain but Technology and Taxes**  
Chair: Jason Robert  
- Facing a Future of Medical Enhancements (Courtney Campbell)  
- Do We Have a Duty to Die in the Age of Life Extension?: Responsibility to Future Generations and Life Extension Technology (Robert Vigliotti)  
| 10:30 am – 11:00 am | Break - Main Place Courtyard                                      |
| 11:00 am – 12:30 pm | Session F1 - EAC at UT Austin: Sustainability, Ethics, and Strategic Partnerships  
Chair: Alice Gerhart  
Alice Gerhart, Jess Miner and Cara Bissocci  
- Session F2 - Ethics and the Health Professions  
Chair: Jeannie Sokolac  
- Integrating ethics learning across curricula in population and public health (Michael Burgess, Gary Poole and Kim Taylor)  
- Analyzing The Current Code Of Ethics Used By Genetics Counselors (Amanda Courtright)  
- Proposing an Ethic of Restraint in health professions education (J.A. Eve Krahe)  
- Session F3 - Why Are We in Arizona? And Other Contemporary Issues  
Chair: Clifton Guthrie  
- Justifying an Arizona Boycott (Alan Tomhave and Mark Vopat)  
- Ethics, Disability and the Visual Experience (Danney Ursery)  
- Session F4 - Ethical Reasoning  
Chair: Richard Wilson  
- Motivating Moral Reasoning: Contextualism and Moral Remainder (Christopher Meyers)  
- Psychology and Morality: Using Ethical Reasoning to Guide Moral Intuitions (Robert Doyle)  
- Does Utilitarianism Demand Complete Impartiality (Erik Wingrove-Haugland)  
| 12:30 | Box lunches available in Main Place Courtyard |
Ethics for Developing Technologies

Deborah G. Johnson, University of Virginia

An important trend in recent scholarship on ethics and technology is to identify and analyze the ethical issues raised by new technologies while these technologies are still in the early stages of development. A major thrust of this trend is to have ethical considerations and social values influence the development of future technologies. The promises of “anticipatory ethics” are compelling, though the challenges are daunting. The challenges have to do both with the contingent nature of technological development and the malleability of moral concepts. The discourse around responsibility and artificial agents illustrates the promises and challenges of anticipatory ethics. Artificial agents are computational devices that perform tasks on behalf of humans and do so without immediate, direct human control or intervention, e.g., software programs, robots, drones. Because of their complexity and autonomy and especially because of their capacity to learn as they operate, some argue that in the future there will be artificial agents for which no humans can be (or can fairly be held) responsible. Addressing the responsibility issues posed by artificial agent technology illustrates the challenges of anticipatory ethics.

Keynote Biography

Deborah G. Johnson is the Anne Shirley Carter Olsson Professor of Applied Ethics in the Science, Technology, and Society (STS) Program in the Department of Engineering and Society, School of Engineering and Applied Sciences, University of Virginia. Best known for her work on computer ethics and engineering ethics, Johnson’s research examines the ethical, social, and policy implications of technology, especially information technology.

Johnson is the author/editor of nine books including four editions of Computer Ethics (Prentice Hall/Pearson) and just this year, Surveillance and Transparency as Sociotechnical Accountability: A House of Mirrors with Priscilla Regan (Routledge, 2014). She has published over 100 papers in a variety of journals and edited volumes.

Johnson’s research has repeatedly received support from the National Science Foundation. Most recently she received funding for a project on Surveillance and Transparency as Sociotechnical Systems of Accountability and another project on Ethics for Developing Technologies: An Analysis of Artificial Agents.

In recognition of her contributions, Johnson received the John Barwise prize from the American Philosophical Association in 2004; the Sterling Olmsted Award from the Liberal Education Division of the American Society for Engineering Education in 2001; and the ACM Special Interest Group on Computers And Society’s Making a Difference Award in 2000. She was awarded an Honorary Degree (Doctor of Philosophy honoris causa) from the Faculty of Arts and Sciences at Linköping University in Linköping, Sweden, May 2009.

Active in professional organizations, Johnson has served as President of the Society for Philosophy and Technology, President of the International Society for Ethics and Information Technology (INSEIT), Treasurer of the ACM Special Interest Group on Computers and Society, Chair of the American Philosophical Association Committee on Computers and Philosophy, and a member of the Executive Board of the Association for Practical and Professional Ethics.
Abstracts

ON THE SYSTEMIC NECESSITY OF HARMING INNOCENT PEOPLE
John Alexander, Phoenix College

In this paper I argue that given the ontological nature of economic systems that there is a systemic constraint inherent in the nature of these systems that will determine what we will do regarding harming innocent people. I will argue that this constraint cannot be overcome by developing and adequate theory of ethics or politics. While I do believe that an equitable and fair business organization should provide a livable income and benefits for all its members, there can come a point where in order to maintain even the semblance of meeting the basic needs of its members, a number of innocent people will be harmed or the entire system will collapse. I am not going to argue how we should determine who should be harmed and who should be saved, only that, given the ontological nature of systems; innocent people will necessarily be harmed. While, I will focus on how this constraint functions in economic systems, this argument has application regarding human membership in other types of systems, e.g., environmental systems.

EDUCATING FOR FORGIVENESS AND RECONCILIATION
Laura Arcila Villa, Grand Valley State University

Forgiveness is a psychological, sociological, and cultural phenomenon and a concept of great moral significance. I explore the nature of forgiveness and some of the most important philosophical treatments of the concept, and pay special attention to the relationship between forgiveness, justice, and peace. I supplement this conceptual investigation with a discussion of one Colombian experience of educating for forgiveness and reconciliation, namely, the work carried out by Fundación para la Reconciliación since the turn of the century. I explore the curriculum and pedagogy of the Schools for Forgiveness and Reconciliation (ESPERE is their acronym in Spanish) and the results of this effort to build a culture of peace through an education. I hope to show by argument as well as by means of this experience that forgiveness is an important political virtue that ought to be cultivated early in life.

ENGINEERING ETHICS IN A WAR ZONE: TWO CONTRASTING CASE STUDIES
Carlos Bertha, US Air Force Academy

The author will present two case studies related to the fields of engineering ethics and military ethics. The intent is to show that sometimes typical engineering ethics principles might not be suitable or enforceable in a combat environment. One of the cases involves safety considerations while the other involves issues of corruption and bribery. These cases contrast because in order to resolve the dilemma in one case it seems plausible to choose a more pragmatic approach (i.e., bend or ignore the rules), while the other seems to demand a more principled approach. In addition, raising these cases might draw attention to whether engineering ethics, as a fairly established field of inquiry, might be informed by just war theory considerations and, conversely, whether just war theory might also be influenced by the engineering ethics narrative. The author does propose some tentative solutions to dilemmas like the two covered by the case studies, but, more importantly, is interested in opening the floor for discussion and recommendations for a way ahead.

EXPLORATION OF UNIVERSITY MEMBERS’ PERCEPTIONS OF INSTITUTIONAL RESEARCH INTEGRITY PRACTICES
Markie Blumer, Elizabeth Buchanan, and Jenny Klucarich, University of Wisconsin-Stout

Although research integrity practices in institutional settings is not a new area of study, because of its foundational importance in university settings it remains a topic worthy of study. In addition, rarely are all members of the university community included as participants in studies focused upon research integrity and ethics. Thus, to add to the existent literature, and to address this particular gap, the authors investigated research integrity practices in a medium-sized Midwestern university setting, and included participants from across all divisions of the university community. This mixed data survey study was comprised of six sections; to be presented here is information for two sections--sample demographics and research integrity. The demographics appear reflective of those of the larger survey, as well as the university setting of study as a whole. In the research integrity section there were two parts--one qualitative and one quantitative. Implications with regard to research integrity and ethics in institutional settings will also be presented.

GETTING TO “OUGHT” A REFLECTION ON TRUTH AND THE ETHICS CURRICULUM
David L. Bodde, Clemson University

The application of moral absolutes to the teaching of ethics requires judgments that balance three criteria: (a) the nature of the act in question; (b) the intent of the actor; and (c) the circumstances under which the act occurred. This judgment can be based on a kind of truth that runs deeper than scientific discovery or engineering solutions--moral truth, which is common to a wide diversity of cultures and worldviews. If we accept the notion of Aristotle and others that the purpose of education is to enable students to like and dislike what they ought, then how can we best convey the moral truths upon which these preferences are based when teaching in state-sponsored institutions? The ethical instruction in the
Army’s leadership programs offers 4 practical guidelines: (a) fully integrate ethical teaching into the technical and management curriculum; (b) demonstrate the links between the ethical teaching and the success of the organization; (c) use case examples because stories are remembered long after the abstractions are forgotten; and (d) avoid the proselytization of any one worldview.

PERFECTIONIST MORAL TASTE IN PROFESSIONAL LIFE

Jon Borowicz, Milwaukee School of Engineering

After the twin pillars of modern normative moral theory—utilitarianism and Kantian ethical theory—moral taste is a third, if more modest, inheritance of 18th century moral thought. In this paper, I will argue for a particular perfectionist approach to professional moral life which places moral taste at its center.

Appearing and being appeared to in a role is central to Perfectionist Moral Taste (PMT), and accordingly, requires a shift in moral thinking. Moral taste gives priority to appearance over effecting external conditions (where appearance is not primarily contrasted with reality). Given that the conditions of joint productive activity repress judgment, from the perspective of one’s role, what is required is that one’s judgment be expressed—that it be made to appear. That it does not occur under the conditions where it ought, given one’s understanding of one’s role, provides the perfectionist animus to cultivate one’s judgment, an activity requiring its public expression.

PMT suggests a particular understanding of standard devices of professional ethics and its pedagogy. Ethics codes, for example, would no longer be regarded under the prejudicial concept of an autonomous moral agent as something to be applied under conditions of deliberation. Rather, it becomes the basis for one’s self-understanding in a professional role. It becomes the basis for determining what appearances one must convey and how things ought to appear to oneself in one’s moral judgments.

INTEGRATING ETHICS LEARNING ACROSS CURRICULA IN POPULATION AND PUBLIC HEALTH

Michael Burgess, Gary Poole, Kim Taylor, University of British Columbia

We undertook a project using a step-wise process to assess and integrate ethics learning distributed throughout the graduate programs in a school of population and public health. The steps included: (1) a literature review and scan of North American curricula produced a set of learning objectives; (2) scans of online syllabi identified potential learning experiences compared to the above learning objectives; (3) faculty interviews explored the nature of resources and experiences provided in some of the courses; (4) a student forum explored student experiences of ethics learning in the curriculum, with primary conclusions that there was considerable diversity in student exposure to and faculty comfort with ethics; and (5) a faculty forum and further conversations revealed that some faculty were operating in a manner that could be highlighted and extended among their colleagues, while others had a moral advocacy approach that raises some concerns.

HEATWAVE: RELATABLE NARRATIVE SCENARIOS FOR CLIMATE FUTURES IN PHOENIX

Michael Burnam-Fink, Arizona State University

A major problem in scenario methods is translating imagination into action. For climate change, even expert actors such as climate treaty negotiators may draw a blank when asked to describe the implications of climate change on their communities and loved ones (Milkoreit, 2012, A Cognitive approach to global climate governance). Traditional scenarios strive to produce accurate and credible visions of the future, but do not contain a relatable protagonist, move a plot towards a resolution, or compellingly use metaphor, imagery, or any of the other emotionally persuasive techniques of literature. Foresight that draws extensively from the literary tradition of science-fiction has an extension track record of mobilizing action around emerging technologies, such as genetically modified organisms, space colonization, and personal computing (MCCray, 2012, The Visioneers).

Narrative foresight, the use of storytelling techniques in generating scenarios, may offer a way to bridge this cognitive-affective gap by making the future more ‘relatable’. This presentation will explore the theoretical basis of narrative foresight and explain the use of Heatwave, a modification of the author’s “Eventuality” engine, in exploring the actions of ordinary people facing a climate change related crisis in an imagined future Phoenix, and the potential future use of Heatwave in other educational, foresight, or public engagement contexts. Grounding foresight in the concrete processes of narrative conflict, development, and resolution serves to make visible concerns about values, differing versions of the future, and the interactions between global issues and personal concerns. Narrative foresight offers a way to engage with the future, even in the absence of specialized technological or policy expertise.

FACING A FUTURE OF MEDICAL ENHANCEMENTS

Courtney Campbell, Oregon State University

Responsibility in facing the future means confronting the ethics of enhancing human capacities now. This paper begins by asking whether proposed enhancements are any different morally than our current efforts towards improving human musical capacity, or athletic achievement. This argument by analogy with precedent is explored through a critical analysis of two authors, legal scholar Michael Sandel, and philosopher John Harris. While Sandel doesn’t succeed in making a compelling case against what he calls “perfection” via enhancements, Harris enthusiastically advocates for enhancements based on liberty of choice and maximizing utility. There are several problems of justice and virtue with Harris’s argument,
has his or her own opinion, so there is no use in debating the issue. For these reasons, it is imperative that among students where they tend to throw their hands up in the air and simply declare that everyone has no “right” answer in ethics as there might be for a science test. This idea leads to an implicit subjectivism error tendencies. Furthermore, high school students seem particularly troubled by the notion that there is right or wrong. Their views tend to be heavily influenced by family, peers, and prevailing cultural norms, and asking students to entertain opposing viewpoints becomes problematic under these circumstances. Because of this, students are prone to engage in fallacious reasoning and display common psychological consequences of advances in their discipline. My recent experiences teaching genetics in at a university for women in Bangladesh has broadened my perspective to consider the highly western perspective of our presentation of new biotechnologies, both human and environmental. Given the trend in US undergraduate education to consider the “global”, I have been exploring ways to integrate analysis of the impact of advances in bioscience on diverse communities throughout the world into my genetics courses with particular consideration of the effects on women and marginalized communities.

THE NEW BIOTECHNOLOGIES: ETHICAL ISSUES AND GLOBAL PERSPECTIVES
Courtney Campbell, Oregon State University

I have shown previously that students majoring in biosciences receive much less exposure to the ethical and social implications of advances in their genetics than their professors would advise. This is part of a broader phenomenon where instructors in the science omit topics outside their basic subject content due to “lack of time” and their belief that the scientific subject matter is the most important. If all science students took ethics courses that contained a consideration of issues in science and technology as part of their total undergraduate requirements the lack of ethics instruction would not be such a concern. However, very few undergraduate science programs require courses in ethics and thus most science students graduate without exposure to multiple perspectives on the social and ethical consequences of advances in their discipline.

ENGAGING STUDENTS IN INTEGRATED ETHICS EDUCATION: A STUDY OF PEDAGOGY AND STUDENTS’ ROLES IN SOCIETY
Heather Canary, University of Utah, Julie Taylor, State University of NY at New Paltz, Joseph Herkert, Arizona State University, Karin Ellison, Arizona State University, Jameson Wetmore, Arizona State University, and Carlos Tarin, University of Utah

In this quasi-experimental study we investigated two elements of ethics education: (1) how participating in ethics education influenced science and engineering graduate students’ views of their roles in society, and (2) what students found most valuable and relevant. Participants were 98 graduate science and engineering students. Qualitative analysis indicated that the most prevalent responses reflected a desire to benefit society. Duty-based responses were more prevalent in pretest than posttest responses. Participants in experimental conditions indicated more complicated notions of their societal roles than control participants. Participants emphasized the value of class discussions for increasing their awareness of issues, alternative views, and their own positions. Results are interpreted using the engaged communication in the disciplines framework with practical implications for educators.

USING ARGUMENT DIAGRAMMING TO IMPROVE STUDENTS’ CRITICAL THINKING ABOUT ETHICAL ISSUES
Allison Cohen, PLATO and Langley High School

This presentation argues for the use of argument diagramming to improve the critical thinking skills necessary to engage students in productive ethical discussions. Teaching ethics to high school students poses many challenges. Students often come to the subject with already held deep beliefs about what is right or wrong. Their views tend to be heavily influenced by family, peers, and prevailing cultural norms, and asking students to entertain opposing viewpoints becomes problematic under these circumstances. Because of this, students are prone to engage in fallacious reasoning and display common psychological error tendencies. Furthermore, high school students seem particularly troubled by the notion that there is no “right” answer in ethics as there might be for a science test. This idea leads to an implicit subjectivism among students where they tend to throw their hands up in the air and simply declare that everyone has his or her own opinion, so there is no use in debating the issue. For these reasons, it is imperative that
teachers cultivate good critical thinking skills in their students. But an effective means of teaching critical thinking proves elusive. The use of argument diagramming at the university level has shown impressive results, and this past year, I sought to replicate that success in a high school setting. This presentation will discuss my findings based on a pre- and post-test analysis using the Cornell Critical Thinking Test Level Z and what this meant for improving the quality of ethical discussions in my classroom.

ANALYZING THE CURRENT CODE OF ETHICS USED BY GENETICS COUNSELORS
Amanda Courtright, Translational Genomics Research Institute

Genetics counselors are in a much higher demand as the field of genetics keeps developing new techniques and tools to determine information about people’s health from their genetic make up. These types of counselors derive their approach from a non-directive principle, which is defined by allowing the client to make their own informed decision based on what was learned from the genetics counselor. Studies have shown that in the case of misattributed paternity, counselors are not following this non-directive principle approach and infringing on their clients’ rights to autonomy. These shortcomings may be a result of the underdeveloped set of ethical codes put in place by the National Society of Genetics Counselors (NSGC). The NSGC code of ethics has been evaluated in comparison to the well-defined set of codes from the American Psychological Association (APA) and American Counseling Association (ACA). The results of the evaluation assisted in developing a revise set of ethical codes for genetics counselors; these altered codes can then be used by counselors to more effectively follow the non-directive approach in an ethical manner when working with patients. Reducing the chances that genetics counselors violate their patient’s rights during the counseling process.

BIOETHICS EDUCATION FOR ECOLOGICAL RESEARCHERS
Gillian Crozier, Laurentian University, Albrecht Schulte-Hostedde, Laurentian University, and Dylan Gault, Western University

Despite growing recognition that ecological research has important ethical implications, this field has not yet created ‘cultural space’ for the discussion of the ethical dimensions of field research methodologies. We identify two elements that should be central in the development of an ethics curriculum for ecological researchers: a set of ethical principles that can apply to both the human and nonhuman entities that are impacted by field research design, and instruction in various kinds of uncertainty as they pertain to ecological research. By introducing these tools into the graduate school curricula for ecological researchers, and by offering similar bioethics training courses for professional field ecologists, a ‘cultural space’ can be opened up for the discussion and debate of the ethical implications of ecological research. We argue that ecological research is a discipline in which the scientists themselves can speak most authoritatively and informatively on the ethically salient dimensions of their discipline’s activities; and that it is, therefore, incumbent upon this discipline to self-monitor, to actively pursue ways to improve the ethical dimensions of their work, and to train future generations of researchers with the tools they need to conduct ethical research.

PSYCHOLOGY AND MORALITY: USING ETHICAL REASONING TO GUIDE MORAL INTUITIONS
Robert Doyle, California Lutheran University

This paper begins with the assumption that there is a relationship between morality and psychology. The starting point for such a statement is expressed in the thesis that there is a distinctive part of our psychology reserved for morality. To highlight this claim, it is imperative to examine how moral judgments differ from other kinds of opinions we have on how people ought to behave. The difficulty in this process is often revealed through the realization that the moral questions that are often presented to us lack a certain degree of certitude. Coincidentally, it is not just our moral judgments that are lacking, but the way in which we arrive at these judgments is also impaired.

This paper explores the tension between moral intuitions and ethical reasoning. It advances the notion that reliance on intuitive ethics hinders ethical reasoning and impedes moral responsibility. It argues that, despite the obvious difficulties in arriving at moral judgments, sound ethical reasoning is a valuable tool and that moral intuitions can and should be influenced by ethical reasoning.

ETHICAL THEORY AND TEACHING ENGINEERING ETHICS
Elaine Englehardt, Utah Valley University, and Michael Pritchard, Western Michigan University

In this presentation, we will discuss a recent three-way debate by C.E. Harris, Michael Davis, and Bernard Gert about the usefulness of ethical theory in courses in engineering ethics. This debate has been published in recent issues of Teaching Ethics (SEAC’s official journal).

In developing our position, we will draw on the ideas of 18th century Scottish philosopher Thomas Reid and 19th century British philosophers William Whewell and Henry Sidgwick. Despite their differences at the level of ethical theory, all three of these philosophers held that philosophical reflection on ethics should hold common sense in high regard and, therefore, be accessible to philosophers and non-philosophers alike.

Common morality, as Bernard Gert calls our everyday morality, does include ideas about the importance of pursuing more good rather than less, less harm rather than more, respecting persons as having dignity, rights, and the like—and it includes much else, but without seeing the need to gather all these important ideas under one all-encompassing principle. Which ideas are most important in courses
in practical ethics depends on the nuances of the practical domains themselves. William Whewell says that, although his work in practical ethics is not philosophical in the sense of dwelling on ethical theory, it is, he hopes, philosophical in the sense of requiring rigorous thinking—and that, we hope, is just what our courses in practical ethics require.

SOCIO-TECHNICAL SYSTEMS, APPROPRIATE TECHNOLOGY, AND THE CAPABILITY APPROACH: ASSESSING ENERGY SOLUTIONS IN PUERTO RICO
William J. Frey, University of Puerto Rico at Mayagüez

Puerto Rico is currently undergoing an energy crisis. Almost all of the energy consumed comes from petroleum which has made the island’s economy and prosperity dependent upon (1) outdated infrastructure, (2) a highly volatile global oil market, and (3) methods of energy production and distribution that have caused severe air and water pollution. Attempts have been made to diversify energy production through a series of rejected proposals made over a period of fifty years. This presentation will explore the opposition to energy projects in Puerto Rico using a framework that combines the Capability Approach, Appropriate Technology, and Socio-Technical System analysis to give voice to this opposition and suggest the possible lines of solution. Finally, it will discuss efforts to use this framework in teaching business students socio-technical, ethical, and global awareness.

EAC AT UT AUSTIN: SUSTAINABILITY, ETHICS, AND STRATEGIC PARTNERSHIPS
Alice Gerhart, Jess Miner, and Cara Biasucci, The University of Texas at Austin

As the world's population continues to grow and political and social landscapes continue to shift, current and future student generations face critical decisions about the efficient use and equitable distribution of the planet's natural resources. The impact of these decisions manifests at all levels of society -- from personal choice to international policy. Students must prepare to address these complex issues; this is the greatest challenge of higher education going forward.

The University of Texas at Austin has been simultaneously working toward implementing sustainability education along with a robust Ethics requirement for all undergraduates. This requirement is part of a broader initiative called the “Skills and Experience Flags,” which covers six “Flag” areas: Writing, Quantitative Reasoning, Global Cultures, Cultural Diversity, Ethics and Leadership, or Independent Inquiry. Great strides have been made toward achieving this goal via partnerships among programs on campus invested in interdisciplinary ethics and sustainability education. The overlap between ethics, leadership, and sustainability was originally identified as a compelling place to develop curricula that both meets the Ethics and Leadership Flag criteria and teaches students real-life critical thinking skills to address complex social, environmental, and economic challenges. From there, new opportunities for expansion were developed by connecting sustainability education with the remaining Flag areas, all of which are relevant to sustainability studies.

This panel discussion includes representatives from the academic units that have partnered to lead the ethics integration effort at UT Austin: the School of Undergraduate Studies, the Office of Sustainability, and the Business, Government and Society Department in the McCombs School of Business. The goals of this panel discussion will be 1) to generate discussion on the intersection of ethics and sustainability education; 2) to present new video-based ethics teaching resources being developed in conjunction with integration efforts; 3) to explain how we successfully acquired internal and external funding; and 4) to share what we have learned about embedding an EAC program at a large state University that, itself, is sustainable.

ETHICAL DIVERSITY, ETHICAL GOVERNMENT, AND THE KINGDOM OF ENDS
Dean Geuras, Texas State University

In engaging the future responsibly, finding a balance between ethical diversity and ethical government constitutes a major challenge. As society becomes more diverse ethnically, culturally, and socially, the need to respect ethical differences becomes increasingly important.

But, as indicated in the code of the American Society for Public Administration (ASPA), government is inherently ethical. It has the responsibility to serve the public interest with public funds. As society becomes more complex, the ethical role of government extends progressively further. The size and influence of private corporations requires more regulation, much of which is ethically based, such as the Dodd-Frank act. Government has the power to influence society morally, and it has taken the opportunity very seriously since the Civil Rights Act of 1964. Today, government uses its moral authority to support the rights of women, gays, lesbians, and ethnic minorities. But to what extent can government legitimately impose moral values on those who disagree? The question becomes increasingly significant as immigration, cultural differences and ideological disagreements become more common. This paper proposes the application of Kant's notion of the kingdom of ends, as interpreted by Christine Korsgaard, as a general guide to reconciling the moral responsibility of government with the moral diversity of citizens. To demonstrate the applicability of the notion of a kingdom of ends, the paper applies the notion to the recent Supreme Court ruling in the Hobby Lobby case.
PROBLEM-BASED LEARNING: EXPLORATORY STUDIES ON THE EFFECTS ON MORAL DEVELOPMENT LEVELS, LEARNING AND DEVELOPMENT OF SOCIAL WORK ETHICS.

Joan Groessl, University of Wisconsin–Green Bay

The teaching of ethics in social work is an integral component of the socialization of students to the social work profession; effective practitioners require self-awareness of values, understanding of professional standards and ongoing reflective practice. How students are instructed in ethics, and the assessment measures used to determine effectiveness of student learning, are up to the discretion of the faculty in social work programs.

The presentation discusses the use of problem-based learning as an approach to teaching ethics in the curriculum comparing and contrasting the three different measures in relation to student learning. This author used this pedagogical approach to assist foundation level Master of Social work (MSW) students to understand and apply moral and ethical theory, and the standards outlined in the National Association of Social Workers (NASW) Code of Ethics (2008).

Study one utilized the Defining Issues Test-2 [DIT-2] (Rest and Narvaez, 1998) measuring change in moral development levels after the completion of an ethics course. Study two examined student responses to a pre- and post-test of understanding of social work ethics using the Nathanson-Giffords Ethics Scale [NGES] (Nathanson, Giffords & Calderon, 2011). And study three examined cohort perceptions of learning after completion of the course using student recall of concepts integral to the course.

HOW MUCH SHOULD LEGAL COUNSEL CONSTRAIN AN ENGINEER’S UNDERSTANDING OF ETHICS AND SOCIAL RESPONSIBILITY? THE GM CASE AND THE PROBLEM OF UNANTICIPATED CONSEQUENCES

Laura Grossenbacher, University of Wisconsin–Madison

We will engage with some challenges raised through discussions with Professional Engineers in the state of Wisconsin. One concern that looms large for practicing engineers in Wisconsin involves the increasing role of legal counsel in engineering decisions.

Because we teach both Professional Engineers and undergraduate engineers, we want to help both of these stakeholders communicate their larger ethical obligations more effectively to decision-makers and company legal counsel, and we want to interrogate the problem that is often presented by our PE’s: are legal departments indeed constraining the ethics of engineers, or is the schism a risk communication problem, or is it both?

The GM case has unfortunately presented itself as a valuable case for exemplifying the problem. While the case is still unfolding, it seems apparent (based on publically available records) that the GM debacle involves multiple failures, only a few of which we will have time to unpack. The GM-sanctioned internal investigation suggests that key discussions were controlled by GM legal counsel. How does such a management approach impact the technical decision-making and the recommendations offered by engineers? What were the financial and legal barriers to addressing the ignition problem before it became catastrophic?

Especially interesting for our PE's is the question: what happens to social responsibility if the company’s legal counsel constrains the engineer’s interpretation of the code of ethics?

FUTURE SELFFIES: WHAT RESPONSIBILITIES DO I HAVE TO MYSELF?

Clifton Guthrie, Husson University

Of all the responsibilities we may have to the future, none typically concern us more than the responsibilities we have to our future selves. Concern for the future self has usually been discussed as the virtue prudence, and characterized as choices we make between present and future desires, and present and future selves. This pragmatic perspective holds today, for example, among psychologists, behavioral economists, and advice givers of all stripes who devote much attention to delayed gratification, the reward system, and “intertemporal choices,” particularly as they concern health and finance. But this traditional and commonsense view depends on certain conceptions of enduring personal identity (either a separate soul, a Cartesian Ego, or a Lockean “Memory Theory of personal identity”). Advances in neuroscience and philosophical critique have undercut support for personal identity theories, making our prudential responsibilities less clear-cut. Derek Parfit, In his influential Reasons and Persons (1984), argued that taking reductionism seriously suggests that we have a different, more objective, relation to our potential future selves, something more like morality than prudence. This matters to how we might understand our obligations to future selves, and to how we think about a number of issues in applied ethics like Advanced Directives, genetic manipulation, and other human enhancement techniques.

A NOVEL ENGINEERING ETHICS CASE STUDY DESIGNED IN THE SIRA FRAMEWORK USING REFLEXIVE PRINCIPALISM TO ENGAGE STUDENTS AND TEACH ETHICAL REASONING

Justin Hess, Purdue University, Jonathan Beever, Pennsylvania State University, Andrew Brightman, Purdue University, Andrew Iliadis, Purdue University, Carla Zoltowski, Purdue University, and Lorraine Kisselburgh, Purdue University

Our novel framework of scaffolded, integrated, reflective analysis (SIRA) using the approach of Reflexive Principilism (RP) has been presented at a previous SEAC meeting. In this presentation we discuss the development of one of the case studies in that approach, involving the 2010 Deepwater Horizon Oil
Spill. This case was selected for development within the SIRA /RP approach due to the broad scope of impact (e.g. human, economic, social, and environmental), the multiple disciplines involved, and the fact that the case was so recently and prominently in the news. We will present the development of the case in the SIRA framework including the staged process students’ work through during the case and the ethical framework utilized by students to analyze the case. Students are challenged to think from the perspectives of individual stakeholders to justify their decisions while using the principles as a guide. The new case has been developed and tested through three rounds of revisions, having been offered in the Spring of 2013, Summer of 2013, and Spring of 2014 with revisions following each implementation. Evaluation of impact of the case on students’ engagement, empathic perspective-taking, and ethical reasoning skills was based on pre/post course assessment tools, analysis of case reports, in-class discussion transcripts, post-case meta-reflections, and end of course interviews. Preliminary results suggest that the breadth of stakeholders involved in the case, and the sharing of these stakeholders’ perspectives through collaboration within teams or in-class, was particularly perspective-altering for the students.

GLOBAL ECOTOURISM: THE DILEMMA OF IRRESPONSIBILITY
Elizabeth Hoppe

International tourism is a $1 trillion dollar industry, having reached that landmark for the first time in 2012 (UNWTO). Ecotourism dates back to the early 1980’s, and it has been acknowledged to be one of the fastest growing sub-sectors of the tourism industry. According to The International Ecotourism Society (TIES), ecotourism is defined as: “responsible travel to natural areas that conserves the environment and improves the well-being of local people.” (TIES, 1990). Due to the importance of ecotourism as an international industry and the moral problems associated with it, especially potential harm to the environment and the local economies, this topic is important to investigate within the context of ethics. Although one can find a great deal of literature on the pitfalls of ecotourism, much less research has been carried out within the field of ethical theory. However, ethics can play a significant role in both investigating ecotourism’s problems as well as examining possible solutions. Based on concerns that ecotourism often exploits the local people, an important approach is to examine the dilemma from a Kantian perspective, in particular the Kingdom of Ends. The paper will then investigate some alternatives to current ecotourism models, one of which is called “conscious travel”. As Ron Mader defines it, conscious travel “is traveling with one’s conscience and connecting with others in a particular place” (Planeta.com). By applying ethical theory to the existing research on ecotourism, this paper will provide moral alternatives in order to help resolve the dilemmas that currently plague the ecotourist industry.

ENERGY TRANSITION FOR THE GOOD LIFE
Robert Jan Geerts, Wageningen University

In current debates on energy transition (understood here as a shift from a fossil-fuel based to a sustainable energy system), the discussion can be divided roughly between the ‘boundless consumption’ approach, and the ‘eco-frugality’ approach. The boundless consumption camp argues that growth will remain possible via efficiency improvements and novel energy technologies; eco-frugalists argue that instead, consumption should decrease radically by making energy conservation a central aspect of our lives.

This paper problematizes both routes via their implicit understanding of the good life, and proposes a third route. Not only are we interested in a sustainable energy system, but it should also (and perhaps primarily) cater to our needs and enable us to flourish as human beings. Neither side in the current debate seems to have this worked out very well. Boundless consumption has already proven to be ineffective: over the last half century, growing energy consumption has not led to better lives in the western world. Eco-frugality meanwhile focuses our attention on everything we cannot do: a protestant ethic without the appeal of a good afterlife.

The way forward may be found in the concept of simplicity, understood as a virtue that balances our stance towards consumption. Living simply would mean to reject high-energy technologies not because they are wasteful, but because they inhibit us to live good lives.

To conclude, a number of suggestions are made which could help cater ‘simple’ energy practices.

PUBLIC ENGAGEMENT; ROUNDTABLES ON ETHICS, TRANSPARENCY, AND ACCOUNTABILITY
Linda M. Johnston, Kennesaw State University

This presentation will explore the results of four Roundtable discussions held at the Siegel Institute for Leadership, Ethics, and Character at Kennesaw State University in the Fall of 2013. These Roundtables were convened to gauge the current challenges related to ethics, transparency, and accountability in four realms of work: Education, Non-Profits, Business, and Civil Service. The results of the Roundtables will be discussed as well as the history of the development of Ethics, Transparency, and Accountability in each of those fields.
THE HUMANITY OF DATA
Douglas Jordan, US Army

Data, one of the most popular characters in Star Trek: the Next Generation, is a not human. He is by self-proclamation, an android, albeit a highly developed one. His goal for his existence is to become human. This paper looks at two questions related to Data. The first is whether he is human. The second is whether it is possible to become human.

Is Data a human? This requires an understanding of what it means to be human. There are several theories in modern philosophy on what the essential elements of being human are. One of the most important distinctions to understand is the difference between human and person.

The other issue is whether it is possible to transform from non-human to human. If it is not possible to transform from non-human to human, is it possible to gain personhood.

Factors that are considered are free will, self-awareness, sentience, emotions, attachment, sentiment, desire, rationality, friendship, loyalties and the interaction with his shipmates. These factors will be supported with evidence from the series in important and seminal episodes, such as Measure of a Man, Offspring, In Theory, and Brothers.

PROPOSING AN ETHIC OF RESTRAINT IN HEALTH PROFESSIONS EDUCATION
J.A. Eve Krahe, Arizona State University

Proposed is the necessity of a new “ethic of restraint” within the health professions education context. Identified is its utility in framing undergraduate and graduate education of health professions students.

In dialectic with this ethic is the concept of patient-centered Care, a way of viewing health and healing reflected in educational and policy guidelines from the Institute of Medicine, the Joint Commission, and the Patient Centered Outcomes Research Initiative, among others. The proposed ethic of restraint answers the shortfalls of patient-centered care. The ethic of restraint is an emerging philosophical perspective that reflects the diversity of worldviews in healthcare, and the importance of educational preparation for students and practitioners that prepares them for the prevailing disparateness.

Rather than the requisite collaboration of patient-centric paradigms, the ethic of restraint permits myriad individual stories and preferences to surface that are not found within extant systems. The ethic of restraint presupposes nothing.

The ethic of restraint is underpinned by the perspectives of Derrida, Foucault, and Lyotard. It pulls from philosophy of science and the questions of Feyerabend and Kuhn. It eschews the existence of a metanarrative and is keenly aware of the binary oppositions that would lead learners to believe what is arbitrary is in fact, objective. It encourages learners to consider that healthcare is informed by cultural structures that are neither timeless nor blameless.

The ethic of restraint seeks to unpack the complex intricacies of patient-centered care, permit emergence of more localized narratives, and eschew systems that are no longer effective.

CIVICS, GLOBAL CITIZENSHIP, COMMUNITY SERVICE, INTERNATIONAL VOLUNTEERING AND ETHICS: IT’S STILL MORAL EDUCATION TO ME!
Joanne Lalonde, University of Ottawa

Explicit moral education in the academy has gone deep underground and instead, we now have the much more palatable and theoretically politically ‘neutral’ discourses of civics, global citizenship, community service learning, international volunteering, and ethics. But, by any name, moral education continues to be a key component in the production of the modern citizen, instrumental in the development of the ‘particular identity’ of citizenship that supports the desired social relationships with and within the state. The underlying goal of forming the ‘good citizen’ based on liberal criteria of citizenship has evolved little over the last several decades while the various discursive framings reflect the evolving debates, critiques and vectors of resistance to the production of a citizen of modern democratic nations. Universities continue a commitment to evolving practices of moral education that aim at producing the liberal-cosmopolitan conceptualization of an ideal citizen.

Whether deliberately through ‘ethics of...’ classes, community service learning, volunteer programs and/or through the hidden curriculum of everyday campus practices, forms of moral education are always ‘going on’ in our universities and colleges. This presentation will explore some of the tensions entailed with educating tomorrow’s engaged democratic citizens that have emerged due to the ‘historical turns’ of feminism, globalization and ‘applied ethics. Furthermore, despite the academy’s pedagogical and discursive responses to these challenges, ideologically, I argue that we remain firmly grounded in a liberal conceptualization of the good citizen and that institutions of higher education continue to do what they have done for decades: educate their students to become those citizens.

AN IN SITU APPROACH TO GET STUDENTS THINKING ABOUT PRIVACY, SECURITY, AND ETHICS
Lundy Lewis, Southern New Hampshire University

There are complaints that the current generation of students is not concerned with the privacy vs. security issue to the extent that it should be. In this talk we outline an approach to generate interest in the topic by conducting an in situ experiment as follows: (i) fly a drone around campus so that students can see it, (ii) via the drone, take a picture of students doing something undesirable on campus but such that
the students are acting, (iii) have a student publish the picture and a scathing article in the student newspaper, hopefully getting the student population to protest, (iv) announce in a follow-on article that the article was a hoax and the students were acting, and (v) have a university-wide student panel event in which students discuss the privacy vs. security issue and the social and ethical ramifications thereof. Other emerging technologies that can figure into the discussion include Google Glass, tele-presence robots, and humanoids. These technologies can be controlled or programmed to take pictures and videos of what they see. It is anticipated that such in situ experiments will provide a method of engagement that will bring to the fore important issues in governance, human rights, and responsible engagement of the future.

ILLUSTRATING SOCIAL CHANGE THROUGH ENGINEERING ETHICS AND HISTORY OF TECHNOLOGY

(OR: HOW I LEARNED TO STOP WORRYING AND TEACH THE BOMB)
Christina Matta, University of Wisconsin-Madison

Over roughly the last decade, scholars have emphasized the need to integrate science and technology studies and the history of science, technology, and medicine into engineering ethics. Such an approach, they argue, will help students recognize the social consequences of their discipline beyond the micro/macro levels. I suggest that integrating STS and HSTM will serve a second, much-needed purpose: leading students beyond case studies and codes of ethics to contemplate their individual roles and responsibilities in shaping our technological, social, and political futures; and illustrate how engineers, as possessors and creators of expert knowledge, can influence society through the long-term consequences of their work.

My paper describes the ways in which I included historical examples in Social and Ethical Impacts of Technology, a one-credit engineering ethics elective, and how that course then informed The History of Twentieth-Century Science, which I taught in the History of Science Department (both at UW-Madison). In both courses, I emphasized the need for engineers and scientists to consider the consequences of their work and to explore the roles they play in the mutual shaping of science, society, and culture. Are engineers responsible for any consequences – positive and negative - that might result? Such questions take ethics beyond cases and codes and into the long-term consequences of their ideas and designs, and help students outside the STEM disciplines think more critically about the scientific knowledge and devices they “consume.”

MOTIVATING MORAL REASONING: CONTEXTUALISM AND MORAL REMAINDER
Christopher Meyers, California State University-Bakersfield

Students typically approach the academic study of ethics as either naïve relativists or as simplistic absolutists. Our task as educators, thus, is to help them recognize that each such position is fraught with problems: while there may be correct answers in ethics, they are always rooted in the ambiguities of the specific circumstance.

That task is associated with a key element of entry-level ethics courses: our goal is as much about teaching effective moral reasoning as elucidating traditional moral theory. The task is also foundational to the idea that good ethics decision-making – because it is so hard and thus takes committed engagement – emerges best from persons of good moral character.

In this presentation I will recommend two conceptual points – both taken from W.D. Ross – that are key to understanding and engaging in moral reasoning. The first is the distinction between relativism and contextualism; i.e., the recognition that two seemingly similar ethics problems can have very different right answers, depending on context. The second – “moral remainder” – gets at the idea that, by their nature, ethical dilemmas will always leave a morally significant residue, even when one makes the right choice. I will show how, despite its counter-intuitive nature – in doing right we frequently do wrong – this concept logically emerges from the nature of dilemmas and also reinforces the complexity of moral reasoning.

I will close with a discussion of pedagogical methods for helping students embrace these concepts.

ETHICS ACROSS THE CURRICULUM: WHERE IT CAME FROM AND WHERE IT MAY BE GOING
Elaine Englehardt, Utah Valley University; Carl Mitcham, Colorado School of Mines, Andoni Ibarra, University of the Basque Country, and Xue Guibo, Nanjing Forestry University

This session will begin with a joint reflection by Elaine Englehardt and Carl Mitcham on the origins and possible futures of the ethics across the curriculum movement. As one of the founders of EAC, Englehardt will go first, summarizing key aspects of her experience and presenting a vision for the future. As someone who has been trying to bridge RCR education and EAC at a technological university, Mitcham will follow with a brief review of his problematic experience and try to project potential paths forward. This collaborative presentation will be followed by short commentaries offering international perspectives by a leading scholar from the Basque Country in Spain and by a younger scholar from Nanjing in China. The goal is to stimulate further commentary and discussion with the audience. Our hypothesis is that the “across” in “Ethics Across the Curriculum” needs to be extended across more disciplines in ways that promote more intense collaboration and integration and across the world, globally.
TEACHING AND LEARNING ETHICS AT THE UNIVERSITY: WHAT’S THE MEANING FOR FACULTY AND STUDENTS?

Juny Montoya, Mónica Almanza, and Angela Salas, Universidad de Los Andes

The purpose of this paper is to introduce partial results coming from an exploratory research about Ethics as a cross-curriculum component developed by the Center for Applied Ethics (CEA) at Universidad de los Andes in Bogotá, Colombia. The CEA actions are focused to involve a significant component of ethics within disciplinary courses at the university. A specific action in this process is to support professors in order to include and assess a significant component of ethics in their courses.

Our research explored the ethical education goals and contents in the courses in order to build a conceptual framework to introduce and assess the ethics components used by teachers in disciplinary courses. This concern was referred to learning content, activities, outcomes and teaching practices, above all. At this moment, the question isn’t solved at all, however there are remarkable partial findings consisting in an outcomes list that can be used as framework and even as assessment criteria. Also these outcomes serve as a guide in the development of ethics across the curriculum. This paper is divided in three sections proceeded by the outcomes list and the categories related to ethics across the curriculum. First section provides a description of the research according to the main goals proposed by CEA. The second part includes the methodology used. The final section presents evidence that support the learning outcomes found. By this work, the CEA are identifying some directions useful to improve the current activities in learning and teaching.

BEHAVIORAL LEGAL ETHICS, DECISION MAKING, AND THE NEW ATTORNEY’S UNIQUE PROFESSIONAL PERSPECTIVE

Catherine Gage O’Grady, Arizona State University

This article explores the emerging field of behavioral legal ethics to analyze the dynamic that takes place when a new attorney makes ethical decisions that diverge from ethical beliefs. Behavioral legal ethics has its roots in social psychology and business. Recently, scholars have begun to apply these principles to the practice of law - examining behavioral legal ethics. While all accredited law schools are required to teach ethics, most courses focus on learning a body of laws and rules, and not on understanding the situational pressures, psychological factors, and decision making heuristics that factor importantly into ethical (or unethical) action. In contrast to viewing ethics as grounded in rules of conduct, behavioral ethics explores empirically how people actually behave and attempts to understand the influence of situational and psychological pressures. It thus allows a comparison between the actor’s ethical beliefs and ultimate behavior, and it permits fuller consideration of unintentional unethical conduct.

My focus in this area is specifically on the new attorney - the practitioner with less than six years of practice experience. My thesis is that the new lawyer experiences the psychology of ethical decision making differently than her more experienced colleague. New attorneys are uniquely vulnerable to certain situational pressures and especially susceptible to some decision making heuristics; however, they may actually be more willing to see ethical implications and frame a situation in ethical terms rather than relying on moral intuition and business schemas. Understanding the unique dynamics relating to new attorneys is critical to promoting ethicality in the legal profession.

PANEL: HUMAN RIGHTS, “ILLEGALS” AND IMMIGRATION

Gabriel Palmer-Fernandez, Youngstown State University, Christopher Meyers, California State University-Bakersfield, Courtney Campbell, Oregon State University, and Daniel E. Wueste, Clemson University

Panelists will focus on this idea: a genuine commitment to human rights provides criteria for the moral evaluation of policies and laws concerning immigration as well as the treatment of “illegals” by authorities (e.g., border patrol, immigration officers, police) and others. In addition to discussing whether this is true and if so, what its practical implications are, the panelists will consider the philosophical question whether such criteria entail a rejection of any constraint on the free movement of people, including, of course, movement across national borders.

PANEL: ETHICS PEDAGOGY INFORMED BY THE DIT: AT THE INTERSECTION OF RESEARCH AND PRACTICE

Joanne Lalonde, University of Ottawa, Jane Stoneman McNichol, Mount Royal University, and Glenn Sinclair, Concordia University

This panel explores the use of Neo-Kohlbergian concepts of moral thinking, and the Defining Issues Test (DIT) (Rest et al., 1999) in particular, both as a source of research data and as a pedagogical tool for teaching ethics across the curriculum.

The first presenter discusses the results of an analysis of more than 1200 Defining Issues Test (DIT) results, focusing specifically on those of business students, and businessmen and women at various stages of their careers. In this study, business students were found to have mean Principled reasoning (P-scores) scores of 33.8% (n=260), while other participants had mean P-score of 43.2% (n=942). As well they were found to access personal interest schemas of reasoning more often than other groups. It is suggested that based on these research results, business ethics pedagogy incorporate moral reasoning, and ethical sensitivity tests as a starting point for the ethical capacity development of each student. Knowing ones’ own moral thinking schemas can then inform personal reflection that encourages ethical
goal setting through the development of ethical sensitivity and a richer moral vocabulary for business students.

Highlighting the importance of educating public relations professionals to meet the highest ethical standards, the next paper discusses emerging issues of ethical literacy and student reflections on ethical challenges in public relations. The presenter outlines an enhanced pedagogical approach to the ethics training of students in a 4th year undergraduate thesis course in a public relations program that uses a Kohlbergian approach to the discussion of moral dilemmas in the domain of public relations as well as the results of DIT-1’s as a comparator of ethical reasoning with students in other disciplines.

The final presentation offers a personal narrative that draws on more than 20 years of work with the DIT as both a research tool and as a pedagogical tool to explore concepts around the need for diversity of ethics teaching within the academy. Stages/schemas of moral reasoning as seen in the DIT results of over 1200 participants are vocationally or disciplinarily oriented and therefore there is a need to teach differently to different groups of students. The discussion leaves us with the challenging question: Is it possible that with all the pressure to make sure that ethics is a visible part of the curriculum that many in the academy simply want instructors who will stay under the radar and be good foot-soldiers?

EXPLORING THE ETHICS OF SUSTAINABLE DEVELOPMENT VIA STUDY ABROAD
Mary Jane C. Parmentier, and Sharlissa Moore, Arizona State University

Sustainable development (SD) has contested meanings, and perspectives can vary even within a society. Emphases can range from recycling advocacy to eradication of poverty. Assumptions and approaches to sustainable development inherently contain many ethical considerations, such as social and environmental justice, income inequality, wealth distribution, resource extraction and land use. This is significant as these perceptions inform policy and eventual outcomes. Students in the U.S. often do not have exposure to the issues of sustainable development in a global context, and so therefore might have a limited understanding of different socioeconomic realities. While the literature on study abroad supports the advantages to student learning, and the literature on education for sustainable development (ESD) indicates an inherent ethical component, there have been few sustainability programs abroad, and limited research on teaching the ethics of ESD abroad. This study proposes that considering the ethics of SD abroad will help students to understand the varying meanings of the term sustainable development, and raise their awareness of ethical dilemmas in differing contexts. This paper describes an academic program in Morocco and Spain during the summer of 2014, and assesses students’ perceptions of the ethical underpinnings of sustainable development during the study abroad experience. The results indicate that the largest impact on students’ awareness of ethics resulted from their observations and experiences with socioeconomic inequities, and unequal access to infrastructure. U.S. students were more impacted than international students, supporting the proposed advantages of teaching ethics outside of students’ cultural contexts.

FORMULATING AN ADVANCE DIRECTIVE FOR AUTOMOBILE DRIVING: A SAMPLE STUDENT ASSIGNMENT FOR PERSONAL FUTURE DECISION-MAKING
Ruth Forritt, West Chester University

Giving students the opportunity to fully deliberate a future personal decision provides them with the chance to apply the topics of autonomy and self-deception they’ve been studying in their ethics course. The results of their deliberations and research can be formulated into an Advance Directive aimed at their future selves, not a surrogate decision-maker, as we usually do with Medical Advance Directives. This future self is one who may be prone to confusion about alleged autonomy even as it is prone to self-deceive. This future self is probable based on the students’ compassionate observations and research on other people who are older than themselves and who are currently occupying the future conditions the students may one day occupy. The example I use in class is the personal decision about when to stop driving cars. For my presentation I will distribute this example and discuss how it can help students select their own future decision for writing their own advance directive.

THE ETHICS OF RAPID TECHNOLOGICAL CHANGE
Adam Potthast, Park University

Most discussion of the future is indistinguishable from a discussion of future technologies. In this paper I ask why this is and argue that the answer depends on the human propensity to focus on ways to manipulate the environment around them. I will argue that this was helpful and healthy in the recent past. However, humanity’s relationship to technology has changed recently with the advent of the rapid technological change we see in the Internet, advanced building materials, and machinery. This paper is not anti-technology. But I will argue the current rapid pace of technological change presents significant ethical and cultural problems in the near future. Rapid upgrade cycles, platform changes, and information presentation options prevent deeply rooted cultural objects from emerging and weaken cultural institutions. After making some suggestions about how to deal with this phenomenon, I examine some non-technological ways of thinking about ways the future will change.
RAISING THE STAKEHOLDERs: MORAL IMAGINATION, SELF-CULTIVATION, AND LEADERSHIP EXCELLENCE
Alan Preti, Rosemont College

Moral imagination is often viewed as a necessary condition for ethical leadership in the business context on account of its role in managerial decision-making and organizational management. I suggest that an extension of the notion beyond this limited context sheds light on recent reconceptualizations of the nature of business and the relation of business and society proffered by several well-known business leaders. I also suggest that an account of moral imagination which takes into consideration its contribution to the development of a morally deeper and broader perspective and its bearing on character is of particular value for business leaders.

TEACHING ORWELL’S 1984 WITHIN AN INTERDISCIPLINARY CONTEXT
Eric Roark, Millikin University

In my paper I seek to explore some of the main themes from Orwell’s 1984 that help to expose the entering university student to the value and worth of an interdisciplinary approach to ethics and critical thinking generally within a multitude of disciplinary perspectives. Orwell’s invention of an oppressive social and political order organized under the authority of ‘The Party’ is an idea that has the potential to captivate entering University students right from the get-go. It is an idea that entering Freshman students have often grappled with on a much smaller scale as most of them have begun to reflect upon the role of the individual self (their self) within a highly codified and formalized social structure (family structure, institutional school setting, or work setting). This initial captivating power is unlikely to diminish anytime soon as Amazon reported that during the initial week of the Edward Snowden affair, the best selling book in its complete collection was in fact 1984. Further many entering university students have heard of 1984, and a good number have given the text an albeit cursory reading or have in the least have heard references to the text - big brother is watching you. As the reach of the state becomes increasingly omni-present with the latest ways of technological surveillance, the draw and relevance of 1984 increases accordingly and as such offers students an excellent bridge to being an exploration of topics and issues within: literature, ethics, epistemology, theories of truth, sociology, economics, history, and psychology.

MORAL RELATIONS AND MORAL PROBLEMS
Wade Robison, Rochester Institute of Technology

We always hope that if stopped by a police officer for speeding, we will get a warning, not a ticket. The officer can exercise discretion in virtue of being an officer. I cannot stop you and exercise that discretion, but as a professor, I can exercise discretion about holding students to a deadline for a paper.

Such examples illustrate a truth about the various positions we hold in society – a police officer, professor, physician, engineer. Someone holding such a position has a number of moral relations. Your physician is empowered to touch various parts of your body that I, as a professor, cannot touch without risking admonishment and perhaps dismissal.

The main chapters of one text in professional ethics all have a similar title: “Clients and obligations, Society and obligations…” – as though the only relevant moral relations we find ourselves in involve obligations. But we also acquire other moral relations that can also raise moral issues. Not all moral problems we face are dependent on the obligations we take on when we enter into a position. So when we teach ethics in the various disciplines, we need to teach about the other moral relations we enter into and the kinds of problems they can create.

SCENARIO PLANNING FOR SUSTAINABILITY: ARE DIVERSE VOICES HEARD?
Sandra Rodegher, and Cynthia Selin, Arizona State University

Scenario planning is a process for exploring potential futures and thinking critically about complex, highly uncertain issues. Its effectiveness in shifting mental models, engaging diverse stakeholders, and enhancing organizational learning has made it ideal for the action-oriented field of sustainability.

For any collaborative, deliberative process to be just, it must account for potential social factors, such as influence, that might impact one’s ability to authentically participate. Arnstein (1969) coined the term “token participation”, to describe situations in which people are allowed to participate but aren’t granted decision-making power. Conversely, people may have decision-making power but their ability to meaningfully participate is undercut; we coin this "strawman participation". Thus, “authentic participation” allows for both decision-making power and participation free of social influence.

With an energy-focused scenario planning event as a case study, the current project used ethnographic analysis in order to identify which social factors most impact authentic participation. Findings demonstrate that factors including status and gender dynamics impact engagement and hinder authentic participation. The subtly of social influence may lead parties to conclude that the group has engaged in a democratic, participative and just process when, in actuality, it has not. This may result in folding inequalities into the articulation of viable futures that inform long-term planning.
TEACHING ETHICS, MORALITY, AND VALUES IN AN UNDERGRADUATE HUMAN SEXUALITY COURSE
Robert Salt, University of Wisconsin-Stout

Ethical and moral issues regarding human sexuality are currently major topics of debate within politics, religion, and society at large, both in the US and in many other nations. This presentation will discuss the important issue of ethics and morality within the context of an undergraduate human sexuality course. The presentation will cover the key pedagogical techniques, content, and assessment methods. Discussion will include the strengths and weaknesses of the various methods and content. Content will include religion, law, morality, and ethical values and ethical systems.

ECONOMIC INEQUALITY
Stephen Satris, Clemson University

Great economic inequality is a fact — both in this country and in many others. Furthermore, the charts and data in The Spirit Level, by R. Wilkinson and K. Pickett (2009) show that economic inequality is associated with many social ills, such as mental illness, lower life expectancy, and higher rates of imprisonment, homicide, and child abuse, etc. These social problems are not correlated with poor nations, but with nations that have within them a high degree of economic inequality.

More recently, inequality has only grown in most countries of the world; we have seen it firsthand in the U.S. Furthermore, the situation is now recognizably worse, especially in light of such things as the Citizens United case, where greater wealth can easily translate into greater political power. We already know that “the richer get richer and the poor get poorer” but now we can see a specific social dynamic at work. It’s not only that having some money can lead to having more money, but having more money can lead to having a louder voice in what should be a democratic process of legislation. Moneyed corporate collectives can now hire lobbyists who will make sure that our legislators enact laws that will benefit those who have the money to pay those lobbyists.

I consider in detail some philosophical ideas about the nature of society and the ownership of personal property. Finally I suggest some practical means of dealing with — and limiting — economic inequality.

INDIVIDUAL AND COLLECTIVE RESPONSIBILITY FOR CORRUPTION AND CHEATING: AVOIDING A PERUVIAN FUTURE
Stephen Scales, Towson University

Corruption is rampant in Peruvian society. In 2012, one in five Peruvians reported paying a bribe in order to receive some sort of social service and 88% of households perceived both the Peruvian police and the Peruvian judicial system to be either “corrupt” or “very corrupt”.

There are many theories about which economic, political, and cultural factors contribute to increased corruption in a society, but I would like to focus on one: the perception that working hard and playing by the rules will not result in social/economic success and that the only way to succeed is to cheat the system. Peru may stand as an object lesson for the impending future of the United States. Although Peruvian corruption is generally of the illegal variety and U.S. corruption tends to be (technically) legal, the increased concentration of wealth and power in the hands of the richest members of our society may be leading us into a future where the bonds of trust between us and the very sense of legitimacy of our society break down. Only by regaining the sense that we have both the responsibility and the real power to shape the social system surrounding us can we (both the U.S. and Peru) keep the scourge of corruption at bay.

CENSORSHIP OF PORNOGRAPHY: IS THE BATTLE OVER?
Kim Skoog, University of Guam

For nearly a half century, a heated debate has raged over the availability of pornographic material to consenting adult. Yet in recent years, this dispute as simmered with ethics classes dropping or reducing time talking about it, public forums discussing it only infrequently, and fewer pornographers in court. This should not come as a surprise given that the pornography business has bloomed into a multi-billion dollar industry that has taken a predominant place on the internet. For most Americans, pornography is not the filth and threat that it once was perceived to be.

So where lies the future of this cluster of issues? Does society have a right to censor certain material that a dwindling number of citizens find offensive, distasteful? Is there a real harm to society, individuals, and women that we as a society have a responsibility to protect? Should moral concerns give way to the economics of supply and demand? In a larger context, does this issue still make sense, is there still a perceived and justifiable need to ban pornography?

Today we live in a world where pornography has mainstreamed into daily society. The pop culture of rap videos, teenage fashion, and social media propagates this sex-exposed youth culture. The issue is no longer how do we stop pornography, but rather how do we evaluate, classify, and regulate it’s presence and influence in today’s world.
DEVELOPING A SOCIAL MEDIA PLATFORM TO DEFINE & STRENGTHEN SHARED VALUES

Kelly Smith, Clemson University

This Fall, Clemson will begin a partnership with a private company to develop and implement an online system designed to foster campus discussions of values, both personal and institutional. The system uses responses to weekly dilemmas to compute each student’s alignment with the classical values of virtue ethics as well as with the virtue “fingerprint” of the institution, thus setting the stage for a variety of discussions that the system is designed to accommodate and deepen. As with any social media site, all the information in the system will be highly user friendly fashion - for example, users can see snapshots of how their responses and those of the groups they belong to compare to the “ideal” values of the institution. This sets the stage for the kind of friendly competition which has proven an effective means of holding user attention on other platforms. As community members are drawn into the system, they will be forced to actively reflect on what they stand for and why in a way that rarely happens otherwise. There is even a “kudo” system embedded in the software that will allow every member of our community to easily reward meritorious acts by any other member with public recognition to reinforce teachable moments in daily life. After outlining the system and discussing the early results of its implementation, I will give participants access so they can play with its features on their own. In the time remaining, we will have free discussion as participants desire.

NARRATIVES IN THE TEACHING OF BIOMEDICAL ETHICS

Kate Swenson, and Courtney Campbell, Oregon State University

The authors suggest a model of teaching higher-education biomedical ethics courses which integrates narrative practices, to be used in tandem with theoretical and analytical bioethics approaches. The narrative bioethics method makes use of story-telling from experience, interpretation, context and situatedness, and audience to effectively teach the foundations of ethical competence in medicine. This engages students in a multidimensional curriculum which heightens awareness of moral issues, situates students in real-life moral conflicts, and provides opportunity for self-reflection and deliberation. Both written narrative and dramatic films will be used. A sample curriculum is provided, and the authors will discuss their classroom experience both with written and dramatic film approaches to narrative bioethics.

JUSTIFYING AN ARIZONA BOYCOTT

Alan Tomhave, and Mark Vopat, Youngstown State University

Boycotts are commonly called for when a business or business owner engages in morally suspect actions or advocates for certain political positions. We have argued in the past that an organized boycott of a business is only justified in cases where the actions of the business cause unjust harm to others. In cases where the actions simply express an opinion that may not be morally or politically popular, a boycott is problematic.

In this paper we extend the above argument to justify organized boycotts for cases involving the actions of states that enact laws or practices that are morally problematic. On our view an organized boycott of Arizona is justified due to its recent and controversial immigration law (SB 1070). However, if an organized boycott of Arizona is justified, then how can we defend our attendance at this conference? This is an important question not simply for our own moral feelings on our conference attendance, but is also important to questions of how we should engage responsibly with issues such as immigration and human rights in the future. This leads to a secondary concern of our paper, where we consider what would count as a principled exception. In cases where the violation of a boycott is specifically with the intent to enter the marketplace of ideas and engage with the issue which initially justified the boycott, then the boycott may be justifiably violated. Universities are one of the key places where debates in the marketplace of ideas happen. Thus, attendance at this conference satisfies the requirements of a principled exception. This also provides guidance for future interactions with communities that may engage in morally suspect behaviors.

OWNING UP TO YOUR LIFE

John Uglietta, Grand Valley State University

One of the primary questions in engaging the future is engaging our own personal future. Should we pursue our own satisfaction or seek out more meaningful activity? Discussions of meaning often follow one of two paths, either drawing on an objective idea of meaning or a subjective idea of satisfaction. Hybrid theories of meaning incorporate both an objective or external element and an internal or subjective element. While such views seem to match our intuitions, they may seem unjustified or ad hoc. I will argue that we can justify such hybrid views of meaning by recognizing that claims that one’s life is meaningful are claims of responsibility. Similar to claims of moral responsibility, for such a claim to make sense, the person’s actions must have a certain character that includes both subjective and objective components. If we can justify a hybrid account of meaning, we can better understand how a meaningful life relates to a moral life and how meaningful pursuits might not be opposed to self-interest, but might be a part of one’s own personal interest and help make one’s life better. I will finish by sketching a view that distinguishes between lives that are meaningful and ones that are pleasant or satisfying, and suggest that we must understand meaning in order to accurately understand our own self-interest. I will suggest that meaningful activity is an important part of a good life and therefore can be in one’s self interest.
ETHICS, DISABILITY, AND THE VISUAL EXPERIENCE
Danney Ursery, St. Edward’s University

When you visually experience physically impaired bodies what do you see? What does it tell you about your life or the lives of the person being experienced? How can the experience of looking at someone’s dis-abled body which can cause cognitive dissonance or aesthetic anxiety, lead to potentially greater moral understanding? Using Rosemarie Garland-Thomson’s concept of “visual activism”, I will show that bodies, in this case dis-abled bodies, offer us the opportunity to expand our moral awareness and alter the way we see Others and the world.

Physically and cognitively impaired individuals have often not been considered part of a moral community, much less able to influence moral decision-making. The less than “abled” must not only be included in our moral community, but considered essential to this community; this inclusion can provide an experiential understanding of ethics. Through words and images, I will show why experiencing and staring at those with physical dis-abilities can provide a foundation for ethics as well as why “disability ethics” should be included and discussed in many or most academic disciplines.

A SEAT AT THE TABLE
Phylis (Peggy) Vandenberg, Grand Valley State University

This is a state of the discipline report specifically concerning the philosopher’s role in practical ethics. Included in the discussion is professional ethics and ethics in the workplace, the ethics of individual professional schools, ethical codes and policy decisions as well as their application. Particularly addressed is the role of philosophers in the setting of policies and standards, their application and the ongoing modifications needed in response to societal, professional, political, and technical changes and advances that make some ethical principles outdated and inapplicable. What has been the role of philosophy and philosophers in this process? What is it now? What should it be in the future? I begin with Michael Pritchard on the philosophical and public engagement of Socrates, Henry Sidgwick and Thomas Reid. Then briefly consider later public philosophers such as Simone de Beauvoir, Bertrand Russell, Jane Addams, and lately Noam Chomsky. I end with the state of philosophy and philosophers’ engagement in the 21st century. Does philosophical discourse matter and have an impact? The discussion will then move to the teaching of ethics, particularly practical ethics that has been historically the domain of Philosophy and Religion. Yet in academic settings, there are less and less philosophers at the table. Ethics is gradually becoming the domain of the particular discipline, Communication Ethics, Business Ethics, Bio-Ethics, etc. I will end with my own theory on ways philosophers could respond to these developments, become engaged in these important considerations and perhaps earn a seat back at the table.

SOCIAL rEVOLUTION: THE EVOLUTION OF SOCIAL JUSTICE THROUGH GOVERNMENTAL INTERVENTION AND TECHNOLOGICAL REBELLION
Dustin VanPelt, Grand Valley State University

With the grassroots election of Barack Obama and Twitter-led protests in Iran, the focus on technology as a driving social force has just recently come to the attention of people and governments around the world. Technologies such as Twitter and the Internet have been able to spread ideas of social justice where even the most vocal politician has failed, effectively changing the social landscape by giving voice and means to the masses, but it has also created new avenues for governments to suppress and control their citizenry through carefully developed strategies, turning those same technological advances into tools of oppression and manipulation.

In this paper I will introduce Martha Nussbaum’s Capabilities Approach and how it relates to human rights before arguing how her position requires something further: a mechanism for ensuring that those rights can be achieved. With this requirement in mind I will argue how access to technologies like the Internet should not only be a basic human right, but that it can also be the mechanism used to achieve the sorts of capabilities Nussbaum pushes for in her book. It seems that access to the Internet is both within her requirements and outside of them, a basic right and a tool to be utilized to acquire social justice and provide societies with the freedoms and capabilities necessary to fulfill her fundamental conception of a flourishing life.

ETHICAL DIMENSIONS OF SCIENTIFIC RESEARCH WITH A SUSTAINABILITY FOCUS: BUILDING OPEN-SOURCE, INTERACTIVE ONLINE MODULES AT THE GRADUATE LEVEL
Stephanie Vasko, Tess Crossen, Tom Richard, and Nancy Tuana, Pennsylvania State University

Creating online materials for ethics education can be a complex endeavor. In order to provide the best educational experience for students, teams interested in developing these materials must understand the constraints and opportunities offered by online dissemination, as well as possess the knowledge and access to infrastructure to bring their ideas to fruition. Successful teams will bring instructional designers, subject matter and assessment experts, and project managers to the table. Additionally, the roles of the target audience and effective science communication in content creation must be considered. This talk will explore the experience of developing online ethics education modules under the auspices of a National Science Foundation Ethics Education in Science and Engineering (ESEE) grant. Modules being built for this grant focus on topics in sustainability with an eye towards future energy, climate, and food security needs through topics such as biofuels, genetically modified organisms, solar energy, and sea level rise. Students are introduced not only to the science of the topic, but also to
the ethical issues that may arise around the topic using an expanded notion of the ethical dimensions of scientific research (EDSR). EDSR includes research integrity (RCR), as well as embedded ethical questions in scientific research and the broader impacts of scientific research. This paper will touch on challenges and opportunities of developing these modules, including, but not limited to: software, 508 compliance, interactivity, methods for assessment, and content development. Lessons learned from this project will be applicable to groups interested in developing ethics education materials for online only or blended learning uses.

EAC AT TECNOLÓGICO DE MONTERREY, AGAINST ALL ODDS
Norma Velasco, Tecnológico de Monterrey

Mexico is a democrat country with 31 states. According to the Population and Housing Census of 2010, México has 112,336,538 inhabitants. The total population living in poverty is 46.2% of the total population. Another of the greatest concerns in México beside the social, political an economical situation is corruption. The results of Transparency International office has reported México as a country #106 being measured 175 countries. That is why The Tecnologico of Monterrey, aware of the actual situation in México has developed an important program on Ethics.

One of the strategies to meet the academic requirements with the graduate profile proposed by the Mission ITESM 2015 is the inclusion of two classes in Ethics, for all the programs on undergraduate level. The main challenge of this program on Ethics is that we have nearly 54,000 thousand students on 26 campuses around our country.

I proposed an EAC program four years ago with a very original pedagogical structure. At the moment 25% of our faculty are certified on EAC. And nearly 77, 910 students have been impacted by an experience in class through cases of actual situations in order to be aware, of what is morally/ethically at stake in a given situation of their personal, professional and social community life. This project is intended to strength teachers, and students in the ability to contribute to build a better and just society.

DO WE HAVE A DUTY TO DIE IN THE AGE OF LIFE EXTENSION?: RESPONSIBILITY TO FUTURE GENERATIONS AND LIFE EXTENSION TECHNOLOGY
Robert Vigliotti, Rockhurst University

Medical advances and historical demographic trends lead us reasonably to expect that in the twenty-first century humans in developed nations will achieve an average life expectancy of 90 or more years. Such changes in human life spans are already causing drastic social problems and will place increasingly severe burdens on future generations. We therefore need to take up in a new way the question of whether human beings have a duty to die. When John Hardwig first published his controversial meditation on a duty to die, he outlined criteria, based on the quality of life one has lived and the responsibility one has to one’s descendants, that may be relevant today in deliberating about whether our society should continue the project to extend lifespans as long as possible. The philosopher Hans Jonas, in response to problems created by the ever-growing power of technology, proposes an ethics of responsibility that extends to future human generations. Jonas’ moral theory indicates that we may collectively be obligated to refuse life-extension technologies and to accept a duty to die to make room for our descendants. In light of such a responsibility to the future, Hardwig’s criteria for a duty to die may prove relevant not for individuals facing the end of life, but for humanity facing the end of death.

EMBEDDING “VALUES THINKING” IN TEACHER, HEALTHCARE, AND ENGINEERING CURRICULA
Annie Warren, Heather Ross and Rider Foley, Arizona State University

Contemporary higher education in Western societies is, largely, grounded in rationalism that teaches students to fragment knowledge into “evidence-based, rigorous, and scientific” versus “emotional, unsubstantiated, and experiential”. This leads students to a worldview that privileges rational thought and knowledge that is distilled and presumably value-free. For this reason it is important to consider the ideologies and behaviors that professional programs inculcate, especially as higher education institutions seek to shape, prepare, and educate the next generation. Professional degree programs for future teachers, healthcare providers, and engineers are striving to educate the next generation to make informed decisions, challenge the status quo, and identify problems as well as solutions if these professions aspire to improve the human condition. Indeed, ethics is a core competency in every discipline.

This paper intends to explore the topic of Values Thinking as one approach to embedding ethics in preparing future teachers, healthcare professionals, and engineers to tackle complexities at intrapersonal, interpersonal, intragroup, and intergroup levels. We propose that all education and curricula is in fact value-laden. As such, it is important to embed Values Thinking into distinct professional programs as a key competency for ethics education. Values Thinking goes beyond learning to recognize different value sets to engage student to reflect upon their own values and to negotiate between different values. We describe experiences in developing curricula that is explicitly value-laden for teacher preparation, advanced practice nursing, and engineering education. In support of this approach, we discuss links and discontinuities between values thinking and professional ethics.
**TEACHING THE VALUE OF PRIVACY IN AN AGE OF PERVERSIVE SURVEILLANCE TECHNOLOGY**
*Jeremy Weissman, University of South Carolina*

In our age of social media and ever-present recording devices it is increasingly common to hear that privacy is dead, and that we ought to simply adjust to this new reality. In particular, for students today raised in a world inundated with technology, they are often simply unaware of even the value of privacy. Emerging technologies currently in development, such as Google Glass, threaten to erode privacy even further. What often drives resignation in the privacy debate concerning new technology is a zero-sum notion that privacy and a certain class of new technologies are simply incompatible. This, however, is a mistaken notion. Current work being done by the Office of the Information and Privacy Commissioner of Ontario can serve as a model for how this zero-sum model can be countered. Their Privacy by Design initiative seeks to embed new government surveillance technologies with privacy-protecting mechanisms. Such initiatives give hope that solutions could be developed in order to address privacy concerns related to commercially available technology as well. But unless an immediate effort is made to teach the value of privacy in our curriculum, there will be little will among young people today to reach for solutions that will protect privacy in the development and adoption of new technologies. The result will instead be a new reality where privacy really is vanquished, and the feeling of being constantly monitored is pervasive.

**A COMPARISON AND ASSESSMENT OF 3 VERSIONS OF ANTICIPATORY ETHICS**
*Richard L. Wilson, University of Maryland at Baltimore County*

Anticipatory Ethics has recently emerged as an important new direction in practical ethics. In general, anticipatory ethics can be said to relate to the development of emerging and innovative technologies. For the sake of our analysis we shall refer to the development of IT technology. In this discussion 3 variant views on emerging IT and anticipatory ethics will be examined. These views are those of Phillip Brey in “Anticipating ethical issues in emerging IT”, the view of Deborah Johnson in “Software Agents, Anticipatory Ethics, and Accountability”, and the view of Floridi and Sanders in “On the morality of artificial agents”. Each of these views offers important insights for the future development of anticipatory ethics.

The view taken in this analysis is that a comparison and contrast of these 3 views of emerging IT and anticipatory ethics revolves around 3 types of interactions, agent to agent interactions, agent to artefact interactions and artefact to artefact interactions. Each of the authors has a specific view of these relationships and the ethical responsibilities related to these relationships. By comparing and contrasting these views the ground is prepared for seeing the strengths and weaknesses of each these views and then developing a view of anticipatory ethics based upon them.

The importance of anticipatory ethics for practical ethics is crucial because of the influence of information technology in all aspects of contemporary existence. The comparison and contrast of 3 important views on anticipatory ethics prepares us to see what is likely to become important in the future for anticipatory ethics.

**AN ETHICAL ANALYSIS OF UAV’S FOCUSING ON THE MQ-9 “REAPER”**
*Richard L. Wilson, University of Maryland at Baltimore County*

This paper will discuss the ethical and social issues with MQ-9 drone program. The analysis will be divided into three sections. The first will be to explain the technical capabilities and flaws of the MQ-9 drones then move on to discuss strategies for how to overcome them. The second section will deal with the ethical and social issues in regards to the drones and the drone program. The third and final section will develop recommendations made as to how to go about rectifying the ethical and social issues with the MQ-9.

The ethical issues that will be examined include the emotional stress placed on the operators (pilots and sensor operators), more specifically how to go about dealing with that stress, the fact that the operating system of drones can be hacked, and the collateral damage caused by the use of drones. Three ethical principles will be used will in this discussion which are Deontology, Contractarianism, and Rights. This analysis will also be supported with principles contained within the NSPE code of ethics.

The analysis will proceed by developing an Anticipatory Ethical Stakeholder Analysis. Two groups of stakeholders, primary and secondary, will be discussed in this analysis. Primary stakeholders will be defined as those who are immediately affected by the use of drones. The engineers, those killed in drone strikes and the drone operators will all be considered to be primary stakeholders. The secondary stakeholders, those that could potentially become primary stakeholders in the future, will include the future targets of drone strikes, the governments of foreign nations, and the general public.

**DOES UTILITARIANISM DEMAND COMPLETE IMPARTIALITY?**
*Erik Wingrove-Haugland, United States Coast Guard Academy*

Recent proponents and critics of utilitarianism have assumed it demands complete impartiality, and thus makes extremely strong demands regarding how to engage the future responsibly. Peter Singer’s claims that utilitarianism requires us to give much of our income to famine relief efforts in distant lands, and Bernard Williams’ claim that it unreasonably demands we abandon the projects that give our lives meaning, are both based on the assumption that utilitarianism demands complete impartiality. This assumption is now widely seen as obvious, rather than as an interpretation of utilitarianism or an account
of one kind of utilitarianism, although neither Bentham nor Mill made such an assumption. While it is possible to interpret utilitarianism as demanding complete impartiality, it is also possible to interpret utilitarianism as requiring only limited impartiality, which demands we give equal weight to the interests of everyone affected by our acts, but does not require us to ensure that everyone is equally affected by our acts. Mill's focus on quality of pleasure, his distinction between the rule of action and the motive for it, and his rejection of the claim that we must consider the world as a whole in our acts show that Mill's utilitarianism demands only limited impartiality, not complete impartiality. Mill's utilitarianism is more plausible in this respect; interpreting utilitarianism as requiring only limited impartiality makes it more consistent with the views of its founders, refutes Williams' criticisms, and shows that, while utilitarianism demands we increase famine relief efforts, it does so to a lesser extent, for different reasons, and with different priorities than Singer asserts.

IS "ETHICS ACROSS THE CURRICULUM" RUINING THE TEACHING OF ETHICS? THE USE AND ABUSE OF ETHICS ACROSS THE CURRICULUM PROGRAMS

Erik Wingrove-Haugland, United States Coast Guard Academy

It is understandable that those attending a conference on Ethics Across the Curriculum tend to assume that ethics across the curriculum programs are superior to the traditional model of teaching ethics using a course in the discipline of philosophy or religion. While this assumption is usually true, successful ethics across the curriculum programs require significant support from administrators and faculty, and must have a group of interested faculty with expertise in both a technical field and in philosophical ethics. Institutions that replace a required moral philosophy course with an ethics across the curriculum program for which they lack one or more of the required elements are very likely to reduce the effectiveness of their ethics instruction.

This is not merely a theoretical concern; one engineering-oriented undergraduate college that has had a required moral philosophy course for 25 years has proposed replacing it with an ethics "thread" created by putting an "E" next to five required courses indicating that they will cover ethics. Faculty members teaching these five required courses lack both the expertise and the desire to teach ethics which such a model requires. While this institution believes it is replacing an outdated model of teaching ethics with a state-of-the-art "ethics across the curriculum" program, this change is extremely likely to weaken the ethics content of the curriculum. This institution, and many others, would be better off retaining a required course while using shared course development and team-teaching to develop faculty with the skills and commitment needed to teach ethics modules in an across-the-curriculum program.

A PLAGUE OF PLAGIARY?

Daniel E. Wueste, Clemson University

The most recent plagiarism scandal was digital in the sense that it did not involve ink on paper but pixels on computer screens or other devices that connect to the Internet. More interesting, however, is Gene Weingarten's argument that "as a plagiarism scandal, this is bull-doody."

The paper explores some important ways in which what appears to be a plague of plagiary directs attention to the future, largely, though not exclusively, because a digital world differs from the world it seems to have replaced, i.e., a world in which knowledge, news, art and scholarship, for example, took form and were experienced through what we now call "hard copy." We will do this by taking a careful look at (i) Weingarten's provocative claim and argument and some of the responses prompted by them; (ii) Brian Martin's insightful and enormously useful distinction between "institutional plagiarism" and competitive plagiarism; and (iii) what's at stake, so far as responsible engagement with (and the making of our) future is concerned if the "gotcha" mentality exhibited in this seeming plague of plagiary is not checked. In exploring what is at stake, we will look at some actual cases that, it is hoped, will resonate and prompt reflection since, among other things, they will strike close to home for us as educators.

ON PHILOSOPHICAL BELIEFS IN SCIENCE AND ACADEMIA

Brian Zaharatos, Colorado School of Mines

In 2004, the city of Memphis celebrated the "50th Anniversary of Rock 'n' Roll", attributing the origin of the genre to Elvis Presley's 1954 recording of "That's All Right. Some have rightly taken issue with this point of origin; black artists were playing what sounded like rock 'n' roll music for years before Elvis. This event seems to be just one in the history of music in which white artists capitalize on the talent of lesser-known black artists. Still today, some argue that white artists are more successful at pushing boundaries simply because they are white.

Just as the influence of black musicians sometimes goes unacknowledged, the influence that philosophers and ethicists have had on science often goes unacknowledged. In this paper, I will argue that, despite the recent criticisms of philosophy given by Lawrence Krauss, Neil deGrass Tyson, and Stephen Hawking, philosophical thinking has a central place in modern science and academia.

If my arguments are successful, then it follows that a strong science education ought to include some study of philosophy and ethics. Further, since philosophical thinking is integrated into scientific practice, philosophical and ethical learning ought to be integrated into science education. For example, the study of philosophical topics in secondary and post-secondary education, such as the interpretation of probability and the problem of induction, may prove to be more representative of mathematical and scientific practice and more engaging to students.
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We hope you enjoyed your stay in Scottsdale. Please return your name badge holder to the registration table before departing.
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