

## PHILOSOPHY 333 (99A, 99B) Bio-Medical Ethics (September-December 2025)

**Instructor:** Doran Smolkin, Ph. D. [doran.smolkin@ubc.ca](mailto:doran.smolkin@ubc.ca)

**Course Welcome:** Welcome to PHIL 333! This version of PHIL 333 is taught as an *Online Learning Course*. This means there are no set lecture times, and all learning is done remotely on Canvas. **The course content is almost entirely text-based**, although I will provide a few supplemental video recordings over the term. The schedule for the course, assigned weekly readings, my weekly written lesson summaries, and access to weekly discussion boards are all available through Canvas. All written work, including the final exam, is to be submitted through Canvas.

Although all course work is done remotely, you are welcome to meet with me in virtual office hours or by appointment over Zoom to discuss the course material or any of the assignments. Just join in on my weekly scheduled office hours (no appointment necessary) or email me to set up an appointment. I look forward to meeting you!

**Office Hours:** **Mondays:** 8 am to 10 am on Zoom. See the Canvas course home page for the meeting link.

**Course Description:** What, *in general*, makes actions morally right or wrong, people virtuous or vicious, and policies just or unjust? Is euthanasia morally permissible? Under what conditions, if any, should euthanasia or Medical Assistance in Dying (MAiD) be legal? What is the relationship between patient autonomy, competence, informed consent, and valid consent? When, if ever, is medical paternalism, and paternalism generally, morally justified? Under what circumstances, if any, is abortion morally wrong? For instance, would it be morally wrong to abort because the fetus has Down syndrome? And when, if ever, does the fetus get the moral right to life? What, in general, gives one the moral right to life? And what should we think about how to weigh the autonomy of the pregnant person if it conflicts with the moral right to life of the fetus? What are the morally justified rules of triage, and is it ever morally permissible for a triage nurse to treat one person ahead of another for non-medical considerations, such as a person who is ill or injured through no fault of their own ahead of another person who is at fault for being ill or injured? Under what conditions, if any, should doctors provide alternative, unproven therapies to their patients who request them? Under what conditions, if any, is two-tier MRI morally just? And does Canada's current system of two-tier access to MRI fulfill these conditions for being morally just?

In Philosophy 333, we will explore answers to these and to other questions. We will, in short, critically examine some leading normative ethical theories, and some important, and difficult, ethical issues in health care.

### **Objectives for this course:**

- Acquiring a critical grasp of leading normative ethical theories
- Gaining a critical understanding of some important philosophical literature on some moral problems in health care
- Developing your critical reasoning skills when it comes to identifying arguments in a text, stating those arguments in a precise and clear manner, and raising targeted objections
- Encouraging you to consider your own views on selected moral problems in health care, to consider your reasons for your views, to examine your views and reasons critically, and to rethink your views in response to criticism
- Improving your skills in writing in an organized, clear, fair-minded, and thoughtful manner

More generally, the aim of this course is not to tell you what to think, but to give you the skills to think for yourself, while enhancing your philosophical literacy. By successfully completing this course, you will gain a better understanding of moral theory generally; a greater familiarity with specific arguments on specific ethical issues in health care; a deeper understanding of your own views on these issues, and an enhanced ability to identify, articulate, develop, and critically analyze arguments.

Success in this course will require hard work; consistent participation and engagement with the course materials; writing clearly and carefully; being fair but critical of others' arguments and of your own arguments; and a willingness to keep an open mind.

### **Required Readings:**

- ***Textbook: Debating Health Care Ethics: Canadian Contexts*, 3<sup>rd</sup> edition, Doran Smolkin, Patrick Findler, Warren Bourgeois. Canadian Scholars, 2025.**

The textbook is **available for purchase in print from the UBC Bookstore, or in electronic form through the publisher, <https://canadianscholars.ca/book/debating-health-care-ethics-third-edition/>**. Three e-copies of the book are available through the UBC library at no charge. Unfortunately, **only 1 person** at a time can borrow the library e-book, so access is not always going to be reliable, especially as the paper due dates and the final exam approach.

- ***Selected Articles:*** a selection of influential and important philosophical articles in health care ethics. **Copies of these articles are available free of charge through the “Library Online Course Reserve”** tab on the Canvas course home page.

**Explanation of the Textbook:** *Debating Health Care Ethics: Canadian Contexts* begins with a brief discussion of philosophical arguments and methodology (Chapter 1). It then turns to an in-depth examination of leading ethical theories (Chapter 2). In Chapter 3, each co-author presents their favored ethical theory. The remaining chapters of the book focus on moral problems in health care and are written in **debate** format. More specifically, each chapter begins with a **drama** – a fictional case designed to introduce a particular moral problem. The drama is then followed by a **debate** between the three authors of the text. In the debate, you will witness (hopefully) a lively exchange of ideas, as different perspectives are considered, attacked, occasionally abandoned, sometimes refined, and at other times defended. You will see philosophers sometimes coming to agreement and sometimes agreeing to disagree. You can then decide for yourself whether you agree with any of the authors, why you reject some of the arguments presented, and you can develop your own thoughts on the issues raised in the drama and debate. The format is designed to show you how to develop an argument for a particular position, how to criticize an argument, and how to defend or revise an argument in response to criticism.

**Explanation of the Primary Source Readings:** The primary sources used in this course include some of the leading contributions to the field of medical ethics, on issues like abortion, autonomy, euthanasia,

and access to health care. The articles are primary sources – typically, journal articles, though sometimes book chapters -- which are intended to supplement the debates in the textbook, and to provide students with good examples of professional, philosophical writing.

**Grades:** Grades will be based on the following components:

Participation in online Discussions	25%
Completion of 2 Essays	50% (25% each)
Final Exam	25%

### **Explanation of the Graded Components of the Course:**

**Online Discussions:** At the end of each lesson and throughout the textbook, discussion questions are given. Each week you should go to the Discussion Board through Canvas and answer one of these questions, or you can use the discussions to ask your own questions and make your own comments on the readings, or you can comment on your classmates' postings. To keep discussions manageable, **do one discussion post (or comment) per lesson. As there are 26 lessons total, aim for a total of 26 posts. Please do not do more than 1 post (or comment) per lesson.** Also, to keep discussions timely, **Discussion Boards stay open for 2 weeks after the material is assigned.** After that point, you won't be able to make new discussions posts on that topic.

Note that these discussions are primarily for student interaction, although I do read all posts. Please feel free to **email me directly, or drop into Zoom office hours, if you would like me to answer specific questions about the material.**

**Using AI for discussion posts is a violation of academic integrity and is strictly forbidden.** The penalty for using AI to answer a discussion post is a grade of **zero** for the entire discussion portion of the course. Please act with academic integrity and do your own work.

**Essay Questions:** The essay questions focus on the moral problems raised in the textbook's Drama or and addressed in the textbook's Debates. Essays are designed to move us toward realizing the course objectives. To that end, each essay requires you to state your view on a specific ethical issue in health care; to consider rival arguments; and to explain their weaknesses; to present and motivate your favored argument for your view; to consider targeted thoughtful objections to your argument; and to defend your argument against these objections. It is expected that the papers draw, at least in part, on the assigned readings as a source of the relevant arguments that are discussed in your essays.

Essay questions will be given on 3 topics: Euthanasia; Abortion; and Two-Tier Health Care, each with its own due date. **You are required to complete 2 essays. (You do not have the option of submitting more than 2 essays.)** **If you want feedback relatively early in the course, then you should submit a paper on euthanasia, for the other 2 papers are not due until nearer to the end of term.** It may also to be a good idea to complete the first paper on euthanasia so that the amount of coursework is spread out more evenly, instead of backloading most of the work to the last month of the term. Papers will be graded and returned to you within 2 weeks of their due dates.

You are welcome to meet with a designated TA on Zoom to discuss drafts or outlines of your paper. You can also drop-in in Zoom office hours for extra help.

**Using AI for your papers in this course will be treated as a violation of academic integrity. The minimum penalty for using AI in your paper is a grade of zero for the paper.**

**Final Exam:** The final exam is scheduled during the university's final exam period. It will be accessed through Canvas and written remotely on your personal computer. The Final Exam will be based on the material covered in:

- Textbook, Chapter 1: Arguments and Philosophical Methodology
- Textbook, Chapter 2: Ethical Theory
- Textbook, Chapter 4: Autonomy and the Right to Refuse Care
- Textbook, Chapter 8: Microallocation of Scarce Resources
- Textbook, Chapter 9: Alternative Medications
- Selected Primary Source Readings on abortion and euthanasia (i.e., the philosophical articles on problems in healthcare)

**A comprehensive study guide is included as part of this syllabus.**

**Course Schedule:**

**Note:** each online lesson includes various *tasks*. Tasks include reading the online lesson, reading the textbook and/or reading supplemental articles, and participating in discussion questions. These tasks are explained on Canvas.

Week	Activities	Discussions/ Assignments
<b>Week 1 – Module 1</b> <b>Ethical Theory</b>  <b>(SEPT. 2)</b>	Lesson 1: Philosophical Ethics  Lesson 2: Arguments and Methodology  Lesson 3: Cultural Relativism	Discussions 1 per lesson
<b>Week 2 – Module 1</b> <b>Ethical Theory</b>  <b>(SEPT. 8)</b>	Lesson 4: Utilitarianism  Lesson 5: Kant's Ethics  Lesson 6: Pluralistic Deontology	Discussions 1 per lesson

<b>Week 3 – Module 1</b> <b>Ethical Theory</b> <b>(SEPT. 15)</b>	Lesson 7: Social Contract Theory Lesson 8: Virtue Theory Lesson 9: The Ethics of Care	Discussions 1 per lesson
<b>Week 4 – Module 2</b> <b>Euthanasia</b> <b>(SEPT. 22)</b>	Lesson 10: Euthanasia, Defined Lesson 11: Arguments against the Moral Permissibility of Active Euthanasia Lesson 12: Active Euthanasia vs Passive Euthanasia	Discussions 1 per lesson
<b>Week 5 – Module 2</b> <b>Euthanasia</b> <b>(SEPT. 29)</b>	Lesson 13: An Argument for the Moral Permissibility of Voluntary Active Euthanasia (VAE) Lesson 14: An Argument for the Moral Permissibility of Non-Voluntary Active Euthanasia (NAE) Lesson 15: Legalizing Active Euthanasia (AE)	Discussions 1 per lesson
<b>Week 6 – Module 3</b> <b>Autonomy and the Right to Refuse Care</b> <b>(OCT. 6)</b>	Lesson 16: Autonomy and the Right to Refuse Care	Discussions 1 per lesson
<b>WEEK 7 –Module 4</b> <b>Abortion</b> <b>(OCT. 14)</b>	Lesson 17: The Fundamental Question; and Noonan's Arguments Lesson 18: Potentiality	Discussions 1 per lesson <b>EUTHANASIA PAPER DUE: OCTOBER 17<sup>TH</sup></b>

<b>Week 8 – Module 4</b> <b>Abortion</b> <b>(OCT. 20)</b>	Lesson 19: Mary Anne Warren’s Liberal Defense of Abortion  Lesson 20: L.W. Sumner’s Moderate View on Abortion	Discussions 1 per lesson
<b>Week 9 -- Module 4</b> <b>Abortion</b> <b>(OCT. 27)</b>	Lesson 21: Judith Thomson’s Defense of Abortion  Lesson 22: Don Marquis’ Argument against Abortion  Lesson 23: Discrimination, Virtue Theory and Abortion	Discussions 1 per lesson
<b>Week 10 Module</b> <b>5 Triage</b> <b>(NOV. 3)</b>	Lesson 24: Micro-Allocation of Scarce Resources	Discussions 1 per lesson
<b>Week 11</b> <b>(Nov. 10)</b>	Mid-Term Break: No New Material this week	<b>ABORTION PAPER DUE: NOV. 14<sup>TH</sup></b>
<b>Week 12 – Module 6</b> <b>Alternative Meds</b> <b>(NOV. 17)</b>	Lesson 25: Alternative Medications	Discussion 1 post
<b>Week 13 – Module 7</b> <b>Two-Tier MRI</b> <b>(NOV. 24)</b>	Lesson 26: Two-Tier MRI	Discussions 1 post

<b>Week 14</b>  <b>Review for the Final</b>  <b>(DEC. 1)</b>	Review for the Final Exam	<b>Two-Tier MRI Paper</b>  <b>Due: DEC. 8<sup>TH</sup></b>
--	---------------------------	--

## **Essay Questions:**

### **Essay 1 – On Euthanasia**

**Due: October 17th**

(Late penalty of 5% per day unless an extension is granted. Extensions are granted only for serious reasons, e.g. medical issue, family emergency, etc. Whenever possible requests for an extension should be made prior to the due date.)

**Approximate Essay Length: 2,000 words**

**Submit as a WORD document or PDF on Canvas**

Write an essay on the following 2 questions:

*1. Drawing on a minimum of three arguments from three assigned readings on euthanasia (in addition to the textbook chapter on MAiD), answer the following question: **Is voluntary active euthanasia morally wrong?** 2. Drawing on some of the arguments in the textbook on Medical Assistance in Dying (pp. 161-172) answer the following question: **Do you think it is morally wrong for Canada to legalize VAE (or MAiD) for persons suffering solely from a mental illness?***

Afterword: (roughly 200 more words) After your essay is concluded please explain why you chose the arguments you did. Explain which part of the paper was most difficult to write, and why you found it difficult to write. What was the biggest insight you gained from this topic? (The afterword can affect your paper grade by as much as +/-3%).

Essays should be clearly referenced (in text, author's last name, and page number). **Your paper should contain select, direct quotes from the assigned euthanasia readings (beyond the textbook).** No works cited page is needed unless you are using sources not assigned as part of the course readings. It may be helpful to assume that you are writing for an intelligent, open-minded audience, and you are trying to argue why your view of the matter is correct or most rationally justified. Indeed, it might help to assume that your audience is slightly leaning to the opposing side, and so you will need to work hard to explain why the opposing arguments fail and why your side has the better reasons behind it. Be sure to consider some arguments that you disagree with and explain why they fail. Also, be sure to be self-critical; think of possible weak spots in your favored argument; raise challenges to it and explain how it can be defended against those challenges.

**You are very welcome to schedule a Zoom meeting with the designated TA to discuss a draft or outline of your paper.** Also, feel free to drop-in, no appointment needed, to my regularly scheduled office hours (Mondays 8-10AM) to discuss your paper with me. The final day for Zoom meetings is **Oct. 15<sup>th</sup>**.



## Essay 2 – On Abortion

Due: Nov. 14<sup>th</sup>

(Late penalty of 5% per day unless an extension is granted. Extensions are granted only for serious reasons, e.g. medical issue, family emergency, etc. Whenever possible requests for an extension should be made prior to the due date.))

**Approximate Essay Word Length: 2,000 words**

**Submit as a WORD Doc or PDF on Canvas**

Write an essay on the following:

Drawing on a minimum of three assigned readings on abortion (not including the textbook), answer the following question: *Was Marissa's abortion morally permissible?*

Afterword: (roughly 200 more words) After your essay is concluded please explain why you chose the arguments you did. Explain which part of the paper was most difficult to write, and why you found it difficult to write. What was the biggest insight you gained from this topic? (The afterword can affect your paper grade by as much as +/-5%).

In writing this essay, briefly explain Marissa's case and clearly state your thesis early in the paper. Carefully examine at least three arguments from the assigned primary source readings on abortion, including some that you disagree with. For those arguments that you disagree with, precisely explain exactly why they fail. Be sure to state your favored argument (which may or may not come from the course readings) and explain why you think it is sound. Consider at least 1 targeted objection to your favored argument and thoughtfully reply to it.

Essays should be clearly referenced (in text, author's last name, and page number). Your paper must contain select, direct quotes from at least 3 assigned readings on abortion besides the textbook. No works cited page is needed unless you are using sources not assigned as part of the course readings.

It may be helpful to assume that you are writing for an intelligent, open-minded audience, and you are trying to argue why your view of the matter is correct or most rationally justified. Indeed, it might help to assume that your audience is slightly leaning to the opposing side, and so you will need to work hard to explain why the opposing arguments fail and why your side has the better reasons behind it. Remember to be self-critical: think of possible weak spots in your argument; raise challenges to your argument; explain how your argument can be defended against those challenges.

**You are very welcome to schedule a Zoom meeting with one of the TAs to discuss a draft or outline of your paper.** Also, feel free to drop-in, no appointment needed, to my regularly scheduled office hours (Mondays 8AM-10AM) to discuss your paper with me. The final day for Zoom meetings about this paper is **Nov. 13<sup>th</sup> though no meetings between Nov. 10-12<sup>th</sup> as it is the midterm break.**



### Essay 3 – On Two Tier Medicine

**Due: December 8<sup>th</sup>**

(Late penalty of 5% per day unless an extension is granted. Extensions are granted only for serious reasons, e.g. medical issue, family emergency, etc. Whenever possible requests for an extension should be made prior to the due date.)

**Approximate Essay Word Length: 2,000 words**

**Submit as a WORD doc or PDF on Canvas**

Write an essay on the following:

*Under what conditions, if any, could two-tier MRI be morally just? Given those conditions, explain whether you think two-tier MRI is morally just in Canada today? Was it morally permissible for Sanders' father to purchase a private MRI for his son, if we assume, for the sake of argument, that two-tier MRI is morally unjust in Canada.*

(In answering the first question, be sure to consider and critically examine the libertarian, egalitarian and Rawlsian (or virtue-based) arguments on this topic. In answering the last question, be sure to consider the arguments toward the end of Chapter 8 of the textbook.)

Afterword: (roughly 200 more words) After your essay is concluded, please explain your own experience (or that of someone you know) in the two-tier health care system. Discuss the part of the paper that you found most difficult to explain, and why you think that was the case. Explain whether your views changed in writing this paper, and if so, how they changed. What was the biggest insight you gained from this topic? (The afterword can affect your paper grade by as much as +/-5%).

Essays should be clearly referenced (in text, authors last name, and page number). **Your paper should contain select, direct quotes from the textbook on Two-Tier MRI.**

No works cited page is needed unless you are using sources not assigned as part of the course readings.

It may be helpful to assume that you are writing for an intelligent, open-minded audience, and you are trying to argue why your view of the matter is correct or most rationally justified. Indeed, it might help to assume that your audience is slightly leaning to the opposing side, and so you will need to work hard to explain why the opposing arguments fail and why your side has the better reasons behind it. Remember to be self-critical; think of possible weak spots in your argument; raise challenges to your argument and explain how your argument can be defended against those challenges.

**You are very welcome to schedule a Zoom meeting with one of the TAs to discuss a draft or outline of your paper.** Also, feel free to drop-in, no appointment needed, to my regularly scheduled office hours (Mondays 8AM-10AM) to discuss your paper with me. The final day for Zoom meetings about this paper is **December 5<sup>th</sup>**.

## **Final Exam Study Guide**

**Scheduled by UBC Enrollment Services during the university's exam period.** The exam will be accessed through **Canvas**. The exam will be **3 hours long, open-book, and written remotely on your personal computer**. Students will be asked to sign a pledge not to share their work with others, or to use others' work in the writing of the final exam. Use of AI or use of work that is not your own will result in a grade of zero for the final exam.

The final exam aims to test your knowledge of the *ethical theories* studied in the first part of the course; your critical grasp of the *articles* on issues in medical ethics; and your ability to reason about the ethical issues explored in *chapters 5* (Autonomy and the Right to Refuse Medical Care), *7* (Caesarean-Section by Choice) and *10* (Alternative Medications) in the textbook.

The exam itself will have 3 sections:

1. **Questions** on ethical theories studied in Chapter 2 of the textbook. These questions will ask you to explain, compare, contrast, apply, and or critique the ethical theories examined in this course. (40 marks total)
2. **A long-answer question** based on the articles assigned in the course (one question, 8-10 paragraphs long, and worth 35 marks – *see below for the questions to prepare*);
3. **A long-answer question** based on the debate chapters in the textbook (one question approximately 5 paragraphs long, worth 25 marks – *see below for the questions to prepare*).

**Medium-Length Questions:** To prepare for the questions on ethical theories, you should be able to state, explain, and apply the normative ethical theories studied in this course, and you should be able to explain key challenges for each of these normative ethical theories. Here is a list of the ethical theories studied in the course that may occur on the final exam, and that you should be able to state, explain, compare, contrast, apply, and critique.

1. **Cultural Relativism**
2. **Act Utilitarianism**
3. **Rule Utilitarianism**
4. **Kant's Universal Law Test**
5. **Kant's Humanity Test**
6. **Ross' Pluralistic Deontology (intuitionism) (principlism)**
7. **Hobbes' Social Contract Approach**
8. **Rawls' Social Contract Approach**
9. **Virtue Ethics**

### **Final Exam, Longer Answer Questions based on the Primary Source Readings:**

One of the following questions will be on the exam, and you will be required to answer that question. (Each question is worth 35 marks) Recommended length 8-10 paragraphs. Provide direct quotations from the assigned article(s) when explaining the relevant views and arguments. References can be in text, (author last name and page number). As the exam is open note, and essay-based, I recommend that you pre-write your answers to these questions before the final exam, so you can just copy and paste them into your exam answer.

1. Explain Judith Thomson's views on the moral rights of the fetus. What is the conservative argument that she is questioning? What is the violinist analogy, and what exactly is the point of this analogy? Discuss two objections to her violinist analogy (no straw man objections). Consider how she might best reply to those objections. Explain whether you think those replies to the objections are successful. (Defend your answer.)
2. A common argument against active euthanasia is that it is morally wrong because it involves killing, and killing is, in itself, morally worse than letting die. Explain Jeff McMahan's, James Rachels', and Philippa Foot's responses to this common argument. What is Philippa Foot's arguments concerning the morality of voluntary active euthanasia (VAE), non-voluntary active euthanasia (NAE) and non-voluntary passive euthanasia (NPE). Relate her arguments to your own examples of VAE, NAE, and NPE. Critically evaluate her argument against non-voluntary active euthanasia.

### **Final Exam, Longer Essay Questions based on the Text:**

Two of the following three questions will be on your final. You will pick **one** to answer. (25 marks) Recommended length: 5 paragraphs. As the exam is open note, and essay-based, I recommend that you pre-write your answers to these questions before the final exam, so you can just copy and paste them into your exam answer.

#### **1. Question on the Autonomy Debate**

Do you think it was a moral permissible for the hospital to discharge Mr. Edwards from the hospital when they did? Explain your reasoning for your view, grounding it in an ethical theory studied in the course. Explain two thoughtful objections to your argument. Explain why those objections fail.

#### **2. Question on the Micro allocation Debate**

Was it morally permissible for the triage team to treat Lena ahead of Terence? Carefully explain and motivate your argument for your view. Discuss two thoughtful objections to your argument. Explain why those objections fail.

#### **3. Question on the Alternative Medications Debate**

Do you think that Dr. Anderweg acted immorally when she administered *H* to Nolle? Explain your argument for your view, tying it to an ethical theory discussed in the course. Discuss two thoughtful objections to your argument. Explain why those objections fail.

# **University Policies**

## **Statement of UBC values and policies:**

UBC provides resources to support student learning and to maintain healthy lifestyles but recognizes that sometimes crises arise and so there are additional resources to access including those for survivors of sexual violence. UBC values respect for the person and ideas of all members of the academic community. Harassment and discrimination are not tolerated, nor is suppression of academic freedom. UBC provides appropriate accommodation for students with disabilities and for religious and cultural observances. UBC values academic honesty and students are expected to acknowledge the ideas generated by others and to uphold the highest academic standards in all of their actions. Details of the policies and how to access support are available here: <https://senate.ubc.ca/policies-resources-support-student-success/>.

## **Resources to Support Student Success**

UBC provides resources to support student learning and to maintain healthy lifestyles but recognizes that sometimes crises arise and so there are additional resources to access including those for survivors of sexual violence. UBC values respect for the person and ideas of all members of the academic community. Harassment and discrimination are not tolerated nor is suppression of academic freedom. UBC provides appropriate accommodation for students with disabilities and for religious observances. UBC values academic honesty and students are expected to acknowledge the ideas generated by others and to uphold the highest academic standards in all of their actions. Details of the policies and how to access support are available on the UBC Senate website: <https://senate.ubc.ca/policies-resources-support-student-success>

## **Academic Integrity**

The academic enterprise is founded on honesty, civility, and integrity. As members of this enterprise, all students are expected to know, understand, and follow the codes of conduct regarding academic integrity. At the most basic level, this means submitting only original work done by you and acknowledging all sources of information or ideas and attributing them to others as required. This also means you should not cheat, copy, or mislead others about what is your work; nor should you help others to do the same. For example, it is prohibited to share your past assignments and answers with other students; work with other students on an assignment when an instructor has not expressly given permission; or spread information through word of mouth, social media, websites, or other channels that subverts the fair evaluation of a class exercise, or assessment.

**Why is academic integrity important?** The course teaching team, UBC, and the scholarly community at large share an understanding of the ethical ways that we use to produce knowledge. A core practice of this shared value of academic integrity is that we acknowledge the contributions of others to our own work, but it also means we produce our own contributions that add to the scholarly conversation: we don't buy or copy papers or exams, or have someone else edit them. We also don't falsify data or sources, or hand in the same work in more than one course, nor do we produce work with the assistance of AI, like ChatGPT.

**What should I know about sharing course materials?** We are working hard to provide all the materials you need to succeed in this course. In return, please respect our work. All assignment instructions, quiz questions and answers, discussion questions, announcements, PowerPoint slides, audio/video recordings, Canvas modules, and any other materials provided to you by the Teaching Team or in the textbook are for use in this course by students currently enrolled [course/section]. It is *unacceptable* to share any of these materials beyond our course, including by posting on file-sharing websites (e.g., CourseHero, Google Docs). It is *unacceptable* to copy and paste sentences from the textbook (e.g., definitions) into for-profit software (e.g., Quizlet) for use in studying. Respect the Teaching Team and textbook authors' intellectual property, and follow [copyright law](#).

What happens when academic integrity is breached? Violations of academic integrity (i.e., misconduct) lead to the

breakdown of the academic enterprise, and therefore serious consequences arise and harsh sanctions are imposed. For example, incidences of plagiarism or cheating may result in a mark of zero on the assignment or exam and more serious consequences may apply if the matter is referred for consideration for academic discipline. Careful records are kept to monitor and prevent recurrences. Any instance of cheating or taking credit for someone else's work, whether intentionally or unintentionally, can and often will result in at minimum a grade of zero for the assignment, and these cases will be reported to the Head of the Department of Philosophy and Associate Dean Academic of the Faculty of Arts.

**What support is available?** Feel free to ask me about academic integrity. Part of my job is to guide your growth as a scholar, and I would much rather you ask for clarification than unintentionally engage in academic misconduct, which has serious consequences. If you are unsure about what counts as academic misconduct, please reach out to me at, [doran.smolkin@ubc.ca](mailto:doran.smolkin@ubc.ca). Sometimes students who are experiencing a lot of stress feel the only way to deal with a situation is to cheat. Please do not do this. Talk to me, and I am sure we can work something out together.

To help you learn your responsibilities as a scholar, please read and understand UBC's expectations for academic honesty in the UBC Calendar: "[Academic Honesty](#)," "[Academic Misconduct](#)," and "[Disciplinary Measures](#),". Read and reflect on the [Student Declaration and Responsibility](#). There are resources to help you meet these expectations, for example the Chapman Learning Commons "[Understand Academic Integrity](#)".

For written assignments and help with plagiarism and citation, see the [Centre for Writing and Scholarly Communication](#). Additional resources for learning with integrity can be found on the [UBC Academic Integrity Website](#).

(**Reference:** The content in this section of the syllabus is adapted from the helpful [document](#) Dr. Catherine Rawn and others created in the summer of 2020.)

## Other Course Policies

**Grading Scale:** <https://students.ubc.ca/enrolment/courses/grades>

**Late Penalty:** The standard deduction is 5% per day for a late paper, unless an extension is granted. Extensions will be granted for good reasons such as illness, or family crises, etc. When at all possible, requests for an extension should take place prior the assignment's due date.

## Learning Analytics

In this course, I plan to use analytics data to:

- Track participation in discussion forums
- Assess your participation in the course

**Copyright** All materials of this course (course handouts, lecture slides, assessments, course readings, etc.) are the intellectual property of the Course Instructor or licensed to be used in this course by the copyright owner. Redistribution of these materials by any means without permission of the copyright holder(s) constitutes a breach of copyright and may lead to academic discipline.

*End of document*