

PCOM 505/PHIL 489
Ethical and Social Issues in Science and Technology

New Mexico Tech

Spring 2023

Monday 2:15—4:45 PM

Distance Education (Synchronous via [Zoom](#))

Instructor: Christopher ChoGlueck (pronounced: *KRIS JOH-glukk*)
Assistant Professor of Ethics (CLASS Dept.), Adjunct Professor (Biology Dept.)

Pronouns: he/his

Email: Christopher.ChoGlueck@nmt.edu

Office Hours: TBD (Fitch 215) and by appointment via Zoom: <https://zoom.us/my/cchoglueck>



Artist: [Sara Gironi Carnevale](#)

Syllabus Contents ([Click to follow link](#))

1. Course Description	1
2. Course Grading & Requirements	4
3. Notes from the Professor	7
4. Important Dates and Deadlines (subject to change)	9
5. Detailed Course Schedule.....	9
6. About the Professor	12

1. Course Description

This seminar examines how values influence STEM research as well as the ethics and politics of STEM communication and policy. Students will gain practical skills in ethics relevant to their

professional work, analyzing how research, design, communication, and policy decisions may incorporate, or fail to incorporate, diverse stakeholders' interests. The course explores barriers and power relationships that can prevent certain groups from enjoying the full benefits of scientific and technological change. Assignments will challenge students to operate as public-responsible researchers or communicators and ask them to consider how products and policies can challenge inequality and promote the common good.

1.1. Mode of Instruction

This course will be fully *online*. Students should check Canvas regularly for announcements and for weekly modules. Classes will be primarily *synchronous* (live) via Zoom:

- Join URL:
<https://zoom.us/j/98157518935?pwd=cko5cUE1L3hVTmhnUzZHeGxNZ2JTZz09>
- Meeting ID: 981 5751 8935
- Passcode: 222637
- Phone dial-in: +1 346 248 7799

Classes run 2.5 hours on Mondays with a short break in the middle. We will have a mix of lecture, small-group discussion in breakout rooms, and large-group discussions. Students are expected to attend and contribute to class discussion using a webcam and a microphone. Every class will be *recorded* and posted for students who need to watch it at a later time under the Panopto tab on Canvas. All assignments will be done through Canvas.

1.2. Pre-requisites and Co-requisites

Graduate standing. Undergraduates must receive instructor permission.

1.3. Place in Curriculum

Ethics and Social Issues in Science and Technology is a core course in NMT's Public Engagement in Science, Design and Communication Program: https://www.nmt.edu/academics/class/graduate_programs_pages/public_engagement.php. Public Engagement describes the diversity of ways in which specialists interact with non-specialists. By definition, this is a two-way process of communication, which involves empathy and deep listening with the goal of building trust and generating science, technology, policy, or other goods for mutual benefit. This program will serve the growing in-state need for professionals working on the boundary between science and technology with communication and the humanities. It also provides a pathway for students in the communication and humanities to pivot into STEM/design careers (e.g., UX/UI) and for STEM students to move into science communication and grant writing, and it supports STEM professionals who need additional communication training for career advancement.

The undergraduate section of the course can satisfy 3 credits toward either the BA requirement for ethics & technology, or a Philosophy minor, or a Science, Technology, and Society minor: <https://nmt.edu/academics/class/minors.php>.

1.4. Course learning objectives

By the end of the course, students will be able to:

- *Describe* different models of public engagement, such as the knowledge-deficit model evidence-based policy, and participatory science; and *evaluate* their strengths and weaknesses, both empirically and theoretically;
- *Identify* how cultural norms, ethical values, and political interests influence technological design and science communication, including the diversity of stakeholders, different conceptions of justice & democracy, and biases/barriers related to gender, race, class, ability, nationality, etc.;
- *Analyze* how public trust and mistrust in technology are related to scientific uncertainties, the history & politics of science, and larger intersecting systems of oppression, such as identity-based marginalization, democratic (under)representation, capitalistic exploitation, settler colonialism, sexist/racist paternalism, etc.;
- *Plan* a research project (including stages of proposing, drafting, reviewing, and revising) related to ethical and/or social issues in public engagement, such as accountability, equity, and inclusion, and *integrate* scholarly research into an analysis of current social significance.

1.5. Required Texts

There are five textbooks required for this course. If you are unable to secure any of these books, email the professor ASAP. All other readings & assignments will be available on Canvas (Files>Readings) or online.

1. Benjamin, Ruha. (2013). *People's Science: Bodies and Rights on the Stem Cell Frontier.* Stanford University Press.
Paperback from NMT Bookstore: \$26 new / \$20.80 used
eBook from [RedShelf](#): \$20.80 EPUB
2. Costanza-Chock, Sasha. (2020). *Design Justice: Community-Led Practices to Build the Worlds We Need.* MIT Press.
Paperback from NMT Bookstore: \$29 new / \$23.20 used
eBook from [VitalSource](#): \$18.99 EPUB
3. Goldenberg, Maya J. (2021). *Vaccine Hesitancy: Public Trust, Expertise, and the War on Science.* Pittsburgh University Press.
Paperback from NMT Bookstore: \$42.75 new / \$34.20 used
eBook from [Kobo](#): \$32.99 EPUB 3 (Adobe DRM)
4. Liboiron, Max. (2021). *Pollution Is Colonialism.* Duke University Press.
Paperback from NMT Bookstore: \$28.95 new / \$23.30 used
eBook from [Kobo](#): \$17.99 EPUB 3 (Adobe DRM)
5. Waggoner, Miranda R. (2017). *The Zero Trimester: Pre-Pregnancy Care and the Politics of Reproductive Risk.* University of California Press.
Paperback from NMT Bookstore: \$34.75 new / \$27.80 used
eBook from [Kobo](#): \$24.95 EPUB 2 (Adobe DRM)

2. Course Grading & Requirements

The total points for the class (100%) are broken down into 6 categories:

1. Participation (20%): attend and contribute during classes, including large- and small-group discussions.
2. AORs (20%): for each of the assigned books (5), write a brief analysis of one claim using Argument-Objection-Response structure (2 pages max., 4% each).
3. Student-led Discussion (15%): give a short presentation (15 min.) on an issue/event related to course themes, and facilitate a class discussion (15 min.) with prepared questions.
4. Proposal Presentation for Research Paper (10%): present preliminary ideas for a final research project on an ethical/social issue related to public engagement, science communication, ethical research, and/or design justice, including a written proposal (2 pages) and oral presentation (7 min.).
5. Draft Final Paper (15%): research & draft an analysis that poses and then answers a specific ethical/social question of social significance and integrates scholarly research (12-pg.).
6. Revised Final Paper (20%): revise and expand the draft analysis with peer review comments to contribute to scholarly research, and polish it for a professional conference (15-pg.).

2.1. Participation

As a graduate seminar, the course is primarily discussion-based, with interactive and collaborative conversations among peers. Hence, regular attendance and engaged participation are required. All students are expected to attend every class and participate in discussion, unless of emergency or other valid excuse. Valid excuses include persistent technical problems with Zoom, hospitalization/serious illness, occupational/educational duties, family emergencies, triggering content, and religious holidays. Students are responsible for communicating with the professor via email/Canvas. Attendance will not be recorded but is monitored, and students with infrequent attendance will earn lower participation scores. Students will receive semi-regular feedback throughout the semester on their participation. Grading is tiered:

1. Excellent (100%): regular attendance with very high quality, consistent engagement;
2. Average (90%): regular attendance with satisfactory engagement on a semi-regular basis;
3. Below average (80%): unsatisfactory engagement in terms of quantity or quality, including infrequent attendance.

2.2. AORs

Students will write 5 brief analyses, one for each of the assigned books throughout the course (2 pages max., double spaced, 12-point font, 1" margins). *Undergraduates may skip one of the five analyses (4 required).* In these short papers, students should pick a specific claim from the book. The analysis should use the Argument-Objection-Response (AOR) structure:

1. *Claim*: pick a claim made in the assigned reading material *that you agree or disagree with*, state/quote it succinctly, and identify the page it appeared;
2. *Argument*: state a reason that you agree/disagree with it (the more reasons, the better);
3. *Objection*: identify one strong objection to your argument; and

4. *Response*: reply to that objection in an equally strong manner.

Before entertaining objections, papers should also state the ethical or social *significance* of the issue. References should be in APA format (see [here](#)). The aim of this exercise is to facilitate charitable reading, clear reasoning, and ability to engage constructively with objections. The professor will grade the papers for (1) *completeness*, (2) *charity*, and (3) *clarity*. Late papers may be submitted for partial credit, with a starting grade penalty of 75%.

2.3. Student-led Discussion

Each student will lead a 30-minute discussion in class addressing the legal and social dimensions of an event related to public engagement/communication about science or technology.

Undergraduates will present in groups. Students will select a specific event or debate in the current or recent news. Presentation slots will be evenly distributed throughout the semester, and students will be able to choose when they present. Presentations should offer around 10 minutes of background and context on the news event, historical background, social/political context, and debated ethical issues, followed by 20 minutes of open discussion around 2-3 discussion questions on ethical/social dimensions raised. Students should make sure to provide sufficient historical, cultural, economic, political, and technical context. Questions should be open-ended to facilitate discussion and invite a variety of responses. Presentation should include some visual, such as PPT slides, and be presented in a professional, practiced, and polished manner. Students will be graded in terms of completeness (complete/incomplete).

2.4. Proposal Presentation for Research Paper (Final Project Stage 1)

For their final (equivalent to an exam), students will plan & complete a research project on an ethical/social issue related to public engagement, science communication, ethical research, and/or design justice. This final project involves writing and presenting a proposal (Stage 1), researching and drafting a paper (Stage 2), and then revising and polishing it for a professional/academic conference (Stage 3). To begin developing their paper, students will present the following in the middle of the semester:

1. Written Proposal: Students will write a 2-page (double spaced) proposal for their final project. Students should include a clear initial ethical question and/or social issue raised by the project topic, as well as preliminary plans for research. The goal of the written proposal is to begin the research process, so the proposal should include relevant articles, books, reports, etc., that they plan to investigate.
2. Oral Presentation: The content of this written proposal will be the focus of a presentation in the middle of the semester. Students will make a brief presentation of their proposed topic (7 minutes max.), including ethical/social focus, research question(s), and preliminary analysis. Presentation should include some visual, such as PPT slides, and be presented in a professional, practiced, and polished manner. After their presentation, students will receive questions and feedback from peers and the instructor.

Proposal presentations will be evaluated (complete/incomplete) in terms of the quality of their (1) overview and background, (2) research question, (3) clarity of research plans, and (4) writing and presentation polish.

2.5. Draft Final Paper (Final Project Stage 2)

For the next stage of the final project after the proposal, students will research and draft an analysis of no less than 12 pages, including abstract and references (double spaced, 12-point font, 1” margins). *For undergraduates, papers should be at least 8 pages, including abstract and references (double spaced, 12-point font, 1” margins).* Paper should address a specific research question about an ethical/social issue related to public engagement, science communication, ethical research, and/or design justice. They must have a clearly defined thesis statement that lays out a specific argument with clear grounds in response to their research question. Students should incorporate the following to organize their drafts:

- An *abstract* summarizing the paper’s argument and its contribution to scholarship;
- An attention grabbing *introduction* with [a hook](#) and an outline of the paper organization;
- A *research question* that is clear, focused, and answerable within the scope of the paper;
- A statement of the *thesis* that follows the introduction and answers the research question;
- A *literature review* of relevant previous scholarship on the topic, dependent on the specific audience;
- A *well-developed argument* in support of the thesis (which responds to the research question) and builds on existing scholarship;
- *Defense* of the argument from objections and concerns (ethical, legal, practical, etc.), covering any possible weaknesses of the argument and approach;
- A *conclusion* which indicates the significance of the argument for the chosen field and any broader impacts.
- A bibliography of *references* formatted according to scholarly convention.

During a peer-review workshop at the end of the semester, students will receive comments from their peers for improving their draft. The instructor will evaluate draft papers in terms of completeness (complete/incomplete) and provide detailed comments and questions for the revision.

2.6. Revised Final Paper (Final Project Stage 3)

Based on the comments from their peers and the instructor, students will revise and expand their draft (Stage 2) to 15-pages maximum (double spaced, 12-point font, 1” margins). To fit a fully developed and well-researched argument in the space and time allowed by a conference paper, it is vital to have a specific, narrowly scoped question. Attempting to cover too broad a question will make research more difficult. It will also prevent presenting the depth of research and detail in the argument needed to make an effective intervention in the existing scholarship. Papers should include a brief note indicating a professional conference to which the project is intended for submission. The citations and references should be formatted in the conventions most common to the academic discipline or profession represented at the selected conference venue (see example papers or presentations from conference proceedings). *Undergraduates do not need to select a conference venue, though they are encouraged to do so, including the Student Research Symposium (April 18-21, 2023, details [here](#)).* Revised papers will be evaluated in terms of quality of argument, quality of research, clarity of language & concepts, and polish (see rubric).

2.7. Final Grades

Final grades will be based on the percentage of total points earned (see Gradebook on Canvas): **A** (100-93%), **A-** (92-90%), **B+** (89-87%), **B** (86-83%), **B-** (82-80%), **C+** (79-77%), **C** (76-73%), **C-** (72-70%), **D** (69-60%), and **F** (<60%).

3. Notes from the Professor

I encourage all students to come by my virtual office hours in the beginning of the semester and personally introduce yourself. My office hours are a *safe space*; I am happy to help you work through any questions or problems that might arise related to the course or school more generally. Please approach me if you have any questions about the assignments, readings, grading, other aspects of the class, or philosophy as a field of study (and the [Philosophy minor](#) for undergrads). The best way to communicate with me is via email.

3.1. Course Policies for Respect and Equity

It is my intent that students from all diverse backgrounds and perspectives be well-served by this course, that students' learning needs be addressed both in and out of class, and that the diversity the students bring to this class be viewed as a resource, strength, and benefit. I aim to present materials and activities that are respectful of diversity: gender identity, sexuality, disability, age, socioeconomic status, ethnicity, race, nationality, religion, and culture. Given the sensitive and challenging nature of the materials discussed in class, it is imperative that there be an atmosphere of *safety*, *inclusiveness*, and *equity* in the classroom. Accordingly, we will follow the advice of the writer James Baldwin:

*We can disagree and still love each other
unless your disagreement is rooted in my oppression and
denial of my humanity and right to exist.*

In line with this, students are also expected to promote *respectful inclusiveness*, especially in the face of differences, disagreement, and discrimination. Accordingly, certain disagreements, e.g., over the humanity, value, or abilities of marginalized groups, are disrespectful, unfair, and against our ground rules. As the instructor, I will attempt to foster an environment in which each class member is able to hear and respect each other.

Relatedly, students are expected to adopt a policy of *step forward; step back*: In order for everyone's voice to be heard, students who tend to dominate discussions should attempt to "step back" so that other students may participate and contribute to discussion; students who tend to keep quiet during discussions should attempt to "step forward" and let the class benefit from their contributions. In any discussions, all students are encouraged to ask questions and engage fellow students in a respectful manner that facilitates an interdisciplinary setting. Students should also have respect for their fellow classmates and refrain from repeating sensitive or confidential discussions outside of the classroom.

3.2. Land Acknowledgement

We acknowledge that the New Mexico Tech main campus stands on the unceded ancestral lands

of the Pueblo and Mescalero Apache peoples. These lands were taken by Congress in the Indian Land Cession 689 on October 1, 1886, and the military forcibly moved the Native peoples to reservations. These injustices were accomplished under false white-supremacist ideologies such as Manifest Destiny and the Doctrine of Discovery. For those of us who are visitors to these lands, we appreciate their millennia of stewardship to the land, water, animals, and plants, and the opportunity to live and learn here. Please visit <https://indianpueblo.org/new-mexicos-19-pueblos> and <https://mescaleroapachetribe.com/> to learn more about these Native nations, their cultures and sovereignty.

3.3. Technology Etiquette

In this distance-education seminar, students are expected to start their video and unmute their audio. To enable genuine interactions and authentic engagement, students should keep their webcam enabled at all times, unless they are having technical issues or receive permission from the instructor. To encourage open discussion, students may leave their audio unmuted, as long as they do not have disruptive sounds in the background.

3.4. Disability and Accommodations

I want this class to be accessible for each student to flourish with their unique abilities. New Mexico Tech is committed to protecting the rights of individuals with disabilities and providing access and full participation in the educational experience. Students with disabilities who require reasonable accommodations are invited to make their needs known to the Office for Student Access Services (SAS) as soon as possible. Accommodations are not retroactive and may take some time to implement. The process for requesting accommodations can be found at their website <https://www.nmt.edu/ds/academicaccommodations.php>. You can contact SAS in person at the Fidel Center Room 245, call 575-835-6209, email access@nmt.edu or book through the link on our [website](#).

3.5. Counseling Services

Your mental health and experience in this class is important to me. New Mexico Tech offers individual and couples counseling, safety assessments, crisis intervention, outreach and consultations through the Counseling Center. These confidential services are provided free of charge by licensed professionals. Please note that changes in the delivery of counseling services may still be on going. For more information on how to access services, please call 575-835-6619, email counseling@nmt.edu or check out our website at <https://www.nmt.edu/cds/>.

3.6. Academic Dishonesty

Students are expected to submit their original work on journals, papers, and other assignments. For papers, students must acknowledge any use (in part or full) of someone else's work with proper citations (in [APA style](#)). While students may use AI chatbots (e.g., ChatGPT) for inspiration and ideas, the text outputs generated by these tools may not be submitted as the student's own work. The instructor will not tolerate either plagiarism or cheating, which will result in an automatic failing grade on the assignment and/or the class. New Mexico Tech's Academic Honesty Policy for undergraduate and graduate students is found in the catalog, which can be found at: <https://www.nmt.edu/registrar/catalogs.php/>. Further information about

academic honesty can be found on the Associate Vice President for Academic Affairs website: https://www.nmt.edu/academicaffairs/avpaa/academic_honesty.php. Students are responsible for knowing, understanding, and following this policy.

3.7. Title IX Reporting (Sex/gender-based Discrimination)

Sexual misconduct, sexual violence and other forms of sexual misconduct and gender-based discrimination are contrary to the University's mission and core values, violate university policies, and may also violate state and federal law (Title IX). Faculty members are considered "Responsible Employees" and are required to report incidents of these prohibited behaviors. Any such reports should be directed to Tech's Title IX Coordinator (Dr. Peter Phaiah, 122 West Hall, 575-835-5953 (Office), 575-322-0001 (Cell), titleixcoordinator@nmt.edu) or reports can be filed online to [Tech's Title IX & Sexual Misconduct Report](#). Please visit [Tech's Title IX Website](#) (www.nmt.edu/titleix) for additional information and resources.

3.8. Student Success

New Mexico Tech offers numerous peer tutoring services for students who are struggling in their courses, or who just wish to receive friendly advice, including the Office of Student Learning (Skeen Library, <https://www.nmt.edu/osl/>), the Writing and Communication Lab (Skeen Library, <https://www.nmt.edu/academics/class/center.php>), and numerous department-run centers. These services are *free* of charge to students! Students may also consult the Associate Dean of Student Success, Elaine Debrine Howell (elaine.debrinehowell@nmt.edu) or may receive emails from her if they are struggling in class. To read about the services a student will need to be successful visit MyNMT: <https://www.nmt.edu/mynmt.php>.

4. Important Dates and Deadlines (subject to change)

- 2/13: AOR 1 due
- 2/20: Student-led discussions begin
- 2/27: AOR 2 due
- 3/20: AOR 3 due
- 3/27: Written Proposal for Final Project due
Oral Presentations in class
- 4/10: AOR 4 due
- 4/17: Draft Final Paper due
Peer Review Workshop in class
- 5/1: AOR 5 due
- 5/6: Revised Final Paper due
- 5/6: Late assignments due

5. Detailed Course Schedule

Required readings/prep (—), expected in-class activities (>), and assignment due dates (*); note that content warnings (CW) are marked with double asterisks (**):

v1 (1/16/22)

Week 1: Mon. 1/16

[No Class: Dr. Martin Luther King, Jr. Day]

Week 2: Mon. 1/23

Course Introduction: In Science We Trust

—Review: Handout 1 on Basics of Logic

—Review: Handout 2 on Common Logical Fallacies

—Read (on Canvas): Oreskes, Naomi. (2019). Why Trust Science? Perspectives from the History and Philosophy of Science (pp. 15-68) in *Why Trust Science*. Princeton University Press.

>In class: Activity on debates and logical fallacies

Part I: Science Communication & Public Engagement

Week 3: Mon. 1/30

The War on Science and the Rejection of Expertise

—Read: Goldenberg, Maya J. (2021). Introduction (pp. 3-18), The “Ignorant Public” (pp. 21-40) The Stubborn Mind (pp. 41-70), the “Death of Expertise” (pp. 71-90), and Politicized Science and Scientized Politics (pp. 91-107) in *Vaccine Hesitancy: Public Trust, Expertise, and the War on Science*. Pittsburgh University Press.

—Review: Handout 3 on Two Examples for Writing Analytic Arguments

>In class: Signup for Student-led Discussions

>In class: Tips for Scholarly Reading

Week 4: Mon. 2/6

A Crisis of Trust and the PR of Science

—Read: Goldenberg, Maya J. (2021). Trust and Credibility in Science (pp. 111-137), The Scientific Expert as Hero and Maverick (pp. 138-168), and Conclusion: Rebuilding Trust (pp. 168-183) in *Vaccine Hesitancy*.

>In class: Tips for Analytic Writing

Week 5: Mon. 2/13

Public Health Messaging and Reproductive Risks

—Read: Waggoner, Miranda R. (2017). Someday, Now (pp. 1-33), From the Womb to the Woman (pp. 34-65), and Anticipating Risky Bodies (pp. 66-94) in *The Zero Trimester: Pre-Pregnancy Care and the Politics of Reproductive Risk*. University of California Press.

*Due: AOR1 (Goldenberg 2021)

Week 6: Mon. 2/20

Women’s Health and the Politics of Motherhood

—Read: Waggoner, Miranda R. (2017). Whither Women’s Health (pp. 95-124), Get a Reproductive Life Plan! (pp. 125-148), Promoting Material Visions (pp. 149-168), and Governing Risk, Governing Women (pp. 169-188) in *The Zero Trimester*.

>In class: Student-led discussions begin

v1 (1/16/22)

Week 7: Mon. 2/27

Participatory Science and “The Public”

—Read: Benjamin, Ruha. (2013). Introduction: To the Moon (pp. 1-26), Locating Biological Citizenship (pp. 27-54), Whose Body Politic? (pp. 55-78) in *People's Science: Bodies and Rights on the Stem Cell Frontier*. Stanford University Press.

*Due: AOR2 (Waggoner 2017)

Week 8: Mon. 3/6

The Right to Research for Consumers vs. Citizens

—Read: Benjamin, Ruha. (2013). Eggs for Sale (pp. 79-112), Race for Cures (pp. 113-134), Depathologizing Distrust (pp. 135-156), and Toward Real Utopias (pp. 157-182) in *People's Science*.

>In class: Assign Proposal & Presentation for Research Paper (Final Project Stage 1)

[M 3/13—F 3/17: No Class, Spring Break]

**Part II:
Ethical Research & Design**

Week 9: Mon. 3/20

Design Justice and Community-Led Participation

—Read: Costanza-Chock, Sasha. (2020). Introduction: #TravelingWhileTrans (pp. 1-30), Design Values (pp. 31-68), and Design Practices (pp. 69-102) in *Design Justice: Community-Led Practices to Build the Worlds We Need*. MIT Press.

>In class: Tips for Scholarly Research

*Due: AOR3 (Benjamin 2013)

Week 10: Mon. 3/27

Presentations for Final Project

—No readings

>In class: Students present proposals (7 mins. max.), followed by Q/A

*Due: Written proposal for final project

Week 11: Mon. 4/3

The Power of Stories and the Hubs of Innovation

—Read: Costanza-Chock, Sasha. (2020). Design Narratives (p. 103-134), and Design Sites (pp. 135-172), and Directions for Future Work (pp. 211-236) in *Design Justice*. [Skip pp. 173-210]

>In class: Assign Draft Final Paper (Final Project Stage 2)

Week 12: Mon. 4/10

Indigenous Knowledges and Colonial Science

—Read: Liboiron, Max. (2021). Introduction (1-38) and Land, Nature, Resource, Property (pp. 39-80) in *Pollution Is Colonialism*. Duke University Press.

>In class: Tips for Scholarly Writing

v1 (1/16/22)

*Due: AOR4 (Costanza-Chock 2020)

Week 13: Mon. 4/17

Peer Review Workshop

—No readings

*Due: Draft Final Paper

Week 14: Mon. 4/24

Environmental Violence and Anticolonial Methodologies

—Read: Liboiron, Max. (2021). Scale, Harm, Violence, Land (pp. 81-112) and An Anticolonial Pollution Science (pp. 113-156) in *Pollution Is Colonialism*.

>In class: Vote for next week's Student Choice Topic

>In class: Assign Revised Final Paper (Final Project Stage 3)

Week 15: Mon. 5/1

Course Conclusion & Student Choice Topic

—Read: TBD

*Due: AOR5 (Liboiron 2021)

[R 5/4—T 5/9: No class, Finals Week]

*Due Sa 5/6 (by 11:59 PM): Revised Final Paper

*Due Sa 5/6 (by 11:59 PM): Late assignments

(Note: No final exam)

Disclaimer:

The content of this syllabus is subject to change. The instructor will notify students in class and via Canvas of any changes with prior warning.

6. About the Professor

Chris ChoGlueck (he/his; pronounced JOH-gluek) is the Assistant Professor of Ethics at New Mexico Tech. He is a philosopher of science and values, whose [research](#) explores the ethics and politics of drug regulation and reproductive health. Chris has written about how values have influenced the labeling of the emergency contraceptive Plan B, as well as how gender norms have stymied the research & development of contraceptives for people who produce sperm (“male contraception”). He serves as the Faculty Advisor for Responsible Conduct of Research with the NMT Office of Research and directs the [Research Ethics series](#).

Chris has published across philosophy and outside the humanities, with articles in *Philosophy of Science*, *Synthese*, *Hypatia*, *Studies in History and Philosophy of Science*, *Public Affairs Quarterly*, and *Accountability in Research*, and a recent commentary in the medical journal *Contraception*. His research on the Food and Drug Administration (FDA) has been covered by the [media](#) on news sites such as CNN & Scientific American and in the continuing medical education platforms *Contraceptive Technology Update*.

v1 (1/16/22)

Chris's [teaching](#) offerings include general education courses in Ethics & Values in STEM and Science & Gender, as well as foundational ethics courses for the following degree programs: Biomedical Sciences, Computer Science, Information Technology, and Cybersecurity. To get outside his head, Chris climbs rocks, reads comics and "just for fun" philosophy, and makes cocktails. His daily struggle is keeping house plants alive in the desert climate of New Mexico, which is much less cooperative than back home in New Orleans.