John Paul II Catholic University of Lublin Faculty of Philosophy academic year 2012/2013

field of study

philosophy
third-cycle studies
full-time studies

| Subject catalog | gue: Selected topics in the etl | nics of science - social and | ethical consequences of tech | no-scientific progres |
|---|---|---|---|--|
| Type: | lecture | | | |
| Hours:* | winter semester | - | summer semester | 30 |
| If a subject consists of e. g. lecture and classes, the proper hours to any classes should be given. | | | | |
| ECTS | winter semester | - | summer semester | 1 if C; 2 if E |
| Language of tuition: | English | | | |
| Method of assessment:* | winter semester | - | summer semester | credit without mark (C) or paper (E) |
| If a subject consists of lecture and classes, the proper method of assessment to any classes should be given. | | | | |
| SUBJECT SPECIFIC OBJECTIVES | | | | |
| 1. | introducing students to the debate on social and ethical consequences of techno-scientific progress; | | | |
| 2. | discussing with students main arguments for the value-neutrality and value-ladenness of techno-science; | | | |
| 3. | developing skills of discerning and analyzing social and ethical problems in techno-science; | | | |
| 4. | improving the knowledge of English; developing skills of discussing and/or writing papers; | | | |
| 5. | inspiring students to think about their own responsibility for the techno-scientific progress; | | | |
| 6. | engaging students into discussions on socially important issues; | | | |
| PREREQUISITE (KNOWLEDGE, SKILLS, COMPETENCE, OTHERS | | | | |
| 1. | Knowledge of English (medium level), general knowledge of the philosophy of science and ethics | | | ence and ethics |
| | LEARNING OUTCOMES | | Correlation with programme learning outcomes | |
| Knowledge | | | | |
| 1. | | knowledge and deep understan | | K_W01, K_W04 |
| 2. | | ound and crucial arguments of the ladenness of technoscience an | ne debate over the value-neutrality ad its progress | K_W05, K_W06, K_W07 K_W08 |

| 3. | A student discerns and understands social and ethical consequences of the development of techno-science and knows contemporary institutions designed to deal with those consequences | K_W03, K_W09 | | |
|---|---|----------------------|--|--|
| Skills | | | | |
| 1. | A student is able to find, analyze, evaluate, arrange and use information by employing sources both printed and digital; | K_U01 | | |
| 2. | A student develops research skills - including finding, formulating and analyzing research problem | K_U02, K_U03 | | |
| 3. | A student is able to present research results clearly and critically both in an oral and written form, | K_U04, K_U05 | | |
| 4. | A student is able to analyze philosophical arguments as well as to identify their key theses, assumptions and consequences | K_U06, K_U07 K_U13 | | |
| 5. | A students possesses the skill of translating from and into English | K_U14 | | |
| Social Competence | | | | |
| 1. | A student is able to discern social and ethical problems related to techno-scientific progress | K_K02, K_K04, K_K06, | | |
| 2. | A student understands and accepts her own responsibility for consequences of techno-scientific progress | K_K05, K_K08 | | |
| 3. | A student understands the need to be engaged in institutions which are designed to analyze and control the techno-scientific progress | K_K02 | | |
| TEACHING CONTENT (SUBJECT DESCRIPTION) | | | | |
| 1. The basic concepts: technology, science, progres, society; 2. The change from science and technology to technoscience; 3. The philosophical sources of the idea of progres; 4. The idea of value-neutrality and value-ladenness and its historical sources; 5. Arguments for value-neutrality of technoscience and their criticism; 6. Arguments for value-ladeness of technoscience; 7. Developing technoscience and its consequences in varius domains of life; 8. Risk-assessment and the quest for controlling technoscience; 9. Philosophical foundation of any evaluation of progres; 10. Progres and responsibility of scientists and society. | | | | |
| TEACHING METHODS* | | | | |
| Traditional lecture, discussion | | | | |
| *If a subject consists of lecture and classes, the proper teaching methods to any classes should be given. | | | | |
| METHODS OF LEARNING ACIEVEMENTS ASSESSMENT* | | | | |
| 1. | Credit with mark: Activity during clasess 20%, written paper on a topic agreed with the lecturer (ca 7 -10 p.) - 80%. A paper may be in Polish if the literature on which it is based is in English or in other foreign language. Otherwise it should be in English | | | |
| 2. | Credit without mark: Attendance and activity during clasess 100%. | | | |

| Grading scale for 1.* | | | | |
|-----------------------|--|--|---|--|
| LEARNING OUTCOMES | 2 unsatisfactory (fail) | 3 satisfactory | 4 good | 5 very good |
| Knowledge | A student does not attend (with no excuse) more than 50% of classes; has only a common understanding of key concepts and common knowledge on debates over the technoscientific progress and only vague knowledge on arguments concerning value-neutrality and value-ladenness of technoscience and sees only commonly known social and ethical consequences of technoscientific progress, does not know institutions dealing with those consequences | A student regularly attends classes and has good knowledge of the problems related to the techno-scientific progress and is able to formulate and to criticize at least some arguments in favor of the value-neutrality and value-ladenness of technoscience; sees problems concerning the techno-scientific progress and understands key concepts involved in the debates over that progress; | A student has very good knowledge of historical background and key concepts and problems related to the techno-scientific progress, is able to present and to criticize main arguments for the valueneutrality and value-ladenness of techno-science, is able to indicate institutions which deal with consequences of the techno-scientific development | A student possess extensive knowledge on historical and current issues concerning the techno-scientific progress, as well as on historical development of the debate on the techno-scientific progress; understands key concepts involved in debates, presents main arguments for the value-neutrality and value-ladenness of techno-science, sees their weaknesses and merits; |
| skills | A student is able to find only basic information necessary to prepare a paper; is not able to find an original topic for a paper, does not submit a paper; | A student is able to find new information necessary to prepare a paper; is able to find a topic for his/her paper and submits a paper; yet, the paper has an acceptable structure and argumentation but no criticisms of that argumentation is developed; there are linguistic mistakes (if the paper is written in English) | A student is able to find original information necessary to prepare a paper; is able to find an original topic for his/her paper, submits a paper on an important issue; the paper is clearly written, and has a good structure with clear thesis, good analysis of key concepts and argumentation, some criticism is included; there are minor linguistic mistakes (if the paper is written in English); | A student is able to find original and topical information necessary to prepare a paper, submits a paper on a topical issue which was not discussed or even indicated during classes; the paper is clearly written and has a good structure, with a clear question and a thesis as its solution, good analysis of key concepts and argumentation as well as with original criticism of argumentation and indication of further consequences and difficulties of a solution; there are no important linguistic mistakes (if the paper is written in English); is able to indicate institutions which deal with consequences of the techno-scientific development; |

| social competences | A student is able to indicate only very common ethical and social problems related to the technoscientific, does not cooperate to discuss such problems, sees no need for her/his personal responsibility for any consequences of the technoscientific development | A student is able to list typical problems connected to the techno-scientific progress, cooperates with other students in discussions designed to develop a solution for those problems, sees the necessity of taking responsibility for the progress. | the aspect of their social and ethical consequences; eagerly engages himself/herself in discussions concerning social and ethical consequences of the techno-scientific progress, brings into discussion original remarks; accepts his/her personal responsibility for that progress and sees the need to engage into discussions concerning that progress | controversial cases in current techno-science, eagerly participates in discussions on their social and ethical dimensions and cooperates with other students to suggest a solution, bringing original ideas; accepts his/her personal responsibility for the techno-scientific progress and the need to engage himself/herself into discussions and institutions that deal with that progress; |
|-----------------------------------|---|--|---|--|
| Sometimes the plus symbol or deci | mal is used the modify the numerical grades | S | | |
| | | Grading scale for 2.* | | |
| LEARNING OUTCOMES | fa | | pass | |
| Knowledge | A student does not attend (with no excuse) more than 50% of classes; has only vague knowledge on concepts and problems related to the techno-scientific progress and on arguments concerning value-neutrality and value-ladenness of technoscience and sees only very commonly discussed social and ethical consequences of techno-scientific progress; | | A student possesses good knowledge on problems related to the techno-scientific progress and on arguments concerning value-neutrality and value-ladenness of techno-science as well as on debates on social and ethical consequences of techno- scientific progress; sees problems concerning the techno-scientific progress and understands key concepts involved in the debates over that progress; | |
| skills | A student is not able to analyze indicated readings and to sum up issues discussed during classes, is not able to find new information about discussed issues; | | A student able to analyze indicated readings, to sum up issues discussed during classes, to make some criticism of arguments on value-neutrality and value-ladenness of techno-science, and to find additional information (also in English) on discussed issues and to present clearly that information in English; | |
| social competences | A student is able to indicate only very commonly discussed social and ethical problems related to the techno-scientific progress, does not often participate in discussions during classes; | | A student is able to indicate social and ethical problems related to the techno-scientific progress, participate often in discussions during classes, sees the necessity to take personal responsibility for the direction of techno-scientific progress and is able provide some argument for that necessity. | |
| | | STUDENT WORKLOAD | | |
| Activity | | Average time students typically need to complete proper learning activity | | |
| the time with the lecturer | | 30 | or 30 | |
| reading and preparing a pap | per | | 0 | or 30 |
| | | TOTAL HOURS | 30 | or 60 |
| | ts typically need to complete all learning act edit corresponds to 25 to 30 hours of work. | tivities required to achieve the expected lea | arning outcomes. In most cases, student wo | orkload ranges from 1,500 to 1,800 hours for |
| TOTAL ECTS: | | | 1 | or 2 |

A student is able to analyze new cases of techno-science under

A student looks for new controversial cases in current

| REQUIRED READING LIST | | |
|-------------------------|---|--|
| 1. | Postman N. Technopoly: The Surrender of Culture to Technology New York 1993 | |
| 2. | Winner L., The Whale and the Reactor. A Search form Limits in an Age of High Technology, Chicago 1986 | |
| 3. | Hughes Th. P., Human-built Word. How to Think abort Technology and Culture, Chicago 2005. | |
| 4. | Ellul, J., The Technological Society, New York 1964 | |
| RECOMENDED READING LIST | | |
| 1. | Agazzi, E., Right, Wrong and Science. The Ethical Dimensions of the Techno-Scientific Enterprise, Amsterdam 2004 | |
| 2. | Brey Philip (2006), "The Social Agency of Technological Artifacts", in: P. P. Verbeek and A. Slob, Kluwer (red.), A Typology, User Behavior and Technology Develoment, Dordrecht, 71-81 | |
| 3. | Brey Philip (2007), "The Technological Construction of Social Power", Social Epistemology 22(1), 71-95 | |
| 4. | Green Lelia (2001), Technoculture: From Alphabet to Cybersex, Sydney | |
| 5. | Ihde Don (1990), Technology and the lifeworld: from garden to earth, Bloomington | |
| 6. | some other readings will be indicated for particular topics | |

Lublin, 1.10.2012

dr hab. Ewa Agnieszka Lekka-Kowalik prof.. KUL

place, date

signature