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FEBRUARY 20 – 23, 2020 | ATLANTA, GEORGIA
WELCOME TO THE 29TH ANNUAL APPE INTERNATIONAL CONFERENCE

The Association for Practical and Professional Ethics (APPE) was founded in 1991 as an organization dedicated to teaching and embedding the practice of ethics and ethical decision-making into all aspects of society.

Through this conference and its other programming, the association facilitates scholarly exchange, supports a network of individuals and institutions committed to bridging ethics theory with practice, and serves as an advocate for the practical application of ethical principles across all sectors of society.

Together, we take rigorous academic work and make it relevant and actionable in the real world.

Association for Practical and Professional Ethics
The Janet Prindle Institute for Ethics
DePauw University
P.O. Box 37
Greencastle, Indiana 46135
Phone: 765-658-5015
Email: contact@appe-ethics.org

Patti A Stauffer, Executive Director
WELCOME TO THE 19TH ANNUAL APPE INTERNATIONAL CONFERENCE

Founded in 1991 as an organization dedicated to teaching and embedding the practice of ethics and ethical decision-making into all aspects of society. Through this conference and its other programming, the association facilitates scholarly exchange, supports a network of individuals and institutions committed to bridging ethics theory with practice, and serves as an advocate for the practical application of ethical principles across all sectors of society.

Together, we take rigorous academic work and make it relevant and actionable in the real world.

Association for Practical and Professional Ethics
The Janet Prindle Institute for Ethics
DePauw University
P.O. Box 37
Greencastle, Indiana 46135
Phone: 765-658-5015
Email: contact@appe-ethics.org

APPE Conference Sponsors

We extend our sincere thanks to the sponsors of this year’s conference
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Schedule of Events
Getting Ethics TO WORK

Give us your workplace moral dilemma and we might use it on the show!

Fill in the information below and deliver it to our conference table, or visit prindleinstitute.org/dilemma and submit your dilemma digitally.

Name __________________________ Email __________________________

Your moral dilemma

________________________________________________________________________

________________________________________________________________________

________________________________________________________________________

________________________________________________________________________

________________________________________________________________________

________________________________________________________________________

________________________________________________________________________
## Schedule of Events

### Thursday, February 20, 2020

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TIME</th>
<th>EVENT</th>
<th>LOCATION</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>7:00 am – 8:00 pm</td>
<td>Annual Conference Registration</td>
<td>Capitol North/Center</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8:00 am – 8:00 pm</td>
<td>Book Resource Room</td>
<td>Capitol North/Center</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8:00 am – 3:00 pm</td>
<td>2020 Ethics Center Directors Summit</td>
<td>Georgia 6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sponsored by Business Integrity Leadership Initiative, University of Arkansas</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8:30 am – 3:00 pm</td>
<td>RISE Workshop (RCR Lunch – Georgia 2)</td>
<td>Georgia 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8:30 am – 12:30 pm</td>
<td>Public Health Ethics Workshop</td>
<td>Georgia 7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12:30 pm – 3:00 pm</td>
<td>Graduate Student and Early Career Scholar Seminar on Teaching Ethics</td>
<td>Georgia 9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sponsored by Center for Professional and Applied Ethics, University of North Carolina, Charlotte</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3:30 pm – 4:30 pm</td>
<td>Concurrent Session 1</td>
<td>See Session Details</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4:45 pm – 6:00 pm</td>
<td>Annual Conference Opening and Plenary Speaker: Alexis Shotwell, Ph.D</td>
<td>Capitol South</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6:00 – 8:00 p.m.</td>
<td>Opening Reception</td>
<td>Capitol North/Center</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sponsored by the APPE Board of Directors</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Friday, February 21, 2020

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TIME</th>
<th>EVENT</th>
<th>LOCATION</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>7:00 am – 8:00 pm</td>
<td>Annual Conference Registration</td>
<td>Capitol North/Center</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8:00 am – 8:00 pm</td>
<td>Book Resource Room</td>
<td>Capitol North/Center</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7:00 am – 8:00 am</td>
<td>Breakfast with an Author</td>
<td>Georgia 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8:00 am – 1:30 pm</td>
<td>Business Ethics Seminar</td>
<td>Atlanta 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8:00 am – 9:30 am</td>
<td>Concurrent Session 2</td>
<td>See Session Details</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9:30 am – 10:00 am</td>
<td>Morning Break</td>
<td>Capitol North/Center</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10:00 am – 11:00 am</td>
<td>Concurrent Session 3</td>
<td>See Session Details</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11:15 am – 12:15 pm</td>
<td>Concurrent Session 4</td>
<td>See Session Details</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12:30 pm – 1:30 pm</td>
<td>Business Ethics Seminar Luncheon</td>
<td>Atlanta 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12:30 pm – 1:30 pm</td>
<td>RISE Luncheon</td>
<td>Georgia 6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12:30 pm – 1:30 pm</td>
<td>Topic Table Luncheon</td>
<td>Georgia 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1:45 pm – 2:45 pm</td>
<td>Friday Conference Plenary Speaker – Keith T. Darcy, President Darcy Partners, Inc.</td>
<td>Capitol South</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2:45 pm – 3:15 pm</td>
<td>Afternoon Break&lt;br&gt;Sponsored by TTU Ethics Center, Texas Tech University</td>
<td>Capitol North/Center</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3:15 pm – 4:15 pm</td>
<td>Concurrent Session 5</td>
<td>See Session Details</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4:30 pm – 5:30 pm</td>
<td>Concurrent Session 6</td>
<td>See Session Details</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5:45 pm – 6:45 pm</td>
<td>APPE Members Meeting</td>
<td>Capitol South</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6:45 pm – 7:45 pm</td>
<td>Poster Session</td>
<td>Capitol North/Center</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6:45 pm – 7:45 pm</td>
<td>Authors Reception (light refreshments)</td>
<td>Capitol North/Center</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Saturday, February 22, 2020

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TIME</th>
<th>EVENT</th>
<th>LOCATION</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>7:00 am – 5:00 pm</td>
<td>Annual Conference Registration</td>
<td>Capitol North/Center</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8:00 am – 5:00 pm</td>
<td>Book Resource Room</td>
<td>Capitol North/Center</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7:00 am – 8:00 am</td>
<td>First Time &amp; International Attendee Breakfast</td>
<td>Georgia 8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7:00 am – 8:00 am</td>
<td>Business Ethics SIS Breakfast</td>
<td>Georgia 6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8:00 am – 9:00 am</td>
<td>Concurrent Session 7</td>
<td>See Session Details</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7:00 am – 8:00 am</td>
<td>RISE SIS Group Meeting</td>
<td>Atlanta 4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9:00 am – 9:30 am</td>
<td>Morning Break</td>
<td>Capitol North/Center</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9:30 am – 10:30 am</td>
<td>Concurrent Session 8</td>
<td>See Session Details</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10:45 am – 11:45 am</td>
<td>Concurrent Session 9</td>
<td>See Session Details</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12:00 pm – 1:00 pm</td>
<td>Annual Conference Awards Luncheon</td>
<td>Capitol South</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1:15 pm – 2:15 pm</td>
<td>Concurrent Session 10</td>
<td>See Session Details</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2:30 pm – 3:30 pm</td>
<td>Concurrent Session 11</td>
<td>See Session Details</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3:30 pm – 4:00 pm</td>
<td>Afternoon Break</td>
<td>Capitol North/Center</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4:00 pm – 6:30 pm</td>
<td>Concurrent Session 12</td>
<td>See Session Details</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
APPE Conference Registration Hours

**Thursday:**
Opens: 7:00 am  
Closes: 8:00 pm

**Friday:**
Opens: 7:00 am  
Closes: 8:00 pm

**Saturday:**
Opens: 7:30 am  
Closes: 5:00 pm

APPE Book Resource Room Hours

**Thursday:**
Opens: 8:00 am  
Closes: 8:00 pm

**Friday:**
Opens: 8:00 am  
Closes: 8:00 pm

**Saturday:**
Opens: 8:00 am  
Closes: 12:00 pm  
Re-Opens: 3:30 pm  
Closes: 5:00 pm
2020 Conference Highlights

Look for your SIS group meetings and special events!
Check the daily highlight pages and schedules to find the meetings and events for each of the Special Interest Sections programming.

Business Ethics Seminar
Friday, February 21 | 8:00 am – 1:30 pm | Atlanta 5
Build your understanding of how compliance and business ethics are inherently linked.

Don’t miss the Friday Members Meeting!
Friday, February 21 | 5:45 – 6:45 pm | Capitol South
Make your voice heard at the Annual APPE Members meeting! Everyone is welcome and encouraged to attend. We look forward to seeing you there!

Media Ethics SIS group offsite dinner
Friday, February 21 | 8:00 pm
The Media and Journalism Ethics SIS group is gathering for a casual meeting at Crazy Atlanta, .2 miles from the conference venue. Contact Lee Anne Peck if you are interesting in joining.

First-Time and International Attendee Breakfast
Saturday, February 22 | 7:00 am | Georgia 8
This event is open to all first time attendees to the APPE Annual Conference and to our International Attendees. Come enjoy a free breakfast and get to know some of the APPE Board of Directors members and other attendees.

APPE Intercollegiate Ethics Bowl℠ National Competition
Saturday – Sunday, February 22 - 23
The APPE Intercollegiate Ethics Bowl℠ (APPE IEB℠) competition combines the excitement and fun of a competitive tournament with an innovative approach to education in practical and professional ethics for undergraduate students. Thirty-six teams have been selected from the twelve APPE IEB℠ regional competitions, last fall. These teams will compete in a tiered competition, with the final two teams competing in the final round at 5:30 pm on Sunday.

APPE Awards Luncheon
Saturday, February 22 | 12:00 pm | Capitol South
Join us in celebrating our Award Winners at the Annual Awards Luncheon. This event is open to all attendees. Luncheon ticket $50.
Award Winning Papers

Early Career Scholar Paper Competition
Sponsored by the Poe Center for Business Ethics Education and Research, University of Florida

Danielle Wenner, Carnegie Mellon University
Saturday 10:45-11:45 Session 9G - Georgia 5

Clinical Research as Basic Structure & the Ethics of Health Research Priority-Setting

Graduate Student Paper Competition
Sponsored by Jean Beer Blumenfeld Center for Ethics, Georgia State University

Dayoung Kim, Purdue University
Friday 3:15-4:15 Session 5H - Georgia 9

Promoting Professional Socialization: A Synthesis of Durkheim, Kohlberg, Hoffman, and Haidt for Professional Ethics Education

Undergraduate Student Paper Competition
Sponsored by University of Central Florida Department of Philosophy

Valerie Joly Chock, University of North Florida
Friday 6:45-7:45 Poster Session - Capitol North/Center

The Moral Permissibility of Nudges
Thursday, February 20th
### Thursday, February 20, 2020

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TIME</th>
<th>EVENT</th>
<th>LOCATION</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>7:00 am – 8:00 pm</td>
<td><strong>Annual Conference Registration</strong></td>
<td>Capitol North/Center</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8:00 am – 8:00 pm</td>
<td><strong>Book Resource Room</strong></td>
<td>Capitol North/Center</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8:00 am – 3:00 pm</td>
<td><strong>2020 Ethics Center Directors Summit</strong></td>
<td>Georgia 6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sponsored by Business Integrity Leadership Initiative, University of Arkansas</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8:30 am – 3:00 pm</td>
<td><strong>RISE Workshop</strong></td>
<td>Georgia 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(RCR Lunch – Georgia 2)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8:30 am – 12:30 pm</td>
<td><strong>Public Health Ethics Workshop</strong></td>
<td>Georgia 7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12:30 pm – 3:00 pm</td>
<td><strong>Graduate Student and Early Career Scholar Seminar on Teaching Ethics</strong></td>
<td>Georgia 9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sponsored by Center for Professional and Applied Ethics, University of North Carolina, Charlotte</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3:30 pm – 4:30 pm</td>
<td><strong>Concurrent Session 1</strong></td>
<td>See Session Details</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4:45 pm – 6:00 pm</td>
<td><strong>Annual Conference Opening and Plenary Speaker: Alexis Shotwell, Ph.D</strong></td>
<td>Capitol South</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6:00 – 8:00 p.m.</td>
<td><strong>Opening Reception</strong></td>
<td>Capitol North/Center</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sponsored by the APPE Board of Directors</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

For the full session abstracts go to [https://easychair.org/smart-program/2020APPEAIC/]
Thursday, February 20 Highlights

2020 Ethics Center Directors Summit | 8:00 am – 3:00 pm | Georgia 6

RISE Workshop | 8:30 am – 3:00 pm | Georgia 2

Public Health Ethics Workshop | 8:30 am – 12:30 pm | Georgia 7

Graduate Students & Early Career Scholars Seminar on Teaching Ethics | 12:30 pm – 3:00 pm | Georgia 9

APPE Conference Opening & Plenary | 4:45 pm | Capitol South

APPE Annual Conference Opening Reception | 6:00 pm | Capitol North/Center

For the full session abstracts go to https://easychair.org/smart-program/2020APPEAIC/
Association for Practical and Professional Ethics
Ethics Center Directors Summit
Sheraton Atlanta Hotel
Georgia 6
Thursday, February 20, 2020
8:00 a.m. – 3:00 p.m.

Sponsored by Business Integrity Leadership Initiative, University of Arkansas, Sam M. Walton College of Business

8:00 a.m. Continental Breakfast and Networking
8:30 a.m. Welcome / Ice Breaker
         Brad Agle / Ralph Ferguson
         Rose Procter / Janey Roeder

9:15 a.m. Moderated Roundtable Discussions (Rounds 1 and 2)
         Janey Roeder
         • Adding Value through Speakers and Programs
         Cara Biasucci
         • Establishing an Ethics Center on your Campus
         Andrew Hill
         • Fundraising and Sustainability
         Don Heider
         • Leveraging your Digital Presence
         Lora Lopez
         • Offering Consulting Services
         Rose Procter
         • Succession Planning for your Center
         Ralph Ferguson

10:15 a.m. Break
10:30 a.m. Continue Roundtable Discussions (Round 3 and wrap-up)

11:15 a.m. Building the Community and Sharing Resources
         Brad Agle

12:05 p.m. National Ethics Project Update
         Deni Elliott / Maggie Schein

12:15 p.m. Lunch Speaker: What Awesome Looks Like

1:15 p.m. Break

1:30 p.m. Advisory Councils
         Rose Procter

2:15 p.m. Engaging University Leadership
         Ralph Ferguson

2:50 p.m. Concluding Remarks
The Business Integrity Leadership Initiative of the University of Arkansas Sam M. Walton College of Business is pleased to sponsor the Annual Conference of the Association for Practical and Professional Ethics.
APPE

Research Integrity Scholars Educators

Inaugural APPE RISE Consortium Pre-Conference Event

Feb. 20, 2020 | 9 a.m. - 3 p.m.
Sheraton Atlanta Hotel, Atlanta, Georgia
Registration Fee: $130
Register at: appe-ethics.org/2020-conference-registration

C.K. Gunsalus | Keynote Speaker
Director of the National Center for Professional and Research Ethics • University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign
Co-author of the 2017 National Academies Consensus Study report Fostering Integrity in Research.

This pre-conference is dedicated to fostering research integrity, scholarship, and networking. The APPE RISE Consortium seeks to engage researchers and scholars in the responsible conduct of research as well as bring new interests and activities to APPE.

We welcome you to join us in what promises to be an exciting workshop with several presentations and a poster session.

We look forward to seeing you there!
Dena Plemons and Michael Kalichman, pre-conference co-chairs

C.K.
Gunsalus
keynote speaker
APPE RISE Consortium
Inaugural Pre-Conference Event
Thursday, February 20, 2020
9am-3pm

Agenda

8:30am  Registration
Display Posters*

9:00  Plemmons & Kalichman  Introduction, Overview

9:15  Gunsalus  Keynote and Q&A

9:45  Panel 1
   Jordan  Designing an RCR Curriculum for Artificial Intelligence Research
   Shriver  Understanding and Supporting Oversight Professionals’ Roles in Ensuring the Responsible Conduct of Research
   Hildt and Laas  Towards Expanding the Concept of Responsible Conduct of Research

10:45  Break

11:00  Panel 2
   Pease  Effectiveness of Multi-Media in Teaching Research Ethics and Integrity
   Solomon Cargill  RCR Education as Behavioral Intervention: Improving pedagogy by learning from behavioral change theory
   McCleskey  Assessing the Uncertain: How Philosophy Can Aid Assessment Efforts in Ethics Training

12:00pm  Lunch

1:00  Panel 3
   Bruton  What Should be Done to Reduce QRPs in Your Field?: Responses from Federally Funded Researchers
   Ribeiro  The Influence of Retractions on the Career of Scientists from the most Productive Countries in the Biomedical Sciences
   Moskovitz  Findings from the Text Recycling Research Project
   Rasmussen  A Survey of Institutional Authorship Policies

2:20  Wrap-up and next steps  Plemmons & Kalichman

3:00  Adjourn

*Posters (8:30am-3pm)

Hosting Workshops to Foster Community: First Steps in Transforming the Online Ethics Center and STEM Ethics Education

Moustafa  Curbing the Practices of Research Misconduct: A Qualitative Study on the Perceptions of Researchers at Egyptian Public Institutions
Public Health Ethics Workshop

Thursday, February 20 – 8:30-12:30 pm  Georgia 6

The Complementary Roles of Ethics and Law in Improving the Public’s Health

Public health officials regularly have to balance competing ethical, legal and professional obligations (e.g., allocating scarce resources efficiently but fairly, protecting community health without violating individual rights, or conducting surveillance while ensuring data confidentiality). Compared to the patient focus of clinical ethics or the bioethical focus on individual autonomy, public health ethics explores ethical issues that arise at the population level. This population focus raises special ethical challenges, such as how to work across sectors, engage communities, and incorporate a variety of stakeholder values and interests in making decisions. Public health ethics provides an approach for evaluating, prioritizing, and weighing these interests and values and sometimes negotiating compromises between them.

Kathy Kinlaw, MDiv, is Associate Director of the Emory University Center for Ethics and Director of the Center’s Program in Health, Science, and Ethics. She is an Assistant Professor of Pediatrics, Emory School of Medicine; and Director of the Health Care Ethics Consortium of Georgia. Since 1994 Professor Kinlaw has co-directed integration of Clinical Ethics into the School of Medicine’s curriculum and enjoys teaching in multiple departments and modules, including residency programs.

Leonard Ortmann, PhD, is an ethicist working with the CDC Public Health Ethics and Strategy Unit. Projects in which he is involved include ethics training and consults, ethical guidance in emergency response, and co-editing an international public health ethics casebook. He began his association with CDC as a Public Health Ethics Fellow from October 2008 to October 2010.

Matthew Penn, JD, MLIS, serves as Director of CDC’s Public Health Law Program, located in the Center for State, Tribal, Local, and Territorial Support. In this position, Mr. Penn provides critical legal expertise and leadership to advance public health practice through law. He leads a team of public health advisors and analysts in supporting practitioners and policy makers at the state, tribal, local, and territorial levels through the development of practical, law-centered tools and legal preparedness to address public health priorities.
Workshop Learning Objectives:
1. Distinguish the field of public health ethics from other fields of ethics.
2. Describe how public health ethics and law can work together to address ethical challenges.
3. List practical approaches for training public health students and professions about the ethical practice of public health.
4. Discuss approaches for building trust in public health recommendations.
5. Describe resources for building skills in public health ethics

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Agenda</th>
<th>Duration</th>
<th>Details</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Introductions</td>
<td>15 mins</td>
<td>Drue Barrett, PhD, Lead, Public Health Ethics and Strategy Unit, Office of Scientific Integrity, Office of Science, CDC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Health Ethics: From Foundations to Practice</td>
<td>45 mins</td>
<td>Leonard Ortmann, PhD, Senior Ethics Consultant, Public Health Ethics and Strategy Unit, Office of Scientific Integrity, Office of Science, CDC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Complementary Roles of Public Health Law and Public Health Ethics</td>
<td>45 mins</td>
<td>Matthew Penn, JD, MLIS, Director, Public Health Law Program, CDC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Break</td>
<td>10 mins</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Innovative Approaches for Building Skills in Public Health Ethics</td>
<td>45 mins</td>
<td>Kathy Kinlaw, MDiv, Associate Director, Center for Ethics; Director, Program in Health Sciences and Ethics, Center for Ethics, Emory University, Atlanta, GA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fostering Trust in Public Health Recommendations</td>
<td>45 mins</td>
<td>Kathy Kinlaw, MDiv, Associate Director, Center for Ethics; Director, Program in Health Sciences and Ethics, Center for Ethics, Emory University, Atlanta, GA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Health Ethics Resources</td>
<td>20 mins</td>
<td>Drue Barrett, Lead, Public Health Ethics and Strategy Unit, Office of Scientific Integrity, Office of Science, CDC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Final Questions and Concluding Comments</td>
<td>15 mins</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Graduate and Early Career Scholar Seminar on Teaching Ethics

Sponsored by the Center for Professional and Applied Ethics at University of North Carolina, Charlotte

Thursday, February 20, 2020
12:30 pm – 3:00 pm
Georgia 9

This highly interactive seminar is intended for graduate students and early career scholars who are currently teaching classes in ethics (for less than three years) or who have plans to do so. It is designed to boost confidence, confront pedagogical issues and provide philosophical comfort. Topics for the session include learning goals, pedagogical approaches and assessment strategies.

Dr. Wendy Wyatt, Professor of Media Ethics and Associate Vice Provost for Undergraduate Studies at the University of St. Thomas, will lead this engaging event.

Wyatt has been an active member of APPE for 20 years and has a longstanding interest in ethics teaching, which started at the University of Montana where she pursued a master’s in philosophy with a teaching ethics emphasis. Most of Wyatt’s ethics teaching has been in the areas of media and communication, and she has taught the capstone ethics course in the St. Thomas Communication and Journalism department for 15 years. She has also worked with elementary and middle school students, community groups, professional organizations and senior citizen programs. Wyatt is the author or editor of three books, and her work on journalism ethics and ethics pedagogy appears in several edited volumes and journals. Recently, Wyatt was part of the five-person editorial team that guided development of the Online News Association’s Build Your Own Ethics Code platform. This crowd-sourced tool, funded by a grant from the Ethics and Excellence in Journalism Foundation, allows journalists to easily customize and publish a digital ethics code.
Center for Professional and Applied Ethics

Working to shape an interdisciplinary intellectual and moral space in which people can critically assess, thoughtfully discuss, and strategically address contemporary ethical challenges

Programming in Precision Medicine – Being Muslim in America – Data Science – End of Life Decision-making – Continuing Ethics Ed. – Business Ethics – and more...

2018-2019 Philosophy Faculty

Daniel Boisvert, PhD. Philosophy of Language and ethics, philosophy of mind, logic.
Ruth Groenhou, PhD. Bioethics, health care ethics, ethical theory, feminist philosophy.
Gordon Hull, PhD. Moral and political, early modern, philosophy of law and technology, continental philosophy.
Robin James, PhD. Popular music studies, feminist theory, social and political philosophy, critical philosophy of race.
Michael Kelly, PhD. Aesthetics, ethics, contemporary European philosophy, Nietzsche.
Phillip McReynolds, PhD. American philosophy, continental philosophy, philosophy of technology, philosophy of film.
Trevor Pearce, PhD. Philosophy of biology, history and philosophy of science, American philosophy.
Elisabeth Paquette, PhD. Feminist and queer theory, social and political philosophy, continental philosophy, decolonial theory.
Andrea Pitts, PhD. Philosophy of race and gender, social epistemology, Latin American and U.S. Latina/o philosophy, critical prison studies.
Lisa Marie Rasmussen, PhD. Research ethics, clinical ethics, bioethics, ethical theory.
Mark Sanders, PhD. American philosophy, social and political philosophy, phenomenology, ethics.
Eddy Souffrant, PhD. Ethics, social and political philosophy, Africana philosophies, collective responsibility, international affairs.
Shannon Sullivan, PhD. Feminist philosophy, critical philosophy of race, American philosophy, continental philosophy.
Jayne Tristan, PhD. American philosophy, theory of inquiry, philosophy of science and technology.

MA in Ethics and Applied Philosophy

Our department focuses on using intertraditional philosophical tools and practical experience to address concrete problems.

We support work within and between different philosophical traditions, both contemporary and historical, aiming to build a scholarly culture where subdisciplinary boundaries are less important than the resources they provide for addressing living issues.

ethics.uncc.edu | philosophy.uncc.edu
Thursday, February 20th

- **Pre Conference 1**  Ethics Center Directors Summit 8:00 AM–3:00 PM
  
  Room: Georgia 6
  
  For more information see page 17

- **Pre Conference 2**  RISE Research Integrity Pre-Conference Workshop 8:30 AM–3:00 PM
  
  Room: Georgia 2
  
  For more information see page 19

- **Pre Conference 3**  Public Health Ethics Workshop: The Complementary Roles of Ethics and Law in Improving the Public’s Health 8:30 AM–12:30 PM
  
  Room: Georgia 7
  
  For more information see page 21

- **Pre Conference 4**  Graduate Student and Early Career Scholar Seminar on Teaching Ethics 12:30 PM–3:00 PM
  
  Room: Georgia 9
  
  For more information see page 23

- **1A** 3:30 PM–4:30 PM
  
  Room: Atlanta 4
  
  Chair: Lisa M Lee

  - **The Ethics of Physician Non-Compete Clauses**
    
    Kristin Schaupp, University of Wisconsin - Eau Claire
    Julia Kyle, University of Wisconsin-Madison
    
    Topics: Health Ethics (including Biomedical); Social and Societal Ethics
    
    The use of non-compete clauses is becoming increasingly common in the medical profession as a way of curtailing a physician’s ability to set up a competing practice. While protecting a clinic’s financial interests, these have serious consequences for patients, communities, and individual physicians. While much has been written about physician non-competes from a legal or business perspective, the ethical perspective remains under-explored. We use the Declaration of Geneva and the principles of beneficence, non-maleficence, autonomy, and justice to examine the ethical implications of the non-compete agreements and their enforcement.

  - **Hippocratic Paradox: Co-evolution of Medical Ethics, Health Law, and Social Practice**
    
    Junying Zhao, University of California
    Donald G. Saari, University of California
    
    Topics: Health Ethics (including Biomedical); Law, Government, and Military Ethics; Science, Technology, and Engineering (STEM)
    
    This paper is the first mathematical theory for the co-evolution of medical ethics, health law, and social practice. It offers a way of thinking and a new tool for prediction and health policy-making.
The Ethics of AI Enabled Machines: Forward into the Past
Edward Queen, Emory University Center for Ethics
Topics: Science, Technology, and Engineering (STEM)

This presentation on the ethics of AI enabled machines emerges out of an ongoing project on police drone use and suggests that the ethical issues of AI do not, primarily, implicate the determination of ethical rules/principles for AI, since AI is created within identifiable moral universes. The main issues involve the AI’s ability to effect those rules/principles within its technical limitations, select between potentially competing rules/principles in a given situation, and apply them appropriately given the context.

Additionally, it highlights the need for the AI enabled machine to be able to communicate what it is learning and how.

Making the MQ-9 Fully Autonomous: An Anticipatory Ethical Analysis
Richard Wilson, Towson University
Todd Burkhardt, Indiana University Bloomington
Topics: Science, Technology, and Engineering (STEM); Social and Societal Ethics

This analysis will discuss the ethical and social issues with MQ-9 drone program. Of particular interest is the degree to which Artificial Intelligence can be employed to make the MQ-9 fully autonomous. The Reaper will serve as an example of the evolution of the drone program’s development. Through the discussion of the MQ-9 progress can be made towards developing an autonomous drone, the technical and ethical issues will be understood, and recommendations can be developed to attempt to alleviate these problems. UAVs (Aerial Robots) have changed the nature of warfare and this case study will inform the audience of ethical issues related to the MQ 9 “Reaper” UAV. This analysis researches the obstacles that must be overcome in the area of AI to make the MQ-9 autonomous.

Would it Be Ethical to Delegate Human Caring Practices to Robots?
Lukas Chandler, The Kennedy Institute of Ethics
Topics: Health Ethics (including Biomedical); Moral Theory

Carebots, understood as social robots that assist human caregivers attending to the sick, young, elderly, and vulnerable, are on the horizon of future caring practices. Carebots offer the prospect of massive therapeutic benefit to vulnerable individuals in need of care. What do we gain if we shift our caring practices to carebots? What do we lose? In this presentation, the human-robot interaction is illustrated at the specific nexus of caring activities, where carebots assume the mantle of care-giver. Through the power of image and narrative, this presentation assesses foreseen and potentially unforeseen consequences for delegating our caregiving practices to carebots.

EVOLUTION AND CONTROL OF UNETHICAL PRACTICES IN SALES: a study of institutionalized bribery in developing country markets
Irfan Ameer, University of Turku
Topics: Business Ethics
Session abstracts can be found on the online program: https://easychair.org/smart-program/2020APPEAIC/

I would like to present my doctoral dissertation summary in 3 minutes competition.

- **Motor Learning after Stroke**  
  Lauren Edwards, Emory University

1D  
Room: Atlanta 3  
Chair: Michael Davis

- **Public Administrator Self-Censorship: An Ethical Analysis**  
  James Szymalak, University of Wisconsin-La Crosse  
  Topics: Law, Government, and Military Ethics; Professionalism

  In the current “regressive” or “post-truth” era, where belief trumps facts and values-based appeals prevail over empirical arguments, public administrators struggle to fulfill Frederickson’s mandate to foster an active and informed citizenry. Many confuse transparency with being informed, but comprehension asymmetries require great effort to process the information overload, which leads to cognitive shortcuts such as motivated reasoning that confirms the pre-existing negative perceptions. This project explores the ethicality of administrators permissibly refraining from disclosing additional information that could otherwise ameliorate such processing costs. Svara’s ethics triangle analysis is employed to determine if such self-censorship is congruent with administrative ethics.

- **AGENTS OF ADMINISTRATIVE LAW: ILLICIT OR VIRTUOUS?**  
  Thomas Pearson, The University of Texas Rio Grande Valley  
  Topics: Law, Government, and Military Ethics; Professionalism; Social and Societal Ethics

  This paper will briefly examine the structure and function of federal, state and local administrative agencies, the laws and regulatory provisions such agencies promulgate, and the ethical mandates under which they operate. Following Alasdair MacIntyre, the question will be raised as to whether such agencies fit the model of a social practice, with internal goods inherent in the practices of administrative law, goods that accelerate the achievement of a virtuous professional character, a character then manifested by those who perform their duties on behalf of the administrative state.

1E  
Room: Georgia 7  
Chair: Gregory Bock

- **The Ethics of Forgiveness**  
  Gregory Bock, The University of Texas at Tyler  
  Chad Bogosian, Clovis Community College  
  Joshue Orozco, Whitworth University  
  Topics: Moral Theory; Social and Societal Ethics

  The purpose of this panel is to explore current issues in the ethics of forgiveness, including whether forgiveness requires reconciliation, whether forgiveness is possible if the wrong is not acknowledged, and whether anger is compatible with loving one’s enemies.

  Paper 1: “When Refusing to Reconcile Amounts to Failing to Forgive.”  
  Paper 2: “The Armenian Genocide and Forgiveness.”  
Exemplary scientists have a characteristic way of viewing the world and their work: their mindset and methods all aim at discovering truths about nature. In An Instinct for Truth, Robert Pennock explores this scientific mindset and argues that what Charles Darwin called “an instinct for truth, knowledge, and discovery” has a tacit moral structure—that it is important not only for scientific excellence and integrity but also for democracy and human flourishing. In an era of “post-truth,” the scientific drive to discover empirical truths has a special value.

Taking a virtue-theoretic perspective, Pennock explores curiosity, veracity, skepticism, humility to evidence, and other scientific virtues and vices. He explains that curiosity is the most distinctive element of the scientific character, by which other norms are shaped; discusses the passionate nature of scientific attentiveness; and calls for science education not only to teach scientific findings and methods but also to nurture the scientific mindset and its core values.

Drawing on historical sources as well as a sociological study of over a thousand scientists, Pennock’s philosophical account is grounded in values that scientists themselves recognize they should aspire to. Pennock argues that epistemic and ethical values are normatively interconnected, and that for science and society to flourish, we need not just a philosophy of science, but a philosophy of the scientist.
RESPONDING ETHICALLY TO COMPLICITY AND COMPLEXITY

Many of us struggle with how to reckon, ethically or politically, with complex situations in which we are complicit. In this talk, Dr. Shotwell argues that relying on a conception of an individual moral willer, knower, and actor has foreclosed a significant part of our ethical capacities to respond to wicked problems, and offers a conception of relational ethics that will help us confront problems that are not resolvable individually but towards which we have responsibility.

For more information on Alexis Shotwell visit alexishotwell.com
Opening Plenary Address

Alexis Shotwell, Ph.D.
Carleton University Professor, Department of Sociology and Anthropology, on unceded Algonquin territory

Responding ethically to complicity and complexity

Many of us struggle with how to reckon, ethically or politically, with complex situations in which we are complicit. We are confronted with wicked problems such as participating in activities that produce global warming while wanting to stop it, benefiting from racism and colonialism but espousing antiracism, believing that food workers deserve dignity while eating foods produced using forced labour of various sorts, traveling to countries that oppress their citizens, and more. In this talk, I argue that relying on a conception of an individual moral willer, knower, and actor has foreclosed a significant part of our ethical capacities to respond to wicked problems, and offer a conception of relational ethics that will help us confront problems that are not resolvable individually but towards which we have responsibility.

Biography:

Alexis Shotwell is a professor at Carleton University, on unceded Algonquin territory. Her academic work addresses impurity, environmental justice, racial formation, disability, unspeakable and unspoken knowledge, sexuality, gender, and political transformation. Her political work focuses on queer liberation, Indigenous solidarity, and feminist community education. She also gives workshops on reducing suffering in our writing and teaching practices. She is the co-investigator for the AIDS Activist History Project (aidsactivisthistory.ca), and the author of Knowing Otherwise: Race, Gender, and Implicit Understanding and Against Purity: Living Ethically in Compromised Times.

Website: alexisshotwell.com
Annual Conference Opening Reception
and Book Resource Room Open House
Sponsored by the APPE Board of Directors

Thursday, February 20, 2020 6:00 pm – 8:00 pm Capitol North/Center

We invite you to join your colleagues and fellow conference participants for drinks, hors d'oeuvres, conversation, and networking.

APPE Book Resource Room

Browse the book displays while you sip your wine and enjoy your hors d'oeuvres!

Book display copies can be purchased at 20% off the retail cost, unless the book is marked ‘not for sale.’ This is on a first come basis. Purchased book copies must remain on display in the Book Resource Room until 11 am on Saturday of the conference. These pre-purchased materials may then be claimed between 12:30 and 2:15 pm.

Any remaining books and materials will be sold at a 50% or more discount during the Final Clearance Sale beginning during the final afternoon break at 3:30 pm.
Friday, February 21st

APPE
ASSOCIATION FOR PRACTICAL
AND PROFESSIONAL ETHICS
# Friday At A Glance

## Friday, February 21, 2020

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TIME</th>
<th>EVENT</th>
<th>LOCATION</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>7:00 am – 8:00 pm</td>
<td>Annual Conference Registration</td>
<td>Capitol North/Center</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8:00 am – 8:00 pm</td>
<td>Book Resource Room</td>
<td>Capitol North/Center</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7:00 am – 8:00 am</td>
<td>Breakfast with an Author</td>
<td>Georgia 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8:00 am – 1:30 pm</td>
<td>Business Ethics Seminar</td>
<td>Atlanta 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8:00 am – 9:30 am</td>
<td>Concurrent Session 2</td>
<td>See Session Details</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9:30 am – 10:00 am</td>
<td>Morning Break</td>
<td>Capitol North/Center</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10:00 am – 11:00 am</td>
<td>Concurrent Session 3</td>
<td>See Session Details</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11:15 am – 12:15 pm</td>
<td>Concurrent Session 4</td>
<td>See Session Details</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12:30 pm – 1:30 pm</td>
<td>Business Ethics Seminar Luncheon</td>
<td>Atlanta 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12:30 pm – 1:30 pm</td>
<td>RISE Luncheon</td>
<td>Georgia 6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12:30 pm – 1:30 pm</td>
<td>Topic Table Luncheon</td>
<td>Georgia 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1:45 pm – 2:45 pm</td>
<td>Friday Conference Plenary Speaker – Keith T. Darcy, President Darcy Partners, Inc.</td>
<td>Capitol South</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2:45 pm – 3:15 pm</td>
<td>Afternoon Break Sponsored by TTU Ethics Center, Texas Tech University</td>
<td>Capitol North/Center</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3:15 pm – 4:15 pm</td>
<td>Concurrent Session 5</td>
<td>See Session Details</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4:30 pm – 5:30 pm</td>
<td>Concurrent Session 6</td>
<td>See Session Details</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5:45 pm – 6:45 pm</td>
<td>APPE Members Meeting</td>
<td>Capitol South</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6:45 pm – 7:45 pm</td>
<td>Poster Session</td>
<td>Capitol North/Center</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6:45 pm – 7:45 pm</td>
<td>Authors Reception (light refreshments)</td>
<td>Capitol North/Center</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

For the full session abstracts go to https://easychair.org/smart-program/2020APPEAIC/
Friday, February 21 Highlights

Breakfast with an Author | 7:00 am – 8:00 pm | Georgia 2

RISE SIS Business Meeting | 7:00 am – 8:00 am | Georgia 4

Business Ethics Seminar | 8:00 am – 1:30 pm | Atlanta 5

Special Bioethics/Health Ethics SIS Panel Session | 10:00 am – 12:00 pm | Georgia 12

Law, Government, and Military SIS Lunch Opportunity | 12:30 pm | Sheraton’s Fandangles Restaurant & Bar

Friday Keynote Plenary | 2:45 pm – 3:45 pm | Capitol South

Special Media/Journalism SIS Panel Session | 3:15 pm – 5:15 pm | Georgia 12

APPE Members Meeting | 5:45 pm – 6:45 pm | Capitol South

Poster Session | 6:45 pm | Capitol North/Center

Authors Reception | 6:45 pm | Capitol North/Center

Media SIS Dinner Opportunity | 8 pm | Crazy Atlanta

The Media and Journalism Ethics SIS group is gathering for a casual meeting 8 pm Friday at Crazy Atlanta, 182 Courtland St. NE (0.2 miles from the conference hotel and immediately after the author event).

For the full session abstracts go to https://easychair.org/smart-program/2020APPEAIC/
Breakfast with an Author

Author Table 1:
Gregory Bock, Center for Ethics, University of Texas at Tyler
The Philosophy of Forgiveness – Volume III: Forgiveness in World Religions
(Vernon Press, Sep 20, 2018)
The Philosophy of Forgiveness – Volume IV: Christian Perspectives on Forgiveness
(Vernon Press, Sep 20, 2018)

Author Table 2:
Sonya Charles, Department of Philosophy and Comparative Religion, Cleveland State University
Parents and Virtues: An Analysis of Moral Development and Parental Virtue
(Lexington Books, March 11, 2019)

Author Table 3:
Yaw A. Frimpong-Mansoh, Department of Philosophy, Northern Kentucky University
Bioethics in Africa: Theories and Praxis
(Vernon Press, September 27, 2018)

Author Table 4:
J. Brooke Hamilton, Ethics OPs
Noggin – My Brain on Ethics

Author Table 5:
Elizabeth Hoppe, Department of Philosophy, Loyola University Chicago
Ethical Issues in Aviation
(Routledge; 2nd edition, October 18, 2018)

Author Table 6:
Terrence Kelly, Department of Philosophy, University of Alaska, Anchorage
Professional Ethics: A Trust-Based Approach
(Lexington Books, 2018)
Educational institutions offer students numerous courses on ethical decision-making; the hope is that students become employees better equipped to make ethical decisions. Simultaneously, organizational ethics and compliance programs must educate employees about how to respond ethically to work situations that present compliance dilemmas.

By bringing together compliance professionals and ethicists during this APPE program, participants will explore ethics' and compliance's essential symbiosis, develop better understandings and more effective education materials, and form mutually beneficial working relationships.

Cost for registration is $150 and includes lunch. Register at appe-ethics.org/2020-conference-registration/

---

**Author Table 7:**

Jennifer Kling, Department of Philosophy, University of Colorado, Colorado Springs  
*War Refugees: Risk, Justice, and Moral Responsibility*  
(Lexington Books, April 4, 2019)

**Author Table 8:**

Daryl Koehn, Institute for Business and Professional Ethics, DePaul University  
*Toward a New (Old) Theory of Responsibility: Moving beyond Accountability*  

**Author Table 9:**

Jonathan H. Marks, Rock Ethics Institute, Penn State University  
*The Perils of Partnership: Industry Influence, Institutional Integrity, and Public Health*  
(Oxford University Press, February 28, 2019)

**Author Table 10:**

Robert Pennock, Department of Computer Science & Engineering, Michigan State University  
*An Instinct for Truth: Curiosity and the Moral Character of Science*  
(The MIT Press, August 13, 2019)

**Author Table 11:**

Eddy Souffrant, Center for Professional and Applied Ethics, University of North Carolina, Charlotte  
*Global Development Ethics: a Critique of Global Capitalism*  
(Rowman & Littlefield International, April 15, 2019)

**Author Table 12:**

J. Thomas Whetstone III, Consultant/writer in Leadership Ethics  
*Light for the Dark Side: Ethics Cases for University Administrators*  
(Dorrance Pub Co, April 18, 2019)  
*Leadership Ethics & Spirituality: A Christian Perspective, Revised Edition*  
(Toplink Publishing, March 25, 2019)
Educational institutions offer students numerous courses on ethical decision-making; the hope is that students become employees better equipped to make ethical decisions.

Simultaneously, organizational ethics and compliance programs must educate employees about how to respond ethically to work situations that present compliance dilemmas.

By bringing together compliance professionals and ethicists during this APPE program, participants will explore ethics’ and compliance’s essential symbiosis, develop better understandings and more effective education materials, and form mutually beneficial working relationships.

Cost for registration is $150 and includes lunch. Register at appe-ethics.org/2020-conference-registration/
Business Seminar Agenda

I. Continental Breakfast & Networking

II. Welcome

III. Opening Remarks (8:45 a.m.)

IV. Panel Discussion (9 a.m.)

What do compliance officers & ethicists need and want? 
A conversation about expectations and approaches

- Nathan Nobis, Ph.D. (Moderator)
  Associate Professor, Philosophy, Morehouse College

- Daryl Koehn, Ph.D.
  Wicklander Chair in Professional Ethics, DePaul University

- Blair Marks, MS, MBA
  Vice President, Ethics & Business Conduct, Lockheed Martin

- Danette O’Neal, Ph.D.
  Broker/Owner, Danette O’Neal Realtors

V. Panel Discussion (10 a.m.)

Compliance and ethics challenges & creative approaches to address them

- Eddy Nahmias, Ph.D. (Moderator)
  Professor & Chair, Philosophy, Georgia State University

- Arnold B. Evans
  Executive Vice President
  Enterprise Ethics Officer, SunTrust Bank / Truist Financial Corporation

- Beverly J. Kracher, Ph.D.
  Executive Director, Business Ethics Alliance
  Robert B. Daugherty Chair in Business Ethics & Society, Creighton University

- Patricia H. Werhane, Ph.D.
  Fellow & Visiting Professor
  Center for Professional Responsibility in Business and Society
  Gies College of Business, University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign

VI. Moderated Conversation (11 a.m.)

VII. Lunch (noon)

VIII. Special Address (1 p.m.)

IX. Concluding Remarks (1:30 p.m.)
Friday, February 21st

Breakfast w/ Author For more information see page 37
Room: Georgia 2

Global Development Ethics: A Critique of Global Capitalism
Eddy Souffrant, University of North Carolina, Charlotte
Topics: Business Ethics; Law, Government, and Military Ethics; Social and Societal Ethics

Cases of famine, governmental overreach, political abuse and neglect persist even in today's globalised world. Corporate malfeasance, disregard of the environment, and blatant ignorance of the instigators of disasters large and small also continue to register high human costs. In trying to address this, theorists have attempted to elucidate a global ethics that would prescribe courses of actions even when individual and direct causal agency cannot be identified.

Following in this tradition, the author explores the concept of a global development ethics, taking in topics including famine, immigration, capitalism, race, and technology. He demonstrates that defining the constituents of a global development ethics depends on a successful analysis of the theoretical and practical structures that cause such global and seemingly intractable conditions. He challenges existing conceptions of global justice and argues for a theory of global ethics that relies on our commonality, such that enables us to welcome the "other", thereby fuelling our recognition of the inequalities that motivate prospective development projects. Ideal for advanced-level students in global ethics, global justice and development studies, this text articulates a vital new ethics of human development.

Breakfast with an Author: What You Should Know About Anti-Bribery Compliance
Alexandra Wrage, Trace, International
Topics: Business Ethics

A collection of white papers from TRACE covering essential topics in global anti-bribery compliance including international due diligence standards, individual liability and facilitation payments – a must have for any compliance professional.

Toward a New (Old) Theory of Responsibility: Moving beyond Accountability
Daryl Koehn, Institute for Business and Professional Ethics, DePaul University
Topics: Business Ethics; Moral Theory; Social and Societal Ethics

This book offers a much needed overview of the neglected notion of responsibility. Instead of offering vague talk about “individual responsibility” or “corporate responsibility,” Daryl Koehn examines in detail four accounts of responsibility, taking care to specify what responsibility does and does not mean in each account. She argues for a return to the ancient concept of Socratic dialogical responsibility, a concept that avoids many of the problems inherent in the other accounts.

After examining the Anglo-American criminal legal system’s treatment of responsibility as intentional agency, she critiques Hans Jonas’s concept of responsibility as ontological care and Hannah Arendt’s notion of communicative responsibility. She provides a careful analysis of the strengths and weaknesses of each approach to responsibility. The final chapter makes the case for Socratic dialogical responsibility. Dialogical responsibility has many strengths in its own right and avoids the major pitfalls of the other notions of responsibility examined in the book. It serves as an eminently practical way to hold ourselves responsible for our actions and speech. In addition, dialogical responsibility alone qualifies as a virtue integral to the good life.
Exemplary scientists have a characteristic way of viewing the world and their work: their mindset and methods all aim at discovering truths about nature. In An Instinct for Truth, Robert Pennock explores this scientific mindset and argues that what Charles Darwin called “an instinct for truth, knowledge, and discovery” has a tacit moral structure—that it is important not only for scientific excellence and integrity but also for democracy and human flourishing. In an era of "post-truth," the scientific drive to discover empirical truths has a special value.

Countless public health agencies are trying to solve our most intractable public health problems—among them, the obesity and opioid epidemics—by partnering with corporations responsible for creating or exacerbating those problems. We are told industry must be part of the solution. But is it time to challenge the partnership paradigm and the popular narratives that sustain it?

The current refugee crisis is unparalleled in history in its size and severity. According to the United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees (UNHCR), there are roughly 67 million refugees worldwide, the vast majority of whom are refugees as the result of wars and other military actions. This social and political crisis—1 in every 122 humans is a refugee—cries out for normative explanation and analysis. Morally and politically, how should we understand this crisis? How should we respond to it, and why?

It is widely recognized that professionals, such as doctors, nurses, engineers, and teachers have duties that go far beyond those of ordinary citizens, but there is much disagreement as to why they have such duties.

This edited volume explores bioethics in Africa from pluralistic and inter-cultural perspectives. The selected papers offer diverse theoretical and practical perspectives on the bioethical challenges that are common and specific to the lives of Sub-Sahara Africans.
Breakfast with an Author: Ethical Issues in Aviation
Elizabeth Hoppe, Loyola University Chicago
Topics: Science, Technology, and Engineering (STEM)

The aviation industry is unique in two major ways: firstly, it has a long history of government involvement dating back to the early days of aviation; and secondly, its primary concern is the safety of its passengers and crew. These features highlight the importance of ethical decision-making at all levels of the industry. However, well-publicized problems such as the disappearance of Malaysia Airlines Flight 370 highlight the need for ethics to take a more prominent role in the field.

Ethical Issues in Aviation focuses on both past and current topics in aviation, providing the reader with an overview of the major themes in aviation ethics that cover a broad range of subjects.

Noggin - My Brain on Ethics
J. Brooke Hamilton, EthicsOps

Noggin – My Brain on Ethics is an on-line resource for undergrad and graduate courses, business and professional training, and personal development.

Designed for the brain I have rather than the brain I think I have and based on ethical traditions, religions, and contemporary research in philosophy, psychology, and behavioral science, Noggin provides easily remembered ideas and language to understand not only what is right or wrong but also how I make judgments and act and why an action is right or wrong.

Noggin’s core skills can give me confidence in my quick/automatic gut judgments and an understanding of their reliability, provide more reasons for my slow/deliberate judgments, and make me more effective in engaging with ethical exemplars. Mastery level skills can help me better recognize ethics issues, be aware of defensive reactions when judging right or wrong, decide whether I am the kind of person who will do what is right, and choose tactics for acting ethically in the face of organizational and situational pressures. I will know to look back after I have acted to adjust my ethics standards and processes, and will be better at resolving ethics disagreements by identifying and speaking directly to their causes.

Parents and Virtues: An Analysis of Moral Development and Parental Virtue
Sonya Charles, Cleveland State University
Topics: Moral Theory; Social and Societal Ethics

Even though individual parents face different issues, I believe most parents want their children to be good people who are happy in their adult lives. As such, a central motivating question of this book is how can parents raise a child to be a moral and flourishing person? At first glance, we might think this question is better left to psychologists rather than philosophers. I propose that Aristotle’s ethical theory (known as virtue theory) has much to say on this issue. Aristotle asks how do we become a moral person and how does that relate to leading a good life? In other words, his motivating questions are very similar to the goals parents have for their children. In the first part of this book, I consider what the basic components of Aristotle’s theory can tell us about the project of parenting. I discuss questions such as: What can Aristotle tell us about the process of moral development? Does parenting require a specific kind of practical wisdom? What does it mean to flourish in an unjust society? In the second part, I shift my focus to consider some issues that present potential moral dilemmas for parents and whether there are specific parental virtues we may want to use to guide parental actions. This part of the book takes up questions such as: What does it mean to be a trustworthy parent when using anonymous “donor” gametes? How should parents make decisions about permanent body modifications for young children? is it wrong to have a child when you know you will not be able to see this child to adulthood? In the end, I hope this project encourages others to think about how virtue ethics can be useful for both bioethics and debates in the ethics of parenthood.
The Philosophy of Forgiveness – Volume IV: Christian Perspectives on Forgiveness
Gregory Bock, University of Texas at Tyler
Topics: Social and Societal Ethics

The Philosophy of Forgiveness, Volume IV: Christian Perspectives on Forgiveness is a collection of essays that explores different Christian views on forgiveness. Each essay takes up a different topic, such as the nature of divine forgiveness, the basis for forgiving our enemies, and the limits of forgiveness.

The Philosophy of Forgiveness – Volume III: Forgiveness in World Religions
Gregory Bock, University of Texas at Tyler
Topics: Social and Societal Ethics

The Philosophy of Forgiveness, Volume IV: Christian Perspectives on Forgiveness is a collection of essays that explores different Christian views on forgiveness. Each essay takes up a different topic, such as the nature of divine forgiveness, the basis for forgiving our enemies, and the limits of forgiveness.

John Whetstone, Retired
Topics: Business Ethics; Education; Moral Theory; Professionalism

A practical guide for those seeking to be good leaders. Drawing upon philosophical and theological analysis and workplace examples, Leadership Ethics & Spirituality explains why and how a person can be both effective and ethical as a successful leader while walking by faith. From a biblical worldview, it draws upon leadership research and ethics theory to explain what practices and character qualities a person needs to be a good leader and how to develop and apply them successfully to the challenges faced in today’s organizations. The revised 2019 edition adds questions to each chapter to encourage personal reflection and facilitate group discussion. Although written primarily to Christian leaders, it offers useful insights for those from other spiritual traditions and perspectives as well.

Light for the Dark Side: Ethics Cases for University Administrators
John Whetstone, Retired
Topics: Business Ethics; Education; Professionalism

Educators, administrators, and faculty of Christian institutions should, and can, serve their institution’s mission according to a God-honoring ethic. But this is not easy. Teaching and research faculty commonly refer to their administration—the president, provost, and deans—as the Dark Side. Faculty members appointed to administrative positions are sometimes considered traitors for going over to the Dark Side.

The twelve cases offered in this book are based on actual situations involving relations and tensions among university presidents, provosts, deans, department chairs, and other full-time and adjunct faculty members. Essays and the case questions seek to guide rational discussion of ethical issues involving conflicts of interests, hiring and termination, communication practice, new program development, and relations among students, faculty, and consultants.

SP1
Business Ethics Seminar: Compliance and Ethics - An Essential Symbiosis
7:59 AM–1:30 PM

Room: Atlanta 5

For more information see page 39
2A  

**Room:** Atlanta 1  

**Chair:** Charlotte McDaniel  

- **Ethical Principles Involved in Implementation of the MOLST/POST Paradigm**  
  *Pamela Teaster, Center for Gerontology, Virginia Tech*  
  *Al Giwa, Icahn School of Medicine at Mount Sinai*  
  **Topics:** Health Ethics (Including Biomedical); Social and Societal Ethics  
  The purpose of this presentation is to explore the ethical principles involved in the implementation of Medical Orders for Sustaining Treatment (MOLST, New York, statutory model)/Physician Orders for Scope of Treatment (POST, Virginia, best practice model).

- **The Ethics of Organ Transplant Offer Nondisclosure: Patient Transparency, Discard Reduction & Fairness**  
  *Gerard Vong, Center for Ethics, Emory University*  
  **Topics:** Health Ethics (Including Biomedical)  
  This presentation provides three ethical arguments for the reform of the common practice of refusing organ transplant offers to patients on organ waitlists without notifying patients of either the offer or its refusal. We argue that the clinician(s) that made the refusal decision have an ethical obligation to notify all waitlisted patients about such refusals (and provide explicit justifications for such refusals) unless those patients explicitly opt out of receiving such notifications. Doing so would promote transparency to stakeholders, promote public health through greater organ utilization and reduce unjustified variability in donor organ acceptance criteria.

- **Ageism, Autonomy and Dementia: Person-Centered Care Reconsidered**  
  *Susan Kennedy, Boston University*  
  **Topics:** Health Ethics (Including Biomedical); Moral Theory  
  Person-centered care frameworks have become a popular method for improving the quality of care for individuals with dementia. This framework suggests that caregivers should strive to preserve continuity between the premorbid and current identity of the individual with dementia. I contend that person-centered care places too much emphasis on an individual’s premorbid identity and, as a result, harbors an implicit and pernicious ageism by systematically discounting the possibility of evolving preferences. By drawing a relevantly similar comparison to childrearing, I argue that person-centered care ought to leave room for the morally- permissible shaping of a person’s preferences and values.

2B  

**Panel Session**  

**Room:** Georgia 11  

**Chair:** J Britt Holbrook  

- **Assessing Ethics Education**  
  *J Britt Holbrook, New Jersey Institute of Technology*  
  *Michael Hoffmann, Georgia Institute of Technology*  
  *Chet McLeskey, Michigan State University*  
  *Michael O’Rourke, Michigan State University*  
  **Topics:** Education; Research Ethics; Science, Technology, and Engineering (STEM)
Although there exist several well-known approaches to assessing ethics education interventions, we still lack consensus on what exactly should be assessed. This panel discusses the results of an NSF-sponsored workshop on Assessing Ethics Education. It includes some of the PIs and participants of the workshop, who will give their own takes on what was accomplished, as well as future directions for assessment of ethics education interventions. Each of the panelists will talk for approximately 10 minutes, with 10 minutes after each presentation for questions and discussion. The remainder of the time will be spent in full group discussion with the audience. Since many of the workshop participants are regular attendees at APPE, we will also endeavor to have them join the session.

**Room:** Atlanta 3

**Chair:** Matthew Altman

- **Autonomous Weapon Systems and the Claim-Rights of Innocents on the Battlefield**
  
  *Hunter Cantrell, United States Military Academy*
  
  **Topics:** Law, Government, and Military Ethics

  Much of the debate about autonomous weapon systems is “pre-implementational.” As such, questions like “can AWS be in compliance with the regulations of the Geneva Conventions?” are often the focus. As such, the debate centers on whether the system itself would be able to comply with current or future possible IHL. What this debate does not address is, if AWS can conform to IHL and the JWT, how does this change the duties, rights, and responsibilities inherent on the battlefield? To do this, we must shift the debate from pre-implementation to post-implementation. In support of this, I focus on the claim-rights of innocents against combatants to use AWS in order to reduce instances of unjust killing and collateral damage. Leif Wenar, in “The Nature of Claim-Rights,” argues that the most philosophically robust form of the claim-right is the “Kind-Desire” as opposed to will and interest claim-right theories. Wenar defines Kind-Desire claim-rights as, “some systems of norms refers to entities under descriptions that are kinds (“parent,” “journalist,” “human,” etc.). Within such a system, claim-rights correspond to those enforceable strict duties that the members of the relevant kind want to be fulfilled” (Wenar 2013, 219). Using Wenar’s concept, I argue that “If and only if AWS are such that they can better discriminate targets and precisely employ deadly force, then an innocent on the battlefield has a claim-right against the combatants to use such weapon systems.” This claim is a fulfillment of the “strict duties that the members of the relevant kind want fulfilled,” namely to not be killed, injured, nor have their property destroyed unjustly. This application of Wenar’s Kind-Desire Theory of claim rights also accords with Convention IV Article 27, “Protected persons are entitled… to respect for their persons… They shall at all times be humanely treated, and shall be protected especially against all acts of violence or threats thereof…” (ICRC 1949). I conclude that with the implementation of sophisticated AWS, innocents will have a claim-right on their use by combatants and combatants have a duty to use AWS in fulfillment of this claim-right.

- **Environmental Protection and Armed Conflicts: Greening the Principles of Military Necessity and Humanity**
  
  *Mark Woods, University of San Diego*
  
  **Topics:** Law, Government, and Military Ethics

  I bring together environmental philosophy and the ethics of war and peace to develop a segment of environmental just war theory. Two customary law principles from international humanitarian law are the principle of military necessity and the principle of humanity. I recast these as green jus in bello principles that can be used to offer protection for the environment during armed conflicts.
The Neglect of Right Intention
Kevin Cutright, U.S. Military Academy
Topics: Law, Government, and Military Ethics; Moral Theory; Social and Societal Ethics

Right intention in military ethics refers to a disposition toward a just and lasting peace. It is an explicit principle of jus ad bellum, the category of military ethics meant to govern political leaders’ decisions to initiate war. I argue that it ought to be an explicit principle of jus in bello, as well, which is the category of military ethics meant to govern soldiers’ conduct of the war. Such emphasis would help to correct soldiers’ self-perception as killing machines.

Normalizing the Aberrant: Responsible Journalism in a Hyper-Partisan Era
Stephanie Craft, University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign
Christopher Meyers, CSU Bakersfield
Patrick Plaisance, The Pennsylvania State University
Ryan Thomas, University of Missouri
Ed Wasserman, University of California, Berkeley
Topics: Media and Journalism

The notion that news coverage can “normalize” the aberrant underlies much of the discussion about how journalists do and should cover President Trump, whose tenure in office has been marked by significant deviations from norms governing presidential behavior. This panel will consider whether and what kind of ethical issues normalization presents. Given that news coverage unavoidably confers status on its subjects and that deviance is part of the very definition of news, how can we understand what ethically responsible reporting entails?

A Practical Approach to Improving Research Quality through an Expanded Understanding of Research Ethics
Jarvis Smallfield, University of Illinois at Urbana/Champaign
Elizabeth Luckman, University of Illinois at Urbana/Champaign
Dena Plemmons, University of California, Riverside
Gretchen Winter, University of Illinois at Urbana/Champaign
C. K. Gunsalus, University of Illinois at Urbana/Champaign
Topics: Research Ethics

The National Center for Professional and Research Ethics promotes research integrity through evidence-based, research backed intentional professional development, based on real-life situations, with solutions that are achievable by researchers. The workshop will begin with a short presentation of the theoretical foundations for improving ethical outcomes in research followed by an overview of evidence-based tools promoting research integrity and their current use. We will move to a hands-on demonstration of these tools, culminating with discussion among the audience and panelists covering the presented approaches, the practical benefits of maintaining research integrity, and the relationship between these methods and research excellence.
**Cultivating an Ethics-Inclusive Mindset Through Role Play in Undergraduate Computer Science Courses**

*Emma Logevall, Georgia Institute of Technology*
*Jason Borenstein, Georgia Institute of Technology*
*Amanda Meng, Georgia Institute of Technology*
*Benjamin Shapiro, Georgia Institute of Technology*
*Ellen Zegura, Georgia Institute of Technology*

Topics: Business Ethics; Education; Science, Technology, and Engineering (STEM); Social and Societal Ethics

Institutions of higher education are increasingly recognizing the importance of embedding ethics in undergraduate STEM curricula. Our research team posits that role play can be a particularly useful method for broadening student perspectives and meaningfully integrating ethics into computer science classes specifically. Over the course of our study, we will design and pilot a role play activity that requires undergraduate participants (stakeholders at a committee meeting) to decide whether or not to introduce autonomous buses into a community. In this session, the presenter will share the activity design, assessment strategy, and the results from the pilot round.

**A Comparative Study of Personality Types Based on Personal Values of Engineering Undergraduates in an Ethics Course**

*Atma Sahu, Mathematics & Computer Science, Coppin State University, Baltimore MD USA*
*Keeerti Jain, Assistant Professor of Mathematics, NIIT University, Neemrana 301705 Rajasthan, India*

Topics: Business Ethics; Education; Science, Technology, and Engineering (STEM); Social and Societal Ethics

This paper is targeting Conference participants in research areas: 1) Engineering, Science and Technology Ethics, 2) Business Ethics, 3) Engineering, Science and Technology Education, in that order.

**Teaching Ethics in a High School Summer Camp**

*Pauline Mosley, Pace University*

Topics: Business Ethics; Science, Technology, and Engineering (STEM); Social and Societal Ethics

In this session we will share our ethical curriculum design which aims to sensitize students to ethical dilemmas in the use of computers and to the need for the development of personal and corporate codes of practice in information technology. A series of ethical games and strategies will be discussed as a pedagogical tool for teaching ethics and the social implications of unethical behavior. Attention is drawn to the significance for the participation of girls and women in computer based education of the inclusion of ethical and social issues in computing, as well as the identification of a gender related stance in respect of these issues. The theoretical and practical bases of the ethics programs described are supported by reference to the literature.
A panel by three RISE submission, accepted individually and requested to form a panel on RCR/RI education.

Friday A.M. Coffee Break
9:30 AM–10:00 AM

Room: Atlanta 1
Chair: Susan Schelble

What does institutional integrity mean these days?
C.K. Gunsalus, University of Illinois Urbana-Champaign

Topics: Business Ethics; Education; Health Ethics (including Biomedical); Professionalism; Research Ethics; Science, Technology, and Engineering (STEM)

Come to think and talk about what “institutional integrity” means in large decentralized institutions when the acts of people you’ve never met may tar your name, affect your ability to attract and retain the best people, never mind how hard it can be to explain to friends and relatives that your part of the organization “isn’t like that.” Can our complex decentralized organizations maintain institutional integrity? If so, how and whose responsibility is it? What is our individual responsibilities and how can we make a real difference as teachers and scholars of ethics and as members of our institutions’ ethics centers?

The Growth of Ethics Bowls-- A Pedagogical Tool across Disciplines
Lisa M Lee, Virginia Tech

Topics: Business Ethics; Education; Health Ethics (including Biomedical); Media and Journalism; Professionalism; Science, Technology, and Engineering (STEM); Social and Societal Ethics

The initial APPE Intercollegiate Ethics Bowl (IEB), developed by Bob Ladenson at the Illinois Institute of Technology in the early 1990s, uses unique pedagogical tools to teach ethics across various disciplines. Since the first APPE IEB, the ethics bowl format and its pedagogical goals have been adapted to many other academic disciplines and a variety of student populations. The goal of the current project was to quantify the growth of the APPE IEB concept since the early 1990s. We enumerated existing Ethics Bowl programs and performed descriptive analysis, emphasizing pedagogical goals, methods, and outcomes.

The Checks and Balances of Retribution and Deterrence
Matthew Altman, Central Washington University

Topics: Law, Government, and Military Ethics; Moral Theory; Social and Societal Ethics

I defend a mixed theory of punishment according to which the legislature establishes laws and sentencing guidelines that further society’s aims (consequentialism), and judges convict only criminals and assign punishments in proportion to their guilt (retributivism). This two-tiered model does not allow either the framing of innocents or excessive harm for the guilty. The actions of the legislature restrain the judge, so that gratuitous suffering and barbaric actions would be ruled out, and the actions of the judge restrain our consequentialist impulses, since only the guilty would be punished in proportion to their degree of guilt (within the guidelines).
The Ethics of Uncivil Obedience

Peter Barry, Saginaw Valley State University

Topics: Law, Government, and Military Ethics; Moral Theory; Professionalism; Social and Societal Ethics

While civil disobedience has been much discussed by ethicists, uncivil obedience has received much less attention. Uncivil obedience involves complying with the dictates of legal and social rules, often in an especially rigidly or literal manner that has the effect of undermining an agenda or purpose. I aim to defend the practice of uncivil obedience quite generally while considering problematic cases that suggest challenges to this general defense.

Should Perspective be Shared: Journalists, Opinion and Social Media

Luke Cross, University of South Florida St. Petersburg

Topics: Media and Journalism

Journalists’ social media is often not only an alternative repository for news and community interaction, but also a means for journalists to interpret, publicize and orient aspects of their professional and personal lives with an engaged, equally subjective audience. In this sense, the line between unbiased fact collector and media pundit can be blurred — the medium is focused on conversation, with a keen interest in the opinion of participating individuals, despite ostensibly being labeled as a journalistic platform. Can this coincide with contemporary journalistic standards, and if not, how can it be addressed?

“Any conduct which threatens the security:” Applying Millian Security Principles to guide ethical coverage of dissent, protest, and civil disobedience.

Philip Todd, University of Oklahoma

Topics: Media and Journalism

Among the blessings of a free press, its service of providing a forum for dissenting voices – letters to the editor, guest editorials, advocacy journalism, issue-oriented advertising – is widely celebrated. Unfortunately, mass coverage of peaceful protests, boycotts, and civil disobedience may also set a stage for riots, mass shootings, and terrorism. However, John Stuart Mill’s definition of utilitarian security can instead guide more ethical reporting that seeks to inform, but not inflame. The Millian Security Principles seek context, depth and breadth in ethically covering dissenting expression situated in the larger community, directing a more robust and responsible journalism.

Global Perspectives on Artificial Intelligence Ethics and Policy: Findings from a Review of International Documents

Daniel Schiff, Georgia Institute of Technology
Kelly Laas, Illinois Institute of Technology
Jason Borenstein, Georgia Institute of Technology
Justin Biddle, Georgia Institute of Technology
Over the last five years, governments, corporations, and nonprofit organizations have urgently begun developing normative ethics and policy documents to respond to the rapid rise of artificial intelligence (AI) technologies. To better understand the AI ethics and policy landscape, our research team has examined more than 80 AI ethics and policy documents to assess both ethical concerns and policy sectors associated with AI. During the session, the presenter will share quantitative findings, highlighting prominent and neglected topics, and will discuss what consensus, disagreement, and the absence of certain categories implies for the state of global AI ethics and governance.

**The Paradox of State Sovereignty: A Call for Revision**

*Eric Scarffe, Boston University*

Topics: Law, Government, and Military Ethics; Social and Societal Ethics

---

**A Climate of Justice: A Necessary Condition for a Viable Future**

*Marvin Brown, University of San Francisco*

Topics: Law, Government, and Military Ethics; Social and Societal Ethics

The failure to repair the crimes against humanity caused by the European settlement of America has left us in a climate of injustice that prevents us from stopping social fragmentation and global warming. This presentation will propose a strategy to change to a climate of justice. It involves three moves: a critical examination of our understanding of the earth, our humanity, the social, and the civic; a narrative of the impact of white supremacy on American prosperity; and a way to replace the military civic with a civilian civic, which will facilitate the repair of broken relationships.

---

**Climate Legacy: A New(ish) Concept for the Climate Crisis**

*Rachel Fredericks, Ball State University*

Topics: Law, Government, and Military Ethics; Science, Technology, and Engineering (STEM); Social and Societal Ethics

People, especially people in affluent nations, are not doing nearly enough (individually or collectively) to prevent and prepare for the worst consequences of the climate crisis. This is partly because we lack the concepts necessary to motivate climate-stabilizing actions. I identify five desiderata for concepts that have significant potential to motivate climate-stabilizing actions and introduce the concept of a climate legacy, which meets all five. I consider why this concept is sometimes more apt than familiar concepts like climate justice, carbon footprint, and carbon neutrality, then suggest policy proposals and individual actions relating to climate legacies that merit further consideration.

---

**Propaganda and Vaccine Refusal in the “Post-Truth” Era**

*Lisa Fuller, Merrimack College*

Topics: Health Ethics (Including Biomedical); Social and Societal Ethics
The debate around vaccine refusal has often been characterized as a conflict between religious liberty or freedom of conscience and the public good. However, the increase in vaccine refusal that has contributed to recent outbreaks of measles in the US and Europe does not seem to have been motivated by religious or moral convictions. Instead, it seems to have been heavily influenced by the anti-elitism and anti-intellectualism characteristic of populist political rhetoric. Rather than understanding vaccine refusal as conflict between the value of individual liberty and the common good, we should view it as part of a larger partisan political effort to provoke distrust and division among citizens by encouraging the rejection of what were once common epistemic norms.

The Meta Virtue of Integrity, Civility, and the Barmen Declaration

Annalee R. Ward, Wendt Center for Character Education, University of Dubuque
Mary K. Bryant, Wendt Center for Character Education, University of Dubuque

Topics: Moral Theory; Social and Societal Ethics

The relationship between civility and integrity while interwoven, must exist in hierarchical relationship with integrity serving as a meta virtue. Using the historic example of the German Christians at the rise of the Nazis and the Barmen Declaration, we argue that those who pursued civility ended up compromising their integrity. Those who pursued integrity risked much but held fast to the principles that defined Christianity. This expression of their integrity and our understanding of it as a meta virtue has implications for our cultural divides today.

3G  Author Meets the Critics Session  10:00 AM–11:00 AM
Room: Georgia 7
Chair: Sonya Charles

Sonya Charles, CSU Ohio
Judith Andre- Critic, Michigan State University
Allison Wolf- Critic, Simpson College

Topics: Moral Theory

Even though individual parents face different issues, I believe most parents want their children to be good people who are happy in their adult lives. As such, a central motivating question of this book is how can parents raise a child to be a moral and flourishing person?

3H  Special 2 hour Bioethics SIS Panel Session  10:00 AM–12:15 PM
Room: Georgia 12
Chair: Greg Pence

Unmasking Ethical Issues of the Opioid Epidemic
Greg Pence, University of Alabama at Birmingham
Andrew Morgan, University of Alabama at Birmingham
Jason Gray, Auburn University at Montgomery
Daniel Hurst, Rowan University School of Osteopathic Medicine

Topics: Health Ethics (including Biomedical); Social and Societal Ethics

Between 2008 and 2018, at least 400,000 North Americans died of drug overdoses, an unprecedented epidemic fueled by easy availability of dangerous opioids. This panel will discuss: who is responsible for this crisis, conflicting theories of the causes and best treatment for addiction, and racial biases in
portraying people struggling with addiction, as well as ads, marketing, and methods of unscrupulous rehabilitation centers. Throughout, we stress the need for interdisciplinary approaches that use insights from neuroscience, genetics, harm reduction, social justice, Kant, Narcotics Anonymous, and field counselors, to combat a scourge that claims 60,000 lives yearly.

3I Author Meets the Critics Session 10:00 AM–11:00 AM
Room: Georgia 2
Chair: Elizabeth Hoppe

Ethical Issues in Aviation (Routledge; 2nd edition, October 18, 2018)
Elizabeth Hoppe, Loyola University Chicago
Richard L. Wilson- Critic, University of Maryland at Baltimore County
Topics: Science, Technology, and Engineering (STEM)

Ethical Issues in Aviation focuses on both past and current topics in aviation, providing the reader with an overview of the major themes in aviation ethics that cover a broad range of subjects.

4A Panel Session 11:15 AM–12:15 PM
Room: Atlanta 1
Chair: Nanette Elster

Substance Use and Abuse: Ethical Issues in Dentistry
Nanette Elster, American Dental Association, Loyola University Stritch School of Medicine Neiswanger Institute
Vishruti Patel, American Dental Association
Topics: Health Ethics (including Biomedical); Professionalism

The use of medical marijuana, the legalization of recreational marijuana, the opioid epidemic – each raises unique issues for dental practitioners. This panel will be comprised of an ethicist and dental clinicians who will address ethical issues that arise in dental practice with regard to substance use and abuse. Topics to be addressed include: provider and office staff impairment, treating patients under the influence of licit or illicit substances, management of dental pain with and without opioids, and approaches to drug seeking patients.

4B Pedagogical Session 11:15 AM–12:15 PM
Room: Georgia 11
Chair: Timothy Weidel

Teaching Ethical Awareness, Analysis, and Action to Healthcare Leaders: The Methodology of the Aspen Ethical Leadership Program
Ira Bedzow, New York Medical College
Topics: Education; Health Ethics (including Biomedical); Professionalism

To help healthcare leaders navigate the dynamic and evolving health care environment, the faculty of the Aspen Ethical Leadership Program has developed a structured executive leadership retreat that adapts the business ethics methodology of “Giving Voice to Values” to the tasks of cultivating ethical awareness, analysis, and action specifically for healthcare organizations. The program has helped health care executives practice grappling with some of the most contentious ethical issues confronting healthcare today, including, but not limited to, issues related to the flattening of the healthcare team and the adoption of for-profit structures and strategies to non-profit healthcare delivery.
In this presentation, I will review the format of the program and the format’s underlying pedagogical assumptions regarding the teaching of both ethical decision-making for the purpose of creating organizational policies as well as how to implement policies so that they change organizational practices and the organization’s ethos. The presentation will conclude with a presentation of one case study used at a previous retreat to exemplify how the program utilizes case studies in its teaching method.

The presentation hopes to advance the field of practical and professional ethics because the faculty of the retreat believes that it is a concrete example of how to train healthcare leaders to engage in ethical analysis and action in a way that takes into account their limited time to devote to the subject and the complexity of healthcare organizations. It also shows how the academic study of practical and professional ethics can be applied to teaching in non-academic environments.

Be Social. Do Good. Shifting the Goals of Ethics Education
Douglas Adams, University of Arkansas
Topics: Business Ethics; Education; Research Ethics; Social and Societal Ethics

In this presentation, first, I articulate the contributions of the standard model of ethics education. Second, I discuss how to facilitate the emergence of informal social networks in the milieu of research that enhance the deterrence of research misconduct. And Third, I present and demonstrate several simple and effective enhancements to the curriculum of ethics education that leverages processes of informal social control.

Jewish Ethics Regarding Refugees
Tsuriel Rashi, Ariel University
Topics: Law, Government, and Military Ethics

The civil war in Syria, with its hundreds of thousands of dead, two million wounded and more than five million refugees, and the Arab Spring, which at the beginning of the twenty-first century created a wave of refugees from the countries of North Africa to Europe, have reawakened public debate about refugees and what to do about them. This paper addresses the Jewish ethical approach to the issues. According to Jewish ethics, help must be offered to refugees of a foreign people, and sometimes even to those of an enemy state, because of what is known as “for the sake of peace.” Peace is not just a feature of godly behavior that man should emulate. It has its own intrinsic and characteristic value – both as part of the reciprocal responsibilities among civilized peoples in the world and as a way to stimulate, express, and provide the attribute of mercy inherent in human beings. Reviewing the sources, I conclude that from an ethical point of view preference should be given to those who are near over those from further away. Even though in terms of priorities, preference should be given to helping one’s own people and fellow countrymen over other needy individuals, priority must be given to those in acute distress without the basic items of sustenance. Sometimes there is a special value in finding a way to assist even one’s enemies in the hope that such help will break down the barriers of hatred. Similarly, ethically it is preferable to offer help to blameless children over adults, whose actions might be suspect. This preference is linked to the concern that help will reach the wrong hands, which might use it for nefarious purposes. If there is a real concern that the help will reach untrustworthy hands or will not get to its declared destination, one should avoid donating through that channel.
Ethical Concerns of Building VeriCrypt, an Autonomous News Analysis Platform on the Blockchain
Tamara Zubatiy, VeriCrypt
Grant Nelson, VeriCrypt Inc.
Robert Park, VeriCrypt Inc.
Sherry Huang, VeriCrypt Inc.
Amber Brandner, VeriCrypt Inc.
Topics: Business Ethics; Media and Journalism; Science, Technology, and Engineering (STEM); Social and Societal Ethics

VeriCrypt uses AI to autonomously aggregate and analyze news from 30,000 premium content providers, and then uses blockchain technology to autonomously hash the resulting outputs and record them to a global news ledger on the blockchain. We want VeriCrypt to be a trusted source for individuals, businesses, communities and even governments. To ensure this, we need trusted algorithms as well as secure automation, and each of these requirements comes with its own set of ethical concerns.

Dirty Pictures: The Ethics of Covering the Katie Hill Scandal
Rod Carveth, Morgan State University
Topics: Media and Journalism

This paper reviews the ethics involved in the coverage of an affair Congressperson Katie Hill had with a campaign staffer, coverage that included nude photos of Hill. Of particular ethical concern is whether media outlets covering the story are complicit with an attempt at revenge porn by Hill's estranged husband.

Understanding Joseph Butler's Sermons on Resentment and Forgiveness
Gregory Bock, The University of Texas at Tyler
Topics: Moral Theory

The religious philosopher Bishop Butler (1692-1752) writes about anger and forgiveness in Sermons VIII and IX, but what he means is subject to dispute. For one, he distinguishes between anger and resentment and between resentment and indignation; however, he seems to consider each of these terms as referring to the same emotion. Second, Butler is known for defining forgiveness as overcoming resentment. However, is this the correct understanding of Butler, or does he simply mean the overcoming of excessive resentment? Does he feel that we should overcome anger and indignation, too? This paper will consider several interpretations.

False Hope and the Rationality of Hope
Katherine Johnson, Bellarmine University
Topics: Health Ethics (Including Biomedical); Moral Theory
The gap between true hope and false hope is not as big as we think; thus, the main thesis of this project is that false hope and true hope are not as easily distinguishable as it appears. This project aims to contribute to and advance an alternative way of appreciating false hope to show that true hope (like false hope) is predicated on understanding and not simply what appears to be and this claim has especially valuable implications for healthcare providers.

**4F**

**Room:** Georgia 5

**Chair:** Danielle Wenner

- **Taking Offense: Norms for Individuals and Communities**
  
  *Abigail Bruxvoort, Northwestern University*

  Topics: Moral Theory; Social and Societal Ethics

  What is truly offensive? What (if any) moral obligations do we have when it comes to the offense of others? I argue first of all that offense is properly warranted by ideas or symbols that are an affront or opposed to a democratic public. However, I also claim that we have a moral obligation to take the offense of others seriously, even when it appears unwarranted. This obligation rests on norms of interpersonal respect combined with the recognition that individuals have limited and fallible perspectives and so may be unable to understand the offensiveness of a given idea or symbol.

- **Forgiveness and Remembering**
  
  *Elaine Englehardt, Utah Valley University*
  *Michael Pritchard, Western Michigan University*

  Topics: Business Ethics; Education; Moral Theory; Professionalism; Social and Societal Ethics

  Charles L. Griswold’s Forgiveness: A Philosophical Exploration begins: “Nearly everyone has wronged another. Who among us has not longed to be forgiven? Nearly everyone has suffered the bitter injustice of wrongdoing. Who has not struggled to forgive?” These questions press for answers that might enable us to proceed constructively, rather than be held down by the past. One approach is that we “forgive and forget”.

- **What if germs were people? Ethics, human subjects research, and the social sciences**
  
  *Trisha Phillips, West Virginia University*

  Topics: Research Ethics

  This presentation addresses some difficult issues that arise when commonly accepted ethical norms in biomedical research are extended to social science research. For example, whether human subjects protections should be apply to human subjects who are themselves the agents of harm. This presentation will examine the way in which differences between biomedical and social science research present challenges to our commonly accepted positions on non-wrongful harms, outcome-related harms, and deceptive and covert research that presents more than minimal harm to reputations and employability.
On the moral permissibility of testing for animal pain

Jessica Mejia, DePauw University or Janet Prindle Institute for Ethics
Topics: Moral Theory; Research Ethics

Routinely, experiments are performed on animals looking for evidence of pain. Are such experiments morally permissible? Many such experiments involve subjecting animals to conditions that experimenters think would elicit pain response in animals with pain capacity: removing limbs, pinching, introducing noxious chemicals which may burn, etc. My presentation outlines several such experiments, predominantly on fish and bees. I present an argument for why it is permissible to conduct such experiments on simple-minded creatures by addressing main objections to the practice.

Business Ethics Luncheon 12:30 PM–1:30 PM
For more information see page 59

RISE Lunch 12:30 PM–1:30 PM
Rise Luncheon with Speaker
For more information see page 58

Topic Tables Lunch 12:30 PM–1:30 PM
For more information see page 60

LGM Mtg 12:30 PM–1:30 PM
Law, Government, and Military SIS Group Meeting
Room: Sheraton’s Fandangles Restaurant & Bar

Keynote Plenary 1:45 PM–2:45 PM
Room: Capitol South

Ethics and Compliance: Looking Back, and Looking Ahead
Keith Darcy, President of Darcy Partner, Inc
Topics: Business Ethics

For more information see page 63. Mr. Darcy brings experience in the financial services industry combined with a background in education and applied business ethics. During his plenary address, we asked him to provide insights into the current as well as emerging ethical challenges that are being faced by businesses, an overview of strategies that are being employed to meet these challenges, and suggestions on how conference attendees from multiple sectors may be partners in these solutions.

Friday P.M. Coffee Break: Sponsored by the Texas Tech University Ethics Center 2:45 PM–3:15 PM
Victims again? Pursuing Justice for the Subjects of the Public Health Service/Guatemala STD Studies

Since an historian’s revelation in 2010 of archival records describing a United States Public Health Service study carried out just after World War II, the research scandal involving intentional infection of some 1300 Guatemalans with syphilis and other STDs has periodically returned to the headlines. Despite promises from the U.S. Department of Health and Human Services to invest $1.8 million to “improve the treatment and prevention of HIV and other sexually transmitted diseases,” neither that funding nor any money to compensate the families of people victimized in the research debacle has reached Guatemala.

One class action lawsuit by the families of victims against the US government was dismissed in 2012. A second suit asking $1 billion in damages was filed in 2015 against Johns Hopkins University, the Rockefeller Foundation, and Bristol-Myers Squibb on behalf of more than 840 Guatemalans. Most recently, a motion for sanctions against the lawyers bringing that suit has been filed. Depositions and other material collected during discover has “revealed that plaintiffs’ claims are based on manufactured evidence, false sworn statements, and unsupportable allegations,” according to the brief of the defendants. The numbers of Guatemalan plaintiffs has been dramatically reduced, and approximately 150 remain in the lawsuit.

This talk will analyze the path of litigation and explore the likelihood that this lawsuit may well turn out to be but another episode in the re-victimization of people in Guatemala who still await redress for the wrongs done to their families more than 70 years ago.
Sponsored by the Northern Plains Ethics Institute, North Dakota State University

Business Ethics Seminar
Compliance and Ethics: An Essential Symbiosis
Luncheon

Feb. 21, 2020 | 12:30 pm | Atlanta 5
Sheraton Atlanta Hotel
165 Courtland St NE, Atlanta, GA

Special Guest Lunch Speaker:
Alexandra Wrage, President
TRACE

Cost for lunch is $50. Register at
appe-ethics.org/2020-conference-registration/
**Table Topic Luncheon Titles and Conveners**

**Table 1:**

**How Should We Deal with Ethicists Who Behave Unethically?**  
Convenor: **Charlotte McDaniel**, Emory University  
We affirm the contributions of our work in ethics and the parallel importance of providing guidance, even modeling, of ethical behavior by those of us engaging this field. However, as much as we assume our colleagues behave in ethical manner; unfortunately, that is not the case. While it is more rare than common, when unethical behaviors occur they pose sensitive and difficult issues. This Table Topic will engage attendees in shared constructive conversation about cases that occurred, what an appropriate response is; raise the question of whether there is an association or 'institutional’ policy response we might consider. Please join us for this timely and important—and rarely discussed—Table Topic.

**Table 2:**

**The Ethics in Political Communication and Advocacy**  
Convenor: **Peter Loge**, The George Washington University  
How do we teach our students to be ethical advocates? What are the ethics of advocacy? Schools increasingly offer majors, minors, graduate degrees and certificates in political communication. Countless students take courses in speechwriting, strategic political communication, digital advocacy, and related courses. Given the importance this communication to our democratic experiment, ethics should be part of political communication courses and curriculum, political communication ethics should be a field of academic analysis, and political communication professionals and engaged citizens should consider the ethics of their actions. What does that look like? How do we accomplish these goals?
Table 3:

Ethical Issues in Higher Education
Convenors: Marcia McKelligan and Jessica Mejia, DePauw University
Everyone agrees that higher education in the United States faces profound challenges – financial, demographic, political, and social – and that these challenges raise compelling and complex moral questions. Meeting these challenges requires informed and well-reasoned responses to the underlying questions and hence inquiry into the purpose and value of higher education and careful consideration of the interests, rights and responsibilities of administrators and trustees, students and alumni, and the public. We are in the early stages of a book project on ethics and higher education. At our table discussion, taking case studies on free speech and diversity as a starting point, we hope to stimulate a conversation about some moral problems in academia today and discuss what the most urgent and interesting issues are.

Table 4:

Should Barr be Disbarred?
Convenor: Elliot Cohen, National Philosophical Counseling Association
A petition is circulating to disbar U.S. Attorney General William P. Barr from practicing law in New York and the District of Columbia, where he is licensed. The petition alleges that Barr should be disbarred for conduct largely pursued in his present capacity as attorney general. This topical discussion will look at the evidence to back up the charge that Barr satisfies the legal criteria for disbarment pursuant to the American Bar Association’s (ABA) Model Rules of Professional Conduct; and, in light of this discussion, consider whether the New York and Washington, D.C., bar associations should take action to disbar Barr.
To promote democratic participation in social and ethical issues affecting the Northern Plains and beyond.

The NPEI asks two fundamental questions: what kind of world do we want to live in? and how do we get there? How we answer these questions should rectify ethical problems achieve the ultimate goal of bettering local, regional, national, and international societies.

Call for Papers: The Northern Plains Ethics Journal is the first and only peer-reviewed, high-quality dedicated ethics and philosophy publication platform in North Dakota. The Journal is devoted to publishing articles in any area of ethics for a wide audience of scholars and community members, so we ask that submissions be written to be understood by a wide variety of thoughtful people. Journal submissions and questions should be sent to Dennis Cooley, Managing Editor, at dennis.cooley@ndsu.edu by no later than 31 August 2020.

Please visit us at https://www.ndsu.edu/institutes/northernplainsethics/
Journal at https://www.ndsu.edu/institutes/northernplainsethics/the_northern_plains_ethics_journal/
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“ETHICS AND COMPLIANCE: LOOKING BACK AND LOOKING AHEAD”

Through his work at Darcy Partners Inc., Keith T. Darcy consults with boards and top executives on a wide variety of complex governance, ethics, compliance, regulatory and reputation risk challenges. Darcy has combined a 40-year career in the financial services industry with his profession as an educator and his long-term involvement in business ethics, corporate governance and organizational leadership. He also teaches Ethics and Leadership at the University of Pennsylvania and served nine years as Executive Director of the Ethics & Compliance Officer Association.

Mr. Darcy has contributed his expertise to numerous conferences and is widely published and referenced in books, newspapers and magazines. In December 2012 he spoke at the United Nations on the occasion of International Anti-Corruption Day and in November 2013 he co-drafted the Seoul Declaration issued by the UN Global Compact.

Keith T. Darcy holds a B.S. degree from Fordham University’s College of Business and an M.B.A from Hagan Graduate School of Business at Iona College.

For more info and registration visit: appe-ethics.org/annual-conference/
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Session abstracts can be found on the online program: https://easychair.org/smart-program/2020APPEAIC/
Wrongful Enrichments and Limits of Offsetting Privilege
Joel Ballivian, University of Wisconsin-Madison
Topics: Business Ethics; Moral Theory; Social and Societal Ethics

Holly Lawford-Smith (2016) has recently argued that innocent beneficiaries of unjust class advantage (what she calls “class privilege”) have obligations to offset their privilege. Offsetting privilege is about reducing and minimizing one’s privilege and is offered as an alternative to “disgorging” the benefits of injustice. Until Lawford-Smith’s work, the standard view claimed that innocent beneficiaries of injustice ought to disgorge some tangible object associated with the injustice or else disgorge the net monetary benefit of the injustice (see Butt, 2007, and Barry and Goodin, 2014). As Lawford-Smith argues, however, disgorging class privilege misfires as a characterization of the compensatory obligations of those with class privilege. I argue that this claim is mistaken. I consider realistic cases of class privilege (particularly in the work place) where offsetting appears to be an inadequate way for beneficiaries of injustice to discharge their compensatory obligations. Instead, I argue, many of the class privileged have obligations to disgorge some of the monetary value associated with their unjust privilege. Moreover, in the work-related cases I have in mind, disgorging should be to the benefit of one’s co-workers. For two reasons, this marks an improvement over the claim that beneficiaries of injustice merely ought to offset. First, offsetting privilege will often leave beneficiaries of injustice in possession of many of the material and monetary enrichments that arose through their privilege. Second, as Lawford-Smith describes offsetting, S’s obligation to offset need not be to the benefit of those most likely impacted by S’s privilege. Each of these consequences is problematic, I argue. My view (that beneficiaries of class privilege sometimes have obligations to disgorge some quantity of money to the benefit of those most likely wronged by their privilege) avoids these problematic consequences. While offsetting class privilege may constitute part of a privileged person’s compensatory obligations, my arguments aim to show that offsetting cannot be the whole story.

Secrecy Supporting Equality: The Case of Pay Secrecy
Matthew Caulfield, University of Pennsylvania
Topics: Business Ethics

Despite our collective negative associations with secrecy, this paper argues that organizational secrecy can serve important values. Not only can secrecy be chosen by firms and employees, and thus represent an expression of their autonomy, but it can also promote equality within organizations and markets more generally. The paper illustrates how we may deploy the ‘secrecy supporting equality’ logic to defend regimes of pay secrecy that are otherwise thought to be ethically pernicious.

On Ethical Challenges of Discontinuation Trials for Management of Chronic Illnesses
Barry DeCoster, Albany College of Pharmacy and Health Sciences
Courtney Reilly, Albany College of Pharmacy and Health Sciences
Patrick Meek, Albany College of Pharmacy and Health Sciences
Topics: Health Ethics (including Biomedical); Research Ethics
This project examines the ethical challenges of discontinuation trials. Unlike traditional RCTs—which study new drug safety and efficacy—discontinuation trials study when and if it is safe to take a patient off of a medication meant to treat a chronic illness, sometimes after decades of use. We identify a number of value conflicts that have discouraged discontinuation trials from being run, but we argue that these trials should be supported at a greater rate.

**5C**

**Room:** Atlanta 3

**Chair:** Keith Miller

**Pedagogical Demonstration: Ethics Infusion: Using Student Presentations to Connect Ethical Issues to Legal Case Problems, Apply Ethical Decision Making, Connect and Distinguish Legal and Ethical Standards, and Promote Ethical Discourse**

Elizabeth Harvey, University of North Carolina Asheville

Topics: Business Ethics; Education; Law, Government, and Military Ethics

Designing class projects to provide students with meaningful opportunities to apply ethical decision making to various course topics and engage in ethical discourse is challenging. In the context of a law and ethics course for management and accountancy undergraduates, this presentation will provide examples of ethical components developed to accompany and strengthen the various student legal presentations. This presentation will feature concrete assignment examples and detail their evolution to nudge ethical issue recognition in the legal context and improved ethical decision making. You’ll walk away with some practical tools for incorporating ethical decision making applications into other course materials.

**Case Study: Teaching Professional Ethics Using Learning Projects. What Do Students Learn?**

Juny Montoya, Universidad de los Andes

Topics: Education

At Universidad de los Andes, Bogotá (Colombia), we have developed a general education undergraduate course on Professional Ethics aimed to foster ethical deliberation across the professions. In recent years, we have introduced a pedagogical innovation called “learning project” to promote a more democratic learning environment, student empowerment with respect to the curriculum and student ownership of the learning outcomes of the course. This communication will show primarily the students’ learning outcomes, achieved by the development of their learning projects.

**5D**

**Room:** Atlanta 5

**Chair:** Daniel Schiff

**Sexual Misconduct and Forgiveness**

Eugene Schlossberger, Purdue University Northwest

Topics: Law, Government, and Military Ethics; Moral Theory

When should sexual misconduct by public figures (and others) be absolved or forgiven? This paper uses an attributionist account of moral responsibility to argue that absolution is appropriate when the offense no longer reflects the offender’s worldview. Meriting forgiveness requires 1) owning, 2) repenting 3) atoning, 4) soul-searching (examining and modifying elements of one’s worldview expressed by the misdeed), and 5) making amends (action to redress), across three dimensions of forgiving: perpetrator-directed, victim-directed, and a vertical dimension (directed toward, e.g., an ideal, profession, or institution).

This account is applied to recent cases of sexual misbehavior (Al Franken and Harvey Weinstein).
Explaining vs. Responding to Ethical Failures in Leadership
Terry Price, Jepson School of Leadership Studies, University of Richmond

Topics: Business Ethics; Law, Government, and Military Ethics; Moral Theory; Social and Societal Ethics

In this paper, I argue that even if self-interest is the ultimate source of ethical failures in leadership, leaders are unlikely to think of what they are doing in terms of self-interest and much more likely to rationalize their exception-making behavior by appeal to the common good or some other purported justification. The best response to ethical failures in leadership is therefore to get leaders to understand their own propensity to justify what they do—indeed, sometimes using ethics itself as a tool in their justifications.

Pedagogical Panel: Teaching Media Ethics in the age of Trump
Lee Peck, Colorado State University Online
Katherine Roberts Edenborg, University of Wisconsin-Stout
Tom Bivins, University of Oregon
Elizabeth Skewes, University of Colorado-Boulder

Topics: Media and Journalism

A panel created by Lee Anne Peck, Colorado State University; Kate Roberts Edenborg, University of Wisconsin, Stout; with TBD.

Because the 45th president of the United States has such disdain for the news media, it is hard not to discuss what his actions toward the press have been. Many current events revolve around what he has said or done. But how does one address this in a media ethics stand-alone course or in any journalism course for that matter?

For instance, one of the panelists recently received these comments in her media ethics course evaluations:

“I enjoyed the class; however, sometimes I felt that it was more politically based on certain days, and sometimes I felt the instructor spoke about her opinion on politics with a little too much detail for a classroom setting.”

And another:

“I understand we are debating media ethics and problems, but it was basically a soapbox for her to complain about the president and spew her hatred toward anything conservative.”

What to do? Many of us may try to stay objective in our courses—and we even say we are not for one side or another—but some students may perceive our comments as one-sided.

This panel will discuss solutions to avoiding these perceived conflicts. Feedback from the audience will be welcome. The panelists hope that everyone in attendance comes away with suggestions to use in their classrooms in the future.
Some Thoughts On A Confucian Professional Ethics

Mark Dixon, Ohio Northern University

Topics: Moral Theory

In the Western philosophical tradition a substantial literature on virtue ethical professional ethics has arisen in the past decade. Within this literature however there has been an almost exclusive focus on Aristotelian virtue ethics. This focus ignores the fact that there is a separate virtue theoretical tradition that holds much promise as a foundation for professional ethics – Confucian virtue ethics. In this paper I will attempt to formulate a Confucian framework for a professional ethics. The purpose here is to demonstrate the Confucian tradition’s richness and power to contribute solutions to the ongoing problems in modern professionalism.

Not All Who Ponder Count Costs: Arithmetic Reflection Predicts Utilitarian Tendencies, but Logical Reflection Predicts both Deontological and Utilitarian Tendencies

Nick Byrd, Florida State University
Paul Conway, Florida State University

Topics: Moral Theory; Social and Societal Ethics

Imagine that five people face imminent harm. However, if you harm another person, the five people will be spared from harm. Is it appropriate to harm the one to spare the five? Past research found that more careful reasoners were more likely to accept such harm tradeoffs. However, that research tested reasoning with mathematical tasks. And, of course, the moral dilemma is, in part, a mathematical task—one vs. five. So, accepting harm tradeoffs might be explained by mathematical reasoning rather than careful reasoning in general. Two studies examined moral dilemma responses and performance on both mathematical and non-mathematical reasoning tests. Sure enough, accepting harm tradeoffs correlated only with mathematical tests. However, both accepting and rejecting harm tradeoffs correlated with non-mathematical tests—e.g., logic tests. So, the alleged link between careful reasoning and accepting harm tradeoffs might be better explained by math than careful reasoning per se.

A Sense of Ethics Ownership: Graduate Student Perceptions of Ethics at a Research Institution

Jonathan Beever, University of Central Florida
Stephen Kuebler, University of Central Florida
Joel Gonzalez, The University of Central Florida

Topics: Education; Research Ethics; Science, Technology, and Engineering (STEM)

This paper explores the cultivation of an institutional ethics culture through a study of graduate students’ perception of ethics at a large high-research-intensive university. We find that disciplinary differences, previous experience “ethics,” and nationality are significant variables in the extent to which graduate students value ethics. Yet, despite these challenges to cultivating an ethics culture, we find that graduate students (a) have a strong sense of their ownership of ethical culture and (b) think ethics is important to their work, across disciplines, even as they offer disparate definitions of the term. We consider implications of these findings.
Consensus and Dissent in the Challenger Disaster
Kristin Schaupp, University of Wisconsin - Eau Claire
Topics: Business Ethics; Science, Technology, and Engineering (STEM)

The decision-making process that led up to the explosion of NASA’s Challenger Space Shuttle has long puzzled members of both the scientific and non-scientific communities. Recent work on disagreement and consensus provides insight into how apparent consensus proceedings can mask disagreement. Examining the events leading up to the explosion of the Challenger demonstrates the undeniable impact that decision-making procedures can have. This allows not only for a more complete understanding of what led to the disastrous decision to launch the Challenger, but it also illustrates the importance of understanding ethical implications of apparent consensus proceedings.

Graduate Student Paper Competition Award Winner: Promoting Professional Socialization: A Synthesis of Durkheim, Kohlberg, Hoffman, and Haidt for Professional Ethics Education
Dayoung Kim, Purdue University
Topics: Education; Moral Theory; Professionalism; Science, Technology, and Engineering (STEM)

In this paper, I synthesize the ideas of Durkheim, Kohlberg, Hoffman, and Haidt on morality, moral education, and moral development. Using this synthesis, I propose a conceptual framework for the professional socialization process. As part of this process, the moral internalization of the newcomers to the profession is influenced by social discipline, which includes both cognitive and affective aspects. I argue that social discipline can be achieved when both aspects are well-balanced. Finally, I connect the conceptual framework with existing motivation theories and discuss the implications of the framework for professional education, with the specific example of engineering ethics education.

Is it us, or is it them? Problems of Ineffective Philosophizing About Abortion
Nathan Nobis, Morehouse College
Topics: Education; Health Ethics (including Biomedical); Social and Societal Ethics


While the book and writings have been received well by other philosophers and have gotten quite a bit of notice for pieces of “public philosophy,” it, unfortunately, seems they have made little difference beyond that.

This may just be due to poor “marketing” on our parts, or the fact that it’s just very big and hard to address issue. But it might be, and this seems more likely, that there hasn’t been as much interest as we hoped there would be because there simply is a general unwillingness to attempt to engage these issues in systematic ways, *except by people who are opposed to abortion and, we argue, have generally poor arguments for their views.* Pro-choice organizations, however, seem to have little interest in public education on this issue, for reasons that are unclear and perhaps unwise. Perhaps, however,
this observation is mistaken and there is interest in educational outreach that I just have not been able to find, despite many efforts.

In this presentation, I share my observations about attempting to be a “public philosopher” on the topic of, why so little positive seems to comes from this and what, if anything can be done about it.

- **Ectogenesis and the Ethics of Abortion**
  
  Joseph Spino, University of Arkansas at Little Rock  
  
  Jana McAuliffe, University of Arkansas at Little Rock  
  
  Topics: Health Ethics (including Biomedical); Law, Government, and Military Ethics; Social and Societal Ethics

Safe and wide-spread availability of artificial wombs and the practice of partial ectogenesis may appear to be a solution to the seemingly intractable issue of the moral permissibility of abortion. Given this technology, what need could there be for purposeful termination of the pregnancy? Far from being a panacea to the debate, we argue availability of ectogenesis-related technologies will compound already existing ethical disagreement, further polarizing the opposing perspectives on abortion. Additionally, the idea of ecotogenesis-related technologies as a potential solution to moral disagreement suffers from question begging assumptions as to the issues at play regarding the ethics of abortion.

- **5J**  
  
  Roundtable on Research Ethics Initiatives at the NSF  
  
  **Room**: Georgia 7  
  
  **Chair**: Trisha Phillips

- **6A**  
  
  **Room**: Atlanta 1  
  
  **Chair**: Kathleen Wilburn

- **Effectiveness of ethics instruction in the accounting and business curriculum**
  
  William Black, University of North Georgia  
  
  Barbara White, University of West Florida  
  
  Topics: Business Ethics; Education; Professionalism

The Action Research into Business Conduct (ARBC) instrument can be used to assess student perceptions of ethical business conduct, and to evaluate the effectiveness of instruction on related ethical topics. The research presented here includes more than 400 students in accounting and business law classes at two regional universities, and provides insights into ethical instruction in business law, auditing, and accounting theory courses.
Case Study: Ethical Deliberation For Business
Catalina Gonzalez, Universidad de los Andes
Juny Montoya, Universidad de los Andes
Topics: Business Ethics

This talk will describe the particular pedagogical experience of designing and teaching a series of workshops on ethical deliberation for business in Colombia and other countries of Latin America. The workshops were designed and taught by the Center of Applied Ethics and the Department of Philosophy of Universidad de los Andes, in Bogotá, Colombia, and directed to the executive directors of the companies that compose the Latin American consortium, Grupo Argos. Their aim was to offer philosophical tools to enrich moral deliberation in business, particularly, through a number of exercises involving reflection on moral sentiments, application of general principles and analysis of consequences. They involved the pedagogical challenge of turning philosophical concepts into real tools for deliberation in business, so that the usual gap between the two areas of knowledge became no longer an issue, and both areas could gain a more complex understanding of their common moral preoccupations.

Room: Georgia 11
Chair: Gerard Vong

Motivational Interviewing and Shared Decision Making: A Link to Enhanced Health Literacy?
Lukas Chandler, The Kennedy Institute of Ethics
Topics: Health Ethics (including Biomedical)

This paper assesses the experience of patient-provider communication as it relates to the quality of patient health literacy and associated behaviors influenced by that literacy. Health literacy may be fostered via the vehicles of shared decision-making and motivational interviewing. By conceptualizing health literacy as a general capacity, we may advance a framework in which a patient’s agency is acknowledged, genuinely respected, and concretely empowered. This paper assesses potential models for enhancing the collaborative nature of patient-provider communication by reviewing what is classified as “behavior” of individual patients (and their providers) and the result for the healthcare system at large.

Pedagogical: Growth Attenuation Therapy and Parental Decision-Making: An 8KQ Ethical Reasoning Approach
Christian Early, James Madison University
Topics: Health Ethics (including Biomedical); Social and Societal Ethics

This session demonstrates the Eight Key Question approach to ethical reasoning and works through a fictional but realistic growth attenuation scenario, or thought experiment, to show its usefulness and flexibility in handling difficult situations without resorting to complicated, and contested, ethical theories or commitments.
Panel Session  

**6C**

**Room:** Atlanta 3  
**Chair:** Susan Schelble

- **Text recycling (AKA “self-plagiarism”): Findings from the Text Recycling Research Project and implications for research practice**  
  Cary Moskovitz, Duke University  
  Michael Pemberton, Georgia Southern University  
  Ian Anson, University of Maryland Baltimore County  
  Chris Anson, North Carolina State University  
  **Topics:** Education; Research Ethics; Science, Technology, and Engineering (STEM)

Text recycling is an increasingly visible and controversial ethical issue in scholarly communication. Supported by a five-year, National Science Foundation grant, the Text Recycling Research Project is the first large-scale investigation of the topic. The panel, comprised of members of this multi-institution, multidisciplinary project, will present on key findings research on the beliefs and attitudes of journal editors, board members, faculty, and students; frequency and patterns of text recycling in STEM research writing, and then discuss ethical and practical challenges in the development of policy and guidelines for journals and educational institutions.

- **6D**

  **Room:** Atlanta 5  
  **Chair:** Nick Byrd

- **Just Returning the Favor: Exploring Connections between Immigration Justice and Emigration History between Colombians and Venezuelans**  
  Allison Wolf, Universidad de los Andes  
  **Topics:** Law, Government, and Military Ethics; Moral Theory; Social and Societal Ethics

I moved to Bogotá, Colombia in June 2019. There I noted in my daily life the impact of Venezuelan refugees on the country. Colombia is not used to this since for over 50 years it has been engaged in a civil war where it became a country of emigration. But this is now changing as hundreds of thousands of Venezuelans are crossing into its borders.

This essay will put a normative lens on this situation. In particular, it will explore questions of immigration justice arising from the specific circumstances between Colombia and Venezuela as they relate to the current refugee crisis in the region. The principal focus of the analysis will be to apply a feminist approximation of immigration justice to interrogate the question: What should be the relationship between history of emigration and immigration policy?

- **Silencing the Whistleblower: Ag-Gag Laws in Animal Agriculture**  
  Donna Yarri, Alvernia University  
  **Topics:** Law, Government, and Military Ethics; Social and Societal Ethics

There has been a recent movement in the United States to create “ag-gag” laws, which are meant to silence and punish whistleblowers in the industry. This presentation will describe current factory farm conditions, provide an overview of whistleblower and ag gag laws, and address the pros and cons of such legislation.
The Ethics of Caring in Artificial Intelligence

Liz Stokes, American Nurses Association Center for Ethics and Human Rights

Topics: Health Ethics (including Biomedical); Science, Technology, and Engineering (STEM)

Artificial intelligence is expanding in health care at a rapid pace. Health care organizations are using machines, algorithms and robots to facilitate data management and the delivery of health care. This presentation will provide a brief background and definition of artificial intelligence for the purpose of a case-based application of the Ethics of Caring framework to AI technology in nursing and health care practice.

Embedding Ethics into Humanoid Robots: Philosophical Underpinnings

Jason Borenstein, Georgia Institute of Technology
Alan Wagner, The Pennsylvania State University
Ronald Arkin, Georgia Institute of Technology

Topics: Moral Theory; Science, Technology, and Engineering (STEM)

The focus of our research study is to determine whether humanoid robots could be programmed to behave ethically. In this presentation, we will describe the methodological and philosophical approach our research team is using to address the issue. The approach entails programming robots to act in accordance with folk and expert morality.

Essentialism, the Human Being, and the Implication for Abortion

Cole James, University of Leeds

Topics: Health Ethics (including Biomedical); Moral Theory; Social and Societal Ethics

Essentialism, which is rooted in the Aristotelian-Thomistic metaphysic of hylemorphism, is the idea that everything has an essence that classifies it as a certain kind of thing. Humans are essentially rational animals, and if so, this may have negative implications for the abortion debate. This essay defends the conditional: If essentialism is true, then abortion is wrong. If humans are essentially rational animals, then they have a right to life very early on in their development. This right to life springs from them being essentially rational animals with specific properties that have a right to be fulfilled.

Living with Dementia as an Affront to Dignity

Samuel Kerstein, University of Maryland

Topics: Health Ethics (including Biomedical); Moral Theory

According to Kantian ethics, persons have dignity. But individuals (e.g., with Alzheimer’s disease) can go on living after losing the set of capacities constitutive of personhood and thus of human dignity. Some philosophers, including Dennis Cooley and David Velleman, have suggested that life after the loss of personhood might be an affront to Kantian dignity. Cooley has argued that it is morally required on Kantian grounds for those who will forfeit their personhood as a result of dementia to hasten their deaths so as not to demean the dignity they once possessed. This paper attempts to charitably understand these claims and to give clear grounds for rejecting them.
6H
Room: Georgia 9
Chair: Daniel Werner

- Understanding Wrongdoing after Modern Disasters: utilizing ecofeminist philosophy to explore technological disaster commemoration
  
  Sarah Roe, Southern Connecticut State University  
  Elyse Zavar, University of North Texas
  
  Topics: Social and Societal Ethics
  
  Following catastrophic events, some landscapes are left uninhabitable. In these extreme cases, the risk to future exposure is best mitigated through property acquisition and relocation, also known as buyouts. Buyouts can result from environmental disasters like severe floods or technological disasters such as the release of toxic chemicals. Whichever the cause, buyouts permanently remove people from hazardous landscapes. The literature identifies that participants of forced relocation experience a sense of nostalgia for their former neighborhoods. Commemoration varies from officially commissioned to spontaneously developed and includes informal remembrances embedded in daily activities. The geographic scholarship on commemoration is extensive and examines the role of place and politics in how we remember and forget tragic events.

  Our project strives to fill a particular lacuna within the literature, namely who ought to play a role in commemoration. After considering whose narratives are included in commemoration and comparatively, whose do not belong, we utilize elements from both Ecofeminist Philosophy and Land Ethics to explore the human-landscape connection.

- Lives Worth Living: The Ethics of Disability and Well-Being
  
  Audra Goodnight, Villanova University
  
  Topics: Health Ethics (Including Biomedical); Moral Theory; Social and Societal Ethics
  
  What makes a life worth living? This paper examines theories of well-being that seem to preclude disabled flourishing. By re-orienting theories of well-being around second-person relationships, it is possible to explain how flourishing is possible for persons with disabilities. There is practical value in this project because it takes seriously the need for community in order to promote and protect the flourishing of all people.

6I
Room: Georgia 6
Chair: Kelly Laas

- Communicating with Faculty about Students’ Ethical Concerns: Notes from an NSF Project
  
  Kelly Laas, Center for the Study of Ethics in the Professions, Illinois Institute of Technology
  Christine Miller, Savannah College of Art and Design
  Elisabeth Hildt, Center for the Study of Ethics in the Professions, Illinois Institute of Technology
  
  Topics: Research Ethics; Science, Technology, and Engineering (STEM)
  
  In our project, “Building a Culture of Responsible Research and Practice in STEM,” we are engaging graduate students and faculty in the active development of context-specific codes-of-ethics based guidelines. This presentation will discuss some of our successes and challenges in engaging faculty in this endeavor, and share strategies to enhance faculty engagement and buy-in.
I. Welcome from Ed Carr, APPE Board Chair

II. Executive Director’s Report
   A. APPE 29th Annual Conference (2020) Update
   B. Announcement of APPE’s 30th Anniversary Campaign (2021)
   C. Membership Report
   D. Finance Report

III. APPE Intercollegiate Ethics Bowl Overview (Gretchen Winter/John Garcia)

IV. Nominating Committee Report (Elizabeth Heitman, Chair)
   A. Presentation of the 2020 Board Nominees

V. Governance Committee Report (Andrew I. Cohen, Chair)
   **ACTION ITEM:** Resolution for Membership vote adopting the recommendations of the Board to amend the Association’s Bylaws

VI. Member Input & Questions

VII. Adjournment
Members Meeting
Room: Capitol South
For more information see page 76

Poster Session
Room: Capitol North and Center

■ Bananas, Beliefs and The Being
Margaret Schneider, Oakland University
Topics: Moral Theory
You are not an agnostic. You, and every other person has a religious belief. Maybe you have been avoiding it. Maybe you haven’t fleshed it out completely. Maybe you aren’t aware of exactly what your religious beliefs oblige you to do. Maybe that’s a little overwhelming, and maybe it should be. Nonetheless, you are a moral agent, and though you may have tried to escape from the transcending, ethical, God Question, your moral actions have spoken louder than your religious words: agnostic, atheist, maltheist, whatever they may be.

■ Moral Instruction for Children in a Day-Camp Setting
Ted Bitner, The Janet Prindle Institute for Ethics, DePauw University
Haley Thompson, The Janet Prindle Institute for Ethics, DePauw University
Topics: Education; Moral Theory
This poster presents the undergirding theory, research design, and results of a study that evaluated a moral instruction curriculum for concrete operational children (ages 7-11) in a day-camp setting. This is a follow-up study investigating the effects of curriculum adjustment from last year’s camp.

■ The Digital Veil of Ignorance: Video Games as Interactive Thought Experiments
Nicholas Smetzer, Trinity University
Topics: Education; Moral Theory; Science, Technology, and Engineering (STEM)
Video games can be useful tools in educating their players on ethical ideas and frameworks. Through interacting with a video game, players occupy their avatar’s perspective; this property of games allows them to demonstrate the assumptions and implications of a thought experiment without the potential for false certainties or misunderstanding that traditional thought experiments allow. Through the development of the game Void Quest, a game based upon John Rawls’ “veil of ignorance” thought experiment, I demonstrate how video games can explicitly function as a means to transfer philosophical arguments.

■ The Period Project at SMU
Marie Joung, Southern Methodist University
Topics: Education; Health Ethics (including Biomedical); Social and Societal Ethics
This presentation will discuss the origins, motivation, and goals of The Period Project at SMU, the results of the Fall 2019 survey on how menstruation affects women’s attendance at class and work, and how plans to improve access to menstrual products on campus is an issue of justice, sexual equality, and access to academic success.

■ Alphas and Betas: An Exploration of Moral Membership Within the False Dichotomy of Humans and Non-Humans
Tommy Sanfilippo, Oakland University
Human history is littered with dark chapters in which entire demographics have been denigrated by the ruling class. Over time, many injustices have been acknowledged and attempts to rectify these situations have been made. However, we have yet to rectify our treatment of non-human animals. This is incongruent with our desire to view ourselves as a species that values justice and ethical behavior. Thus, it is obvious that changes ought to be made. The first of many steps will be to elevate non-human animals to the moral status of human beings.

Undergraduate Student Paper Competition Award Winner: The Moral Permissibility of Nudges
Valerie Joly Chock, University of North Florida
Topics: Business Ethics; Law, Government, and Military Ethics; Social and Societal Ethics

‘Nudging’ is the idea that people’s decisions and behavior can be influenced in predictable, non-coercive ways by making small changes to the choice architecture. Some argue that it is morally permissible to intentionally nudge others as long as the intervention meets the libertarian paternalistic criteria for the permissible use of nudges. In my work, I consider an objection to such criteria which has as its main worry that a specific kind of nudges is manipulative, and thus impermissible. After evaluating this objection, I conclude that even though it is unsuccessful, its implications present challenges for the libertarian paternalistic criteria.

Representing “Unaccompanied Alien Children”
Julietta Rivera, University of Texas Rio Grande Valley
Cynthia Jones, University of Texas Rio Grande Valley
Topics: Law, Government, and Military Ethics

The need for consistent and humane treatment of immigrants is a pressing issue, especially considering the political rhetoric and thinly-veiled racism currently pervasive in discussions of immigration on the national level. The poster attempts to demonstrate how the “pictures and words” format can be used to illustrate this humanitarian border crisis.

Authors Reception
Room: Capitol North and Center
For more information see page 79
Authors Reception

**Gregory Bock**, Center for Ethics, University of Texas at Tyler

*The Philosophy of Forgiveness – Volume III: Forgiveness in World Religions*
(Vernon Press, Sep 20, 2018)

*The Philosophy of Forgiveness – Volume IV: Christian Perspectives on Forgiveness*
(Vernon Press, Sep 20, 2018)

**Sonya Charles**, Department of Philosophy and Comparative Religion, Cleveland State University

*Parents and Virtues: An Analysis of Moral Development and Parental Virtue*
(Lexington Books, March 11, 2019)

**Yaw A. Frimpong-Mansoh**, Department of Philosophy, Northern Kentucky University

*Bioethics in Africa: Theories and Praxis*
(Vernon Press, September 27, 2018)

**Elizabeth Hoppe**, Department of Philosophy, Loyola University Chicago

*Ethical Issues in Aviation*
(Routledge; 2nd edition, October 18, 2018)

**Terrence Kelly**, Department of Philosophy, University of Alaska, Anchorage

*Professional Ethics: A Trust-Based Approach*
(Lexington Books, 2018)

**Jennifer Kling**, Department of Philosophy, University of Colorado, Colorado Springs

*War Refugees: Risk, Justice, and Moral Responsibility*
(Lexington Books, April 4, 2019)
Daryl Koehn, Institute for Business and Professional Ethics, DePaul University

Toward a New (Old) Theory of Responsibility: Moving beyond Accountability

Jonathan H. Marks, Rock Ethics Institute, Penn State University

The Perils of Partnership: Industry Influence, Institutional Integrity, and Public Health
(Oxford University Press, February 28, 2019)

Robert Pennock, Department of Computer Science & Engineering, Michigan State University

An Instinct for Truth: Curiosity and the Moral Character of Science
(The MIT Press, August 13, 2019)

Eddy Souffrant, Center for Professional and Applied Ethics, University of North Carolina, Charlotte

Global Development Ethics: a Critique of Global Capitalism
(Rowman & Littlefield International, April 15, 2019)

J. Thomas Whetstone III, Consultant/ writer in Leadership Ethics

Light for the Dark Side: Ethics Cases for University Administrators
(Dorrance Pub Co, April 18, 2019)

(Toplink Publishing, March 25, 2019)

Alexandra Wrage, TRACE

What You Should Know About Anti-Bribery Compliance
(CreateSpace Independent Publishing Platform, April 25, 2017)
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TIME</th>
<th>EVENT</th>
<th>LOCATION</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>7:00 am – 5:00 pm</td>
<td>Annual Conference Registration</td>
<td>Capitol North/Center</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8:00 am – 5:00 pm</td>
<td>Book Resource Room</td>
<td>Capitol North/Center</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7:00 am – 8:00 am</td>
<td>First Time &amp; International Attendee Breakfast</td>
<td>Georgia 8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7:00 am – 8:00 am</td>
<td>Business Ethics SIS Breakfast</td>
<td>Georgia 6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8:00 am – 9:00 am</td>
<td>Concurrent Session 7</td>
<td>See Session Details</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7:00 am – 8:00 am</td>
<td>RISE SIS Group Meeting</td>
<td>Atlanta 4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9:00 am – 9:30 am</td>
<td>Morning Break</td>
<td>Capitol North/Center</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9:30 am – 10:30 am</td>
<td>Concurrent Session 8</td>
<td>See Session Details</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10:45 am – 11:45 am</td>
<td>Concurrent Session 9</td>
<td>See Session Details</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12:00 pm – 1:00 pm</td>
<td>Annual Conference Awards Luncheon</td>
<td>Capitol South</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1:15 pm – 2:15 pm</td>
<td>Concurrent Session 10</td>
<td>See Session Details</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2:30 pm – 3:30 pm</td>
<td>Concurrent Session 11</td>
<td>See Session Details</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3:30 pm – 4:00 pm</td>
<td>Afternoon Break</td>
<td>Capitol North/Center</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4:00 pm – 6:30 pm</td>
<td>Concurrent Session 12</td>
<td>See Session Details</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

For the full session abstracts go to https://easychair.org/smart-program/2020APPEAIC/
Saturday, February 22 Highlights

First Time & International Attendee Breakfast | 7:00 am – 8:00 am | Georgia 6

Business Ethics SIS Breakfast | 7:00 am – 8:00 am | Georgia 2

APPE Conference Awards Luncheon | 12:00 pm – 1:00 pm | Capitol South

APPE IEB<sup>sm</sup> Ethics Bowl Input Session | 2:30 pm – 3:30 pm | Georgia 12

APPE IEB<sup>sm</sup> Ethics Bowl Team Check In | 4:00 pm – 6:00 pm | Capitol Foyer

APPE IEB<sup>sm</sup> Ethics Bowl Judges and Moderators Training | 6:00 pm – 7:00 pm | Capitol South

APPE IEB<sup>sm</sup> Ethics Bowl Nationals – First Set of Matches | 7:10 pm – 8:25 pm

APPE IEB<sup>sm</sup> Ethics Bowl Nationals – Second Set of Matches | 8:35 pm – 9:50 pm

For the full session abstracts go to https://easychair.org/smart-program/2020APPEAIC/
An effective altruist approach to corporate social responsibility

Carson Young, SUNY-Brockport

Topics: Business Ethics

On what basis should corporate social responsibility (CSR) decisions be made and evaluated? That is the question that motivates this paper. I argue that some popular frameworks from the CSR literature are inadequate, and consider whether effective altruism offers a more promising alternative. I find that it does, but that it must be qualified in some important ways if we are to successful build a plausible normative theory of CSR.

Strategic Volunteerism and Philanthropy: The Ethical Answer

Kathleen Wilburn, St. Edward’s University, Bill Munday School of Business
Ralph Wilburn, St. Edward’s University, Bill Munday School of Business

Topics: Business Ethics

There is currently pressure from governments on companies for transparent reporting of Environmental, Social, and Governance (ESG) goals and performance. As a result, companies are increasing employee volunteerism and donations from their foundations for social and environmental projects. Some volunteer initiatives are not supported by employees because required time spent outside work hours is not compensated, or projects do not use employees work skills. In many cases the results of much volunteerism cannot be measured because employees can choose their own projects. Philanthropic donations by the companies’ foundations can also defy measurement of value when they are simply given to non-profits or NGOs for a myriad of purposes that do not connect with companies’ strategic goals. Additionally, a recent study of philanthropic contributions has uncovered that many companies use their foundations to make politically motivated donations. For example, they give to charities linked to members of Congress who have influence on business. There is definitely a need for an ethical approach of employee volunteerism and philanthropy. This paper analyzed the volunteer programs and the projects supported by Foundations of seventeen companies that rank highly in corporate social responsibility (CSR): 3M, Accenture, Coca Cola, Eli Lilly, Home Depot, IBM, Johnson & Johnson, Kellogg, Kimberly Clark, Luxottica, Nestlé, Nike, Patagonia, PepsiCo, Procter and Gamble, Timberland, and Unilever, to study. The assumption was that a strong CSR commitment would mean the companies would focus their volunteering and philanthropy projects on social and environmental purposes that were connected to the strategic work of the companies. The analysis found that the volunteering and philanthropy efforts of these companies were directly connected to their products and services, for example, volunteers providing their companies’ products free to people in need, or using their expertise honed in their jobs to provide services, like building homes for veterans, or teaching young women the science and technology that volunteers used in their jobs. This model of strategic volunteerism and philanthropy allowed the companies to measure the results of both and to include them in their social/environmental materiality matrices, which assured they were used ethically to support CSR.
Complicity, Collective Responsibility and Expressivist Concerns in Biomedical and Environmental Ethics
Julia Pedroni, Williams College
Topics: Health Ethics (including Biomedical)

Biomedical ethics and environmental ethics have significant overlap in the subject matter with which they are concerned and the conceptual and methodological resources they employ. They also share a propensity toward conceptual confusion among three important general ethical concerns: complicity, collective responsibility, and expressivist objections. Mischaracterization of bioethical and environmental issues under one or another of these labels has led to influential but unfruitful approaches to their resolution. I clarify potential sources of confusion among these concepts, and how they may best illuminate a range of issues in biomedical ethics and environmental ethics that share a common reliance on them.

Finding Yourself: Epistemic Injustice & Medical Feedback in Adolescence
H. Bondurat, Duke University
Topics: Health Ethics (including Biomedical); Moral Theory; Social and Societal Ethics

This paper explores the ethical norms of medical feedback when giving diagnoses to adolescents. A positive outcome of diagnosing youth is that they can receive care and support. Children medication for a mental disorder or allow treatment like suppression of endogenous puberty for transgender teens. Yet controversy surrounds these medical interventions especially for younger patients due to the long-term effects of the treatments. Along with any stigma attached to the diagnosis, medical interventions can carry dangerous long-term effects that can harm adolescents in not only how they see themselves but also their future behavior.

Trading in our lederhosen for kilts: what happens when bio-geographical ancestry information is used to co-opt culture
Adriane Leithauser, Gonzaga University
Brian Steverson, Gonzaga University
Tyler Wasson, twasson@bentley.edu
Topics: Business Ethics; Social and Societal Ethics

The rise of commercial DNA ancestry testing has been touted as a way to bring people together through shared historical connections. There are several moving videos where people learn they have genetic roots in surprising places, and a new industry of “heritage tourism” has emerged. However, we contend that rather than bridging differences, this venture, which rests on ignoring the social construction of race, more often results in co-opting, assimilating, and/or diluting cultural identity.
Psychic Health: Practical Identities and the Constitutional Model of the Self
Jason Skirry, University of St. Thomas
Topics: Moral Theory

Philosophical practice is grounded in the idea that philosophical inquiry can be used as a therapeutic method to help people cultivate mature intellectual, emotional and ethical lives. Philosophical practitioners are an eclectic group with differing opinions on what counts as psychic health and on what methods should be used to help clients achieve it. I examine Christine Korsgaard’s moral psychology of self-constitution and argue that it provides a substantive and defensible account of psychic health that can be used as a normative model for philosophical practitioners.

Dignity and Epistemic Injustice in Health Care Contexts
Derek Estes, Saint Louis University
Topics: Health Ethics (including Biomedical); Moral Theory

Women are not believed as much as men when they report pain to health care providers. The research on this is definitive. But what are the ethical ramifications at work in these cases? I explore this question through the lens of epistemic injustice, a growing subfield in ethics and epistemology. I argue that consequentialist accounts of epistemic injustice in health care contexts are insufficient. Instead, I develop an account of dignitary harm. The project of this paper, then, is to highlight the salient philosophical features of dignitary harm and locate this concept within the moral landscape of epistemic injustice.

Sustainable Development as a Social Commitment: Deriving a Rights-based Argument from Amartya Sen
Kazi Huda, University of Oklahoma
Topics: Moral Theory; Professionalism; Social and Societal Ethics

There is a gap in the capabilities texts that study the rights of future generations; none of this literature explicitly mention that sustainable development is our social responsibility. To fill this gap, I argue that an account of rights-based theory is implicit in Sen that holds that ensuring the rights of future generations by taking sustainable development measures is a social responsibility. Participating in the APPE Conference will allow me to share my original work with a bigger community of professionals, philosophers, and other scholars. I hope that the Conference will help me get peer critique/feedback to improve my project.
- **A Brief (Philosophical) History of Protest**  
  *Jennifer Kling, University of Colorado, Colorado Springs*  
  Topics: Law, Government, and Military Ethics; Social and Societal Ethics  
  On May 2, 1967, thirty Black Panthers carrying guns entered the California state capitol building and made their way to the Assembly Chamber before being disarmed and led away by police. This collective action was in response to proposed California legislation that would forbid carrying a loaded weapon in public. The Black Panthers argued that this was a non-violent protest, while California Governor Ronald Reagan subsequently signed the bill, saying that it would prevent the kind of violence seen in the capitol building earlier that year. Was the Black Panthers’ action violent? Was it morally permissible? And crucially, was it protest?

- **Evaluation of Teaching and Learning in an RCR Course for Biomedical Postdoctoral Fellows**  
  *Elizabeth Heitman, University of Texas Southwestern Medical Center*  
  *Marie Joung, University of Texas Southwestern Medical Center*  
  *Stuart Ravnik, University of Texas Southwestern Medical Center*  
  Topics: Education; Research Ethics; Science, Technology, and Engineering (STEM)  
  RCR training has been a requirement in Biomedical Sciences for many years, primarily at the pre-doctoral level. Despite the prevalence of the training, there is a perception that more evaluation of the effects of such instruction is needed. Well-catalogued, longitudinal studies showing behavior and/or cultural changes are rare and not easily accomplished. Our research is designed to use learning assessment tools to analyze teaching and learning in an RCR course for postdoctoral fellows as a component of promoting changes in campus climate around RCR.

- **How to talk about Artificial Intelligence?**  
  *Elisabeth Hildt, Center for the Study of Ethics in the Professions, Illinois Institute of Technology*  
  Topics: Moral Theory; Science, Technology, and Engineering (STEM)  
  The presentation will discuss how concepts of central relevance for human beings, human interaction, and moral theory, such as autonomy, rationality, communication and sentience, can be transferred to AI and human-AI-interaction.

  It will analyze definitions given for these concepts in the fields of computer science, biomedicine, and philosophy, and compare how these concepts are being used with regard to human beings and AI, respectively. The presentation will then discuss how differences in the meaning and use of these terms in the two different fields may lead to beliefs and misconceptions that hinder a rational debate of human-robot interaction and the moral and legal status of robots and AI.

- **Does Nonhuman Agent have Free Will?**  
  *Pujarini Das, IIT KANPUR, INDIA*  
  Topics: Moral Theory; Science, Technology, and Engineering (STEM)
The topic of my presentation can be listed either “Moral theory” or “Science, technology, and engineering”. Because it talks about the ethical implication and the significant role of the existence of free will for the human-agents, and how it differs from the nonhuman-agents.

7H Panel Session  
**Room:** Georgia 12  
**Chair:** Richard Wilson

- **Electronic Warfare and Special Technical Operations Capabilities: An Anticipatory Ethical Analysis**  
  *Richard Wilson, Towson University*  
  *Michele C.A. Iftimie, Independent Consultant*  
  *Ion A. Iftimie, Central European University*  
  **Topics:** Law, Government, and Military Ethics; Science, Technology, and Engineering (STEM)

This paper discusses the anticipatory ethical and social issues associated with the lethality of emerging space-related capabilities in the age of Artificial Intelligence. We pose that in order to successfully implement its defensive and offensive mandate.

7I Panel Session  
**Room:** Georgia 2

- **Philosophy as Fiction: Two Case Studies**  
  *Michael Boylan, Marymount University*  
  *Deborah Mower, University of Mississippi*  
  *Lisa Kretz, Evansville University*  
  **Topics:** Moral Theory

This panel session will explore how fiction can act as philosophy by exploring two examples—one from Iris Murdoch, *An Accidental Man* and the other from Michael Boylan, *The Extinction of Desire*.

8A Panel Session  
**Room:** Georgia 5

- **An Ethical Framework for the Nonprofit Sector**  
  *Erwin de Leon, Columbia University School of Professional Studies*  
  *Sameer Ladha, Columbia University School of Professional Studies*  
  **Topics:** Business Ethics; Health Ethics (including Biomedical); Professionalism; Social and Societal Ethics

The professionalization of the Third Sector, along with increased scrutiny on nonprofits, led to the development of codes of ethics designed to guide more than 12 million individuals working in the sector. These principles are built on shared values articulated by major nonprofit umbrella associations. To build a sustainable nonprofit ethical framework, we incorporate bioethical principles of autonomy, beneficence, nonmaleficence and justice, as well as a larger communitarian ethic. Couching nonprofit codes of ethics in identifiable principles will guide organizations in aligning practices to a broad set of ethical values, and macroscopically retain a larger sense of purpose and focus.
Ethical and Leadership Challenges by Organizational Culture Type

Daryl Koehn, DePaul University

Topics: Business Ethics; Moral Theory

Most scholars agree that organizational or corporate culture affects employee behavior and corporate performance for better or for worse. To mention but a few effects: Corporate culture is positively correlated with levels of organizational commitment (Boon and Arumugam 2006). Corporate culture affects organizational performance and efficacy (Kotter and Heskett, 1992) and has the potential to impact a wide array of individual and organizational outcomes and traits such as loyalty and job satisfaction (Lund 2003; Li 2004; Chang and Lee 2007). It affects total quality initiatives (Al-Khalifa and Aspinwall 2001), IT governance (Rusu et al 2017), e-commerce adoption (Senaratna et al 2014), CEO turnover (Fiordelisi and Ricci 2014) and corporate reporting on sustainability (Soares et al 2018). Organizational culture also appears to mediate the relationship between leadership styles and corporate performance (Ogbanna and Harris 2000) and to moderate the relation between leadership and a firm’s knowledge management practices (Nguyen and Mohamed 2011). Yet, while many articles touch upon the importance and effects of corporate culture in general, fewer researchers have investigated in a systematic way corporate or organizational culture types and their relationship to ethics and leadership. In this paper, I draw upon one well-known systematic approach to culture assessment—OCAI—with a view to identifying the different ethical and leadership challenges faced by leaders within corporations characterized by various types of culture. The Organizational Culture Assessment Instrument (OCAI-Online 2019) has been widely used by corporations and consultants to identify four dominant organizational culture types. Working through each of OCAI’s four dominant types, I identify distinctive ethical strengths and weaknesses and leadership opportunities and challenges arising in connection with each cultural type. Part 1 provides a brief overview of the four culture types in the OCAI 2x2 matrix. Part 2 delves more deeply into each culture type and specifies the associated ethical and leadership challenges arising in each type of culture. Part 3 identifies some limitations with the OCAI approach, limitations that point to areas for future research.
Pathways to Professional Social Responsibility: The Development of Personal and Professional Values in Undergraduates

Daniel Schiff, Georgia Institute of Technology
Emma Logevall, Georgia Institute of Technology
Jason Borenstein, Georgia Institute of Technology
Wendy Newstetter, Georgia Institute of Technology
Colin Potts, Georgia Institute of Technology
Ellen Zegura, Georgia Institute of Technology

Topics: Business Ethics; Education; Science, Technology, and Engineering (STEM); Social and Societal Ethics

Research on student development has highlighted student attitudes regarding personal responsibility as well as the responsibility of their future profession. However, the linkage between the two forms of responsibility is not well understood. Our research team is in the midst of a multi-year, mixed methods study which aims to develop a better conceptual understanding of this issue. In this session, the presenter will share results from the first administration of the study’s interview protocol to 21 undergraduates at an engineering university. The presentation will discuss the study’s interview design, coding and analysis strategy, and primary themes identified.

No Tinkering Around: Student Protest and Disruption in Higher Education

Timothy Shiell, University of Wisconsin-Stout

Topics: Education; Law, Government, and Military Ethics; Social and Societal Ethics

This paper examines the Tinker v. Des Moines (1969) material and substantial disruption standard for punishable student expression in the context of University of Wisconsin Board of Regents policy 4-21 “Commitment to Academic Freedom and Freedom of Expression” adopted in October 2017 and recent allegations of student disruptions. Adopted amidst intense political pressure, 4-21 added several controversial provisions to existing System policy and identified the material and substantial disruption standard as a basis for mandatory suspensions and expulsions. The U.S. Supreme Court mentioned the Tinker disruption standard in two higher education cases from the 1970s and several lower courts have invoked it in case analysis. I argue it should apply to public higher education students only if it is narrowly tailored and then apply it to recent controversial incidents.


After using case law and legal analysis to defend a narrow interpretation of the Tinker disruption standard, I discuss examples to illustrate its application. Examples may include incidents at UC-Berkeley, the College of William and Mary, UC-Irvine, and UW-Madison.
Panel Session

Room: Georgia 7

Chair: Andrew I. Cohen

Showing how property rights are (un)justified

Andrew Cohen, Jean Beer Blumenfeld Center for Ethics, Georgia State University
Clark Wolf, Bioethics Program, Department of Philosophy and Religious Studies
Peter Lindsay, Dept of Political Science and Dept of Philosophy, Georgia State University

Topics: Moral Theory

This panel brings together three papers that consider whether and how to justify property rights. Drawing on multiple early modern theorists, panelists explore arguments that might vindicate any determinate right to own in modern circumstances.

Room: Atlanta 1

Chair: Karin Ellison

Aiming for Wisdom in Professional Ethics

Zack Loveless, Hyde Park Institute

Topics: Professionalism

The goal of professional ethics, I believe, is to equip people to more reliably make (ethically) good decisions. In short, it aims to develop practical wisdom. Yet many approaches to teaching professional ethics focus nearly exclusively on one aspect of practical wisdom. As such, they fail to adequately encourage reliable decision-making.

Can Professionals Be Moral Exemplars?: Integrating Exemplar Methodology into Professional Ethics

Brett Beasley, University of Notre Dame

Topics: Business Ethics; Education; Moral Theory; Professionalism

Historically applied in the field of moral development, exemplar methodology holds promise for the field of professional ethics. In this paper, I show that, despite appearances to the contrary, there is a natural fit between the types of moral decision-making professionals engage in and the moral guidance that exemplars provide. I also argue that, due to the changing nature of work and the resultant weakening of professional identities, exemplar methodology is more necessary than ever.

Author Meets the Critics Session

Room: Georgia 12

Chair: Jonathan Marks


Jonathan Marks, The Pennsylvania State University
Lisa M. Lee- Critic, Virginia Polytechnic Institute and State University
Leonard Ortmann- Critic, Centers for Disease Control and Prevention

Topics: Business Ethics; Health Ethics (including Biomedical); Law, Government, and Military Ethics; Moral Theory; Professionalism; Research Ethics; Social and Societal Ethics
Public health agencies are trying to solve our most intractable public health problems by partnering with corporations responsible for creating or exacerbating those problems. The Perils of Partnership argues that these relationships create “webs of influence” that undermine the integrity of public health agencies; distort public health research and policy; and reinforce the framing of public health problems and their solutions in ways that are least threatening to the commercial interests of corporate “partners.” We should expect multinational corporations to develop strategies of influence—but public bodies should develop counter-strategies to insulate themselves from corporate influence in all its forms.

8G

**Room:** Atlanta 5

**Chair:** Michael Kalichman

- **Doing Better with Data: Data Driven Quality Improvement for Research Administration/Compliance**
  
  **John Baumann, Indiana University Bloomington**
  
  Topics: Research Ethics
  
  As leaders in research administration/compliance, we work with researchers but all too often fail to recognize a basic principle of research: data matters. A high functioning office not only maintains its operations with integrity and efficiency, it also undergoes continuous and evidence-based quality improvement (QI). This session will present a discussion from a panel of speakers of how they have developed and implemented data-driven programs of QI in their institutions’ research administration and research compliance offices. Specific topics will include methods for collecting, assessing and using data for: selection of QI areas on which to focus; implementing QI activities; and assessing programmatic outcomes of QI efforts.

  Fundamentally, the panelist representing offices of research administration or compliance will describe and assess their experiences with data-driven QI activities.

- **Deliberative sessions on the protection of research misconduct whistleblowers**

  **Allan Loup, University of Notre Dame**
  **Laura Carlson, University of Notre Dame**
  **Cindy Bergeman, University of Notre Dame**
  **John Lubker, University of Notre Dame**
  
  Topics: Education; Professionalism; Research Ethics
  
  This presentation will describe preliminary findings of a project that addresses protections for research misconduct whistleblowers. The project employs a structured deliberative process for eliciting informed and considered views and recommendations on this complex topic from research trainees.

8H

**Room:** Georgia 3

**Chair:** Mark Doorley

- **Environmental Risks of Next Generation Biotechnology: Philosophical Considerations**

  **Paul Thompson, Michigan State University**
  
  Topics: Science, Technology, and Engineering (STEM)
  
  With the discovery and adaptation of the CRISPr system for gene editing and progress in synthetic biology, the field of biotechnology seems poised for a new round of applications beyond human medicine. These include projects of de-extinction, helping threatened species adapt to climate change...
and gene drives to control invasive species. In addition, new biotechnologies will continue to be developed for agricultural applications, continuing a long-standing debate over the impact of gene technologies on biodiversity and ecological integrity. There is always a profound risk associated with our collective ignorance with respect both to the workings of the natural world and to the impacts of new technology.

**Engineering and Justice: Developing the Political Aspect of Engineering Ethics**

*Glen Miller, Texas A&M University*

Topics: Science, Technology, and Engineering (STEM)

Engineering ethics is often framed from the perspective of a sole practitioner, but its social, economic, and environmental impacts give it a political dimension. This recognition demands a more robust concept of justice, the fundamental political virtue, than the pithy “give each person his or her due” provides. This more robust concept can be developed by adding insights from recent political philosophers (e.g., Rawls, Nozick, and Walzer) with insights from feminism (e.g., Jaeger and Fraser) and environmental justice (e.g., Figueroa and Shrader-Frechette) to those inherited from canonical philosophers (e.g., Aristotle, Ross, and Kant).

**Against Conception in the Abortion Debate**

*Matt Stolick, University of Findlay*

Topics: Health Ethics (including Biomedical); Law, Government, and Military Ethics; Moral Theory; Social and Societal Ethics

As there is no consensus among experts as to when life begins, the abortion scene is rife with the appeal to authority fallacy. A critical and reflective assessment of the question of when a human life begins shows conception as a most extreme position, one that also contrasts with the precedent historical answers to this question.

**The Feminized, Sex, and Genuine Consent**

*Lillian Perkins, The Ohio State University*

Topics: Moral Theory; Social and Societal Ethics

In the wake of the Me Too movement, men are surprised to find that the other parties to many of their sexual encounters did not view them as consensual. Some claim they worry that any well-intentioned interaction will be misrepresented as an assault. This worry illuminates a grave reality: Legitimate consent between man and The Feminized cannot be assured in our current patriarchal society. I offer three different lenses that illuminate this conclusion: social contract theory, repressive and ideological state apparatuses, and a phenomenological understanding of embodied femininity. I also propose three steps men should take to mitigate this concern.

**BSIS**

Bioethics Special Interest Section Meeting

Room: Georgia 6
9A

**Room:** Atlanta 1

**Chair:** Gary Rubin

**A practice-based strategic framework for MNCs to control prevailing bribery practices in developing countries**

*Irfan Ameer, University of Turku*

Topics: Business Ethics

This article is a part of my doctoral dissertation. I intend to get feedback on it before sending it to some journal.

**Pedagogical: A Learning Zeitgeist: Learning Methodology Through Technology, Art, and Philosophy**

*Thomas Creely, U.S. Naval War College*  
*Isabel Lopes, U.S. Naval War College*

Topics: Business Ethics; Education; Science, Technology, and Engineering (STEM); Social and Societal Ethics

The zeitgeist methodology is a cross-disciplinary examination of ethics of technology, and its impact on society through the examination of policy, art, values, and philosophy. It gives a deeper view of what it means to be human in an age of technology. Does the zeitgeist methodology reshape and add multiple lens to a person’s thinking? Can technologists have a better understanding of the ethical impact of their innovations? Technology influences the humanities and defines culture for an epoch’s zeitgeist. Arts, culture, society, values, and philosophy have been shaped by innovation embraced by people throughout history.

9B

**Room:** Georgia 9

**Chair:** Kory Trott

**Public-Private Partnerships: Mitigating the Risks**

*Diana Yassanye, Centers for Disease Control and Prevention*  
*Leonard Ortmann, Centers for Disease Control and Prevention*

Topics: Health Ethics (including Biomedical); Law, Government, and Military Ethics

Despite potential conflicts of interest in public-private partnerships, success in public health often depends on partnering. Public health professionals therefore need to form partnerships with safeguards based on assessment of risks and benefits. This panel presentation explores ethical considerations and best practices for fostering public-private partnerships. The first panelist, a federal official, will provide guidance on successful partnerships, including questions to answer before proceeding with partnership. The second panelist, an ethicist at a federal agency, will address objections that ethicists recently have raised about public-private partnerships. Time permitting, a case illustrating risks, benefits, and ethics of partnerships will be discussed.
**9C**

**Room:** Atlanta 3  
**Chair:** Carl Mitcham

**Picking College Students Brains About Ethical & Societal Issues of Technology**

Raquel Diaz-Sprague, University of Alabama at Birmingham  
Alan Sprague, University of Alabama at Birmingham

Topics: Education; Moral Theory; Science, Technology, and Engineering (STEM); Social and Societal Ethics

Ongoing funded research on incorporating an ethics and teamwork minimodule in upper level Computing & Engineering classes. Exploring students personal or group experiences through guided discussions on moral reasoning and animal morality are part of the minimodule. An art, essay, or app design competition on ethical and societal implications of technology is also discussed.

**Pedagogical: The Reflect! platform: Teaching people to cope with ethical challenges of wicked problems and to develop consensus on fundamental disagreements**

Michael Hoffmann, Georgia Institute of Technology

Topics: Education; Professionalism; Social and Societal Ethics

Wicked problems — that is, problems that can be framed differently, depending on the interests, values, and beliefs of those who are looking at them — pose ethical challenges that have scarcely been addressed. Most importantly, we might overlook people who will be harmed by decisions we make based on a too limited perception of the problem, or we are unable to understand other’s perspectives. Preparing students to cope with wicked problem is difficult. This presentation will introduce the Reflect! platform that has been designed as an answer to these challenges, and it will walk the audience through an exemplary student project.

**9D**

**Room:** Georgia 11  
**Chair:** Mark Dixon

**Japanese animal ethics as a kind of relational ethics**

Tetsuji Iseda, Kyoto University

Topics: Professionalism

Japan has been slow in adopting Western animal welfare measures, such as the 3R principle in animal experimentation and five freedom for captive animals. There are multiple factors for this, and a peculiar view on human-animal relationship, which I call “Ethics of Kuyo” seem to play an important role. Understanding this view is important if you want to talk with Japanese people on matters of animal ethics.

**Is It Ever Ethical for an Organization to Pressure Its Professionals to Violate Their Professions’ Ethical Minimums?**

David Ozar, Loyola University Chicago (Emeritus)

Topics: Business Ethics; Education; Health Ethics (including Biomedical); Law, Government, and Military Ethics; Media and Journalism; Professionalism; Research Ethics; Science, Technology, and Engineering (STEM)

Employing professionals brings with it an important set of obligations for the employing organization. For the obligations a person undertakes on becoming a professional are not a product of that person’s own making nor a product of the person’s contractual relationship with the organization. This presentation will argue that therefore these obligations have greater moral weight than any condi-
tions of employment or work-orders that the organization might attempt to impose on the employed professional. Organizations – business organizations or organizations of any other kind – that try to motivate their professionals to violate their professions’ ethical standards are acting unethically themselves.

**9E**

**Room:** Atlanta 5  
**Chair:** J. Thomas Whetstone

**Punishing Treatment(s)**  
*Elizabeth Rhodes, UNC Charlotte*

Topics: Health Ethics (Including Biomedical); Moral Theory; Social and Societal Ethics

This paper will argue that the way admonishment was embedded in human memory in Nietzsche’s historical description of slave morality expressed in his time, is similar to the practice of pathologization of sexual “deviants” which is embedded in our time in an equally violent way. This is a result of the current positivist worldview that mirrors the Christian thought that Nietzsche writes about. This is reductionist and an affront to the human flourishing that Nietzsche so fervently advocates for. I argue, when sexuality does not breathe freedom, the individual does not flourish. This lack of flourishing results from the taxonomization, and pathologization of their sexuality. These individuals, “deviants” face this, as a result of the bio-medical model of assessing and treating paraphilia (i.e. sexual disorders). These treatment(s) will be assessed within this paper. That is, this paper tracks, and compares the reduction of human sexual attributes and characteristics to taxonomical moral failures in Christian ideology, that worried Nietzsche.

**I’ve Heard This Joke Before...Am I Going to Hell?**  
*Connor Kianpour, Georgia State University*

Topics: Moral Theory; Social and Societal Ethics

Some suggest that laughter at malicious (phthonic) jokes is indicative of moral failings in those who laugh at them. The object of the present paper is to demonstrate that laughter is not something for which individuals are culpable because it is an involuntary phenomenon that results from the a priori detection of incongruity relevant to humor. In this sense, the detection of humor shall be treated as more of an epistemic concern than an aesthetic concern. Because laughter is involuntary and not itself harmful, I argue that people cannot be held accountable for it, even in the aftermath of phthonic joking.

**9F**  
**Author Meets the Critics Session**

**Room:** Georgia 7  
**Chair:** Jennifer Kling

*Jennifer Kling, University of Colorado, Colorado Springs*  
*Steven Swartz - Critic, Center for Ethics Education, Fordham University*  
*Peter B. Barry - Critic, Saginaw Valley State University*  
*Andrew Hill - Critic, St. Philip’s College*

Topics: Law, Government, and Military Ethics; Moral Theory; Social and Societal Ethics

The current refugee crisis is unparalleled in history in its size and severity. According to the United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees (UNHCR), there are roughly 67 million refugees worldwide, the vast majority of whom are refugees as the result of wars and other military actions. This social and
political crisis—one in every 122 humans is a refugee—cries out for normative explanation and analysis. Morally and politically, how should we understand this crisis? How should we respond to it, and why?

I argue that war refugees have suffered, and continue to suffer, a series of harms, wrongs, and oppressions, and so are owed recompense, restitution, and aid—as a matter of justice—by socio-political institutions around the world. I make the case that war refugees should be viewed and treated differently than migrants, due to their particular circumstances, but that their circumstances do not wholly alleviate their own moral responsibilities. We must stop treating refugees as objects to be moved around on the global stage, I contend, and instead see them as people, with their own subjective experiences of the world, who might surprise us with their words and works.

■ 9G
Room: Georgia 5
Chair: David May

■ Early Career Paper Award Winner: Clinical Research as Basic Structure & the Ethics of Health Research Priority-Setting
Danielle Wenner, Carnegie Mellon University
Topics: Health Ethics (including Biomedical); Research Ethics; Social and Societal Ethics

This paper explores the ethics of health research priority-setting from the perspective of the recently proposed basic structure model of research stakeholder obligations. This model views the enterprise of clinical research as a fundamental social institution that should be governed primarily by considerations of justice. It problematizes existing approaches to the ethics of priority-setting as insufficiently demanding to meet the requirements of the basic structure model, and proposes a set of desiderata for an ethics of health research priority-setting.

■ Cultivating Foundations for Responsible Innovation
Mark Bourgeois, University of Notre Dame
Topics: Education; Research Ethics; Science, Technology, and Engineering (STEM); Social and Societal Ethics

Responsible Innovation offers a new framing for the ethical considerations of novel science and technology. It attempts to embed broader ethical considerations into the R&D process itself, rather than leaving them as an afterthought, or a task for others. But it also presents serious conceptual and practical challenges, and is too new for pedagogy in it to yet exist. An NSF-funded project at Notre Dame is attempting to address these challenges by involving graduate student researchers in testing and refining the principles of RI with real-world innovation projects, while also training them in the skills essential for it.

■ 9H
Room: Georgia 12
Chair: Jason Borenstein

■ Promoting ethical preparedness for upcoming innovative technological products via systematic ethical analysis
Ilana Kepten, ORT Braude College
Gila Yakov, Yezreel Valley College
Topics: Science, Technology, and Engineering (STEM)

I will give a short explanation regarding the gap between current ethical environment and lack of support to technological innovative product. describe a suggested supportive protocol with 1-2
simulations proving its efficacy. The main goal is to receive feedback and remarks from the listeners regarding the need for valuable preemptive ethical analysis during the engineering design process.

1-2 simulations proving

- **Artificial Intelligence and Racial Injustice: A Case Study on Algorithms in Criminal Sentencing**
  
  *Justin Biddle, Georgia Institute of Technology*
  
  **Topics:** Law, Government, and Military Ethics; Research Ethics; Science, Technology, and Engineering (STEM); Social and Societal Ethics
  
  This paper draws upon recent work on the role of values in science and technology, as well as interdisciplinary scholarship in AI, to argue that decisions about the design and implementation of AI systems is value laden in ways similar to human decision making. To argue for this, I examine recent work on the development and implementation of risk assessment algorithms in criminal justice systems—in particular, algorithms that predict the risk of recidivism. The design of these predictive algorithms involves ineliminable value judgments in the following three areas: concept operationalization, choices of data inputs, and choices of data outputs.

- **Balancing Paternalism and Empowerment in Sexual Misconduct Cases**
  
  *Cynthia Jones, University of Texas Rio Grande Valley*
  
  *Florence Nocar, University of Texas Rio Grande Valley*
  
  **Topics:** Education; Social and Societal Ethics
  
  While states scramble to respond to scandals at colleges and universities over sexual misconduct and violence victimization, legislation at the federal level has shifted focus to the rights of respondents, or those accused of sexual misconduct. This presentation will discuss and critically analyze recent federal changes to policies like Title IX, as well as Texas legislation aimed at preventing colleges and universities from turning a blind eye, so to speak, to the past misconduct of students or employees. Cases from Baylor University, Michigan State, and the University of Utah will be discussed as a starting point and the confounding issues of Greek organizations, college athletics, and professionalism will be discussed.

- **Epistemic Refusal after Sexual Violence**
  
  *Sarah Miller, The Pennsylvania State University*
  
  **Topics:** Media and Journalism; Moral Theory; Social and Societal Ethics
  
  In the face of the extensive social and political injustices that sexual violence represents, an urgent question arises: How should we respond? While some philosophers have argued for the importance of resisting the wrongs of epistemic injustice, I argue for a different approach: epistemic refusal. Epistemic refusal represents a wholesale rejection of dominant forms of knowing through a repudiation of the need for others’ belief in and recognition of one’s status as a sexual violence survivor. Epistemic refusal eschews reliance on the recognition of the credibility of one’s testimony from those least likely to provide it. The case of mass, informal disclosure of survivorhood through social media provides one potent example of how epistemic refusal works in practice and demonstrates how it has the power to open new vistas of knowing by fostering greater empathy and solidarity between survivors.
Panel Session

Room: Georgia 2
Chair: Trisha Phillips

- **Federal Funding Programs for Research Ethics**
  - Trisha Phillips, West Virginia University
  - John Parker, NSF
  - Benyamin Margolis, HHS Office of Research Integrity
  - Topics: Research Ethics; Science, Technology, and Engineering (STEM)

  Presentation 1: “Ethics and Responsible Research (ER2) at the National Science Foundation (NSF)”
  Presenter: John Parker

  Presentation 2: Funding Programs at the Office of Research Integrity (ORI), a division of the US Department of Health and Human Services (DHHS)
  Presenter: TBA

Saturday Awards Luncheon

Saturday, February 22, 2020
12:00 pm - 1:00 pm - Capitol South
Tickets $50

Hosted by:
Edward C. Carr, APPE Board Chair
Patti Stauffer, APPE Executive Director

**Award Winners**

Danielle Wenner, Carnegie Mellon University
**Winner, Early Career Scholar Paper Competition**
Sponsored by the Poe Center for Business Ethics Education and Research, University of Florida

Dayoung Kim, Purdue University
**Winner, Graduate Student Paper Competition**
Sponsored by Jean Beer Blumenfeld Center for Ethics, Georgia State University

Valerie Joly Chock, University of North Florida
**Winner, Undergraduate Student Paper Competition**
Sponsored by University of Central Florida, Department of Philosophy
10A  Panel Session  1:15 PM–2:15 PM

Room: Atlanta 1

Chair: Jason Skirry

- Learning on the Road: Studying Professional Responsibility and Ethics Abroad
  Kathryn Rybka, University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign
  Gretchen Winter, University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign
  Topics: Business Ethics

We will share our experiences in launching a new Study Abroad course from conceptualization to implementation, and why it serves as a powerful tool for enhanced learning about professional responsibility issues. We will also provide ideas and encourage audience input for how to create a study abroad course, organize site visits, successfully travel with students, and make thoughtful itinerary updates while being away from the support and familiarity of your home campus. This new course was launched in May 2019 and held in Paris, France and Brussels, Belgium.

10B  1:15 PM–2:15 PM

Room: Georgia 9

Chair: Samuel Bruton

- Integrating Biomedical and Traditional Healings in African Health Care Systems: An African Bioethical Debate
  Augustine Yaw Frimpong-Mansoh, Northern Kentucky University
  Topics: Health Ethics (including Biomedical)

This paper examines a debate in African bioethics involving questions about the place of traditional medicine (TM) in the African mainstream scientific health care systems. It critically reviews basic bio-epistemological and bioethical questions and concludes that indigenous African holistic worldviews about the world, personhood, and healing support an integrated traditional-scientific health care system.

- The curious case of DCIS: How much diagnosis can we live with?
  Vassiliki Leontis, Bowling Green State University
  Topics: Health Ethics (including Biomedical)

This paper investigates problems in assertions that early breast cancer, and specifically DCIS, should be left undetected and untreated, as the opposite practices constitute overdiagnosis and overtreatment, and have tremendous costs on society and individual patients without saving more lives. The paper’s approach is that against a strict form of consequentialism regarding the allocation of medical resources, and in favor of using the precautionary principle to advocate the obligation to avoid serious and irreversible harm to individual patients. The paper’s impact can be felt in the domain of women’s health care, which often raises important ethical dilemmas.
Panel Session  
**Room:** Atlanta 3  
**Chair:** Deni Elliott  

**National Ethics Project Informational Meeting**  
_Deni Elliott, University of South Florida_  
_Maggie Schein, DePauw University_  
Topics: Education; Moral Theory  
Join the leadership team of the National Ethics Project for an informational meeting to learn how you and your campus can contribute to our vision: Ethics Education. Understood.

Pedagogical Session  
**Room:** Georgia 5  
**Chair:** James Brady  

**Pedagogical: Come to the Movies: Teaching Moral Rationalization through Film**  
_Brad Agle, Brigham Young University_  
Topics: Business Ethics; Education; Health Ethics (including Biomedical); Law, Government, and Military Ethics; Media and Journalism; Moral Theory; Professionalism; Research Ethics; Science, Technology, and Engineering (STEM); Social and Societal Ethics  
In this entertaining and helpful session you will see a demonstration of how to use videoclips to teach the twelve rationalization techniques identified in the literature on “ethical neutralization,” “moral disengagement,” and “blind spots.” The presenter has identified videoclips from movies, TV shows, documentaries, and TV newsmagazines illustrating these techniques. You will see examples of these clips with the techniques labeled in the video as well as clips without the labeling, and learn how this class session has become a favorite among students.

Pedagogical Session  
**Room:** Georgia 11  
**Chair:** Edward C. Carr  

**The Toolbox approach: A flexible model of professional education**  
_Stephanie Cargill, Saint Louis University_  
Topics: Business Ethics; Education; Health Ethics (including Biomedical); Professionalism; Research Ethics; Social and Societal Ethics  
As an instructor who is charged with teaching public health ethics as well as responsible conduct of research, both online and in person (and hybrid), I have developed a well-received approach to course design that works in different areas and is amenable to face-to-face as well as online presentations. I will present the “toolbox” approach of having a set of activities (cases, exercises, debates, games, online engagements, etc.) that can be done individually or as a group, online or in person. I will also present how to do online group work effectively. I would like to present this approach and receive feedback and suggestions for how it can be improved.
“By root or by (muddy) branch”: Patterns of Ethics Learning then Teaching among Faculty

Sara Jordan, Virginia Tech, Center for Public Administration & Policy
Sam Snyder, Virginia Tech
Thomas Staley, Virginia Tech
Stephen Biscotte, Virginia Tech
Diana Bairaktarova, Virginia Tech

Topics: Professionalism; Science, Technology, and Engineering (STEM)

How do faculty learn to teach ethics when they have no formal training in the area?

10F
Room: Georgia 3
Chair: Daniel Wueste

Acceptable Risk in the Pursuit of Athletic Excellence: Reflections on Alex Honnold’s Free Solo Climb
Melissa Fahmy, University of Georgia

Topics: Social and Societal Ethics

In this paper, I use Alex Honnold’s 2017 free solo climb of Freerider on El Capitan in Yosemite National Park as a springboard to think about the appropriate moral response to those who engage in risky behaviors, especially in pursuit of athletic excellence. This analysis has application to sports in general, as well as questions regarding whether athletes should be allowed to use performance-enhancing substances in training or competition.

Harmful Sports: Nonparticipants’ Obligations
Earl Spurgin, John Carroll University

Topics: Moral Theory; Social and Societal Ethics

I hold a form of moral liberalism committed to individuals’ liberty of internal states, individuals’ liberty of external acts, and, despite the preceding liberties, individuals having many moral obligations that frequently restrict, or even prohibit, their acts. This presentation explains that moral liberalism and applies it to nonparticipants’ involvement with harmful sports, those sports that cause, or have a significant probability of causing, grave harm to participants. Perhaps surprisingly given my advocacy of moral liberalism, I argue that sports leagues, team owners, governments, media outlets, and fans often violate their moral obligations by supporting harmful sports.

10G
Room: Atlanta 5
Chair: Leonard Kahn

A Kantian Approach to Dilemmas: Solving the Trolley Problem
Ava Wright, Northeastern University

Topics: Law, Government, and Military Ethics; Moral Theory

I am a Postdoctoral Research Fellow in AI and Ethics at Northeastern University in Boston, MA. My most recent research brings a distinctively Kantian insight into the coordinated relationship between law and ethics to bear on problems in machine and information ethics.
Engineering Consent with Ag-Gag Laws—Oh, the Humanity!
Justin Simpson, University of Georgia
Topics: Business Ethics; Law, Government, and Military Ethics; Moral Theory

Farm protection legislature has passed criminalizing the documentation and/or distribution of information about animal agriculture. Deterring journalism, these laws are referred to as “Ag-Gag” laws. Given its prohibition against lying, one is drawn to Kant’s moral philosophy to address such laws. However, as instances of deception that do not technically involve lying, it is unclear how Kant would handle this issue. Due to the ambiguity of the Formula of Humanity it also does not yield a conclusive verdict. This paper develops a sufficient condition for impermissibly using another merely as a means by deception to apply to Ag-Gag laws.

Author Meets the Critics Session

Professional Ethics: A Trust-Based Approach (Lexington Books, 2018)
Terrence Kelly, University of Alaska Anchorage
Mark Bourgeois - Critic, University of Notre Dame
Topics: Business Ethics; Education; Health Ethics (including Biomedical); Professionalism

It is widely recognized that professionals, such as doctors, nurses, engineers, and teachers have duties that go far beyond those of ordinary citizens, but there is much disagreement as to why they have such duties. In Professional Ethics: A Trust-Based Approach, Terrence Kelly argues that these duties come from the unique trust that professionals must invite, develop, and honor from those they serve.

Group Presentation

Crowdsourcing as a Tool for Research: Ethical, Political, and Methodological Considerations
Qin Zhu, Colorado School of Mines
Hanzelle Kleeman, Colorado School of Mines
Stevie Rea, Colorado School of Mines
Topics: Media and Journalism; Research Ethics; Science, Technology, and Engineering (STEM)

Crowdsourcing platforms (e.g., Amazon Mechanical Turk) have recently become powerful tools for researchers in the social, psychological, behavioral, and computer sciences. However, critical computing scholars have also expressed serious concerns about the use of crowdsourcing platforms in research such as data privacy violation. This paper conceptualizes the concerns about crowdsourcing as a data collection tool in three different dimensions: ethical, political, and methodological. It also examines the possible resolutions proposed by critical computing scholars to address the concerns about crowdsourcing as a research tool, and discusses potential challenges with implementing these resolutions.
Panel Session

Room: Georgia 5

Chair: Lora Lopez

An Empirical Review of Ethical Decision-Making

Lora Lopez, Texas Tech University Ethics Center
Ralph Ferguson, Texas Tech University Ethics Center
Lisa James, Texas Tech University Ethics Center

Topics: Education; Research Ethics

This presentation concerns faculty and administrators’ promotion of academic integrity for international and domestic students. The focus is on decision-making and the use of electronic assessment tools. The aim is to establish best practices in decision-making without overreliance on electronic assessment tools (Safe Aware/iThenticate/Turnitin).

Panel Session

Room: Georgia 9

NHSEB, 7 Years Later: The State and Future of High School Ethics Bowl in the U.S.

Alex Richardson, UNC Parr Center for Ethics
Steve Swartzer, Center for Ethics Education, Fordham University

Topics: Education; Moral Theory; Social and Societal Ethics

An update for partners and supporters, focusing on where the NHSEB has been, its current state, emerging from leadership changes at the program level and at the Parr Center, and, finally, a discussion of how we hope to keep up with the prodigious growth and spread of the program in the future.

Panel Session

Room: Atlanta 3

Chair: Glenn Sinclair

An Attempt at Categorizing the Fake-Threat

Bastiaan Vanacker, Loyola University Chicago

Topics: Law, Government, and Military Ethics; Media and Journalism; Science, Technology, and Engineering (STEM)

Fake threats are expressions that have as their purpose to frighten the recipient, without possessing the elements traditionally assigned to threats. These types of speech actions often take place online. This paper analyzes whether the fake-threat can be seen as a separate speech act.

Cyber Security, Information Deception, and Fake News Security in the Cyber World: An Anticipatory Ethical Analysis

Richard Wilson, Towson University
Alfred Guy, University of Baltimore

Topics: Media and Journalism; Social and Societal Ethics

Obtaining information is crucial for deliberating, making decisions and performing actions. Accurate information and intelligence are at the center of political and military strategy and have to be a focus of security. Intelligence occupies an important role in military strategy and it now seems that information accuracy, confusion, and distortion played an important role in the 2016 presidential election.
Active campaigns of disinformation had an influence upon voters and potentially upon the outcome of the 2016 election. This campaign of disinformation has also been true of the upcoming European elections. From these activities the issues of the active information security must now include instruction in being able to differentiate between information and disinformation, and fake and real news, as well as knowledge of how fake news is disseminated through social media including the use of ‘bots’.

In this analysis a discussion of social and ethical issues with fake news and information deception will be the bases for an anticipatory ethical and social analysis of fake news which will in turn be the foundation for policy recommendations involving political and military security that must include an account of how fake news and information deception can be used as the basis of cyber warfare. This analysis also depends upon analyzing information deception from the perspective of instrumental reasoning.

11D  Panel Session  2:30 PM–3:30 PM

Room: Georgia 7

Chair: Christopher Meyers

Panel, Mission Imperatives: Thinking Through What College Mission Requires of Faculty

Christopher Arroyo, Providence College
Anne Ozar, Creighton University
Timothy Weidel, Gonzaga University

Topics: Professionalism

This panel addresses some issues about the ways in which the missions of Catholic institutions bear upon the ways in which faculty relate to these missions and how these missions should inform the work of faculty. Topics to be discussed are the role of mission in hiring, the ways mission should and should not inform teaching, and the relationship between mission and service-learning courses.

11E  2:30 PM–3:30 PM

Room: Atlanta 1

Chair: Jonathan Beever

Panel, Humanity’s Inescapable Gaze in the Digital Age: Do Animals Have a Right to Privacy?

Joel MacClellan, Loyola University New Orleans

Topics: Moral Theory; Science, Technology, and Engineering (STEM); Social and Societal Ethics

I argue that nonhuman animals do not have a right to privacy because the two primary accounts of what rights defend – interest-protecting and choice-protecting theories – do entail that some animals have some rights, I argue that a right to privacy is not amongst them. While some animals do have interests in concealment and solitude, I defend a reductionist view that privacy rights are not basic to animals. I argue that there are legitimate reasons to surveil animals, and that we ought to better respect animals’ interests through more judicious use of animal surveillance technologies rather than ban them.

Panel, Child Animal Cruelty?

Walter Riker, University of West Georgia

Topics: Health Ethics (including Biomedical); Social and Societal Ethics

A recent study on “child animal cruelty” (CAC) asked children to describe times when they had harmed animals. The researchers identified themes in the children’s narratives that deepen our understanding of this behavior. Here I discuss the nature of cruelty and if, given the themes identified in the children’s narratives, all of the reported behavior should be regarded as “cruel.”
Child-Robot Interaction, Well-Being, and Privacy
Yvette Pearson, Old Dominion University
Topics: Health Ethics (including Biomedical); Science, Technology, and Engineering (STEM); Social and Societal Ethics

Child-robot interaction (CRI) has the potential to promote children’s welfare across multiple contexts, including health care, education, and social interaction with their peers. Despite potential benefits, however, the collection, storage, and use of data generated through CRI, combined with ethical issues related to attachment and potentially deceptive design features, raises concerns about loss of privacy.

A State of Hypocrisy: Paid Parental Leave in the United States
Parker Rose, University of Alabama at Birmingham
Topics: Law, Government, and Military Ethics; Moral Theory; Social and Societal Ethics

Parker Rose (undergraduate, University of Alabama at Birmingham) will be giving a presentation on her paper, which addresses the conditions of paid parental leave in the United States and argues, through philosophical justifications and empirical evidence, that the United States is both justified in and obligated to mandate paid parental leave in the workplace.

On the Lexical Superiority Response to the Repugnant Conclusion: An Essay in Population Ethics
Leonard Kahn, Loyola University New Orleans
Topics: Moral Theory; Social and Societal Ethics

I consider the lexical superiority response to the repugnant conclusion and argue that it faces a dilemma. It is either too strong and leads to counterexamples or too weak and fails to avoid the repugnant conclusion.

Rethinking Relational Values for Environmental Assessment
Robert Kirkman, Georgia Institute of Technology
Emily Grubert, Georgia Institute of Technology
Topics: Moral Theory

Recent efforts to introduce relational values into environmental assessment have fallen into some conceptual confusion, not least because of the emphasis on capturing such values in principles or in quantitative formulae. We suggest that bringing relational values into environmental assessment will not be a matter of capturing the richness of relationships in abstract principles or in calculations, but of recognizing the limits of principles and calculations in attending to what matters in decision making.
11H  
**Group Presentation**  
*Room:* Georgia 11  
*Chair:* Jason Borenstein  

**The Boeing 737 Max: Lessons for Engineering Ethics**  
*Joseph Herkert, North Carolina State University*  
*Jason Borenstein, Georgia Institute of Technology*  
*Keith Miller, University of Missouri - St. Louis*  
*Topics: Science, Technology, and Engineering (STEM)*  

In October 2018 and March 2019, two Boeing 737 Max passenger jets crashed after takeoff; in total, these accidents claimed nearly 350 lives. After the second incident the troubled jet was grounded worldwide. In this presentation we will examine several aspects of the case with relevance to engineering ethics, including: 1) the responsibilities of design engineers; 2) internal production pressure and external industry factors affecting Boeing’s design criteria for the 737 Max; and 3) the growing trend in the airline industry and other industries such as autonomous vehicles to substitute artificial machine intelligence for decisions and actions by human operators.

12A  
**Panel Session**  
*Room:* Atlanta 1  
*Chair:* Patricia Werhane  

**SILO MENTALITIES, DOMINANT LOGICS AND THEIR ETHICAL CHALLENGES: THE BOEING 737 MAX CRASHES**  
*Patricia Werhane, DePaul University and the University of Virginia*  
*Elaine Englehardt, Utah Valley University*  
*Lisa Newton, Fairfield University, Emerita*  
*Topics: Business Ethics*  

Using the Boeing 737 Max aircraft crashes as examples, we will study two circumstances that raise difficult ethical issues in organizations: “silos mentalities” and an organizational culture or an organizational dominant such that this thinking or sets of practices preclude self-examination. We will conclude that these are avoidable phenomena and propose remedies for how to do so.

12B  
**Pedagogical Session**  
*Room:* Georgia 5  
*Chair:* Brett Fulkerson-Smith  

**Seeing Reason: How to Map Case Studies in Ethics**  
*Brett Fulkerson-Smith, Harper College*  
*Nate Otey, ThinkerAnalytix*  
*Anne L’Hommedieu-Sanderson, ThinkerAnalytix*  
*Allison Cohen, Langley High School*
Professional Responsibility in a Case of Noninformed Consent

Daniel Wueste, Clemson University Department of Philosophy and Religion

Topics: Health Ethics (including Biomedical); Professionalism

In The Annals of Thoracic Surgery, Dr. Robert Sade presents a fictitious case involving what he calls “noninformed consent”: the “patient wants a procedure done but refuses to hear the information that will ensure that the patient’s decision is informed.” The case presents an ethical dilemma the prongs of which involve algorithmic and conscientious concepts of professional responsibility. The former is legalistic, the latter is thoroughly ethical calling for consideration of, for example, whether a decision to decline information deserves respect as an exercise of autonomy. The paper argues for the conscientious concept of professional responsibility and an affirmative answer to the question whether to operate.

The Clinical Ethicist as Activist

Christopher Meyers, Kegley Institute of Ethics, CSU Bakersfield (Emeritus)

Topics: Health Ethics (including Biomedical); Professionalism

“Major problems in medicine are also problems of society; the health system is so intimately tied to the broader society that attempts to study one without the other are misleading. … Too narrow an analysis not only overlooks the dynamics that create and reinforce specific problems but also obscures directions of meaningful reform” (Waitzken, 1983, 4, 7).

Waitzken’s reference to “problems of medicine” includes ethical problems. Yet the clinical ethics literature – and daily practice – is almost devoid of structural analyses. That absence can be partly explained through disagreement about the role of ethicists (Watson and Guidry-Grimes, 2018; Rasmussen, 2012), practitioners’ worry that they lack the relevant political skills, and their fear about how activism will impact their institutional standing. The result, however, is that because causal structures are not addressed, clinical ethics problems repeatedly recur.

Clinical ethicists should, I argue, overcome this reluctance. Granting abundant qualifiers, clinical ethicists should be much more aggressive activists, certainly at the institutional level and sometimes at the social. That is, they should, first, give due attention to how institutional and social structures engender routine clinical ethics problems and then engage in the political work necessary to amend those structures.

I start with examples of structural problems, showing their direct link to common clinical ethics cases. I then argue that clinical ethicists, because of their expertise in ethics advocacy (briefly defended) and their assumed organizational cachet, are well-situated to motivate institutional change. Further, ethicists’ repeated experiences with recurring ethics problems makes them especially knowledgeable about those problems’ connection to macro-level structures and thereby – maybe with the aid of better equipped political allies – well-suited to promote institutional and social change. I then consider some objections and close with a call to pick at least some fights.
Complications of Compromise on Conscience

Jason Eberl, Albert Gnaegi Center for Health Care Ethics, Saint Louis University

Topics: Health Ethics (including Biomedical)

This presentation will explicate and defend a compromise view concerning claims of conscientious refusal to provide morally contestable health care services. The basis for respecting such claims requires the adjudication of publicly defensible reasons articulated by providers, or a general consensus that such services are morally contestable on reasonable grounds. This presentation also elucidates various criteria by which degrees of moral complicity may be assessed, as well as operative distinctions within the concept of moral scandal, which subserve a nuanced analysis of typical compromise requirements of transparency, provision of information, and referral/transfer of care.

Panel Session

Room: Georgia 9

Chair: Barton Moffatt

The Ethical, Social and Legal Implications of Open-Source Intelligence Gathering

Barton Moffatt, Mississippi State University
David May, Mississippi State University
Mike Potter, Mississippi State University
Megan Stubbs-Richardson, Mississippi State University
Audrey Reid, Mississippi State University
William Bonduris, Mississippi State University
Dylan Smith, Mississippi State University
Shelby Gilbreath, Mississippi State University

Topics: Business Ethics; Law, Government, and Military Ethics; Media and Journalism; Social and Societal Ethics

This panel explores the emerging ethical questions that arise with the development of the modern surveillance economy and open-source intelligence gathering (OSI). The proper use of open-source information is one of the most important emerging ethical issues of our time. The implications for privacy in the internet era bear on everybody in this connected age. This panel will advance the debates surrounding the ethical, social and legal implication of OSI by exploring the role of local governments in protecting public data, an examining consent in this context and discussing how to deal with incidental research findings in this area.

Panel Session

Room: Atlanta 5

Chair: J Britt Holbrook

Justice in Engineering (Ethics) Education

J Britt Holbrook, New Jersey Institute of Technology
Elliot Douglas, University of Florida
Yvonne Lewis, National Center for African American Health Consciousness
Wenda Bauchspies, Michigan State University

Topics: Education; Research Ethics; Science, Technology, and Engineering (STEM); Social and Societal Ethics

This panel discusses the design of an engineering ethics class around the notion of social justice. We focus on the concept and practice of listening as a way of sensitizing engineering students to issues of
Social justice. We argue that focusing on social justice is more effective than focusing on engineer’s professional responsibilities, and that focusing on listening will help raise students’ sensitivity to social justice. Presenters will describe the role of ethics and social justice in engineering, the format and content of the class, and the planned approach to measure impact on students’ understanding of ethics. Each presenter will speak for 10 minutes, followed by open discussion with the audience. This session will be of interest to educators who seek to expand considerations of engineering ethics in their classes beyond normative approaches that focus on codes of ethics to broader considerations of social justice.

**12F**

**Room:** Georgia 3

**Chair:** Julia Pedroni

- **Is it time to re-think the RCR core competencies?**
  *Kathryn Partin, National Institutes of Health*
  *Kenneth Pimple, Formerly of Indiana University*
  **Topics:** Research Ethics

  A discussion of the need to revise the content of NIH-mandated RCR training and instruction.

- **Determining the boundary between research and non research and developing a framework for appropriate oversight**
  *Liza Dawson, Walter Reed Army Institute of Research*
  **Topics:** Health Ethics (including Biomedical); Moral Theory; Research Ethics

  The boundary of research and non-research activities is often unclear. Using a heuristic approach, I will focus on the desired outcomes regarding level and type of oversight of different activities, such as program evaluation, health policy evaluation, and quality improvement, and then work inductively towards governing principles. Because the level and type of oversight has implications for whether informed consent is required, this analysis brings up broader questions about the role of individual choice within the context of evidence based policy-making, and the role of privacy protections in a world dominated by widespread digital data collection. I will formulate an ethical framework to address these challenges in the context of oversight of research-like activities.

- **Trust Architecture in the Ethics of Research**
  *Lisa Rasmussen, University of North Carolina, Charlotte*
  **Topics:** Research Ethics

  New research methods challenge our current approach to ensuring the work was conducted ethically. In this presentation, I discuss “trust architecture” in research ethics, outlining the historical explanations for our current architecture, suggesting elements of any trust architecture, and using citizen science as a case study for how we could think about building new trust architectures.
Saturday, February 22nd

- Judges and Moderators Training
  Room: Georgia 2
  6:00 PM–7:00 PM

- Judges Room
  Room: Georgia 2
  7:00 PM–10:30 PM

- 1st Set of Ethics Bowl Matches
  7:10 PM–8:25 PM

- 2nd Set of Ethics Bowl Matches
  8:35 PM–9:50 PM

Sunday, February 23rd

- 3rd Set of Ethics Bowl Matches
  9:00 AM–10:15 AM

- 4th Set of Ethics Bowl Matches
  10:25 AM–11:40 AM

- Ladenson Drop-off
  11:15 AM–12:00 PM

- APPE IEB”sm Lunch Break
  11:45 AM–1:15 PM

- Ethics Bowl Quarter Finals
  2:30 PM–2:45 PM

- Ethics Bowl Semi Final Rounds
  4:00 PM–5:15 PM

- APPE IEB”sm Finals
  5:30 PM–6:45 PM

- APPE IEB”sm Reception
  7:00 PM–8:30 PM

Sponsored by Siemens Digital Industries Software

See Ethics Bowl Tab for complete information
Sessions By Topic

APPE & ASSOCIATION FOR PRACTICAL AND PROFESSIONAL ETHICS
Business Ethics

Thursday, February 20th

1C
1C
- Evolution and Control of Unethical Practices in Sales: a study of institutionalized bribery in developing country markets
  Irfan Ameer

Friday, February 21st

Breakfast w/ Author
- Global Development Ethics: A Critique of Global Capitalism
  Eddy Souffrant
- Breakfast with an Author: What You Should Know About Anti-Bribery Compliance
  Alexandra Wrage
- Toward a New (Old) Theory of Responsibility: Moving beyond Accountability
  Daryl Koehn
- Breakfast with an Author: The Perils of Partnership - Industry Influence, Institutional Integrity, and Public Health
  Jonathan Marks
- Breakfast with an Author: Professional Ethics - A Trust-Based Approach
  Terrence Kelly
  John Whetstone
- Light for the Dark Side: Ethics Cases for University Administrators
  John Whetstone

8:00 AM–9:30 AM

2F
- Cultivating an Ethics-Inclusive Mindset Through Role Play in Undergraduate Computer Science Courses
  Emma Logevall, Jason Borenstein, Amanda Meng, Benjamin Shapiro and Ellen Zegura

A Comparative Study of Personality Types Based on Personal Values of Engineering Undergraduates in an Ethics Course
Atma Sahu and Keerti Jain
- Teaching Ethics in a High School Summer Camp
  Pauline Mosley

10:00 AM–11:00 AM

3A
- What does institutional integrity mean these days?
  C.K. Gunsalus
- The Growth of Ethics Bowls - A Pedagogical Tool across Disciplines
  Lisa M Lee

3D
- Global Perspectives on Artificial Intelligence Ethics and Policy: Findings from a Review of International Documents
  Daniel Schiff, Kelly Laas, Jason Borenstein and Justin Biddle

11:15 AM–12:15 PM

4B
- Be Social. Do Good. Shifting the Goals of Ethics Education
  Douglas Adams

4D
- Ethical Concerns of Building VeriCrypt, an Autonomous News Analysis Platform on the Blockchain
  Tamara Zubatiy, Grant Nelson, Robert Park, Sofia Vizcarrondo, Sherry Huang and Amber Brandner

4F
- Forgiveness and Remembering
  Elaine Englehardt and Michael Pritchard

8:00 AM–9:30 AM
Friday, February 21st
1:45 PM–2:45 PM
Keynote Plenary
Capitol South
Keith Darcy

3:15 PM–4:15 PM
5A
Wrongful Enrichments and Limits of Offsetting Privilege
Joel Ballivian
Secrecy Supporting Equality: The Case of Pay Secrecy
Matthew Caulfield

5C
Ethics Infusion: Using Student Presentations to Connect Ethical Issues to Legal Case Problems, Apply Ethical Decision Making, Connect and Distinguish Legal and Ethical Standards, and Promote Ethical Discourse
Elizabeth Harvey

5D
Explaining vs. Responding to Ethical Failures in Leadership
Terry Price

5H
Consensus and Dissent in the Challenger Disaster
Kristin Schaupp

4:30 PM–5:30 PM
6A
Effectiveness of ethics instruction in the accounting and business curriculum
William Black and Barbara White
ethical deliberation for business
Catalina Gonzalez and Juny Montoya

Saturday, February 22nd
8:00 AM–9:00 AM
7A
An effective altruist approach to corporate social responsibility
Carson Young
Strategic Volunteerism and Philanthropy: The Ethical Answer
Kathleen Wilburn and Ralph Wilburn

7C
Trading in our lederhosen for kilts: what happens when bio-geographical ancestry information is used to co-opt culture
Adriane Leithauser, Brian Steverson and Tyler Wasson

9:30 AM–10:30 AM
8A
An Ethical Framework for the Nonprofit Sector
Erwin de Leon and Sameer Ladha
Ethical and Leadership Challenges by Organizational Culture Type
Daryl Koehn

8C
Pathways to Professional Social Responsibility: The Development of Personal and Professional Values in Undergraduates
Daniel Schiff, Emma Logevall, Jason Borenstein, Wendy Newstetter, Colin Potts and Ellen Zegura

8E
Can Professionals Be Moral Exemplars?: Integrating Exemplar Methodology into Professional Ethics
Brett Beasley
Session abstracts can be found on the online program: https://easychair.org/smart-program/2020APPEAIC/

Saturday, February 22nd (continued) 9:30 AM–10:30 AM
- **8F**
  - The Perils of Partnership: Industry Influence, Institutional Integrity, and Public Health
  - Jonathan Marks

10:45 AM–11:45 AM
- **9A**
  - A practice-based strategic framework for MNCs to control prevailing bribery practices in developing countries
  - Irfan Ameer
  - A Learning Zeitgeist: Learning Methodology Through Technology, Art, and Philosophy
  - Thomas Creely and Isabel Lopes

- **9D**
  - Is It Ever Ethical for an Organization to Pressure Its Professionals to Violate Their Professions’ Ethical Minimums?
  - David Ozar

1:15 PM–2:15 PM
- **10A**
  - Learning on the Road: Studying Professional Responsibility and Ethics Abroad
  - Kathryn Rybka and Gretchen Winter

- **10D**
  - Come to the Movies: Teaching Moral Rationalization through Film
  - Brad Agle

- **10E**
  - The Toolbox approach: A flexible model of professional education
  - Stephanie Cargill

- **10G**
  - Engineering Consent with Ag-Gag Laws—Oh, the Humanity!
  - Justin Simpson

10H
- **Georgia 7**
  - Professional Ethics: A Trust-Based Approach (Lexington Books, 2018)
  - Terrence Kelly

Education

Thursday, February 20th 3:30 PM–4:30 PM
- **1F**
  - An Instinct for Truth: Curiosity and the Moral Character of Science
  - Robert Pennock

Friday, February 21st 7:00 AM–7:55 AM
- **Breakfast w/ Author**
  - Georgia 2
  - John Whetstone
  - Light for the Dark Side: Ethics Cases for University Administrators
  - John Whetstone

- **2B**
  - Assessing Ethics Education
  - J Britt Holbrook, Michael Hoffmann, Chet McLeskey and Michael O’Rourke
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Friday, February 21st (continued)

8:00 AM–9:30 AM

2F

Cultivating an Ethics-Inclusive Mindset Through Role Play in Undergraduate Computer Science Courses
Emma Logevall, Jason Borenstein, Amanda Meng, Benjamin Shapiro and Ellen Zegura

A Comparative Study of Personality Types Based on Personal Values of Engineering Undergraduates in an Ethics Course
Atma Sahu and Keerti Jain

9:30 AM–10:00 AM

2G

Responsible Conduct of Research Education Panel
Jun Fudano, Sophia Jui-An Pan and Kathy Partin

10:00 AM–11:00 AM

3A

What does institutional integrity mean these days?
C.K. Gunsalus

The Growth of Ethics Bowls-- A Pedagogical Tool across Disciplines
Lisa M Lee

11:15 AM–12:15 PM

4B

Teaching Ethical Awareness, Analysis, and Action to Healthcare Leaders: The Methodology of the Aspen Ethical Leadership Program
Ira Bedzow

Be Social. Do Good. Shifting the Goals of Ethics Education
Douglas Adams

12:15 PM–1:15 PM

4F

Forgiveness and Remembering
Elaine Englehardt and Michael Pritchard

1:15 PM–2:15 PM

5C

Ethics Infusion: Using Student Presentations to Connect Ethical Issues to Legal Case Problems, Apply Ethical Decision Making, Connect and Distinguish Legal and Ethical Standards, and Promote Ethical Discourse
Elizabeth Harvey

Teaching Professional Ethics Using Learning Projects. What Do Students Learn?
Juny Montoya

2:15 PM–3:15 PM

5G

A Sense of Ethics Ownership: Graduate Student Perceptions of Ethics at a Research Institution
Jonathan Beever, Stephen Kuebler and Joel Gonzalez

3:15 PM–4:15 PM

5H

Promoting Professional Socialization: A Synthesis of Durkheim, Kohlberg, Hoffman, and Haidt for Professional Ethics Education
Dayoung Kim

5I

Is it us, or is it them? Problems of Ineffective Philosophizing About Abortion
Nathan Nobis

4:30 PM–5:30 PM

6A

Effectiveness of ethics instruction in the accounting and business curriculum
William Black and Barbara White

6C

Text recycling (AKA “self-plagiarism”): Findings from the Text Recycling Research Project and implications for research practice
Cary Moskovitz, Michael Pemberton, Ian Anson and Chris Anson
Session abstracts can be found on the online program: https://easychair.org/smart-program/2020APPEAIC/

Friday, February 21st (continued)  6:45 PM–7:45 PM

Poster Capitol North and Center
- Moral Instruction for Children in a Day-Camp Setting
  Ted Bitner and Haley Thompson
- The Digital Veil of Ignorance: Video Games as Interactive Thought Experiments.
  Nicholas Smetzer
- The Period Project at SMU
  Marie Joung

Saturday, February 22nd  8:00 AM–9:00 AM

7F Georgia 3
- Evaluation of Teaching and Learning in an RCR Course for Biomedical Postdoctoral Fellows
  Elizabeth Heitman, Marie Joung and Stuart Ravnik

9A Atlanta 1
- A Learning Zeitgeist: Learning Methodology Through Technology, Art, and Philosophy
  Thomas Creely and Isabel Lopes

9C Atlanta 3
- Picking College Students Brains About Ethical & Societal Issues of Technology
  Raquel Diaz-Sprague and Alan Sprague
- The Reflect! platform: Teaching people to cope with ethical challenges of wicked problems and to develop consensus on fundamental disagreements
  Michael Hoffmann

8C Atlanta 3
- Pathways to Professional Social Responsibility: The Development of Personal and Professional Values in Undergraduates
  Daniel Schiff, Emma Logevall, Jason Borenstein, Wendy Newstetter, Colin Potts and Ellen Zegura
- No Tinker-ing Around: Student Protest and Disruption in Higher Education
  Timothy Shiell

9D Georgia 11
- Is It Ever Ethical for an Organization to Pressure Its Professionals to Violate Their Professions' Ethical Minimums?
  David Ozar

9G Georgia 5
- Cultivating Foundations for Responsible Innovation
  Mark Bourgeois

9I Georgia 3
- Balancing Paternalism and Empowerment in Sexual Misconduct Cases
  Cynthia Jones and Florence Nocar

1:15 PM–2:15 PM

10C Atlanta 3
- National Ethics Project Informational Meeting
  Deni Elliott and Maggie Schein

10D Atlanta 5
- Come to the Movies: Teaching Moral Rationalization through Film
  Brad Agle
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Time</th>
<th>Session</th>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Topic</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| 10E          | Georgia 11 | 10:45 AM–11:45 AM | The Toolbox approach: A flexible model of professional education  
Stephanie Cargill |
| 10H          | Georgia 7  | 10:45 AM–11:45 AM | Professional Ethics: A Trust-Based Approach  
Terrence Kelly |
| 11A          | Atlanta 5   | 2:30 PM–3:30 PM | An Empirical Review of Ethical Decision-Making  
Lora Lopez, Ralph Ferguson and Lisa James |
| 11B          | Georgia 9   | 2:30 PM–3:30 PM | NHSEB, 7 Years Later: The State and Future of High School Ethics Bowl in the U.S.  
Alex Richardson and Steve Swartzler |
| 12E          | Atlanta 5   | 4:00 PM–5:30 PM | Justice in Engineering (Ethics) Education  
J Britt Holbrook, Elliot Douglas, Yvonne Lewis and Wenda Bauchspies |
| 1C           | Georgia 3   | 7:00 AM–7:55 AM | Would it Be Ethical to Delegate Human Caring Practices to Robots?  
Lukas Chandler |
| 2A           | Atlanta 1   | 8:00 AM–9:30 AM | Ethical Principles Involved in Implementation of the MOLST/POST Paradigm  
Pamela Teaster and Al Giwa |
| 3A           | Georgia 5   | 10:00 AM–11:00 AM | What does institutional integrity mean these days?  
C.K. Gunsalus |
| 3F           | Georgia 5   | 10:00 AM–11:00 AM | Propaganda and Vaccine Refusal in the “Post-Truth” Era  
Lisa Fuller |
**Friday, February 21st**

- **3H**
  - Georgia 12
  - **Unmasking Ethical Issues of the Opioid Epidemic**
  - Greg Pence, Andrew Morgan, Jason Gray and Daniel Hurst

  **11:15 AM**

- **4A**
  - Atlanta 1
  - **Substance Use and Abuse: Ethical Issues in Dentistry**
  - Nanette Elster

- **4B**
  - Georgia 11
  - **Teaching Ethical Awareness, Analysis, and Action to Healthcare Leaders: The Methodology of the Aspen Ethical Leadership Program**
  - Ira Bedzow

- **4E**
  - Georgia 7
  - **False Hope and the Rationality of Hope**
  - Katherine Johnson

- **5B**
  - Georgia 11
  - **On Ethical Challenges of Discontinuation Trials for Management of Chronic Illnesses**
  - Barry DeCoster, Courtney Reilly and Patrick Meek

- **5I**
  - Georgia 6
  - **Is it us, or is it them? Problems of Ineffective Philosophizing About Abortion**
  - Nathan Nobis

  **4:30 PM–5:30 PM**

- **6B**
  - Georgia 11
  - **Motivational Interviewing and Shared Decision Making: A Link to Enhanced Health Literacy?**
  - Lukas Chandler

- **6H**
  - Georgia 9
  - **Lives Worth Living: The Ethics of Disability and Well-Being**
  - Audra Goodnight

**Saturday, February 22nd**

- **7B**
  - Georgia 9
  - **Complicity, Collective Responsibility and Expressivist Concerns in Biomedical and Environmental Ethics**
  - Julia Pedroni

  **4:30 PM–5:30 PM**

- **7D**
  - Georgia 11
  - **Dignity and Epistemic Injustice in Health Care Contexts**
  - Derek Estes
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Time</th>
<th>Topic</th>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Title</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>9:30 AM–10:30 AM</td>
<td>8A</td>
<td>Atlanta 1</td>
<td>An Ethical Framework for the Nonprofit Sector</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><em>Erwin de Leon and Sameer Ladha</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>8B</td>
<td>Georgia 9</td>
<td>Substance Use Disorder and Decision-Making Capacity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><em>Jason Chen</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>8F</td>
<td>Georgia 12</td>
<td>What Everyone Should Know About Neuroscience, Neuroethics, and the Brain ...</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>and Why</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><em>Stephanie Bird</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>8I</td>
<td>Georgia 11</td>
<td>The Perils of Partnership: Industry Influence, Institutional Integrity, and Public Health</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><em>Jonathan Marks</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10:45 AM–11:45 AM</td>
<td>9A</td>
<td>Georgia 9</td>
<td>Public-Private Partnerships: Mitigating the Risks</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><em>Diana Yassanye and Leonard Ortmann</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>9B</td>
<td>Georgia 11</td>
<td>Against Conception in the Abortion Debate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><em>Matt Stolick</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10:45 AM–11:45 AM</td>
<td>9C</td>
<td>Georgia 11</td>
<td>Is It Ever Ethical for an Organization to Pressure Its Professionals to Violate Their Professions’ Ethical Minimums?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><em>David Ozar</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><em>Augustine Yaw Frimpong-Mansoh</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>10D</td>
<td>Atlanta 5</td>
<td>The curious case of DCIS: How much diagnosis can we live with?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><em>Vassiliki Leontis</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2:30 PM–3:30 PM</td>
<td>11E</td>
<td>Atlanta 1</td>
<td>Child Animal Cruelty?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><em>Walter Riker</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4:00 PM–5:30 PM</td>
<td>12C</td>
<td>Atlanta 3</td>
<td>Professional Responsibility in a Case of Noninformed Consent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><em>Daniel Wueste</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>12C</td>
<td>Georgia 5</td>
<td>The Clinical Ethicist as Activist</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><em>Christopher Meyers</em></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Law, Government, and Military Ethics

Saturday, February 22nd 2:30 PM–3:30 PM
12F Georgia 3
Complications of Compromise on Conscience
Jason Eberl

Determining the boundary between research and non research and developing a framework for appropriate oversight
Liza Dawson

10:00 AM–11:00 AM

1B
The Neglect of Right Intention
Kevin Cutright

Saturday, February 22nd (continued) 2:30 PM–3:30 PM
3B Georgia 11
The Checks and Balances of Retribution and Deterrence
Matthew Altman
The Ethics of Uncivil Obedience
Peter Barry

Thursday, February 20th 3:30 PM–4:30 PM
1A Atlanta 4
Hippocratic Paradox: Co-evolution of Medical Ethics, Health Law, and Social Practice
Junying Zhao and Donald G. Saari

1D Atlanta 3
Public Administrator Self-Censorship: An Ethical Analysis
James Szymalak

Agents of Administrative Law: Illicit or Virtuous?
Thomas Pearson

3B
The Paradox of State Sovereignty: A Call for Revision
Eric Scarffe

Thursday, February 20th 3:30 PM–4:30 PM
3D Georgia 9
GLOBAL PERSPECTIVES ON ARTIFICIAL INTELLIGENCE ETHICS AND POLICY: FINDINGS FROM A REVIEW OF INTERNATIONAL DOCUMENTS
Daniel Schiff, Kelly Laas, Jason Borenstein and Justin Biddle

3E Georgia 3
A Climate of Justice: A Necessary Condition for a Viable Future
Marvin Brown
Climate Legacy: A New(ish) Concept for the Climate Crisis
Rachel Fredericks

Friday, February 21st 7:00 AM–7:55 AM
Breakfast w/ Author Georgia 2
Global Development Ethics: A Critique of Global Capitalism
Eddy Souffrant

2C Atlanta 3
Autonomous Weapon Systems and the Claims-Rights of Innocents on the Battlefield
Hunter Cantrell
Environmental Protection and Armed Conflicts: Greening the Principles of Military Necessity and Humanity
Mark Woods

3B
The Checks and Balances of Retribution and Deterrence
Matthew Altman
The Ethics of Uncivil Obedience
Peter Barry

Friday, February 21st 7:00 AM–7:55 AM
4C Atlanta 3
Jewish Ethics Regarding Refugees
Tsuriel Rashi

8:00 AM–9:30 AM

11:15 AM–12:15 PM

5C
Ethics Infusion: Using Student Presentations to Connect Ethical Issues to Legal Case Problems, Apply Ethical Decision Making, Connect and Distinguish Legal and Ethical Standards, and Promote Ethical Discourse
Elizabeth Harvey
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### Friday, February 21st (continued)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>3:15 PM–4:15 PM</th>
<th>Atlanta 5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>5D</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| - Sexual Misconduct and Forgiveness  
  Eugene Schlossberger |           |
| - Explaining vs. Responding to Ethical Failures in Leadership  
  Terry Price |           |
| **5I**          | Georgia 6 |
| - Ectogenesis and the Ethics of Abortion  
  Joseph Spino and Jana McAuliffe |           |

### 4:30 PM–5:30 PM

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Atlanta 5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>6D</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| - Just Returning the Favor: Exploring Connections between Immigration Justice and Emigration History between Colombians and Venezuelans  
  Allison Wolf |           |
| - Silencing the Whistleblower: Ag-Gag Laws in Animal Agriculture  
  Donna Yarri |           |

### 6:45 PM–7:45 PM

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Capitol North and Center</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Poster</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| - The Moral Permissibility of Nudges  
  Valerie Joly Chock |           |
| - Representing “Unaccompanied Alien Children”  
  Julietta Rivera and Cynthia Jones |           |

### Saturday, February 22nd

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>8:00 AM–9:00 AM</th>
<th>Atlanta 5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>7E</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| - A Brief (Philosophical) History of Protest  
  Jennifer Kling |           |
| **7H**          | Georgia 12 |
| - Electronic Warfare and Special Technical Operations Capabilities: An Anticipatory Ethical Analysis  
  Richard Wilson, Michele C.A. Iltimie and Ion A. Iltimie |           |

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>9:30 AM–10:30 AM</th>
<th>Atlanta 3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>8C</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| - No Tinker-ing Around: Student Protest and Disruption in Higher Education  
  Timothy Shiell |           |
| **8F**          | Georgia 12 |
| - The Perils of Partnership: Industry Influence, Institutional Integrity, and Public Health  
  Jonathan Marks |           |
| **8I**          | Georgia 11 |
| - Against Conception in the Abortion Debate  
  Matt Stolick |           |

### 10:45 AM–11:45 AM

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Georgia 9</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>9B</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| - Public-Private Partnerships: Mitigating the Risks  
  Diana Yassanye and Leonard Ortmann |           |
| **9D**    | Georgia 11 |
| - Is It Ever Ethical for an Organization to Pressure Its Professionals to Violate Their Professions’ Ethical Minimums?  
  David Ozar |           |
| **9F**    | Georgia 7 |
| - War Refugees: Risk, Justice, and Moral Responsibility  
  Jennifer Kling, Peter B. Barry - Critic, Andrew Hill - Critic and Steven Swartzer |           |
| **9H**    | Georgia 12 |
| - Artificial Intelligence and Racial Injustice: A Case Study on Algorithms in Criminal Sentencing  
  Justin Biddle |           |

### 1:15 PM–2:15 PM

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Atlanta 5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>10D</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| - Come to the Movies: Teaching Moral Rationalization through Film  
  Brad Agle |           |
### Saturday, February 22nd (continued)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Time</th>
<th>Room</th>
<th>Topic</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1:15 PM–2:15 PM</td>
<td>10G</td>
<td>A Kantian Approach to Dilemmas: Solving the Trolley Problem</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Ava Wright</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Engineering Consent with Ag-Gag Laws—Oh, the Humanity!</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Justin Simpson</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2:30 PM–3:30 PM</td>
<td>11C</td>
<td>An Attempt at Categorizing the Fake-Threat</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Bastiaan Vanacker</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4:00 PM–5:30 PM</td>
<td>12D</td>
<td>The Ethical, Social and Legal Implications of Open-Source Intelligence Gathering</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Barton Moffatt, David May, Mike Potter,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Megan Stubbs-Richardson, Audrey Reid, William Bonduris, Dylan Smith</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>and Shelby Gilbreath</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11:15 AM–12:15 PM</td>
<td>3C</td>
<td>Should Perspective be Shared: Journalists, Opinion and Social Media</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Luke Cross</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>“Any conduct which threatens the security:”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Applying Millian Security Principles to guide ethical coverage of dissent, protest, and civil disobedience.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Philip Todd</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Media and Journalism

**Friday, February 21st**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Time</th>
<th>Room</th>
<th>Topic</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>8:00 AM–9:30 AM</td>
<td>2D</td>
<td>Normalizing the Aberrant: Responsible Journalism in a Hyper-Partisan Era</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Stephanie Craft, Christopher Meyers, Patrick Plaisance, Ryan Thomas</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>and Ed Wasserman</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10:00 AM–11:00 AM</td>
<td>3A</td>
<td>The Growth of Ethics Bowls-- A Pedagogical Tool across Disciplines</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Lisa M Lee</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Saturday, February 22nd**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Time</th>
<th>Room</th>
<th>Topic</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>10:45 AM–11:45 AM</td>
<td>9D</td>
<td>Is It Ever Ethical for an Organization to Pressure Its Professionals to Violate Their Professions’ Ethical Minimums?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>David Ozar</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1:15 PM–2:15 PM</td>
<td>10D</td>
<td>Come to the Movies: Teaching Moral Rationalization through Film</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Brad Agle</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Saturday, February 22nd (continued) 1:15 PM–2:15 PM

10I
- Crowdsourcing as a Tool for Research: Ethical, Political, and Methodological Considerations
  Qin Zhu, Hanzelle Kleeman and Stevie Rea

2:30 PM–3:30 PM

11C
- An Attempt at Categorizing the Fake-Threat
  Bastiaan Vanacker
- Cyber Security, Information Deception, and Fake News Security in the Cyber World: An Anticipatory Ethical Analysis
  Richard Wilson and Alfred Guy

4:00 PM–5:30 PM

12D
- The Ethical, Social and Legal Implications of Open-Source Intelligence Gathering
  Barton Moffatt, David May, Mike Potter, Megan Stubbs-Richardson, Audrey Reid, William Bonduris, Dylan Smith and Shelby Gilbreath

Moral Theory

Thursday, February 20th
3:30 PM–4:30 PM

1C
- Would it Be Ethical to Delegate Human Caring Practices to Robots?
  Lukas Chandler

1E
- The Ethics of Forgiveness
  Gregory Bock, Chad Bogosian and Joshue Orozco

Friday, February 21st
7:00 AM–7:55 AM

Breakfast w/ Author
- Toward a New (Old) Theory of Responsibility: Moving beyond Accountability
  Daryl Koehn

8:00 AM–9:30 AM

2A
- Ageism, Autonomy and Dementia: Person-Centered Care Reconsidered
  Susan Kennedy

2C
- The Neglect of Right Intention
  Kevin Cutright

10:00 AM–11:00 AM

3B
- The Checks and Balances of Retribution and Deterrence
  Matthew Altman
- The Ethics of Uncivil Obedience
  Peter Barry

3F
- The Meta Virtue of Integrity, Civility, and the Barmen Declaration
  Annalee R. Ward and Mary K. Bryant

3G
- Author Meets the Critics: Parents and Virtues: An Analysis of Moral Development and Parental Virtue
  Sonya Charles

11:15 AM–12:15 PM

4E
- Understanding Joseph Butler’s Sermons on Resentment and Forgiveness
  Gregory Bock
- False Hope and the Rationality of Hope
  Katherine Johnson
Friday, February 21st (continued) 11:15 AM–12:15 PM
4F
- Taking Offense: Norms for Individuals and Communities
  Abigail Bruxvoort
- Forgiveness and Remembering
  Elaine Englehardt and Michael Pritchard

4G
- On the moral permissibility of testing for animal pain
  Jessica Mejia

3:15 PM–4:15 PM
5A
- Wrongful Enrichments and Limits of Offsetting Privilege
  Joel Ballivian

5D
- Sexual Misconduct and Forgiveness
  Eugene Schlossberger
- Explaining vs. Responding to Ethical Failures in Leadership
  Terry Price

5F
- Some Thoughts On A Confucian Professional Ethics
  Mark Dixon
- Not All Who Ponder Count Costs: Arithmetic Reflection Predicts Utilitarian Tendencies, but Logical Reflection Predicts both Deontological and Utilitarian Tendencies
  Nick Byrd and Paul Conway

5H
- Promoting Professional Socialization: A Synthesis of Durkheim, Kohlberg, Hoffman, and Haidt for Professional Ethics Education
  Dayoung Kim

4:30 PM–5:30 PM
6D
- Just Returning the Favor: Exploring Connections between Immigration Justice and Emigration History between Colombians and Venezuelans
  Allison Wolf

6F
- Embedding Ethics into Humanoid Robots: Philosophical Underpinnings
  Jason Borenstein, Alan Wagner and Ronald Arkin

6G
- Essentialism, the Human Being, and the Implication for Abortion
  Cole James
- Living with Dementia as an Affront to Dignity
  Samuel Kerstein

6H
- Lives Worth Living: The Ethics of Disability and Well-Being
  Audra Goodnight

6:45 PM–7:45 PM
Poster
- Bananas, Beliefs and The Being
  Margaret Schneider
- Moral Instruction for Children in a Day-Camp Setting
  Ted Bitner and Haley Thompson
- The Digital Veil of Ignorance: Video Games as Interactive Thought Experiments.
  Nicholas Smetzer
- Alphas and Betas: An Exploration of Moral Membership Within the False Dichotomy of Humans and Non-Humans
  Tommy Santilippo

Topic
Saturday, February 22nd

8:00 AM–9:00 AM

7B
Finding Yourself: Epistemic Injustice & Medical Feedback in Adolescence
H. Bondurant

7D
Psychic Health: Practical Identities and the Constitutional Model of the Self
Jason Skirry

Dignity and Epistemic Injustice in Health Care Contexts
Derek Estes

7E
Sustainable Development as a Social Commitment: Deriving a Rights-based Argument from Amartya Sen
Kazi Huda

7G
How to talk about Artificial Intelligence?
Elisabeth Hildt

Does Nonhuman Agent have Free Will?
Pujarini Das

7I
Philosophy as Fiction: Two Case Studies
Michael Boylan, Deborah Mower and Lisa Kretz

8A
Ethical and Leadership Challenges by Organizational Culture Type
Daryl Koehn

8D
Showing how property rights are (un)justified
Andrew Cohen, Clark Wolf and Peter Lindsay

8E
Can Professionals Be Moral Exemplars?: Integrating Exemplar Methodology into Professional Ethics
Brett Beasley

8F
The Perils of Partnership: Industry Influence, Institutional Integrity, and Public Health
Jonathan Marks

8I
Against Conception in the Abortion Debate
Matt Stolick

The Feminized, Sex, and Genuine Consent
Lillian Perkins

10:45 AM–11:45 AM

9C
Picking College Students Brains About Ethical & Societal Issues of Technology
Raquel Diaz-Sprague and Alan Sprague

9E
Punishing Treatment(s)
Elizabeth Rhodes

I’ve Heard This Joke Before...Am I Going to Hell?
Connor Kianpour

9F
War Refugees: Risk, Justice, and Moral Responsibility
Jennifer Kling, Peter B. Barry - Critic, Andrew Hill - Critic and Steven Swartzer

9I
Epistemic Refusal after Sexual Violence
Sarah Miller
Saturday, February 22nd (continued) 1:15 PM–2:15 PM

10C
Atlanta 3
- National Ethics Project Informational Meeting
  Deni Elliott and Maggie Schein

10D
Atlanta 5
- Come to the Movies: Teaching Moral Rationalization through Film
  Brad Agle

10F
Georgia 3
- Harmful Sports: Nonparticipants’ Obligations
  Earl Spurgin

10G
Georgia 5
- A Kantian Approach to Dilemmas: Solving the Trolley Problem
  Ava Wright
- Engineering Consent with Ag-Gag Laws—Oh, the Humanity!
  Justin Simpson

2:30 PM–3:30 PM

11B
Georgia 9
- NHSEB, 7 Years Later: The State and Future of High School Ethics Bowl in the U.S.
  Alex Richardson and Steve Swartzer

11E
Atlanta 1
- Humanity’s Inescapable Gaze in the Digital Age: Do Animals Have a Right to Privacy?
  Joel MacClellan

11F
Georgia 3
- A State of Hypocrisy: Paid Parental Leave in the United States
  Parker Rose

11G
Georgia 5
- On the Lexical Superiority Response to the Repugnant Conclusion: An Essay in Population Ethics
  Leonard Kahn

Professionalism

Thursday, February 20th
3:30 PM–4:30 PM

1D
Atlanta 3
- Public Administrator Self-Censorship: An Ethical Analysis
  James Szymalak

1F
Georgia 5
- An Instinct for Truth: Curiosity and the Moral Character of Science
  Robert Pennock

Friday, February 21st
7:00 AM–7:55 AM

Breakfast w/ Author
Georgia 2
  John Whetstone

3A
Atlanta 1
- What does institutional integrity mean these days?
  C.K. Gunsalus
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Time</th>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Topic</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>10:00 AM–11:00 AM</td>
<td>3B</td>
<td>The Growth of Ethics Bowls—A Pedagogical Tool across Disciplines</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Lisa M Lee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4A</td>
<td>The Ethics of Uncivil Obedience</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Peter Barry</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11:15 AM–12:15 PM</td>
<td>4A</td>
<td>Substance Use and Abuse: Ethical Issues in Dentistry</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Nanette Elster</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4B</td>
<td>Teaching Ethical Awareness, Analysis, and Action to Healthcare Leaders: The Methodology of the Aspen Ethical Leadership Program</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Ira Bedzow</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3:15 PM–4:15 PM</td>
<td>4F</td>
<td>Forgiveness and Remembering</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Elaine Englehardt and Michael Pritchard</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4:30 PM–5:30 PM</td>
<td>6A</td>
<td>Effectiveness of ethics instruction in the accounting and business curriculum</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>William Black and Barbara White</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9:00 AM–10:00 AM</td>
<td>8A</td>
<td>An Ethical Framework for the Nonprofit Sector</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Erwin de Leon and Sameer Ladha</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9:30 AM–10:30 AM</td>
<td>8B</td>
<td>What Everyone Should Know About Neuroscience, Neuroethics, and the Brain ... and Why</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Stephanie Bird</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10:45 AM–11:45 AM</td>
<td>8E</td>
<td>Aiming for Wisdom in Professional Ethics</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Zack Loveless</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11:15 AM–12:15 PM</td>
<td>8F</td>
<td>Can Professionals Be Moral Exemplars?: Integrating Exemplar Methodology into Professional Ethics</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Brett Beasley</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10:45 AM–11:45 AM</td>
<td>8G</td>
<td>The Perils of Partnership: Industry Influence, Institutional Integrity, and Public Health</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Jonathan Marks</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8:00 AM–9:00 AM</td>
<td>7E</td>
<td>Sustainable Development as a Social Commitment: Deriving a Rights-based Argument from Amartya Sen</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Kazi Huda</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8:00 AM–9:00 AM</td>
<td>9E</td>
<td>Sustainable Development as a Social Commitment: Deriving a Rights-based Argument from Amartya Sen</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Kazi Huda</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8:00 AM–9:00 AM</td>
<td>9D</td>
<td>Japanese animal ethics as a kind of relational ethics</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Tetsuji Iseda</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Saturday, February 22nd
10:45 AM–11:45 AM
- Is It Ever Ethical for an Organization to Pressure Its Professionals to Violate Their Professions' Ethical Minimums?
  David Ozar
1:15 PM–2:15 PM
- Come to the Movies: Teaching Moral Rationalization through Film
  Brad Agle

10D
- The Toolbox approach: A flexible model of professional education
  Stephanie Cargill
- “By root or by (muddy) branch”: Patterns of Ethics Learning then Teaching among Faculty
  Sara Jordan, Sam Snyder, Thomas Staley, Stephen Biscotte and Diana Bairaktarova

10E
- The Toolbox approach: A flexible model of professional education
  Stephanie Cargill
- Professional Ethics: A Trust-Based Approach
  Terrence Kelly

10H
- Professional Ethics: A Trust-Based Approach (Lexington Books, 2018)
  Terrence Kelly

11D
- Panel, Mission Imperatives: Thinking Through What College Mission Requires of Faculty
  Christopher Arroyo, Anne Ozar and Timothy Weidel

12C
- Professional Responsibility in a Case of Noninformed Consent
  Daniel Wueste
- The Clinical Ethicist as Activist
  Christopher Meyers
Friday, February 21st (continued) 11:15 AM–12:15 PM

4B Georgia 11

Be Social. Do Good. Shifting the Goals of Ethics Education
Douglas Adams

4G Georgia 3

What if germs were people? Ethics, human subjects research, and the social sciences
Trisha Phillips

On the moral permissibility of testing for animal pain
Jessica Mejia

3:15 PM–4:15 PM

5B Georgia 11

On Ethical Challenges of Discontinuation Trials for Management of Chronic Illnesses
Barry DeCoster, Courtney Reilly and Patrick Meek

5G Georgia 5

A Sense of Ethics Ownership: Graduate Student Perceptions of Ethics at a Research Institution
Jonathan Beever, Stephen Kuebler and Joel Gonzalez

5J Georgia 7

Special NSF Session

4:30 PM–5:30 PM

6C Atlanta 3

Text recycling (AKA “self-plagiarism”): Findings from the Text Recycling Research Project and implications for research practice
Cary Moskovitz, Michael Pemberton, Ian Anson and Chris Anson

Saturday, February 22nd 8:00 AM–9:00 AM

7F Georgia 3

Evaluation of Teaching and Learning in an RCR Course for Biomedical Postdoctoral Fellows
Elizabeth Heitman, Marie Joung and Stuart Ravnik

9:30 AM–10:30 AM

8F Georgia 12

The Perils of Partnership: Industry Influence, Institutional Integrity, and Public Health
Jonathan Marks

8G Georgia 5

Doing Better with Data: Data Driven Quality Improvement for Research Administration/Compliance
John Baumann

Deliberative sessions on the protection of research misconduct whistleblowers
Allan Loup, Laura Carlson, Cindy Bergeman and John Lubker

10:45 AM–11:45 AM

9D Georgia 11

Is It Ever Ethical for an Organization to Pressure Its Professionals to Violate Their Professions’ Ethical Minimums?
David Ozar

9G Georgia 5

Clinical Research as Basic Structure & the Ethics of Health Research Priority-Setting
Danielle Wenner

Cultivating Foundations for Responsible Innovation
Mark Bourgeois
Session abstracts can be found on the online program: https://easychair.org/smart-program/2020APPEAIC/

Saturday, February 22nd (continued) 10:45 AM–11:45 AM

9H  Georgia 12
- Artificial Intelligence and Racial Injustice: A Case Study on Algorithms in Criminal Sentencing
  Justin Biddle

9J  Georgia 2
- Federal Funding Programs for Research Ethics
  Trisha Phillips

10D  Atlanta 5
- Come to the Movies: Teaching Moral Rationalization through Film
  Brad Agle

10E  Georgia 11
- The Toolbox approach: A flexible model of professional education
  Stephanie Cargill

10I  Georgia 7
- Crowdsourcing as a Tool for Research: Ethical, Political, and Methodological Considerations
  Qin Zhu, Hanzelle Kleeman and Stevie Rea

11A  Atlanta 5
- An Empirical Review of Ethical Decision-Making
  Lora Lopez, Ralph Ferguson and Lisa James

12E  Georgia 3
- Justice in Engineering (Ethics) Education
  J Britt Holbrook, Elliot Douglas, Yvonne Lewis and Wenda Bauchspies

12F  Georgia 3
- Is it time to re-think the RCR core competencies?
  Kathryn Partin and Kenneth Pimple

Determining the boundary between research and non research and developing a framework for appropriate oversight
Liza Dawson

Trust Architecture in the Ethics of Research
Lisa Rasmussen, George Banks and Bailey Davis

Science, Technology, and Engineering (STEM)

Thursday, February 20th 3:30 PM–4:30 PM

1A  Atlanta 4
- Hippocratic Paradox: Co-evolution of Medical Ethics, Health Law, and Social Practice
  Junying Zhao and Donald G. Saari

1B  Atlanta 1
- The Ethics of AI Enabled Machines: Forward into the Past
  Edward Queen

1F  Georgia 5
- Making the MQ-9 Fully Autonomous: An Anticipatory Ethical Analysis
  Richard Wilson and Todd Burkhardt

An Instinct for Truth: Curiosity and the Moral Character of Science
Robert Pennock

Friday, February 21st 7:00 AM–7:55 AM

Breakfast w/ Author  Georgia 2
- Breakfast with an Author: Ethical Issues in Aviation
  Elizabeth Hoppe

8:00 AM–9:30 AM

2B  Georgia 11
- Assessing Ethics Education
  J Britt Holbrook, Michael Hoffmann, Chet McLeskey and Michael O’Rourke
Cultivating an Ethics-Inclusive Mindset Through Role Play in Undergraduate Computer Science Courses

Emma Logevall, Jason Borenstein, Amanda Meng, Benjamin Shapiro and Ellen Zegura

A Comparative Study of Personality Types Based on Personal Values of Engineering Undergraduates in an Ethics Course

Atma Sahu and Keerti Jain

Teaching Ethics in a High School Summer Camp

Pauline Mosley

What does institutional integrity mean these days?

C.K. Gunsalus

The Growth of Ethics Bowls-- A Pedagogical Tool across Disciplines

Lisa M Lee

Global Perspectives on Artificial Intelligence Ethics and Policy: Findings from a Review of International Documents

Daniel Schiff, Kelly Laas, Jason Borenstein and Justin Biddle

Climate Legacy: A New(ish) Concept for the Climate Crisis

Rachel Fredericks

Ethical Issues in Aviation

Elizabeth Hoppe

Ethical Concerns of Building VeriCrypt, an Autonomous News Analysis Platform on the Blockchain

Tamara Zubatiy, Grant Nelson, Robert Park, Sofia Vizcarrondo, Sherry Huang and Amber Brandner

A Sense of Ethics Ownership: Graduate Student Perceptions of Ethics at a Research Institution

Jonathan Beever, Stephen Kuebler and Joel Gonzalez

Consensus and Dissent in the Challenger Disaster

Kristin Schaupp

Promoting Professional Socialization: A Synthesis of Durkheim, Kohlberg, Hoffman, and Haidt for Professional Ethics Education

Dayoung Kim

Text recycling (AKA “self-plagiarism”): Findings from the Text Recycling Research Project and implications for research practice

Cary Moskovitz, Michael Pemberton, Ian Anson and Chris Anson

The Ethics of Caring in Artificial Intelligence

Liz Stokes

Embedding Ethics into Humanoid Robots: Philosophical Underpinnings

Jason Borenstein, Alan Wagner and Ronald Arkin
Friday, February 21st (continued)

4:30 PM–5:30 PM

6I

Georgia 6

Communicating with Faculty about Students’ Ethical Concerns: Notes from an NSF Project
Kelly Laas, Christine Miller and Elisabeth Hildt

6:45 PM–7:45 PM

Poster

Capitol North and Center

The Digital Veil of Ignorance: Video Games as Interactive Thought Experiments.
Nicholas Smetzer

Saturday, February 22nd

8:00 AM–9:00 AM

7F

Georgia 3

Evaluation of Teaching and Learning in an RCR Course for Biomedical Postdoctoral Fellows
Elizabeth Heitman, Marie Joung and Stuart Ravnik

7G

Atlanta 3

How to talk about Artificial Intelligence?
Elisabeth Hildt

Does Nonhuman Agent have Free Will?
Pujarini Das

7H

Georgia 12

Electronic Warfare and Special Technical Operations Capabilities: An Anticipatory Ethical Analysis
Richard Wilson, Michele C.A. Iftimie and Ion A. Iftimie

9:30 AM–10:30 AM

8C

Atlanta 3

Pathways to Professional Social Responsibility: The Development of Personal and Professional Values in Undergraduates
Daniel Schiff, Emma Logevall, Jason Borenstein, Wendy Newstetter, Colin Potts and Ellen Zegura

8H

Georgia 3

Environmental Risks of Next Generation Biotechnology: Philosophical Considerations
Paul Thompson

Engineering and Justice: Developing the Political Aspect of Engineering Ethics
Glen Miller

10:45 AM–11:45 AM

9A

Atlanta 1

A Learning Zeitgeist: Learning Methodology Through Technology, Art, and Philosophy
Thomas Creely and Isabel Lopes

9C

Atlanta 3

Picking College Students Brains About Ethical & Societal Issues of Technology
Raquel Diaz-Sprague and Alan Sprague

9D

Georgia 11

Is It Ever Ethical for an Organization to Pressure Its Professionals to Violate Their Professions’ Ethical Minimums?
David Ozar

9G

Georgia 5

Cultivating Foundations for Responsible Innovation
Mark Bourgeois

9H

Georgia 12

Promoting ethical preparedness for upcoming innovative technological products via systematic ethical analysis
Ilana Kepten and Gila Yakov

9J

Georgia 2

Federal Funding Programs for Research Ethics
Trisha Phillips

1:15 PM–2:15 PM

10D

Atlanta 5

Come to the Movies: Teaching Moral Rationalization through Film
Brad Agle
Saturday, February 22nd
(continued) 1:15 PM–2:15 PM

**10E**
Georgia 11

“By root or by (muddy) branch”: Patterns of Ethics Learning then Teaching among Faculty
Sara Jordan, Sam Snyder, Thomas Staley, Stephen Biscotte and Diana Bairaktarova

**10I**
Georgia 7

Crowdsourcing as a Tool for Research: Ethical, Political, and Methodological Considerations
Qin Zhu, Hanzelle Kleeman and Stevie Rea

2:30 PM–3:30 PM

**11C**
Atlanta 3

An Attempt at Categorizing the Fake-Threat
Bastiaan Vanacker

**11E**
Atlanta 1

Humanity’s Inescapable Gaze in the Digital Age: Do Animals Have a Right to Privacy?
Joel MacClellan

**11F**
Georgia 3

Child-Robot Interaction, Well-Being, and Privacy
Yvette Pearson

**11H**
Georgia 11

The Boeing 737 Max: Lessons for Engineering Ethics
Joseph Herkert, Jason Borenstein and Keith Miller

4:00 PM–5:30 PM

**12E**
Atlanta 5

Justice in Engineering (Ethics) Education
J Britt Holbrook, Elliot Douglas, Yvonne Lewis and Wenda Bauchspies

Social and Societal Ethics

Thursday, February 20th 3:30 PM–4:30 PM

**1A**
Atlanta 4

The Ethics of Physician Non-Compete Clauses
Kristin Schaupp and Julia Kyle

**1B**
Atlanta 1

Making the MQ-9 Fully Autonomous: An Anticipatory Ethical Analysis
Richard Wilson and Todd Burkhardt

**1D**
Atlanta 3

AGENTS OF ADMINISTRATIVE LAW: ILLICIT OR VIRTUOUS?
Thomas Pearson

**1E**
Georgia 7

The Ethics of Forgiveness
Gregory Bock, Chad Bogosian and Joshue Orozco

Friday, February 21st 7:00 AM–7:55 AM

**Breakfast w/ Author**
Georgia 2

Global Development Ethics: A Critique of Global Capitalism
Eddy Souffrant

Toward a New (Old) Theory of Responsibility: Moving beyond Accountability
Daryl Koehn

Breakfast with an Author: War Refugees - Risk, Justice, and Moral Responsibility
Jen Kling

Parents and Virtues: An Analysis of Moral Development and Parental Virtue
Sonya Charles

The Philosophy of Forgiveness – Volume IV: Christian Perspectives on Forgiveness
Gregory Bock

The Philosophy of Forgiveness – Volume III: Forgiveness in World Religions
Gregory Bock
Friday, February 21st (continued)  8:00 AM–9:30 AM

2A  
Atlanta 1  
Ethical Principles Involved in Implementation of the MOLST/POST Paradigm  
Pamela Teaster and Al Giwa

2C  
Atlanta 3  
The Neglect of Right Intention  
Kevin Cutright

2F  
Georgia 5  
Cultivating an Ethics-Inclusive Mindset Through Role Play in Undergraduate Computer Science Courses  
Emma Logevall, Jason Borenstein, Amanda Meng, Benjamin Shapiro and Ellen Zegura

2F  
Georgia 5  
A Comparative Study of Personality Types Based on Personal Values of Engineering Undergraduates in an Ethics Course  
Atma Sahu and Keerti Jain

2F  
Georgia 5  
Teaching Ethics in a High School Summer Camp  
Pauline Mosley

10:00 AM–11:00 AM

3A  
Atlanta 1  
The Growth of Ethics Bowls-- A Pedagogical Tool across Disciplines  
Lisa M Lee

3B  
Georgia 11  
The Checks and Balances of Retribution and Deterrence  
Matthew Altman

3B  
Georgia 11  
The Ethics of Uncivil Obedience  
Peter Barry

3D  
Georgia 9  
Global Perspectives on Artificial Intelligence Ethics and Policy: Findings from a Review of International Documents  
Daniel Schiff, Kelly Laas, Jason Borenstein and Justin Biddle

3E  
Georgia 3  
A Climate of Justice: A Necessary Condition for a Viable Future  
Marvin Brown

3E  
Georgia 3  
Climate Legacy: A New(ish) Concept for the Climate Crisis  
Rachel Fredericks

3F  
Georgia 5  
Propaganda and Vaccine Refusal in the “Post-Truth” Era  
Lisa Fuller

3F  
Georgia 5  
The Meta Virtue of Integrity, Civility, and the Barmen Declaration  
Annalee R. Ward and Mary K. Bryant

10:00 AM–12:15 PM

3H  
Georgia 12  
Unmasking Ethical Issues of the Opioid Epidemic  
Greg Pence, Andrew Morgan, Jason Gray and Daniel Hurst

4B  
Georgia 11  
Be Social. Do Good. Shifting the Goals of Ethics Education  
Douglas Adams

4D  
Georgia 9  
Ethical Concerns of Building VeriCrypt, an Autonomous News Analysis Platform on the Blockchain  
Tamara Zubatiy, Grant Nelson, Robert Park, Sofia Vizcarondo, Sherry Huang and Amber Brandner

4F  
Georgia 5  
Taking Offense: Norms for Individuals and Communities  
Abigail Bruxvoort
Friday, February 21st (continued) 10:00 AM–12:15 PM

- Forgiveness and Remembering
  Elaine Englehardt and Michael Pritchard

3:15 PM–4:15 PM

5A

- Wrongful Enrichments and Limits of Offsetting Privilege
  Joel Ballivian

5D

- Explaining vs. Responding to Ethical Failures in Leadership
  Terry Price

5F

- Not All Who Ponder Count Costs: Arithmetic Reflection Predicts Utilitarian Tendencies, but Logical Reflection Predicts both Deontological and Utilitarian Tendencies
  Nick Byrd and Paul Conway

5I

- Is it us, or is it them? Problems of Ineffective Philosphizing About Abortion
  Nathan Nobis
- Ectogenesis and the Ethics of Abortion
  Joseph Spino and Jana McAuliffe

4:30 PM–5:30 PM

6B

- Growth Attenuation Therapy and Parental Decision-Making: An 8KQ Ethical Reasoning Approach
  Christian Early

6D

- Just Returning the Favor: Exploring Connections between Immigration Justice and Emigration History between Colombians and Venezuelans
  Allison Wolf
- Silencing the Whistleblower: Ag-Gag Laws in Animal Agriculture
  Donna Yarri

6G

- Essentialism, the Human Being, and the Implication for Abortion
  Cole James

6H

- Understanding Wrongdoing after Modern Disasters: utilizing ecofeminist philosophy to explore technological disaster commemoration
  Sarah Roe and Elyse Zavar
- Lives Worth Living: The Ethics of Disability and Well-Being
  Audra Goodnight

6:45 PM–7:45 PM

Posters

- The Period Project at SMU
  Marie Joung
- Alphas and Betas: An Exploration of Moral Membership Within the False Dichotomy of Humans and Non-Humans
  Tommy Sanfilippo
- The Moral Permissibility of Nudges
  Valerie Joly Chock

Saturday, February 22nd 8:00 AM–9:00 AM

7B

- Finding Yourself: Epistemic Injustice & Medical Feedback in Adolescence
  H. Bondurant

7C

- Trading in our lederhosen for kilts: what happens when bio-geographical ancestry information is used to co-opt culture
  Adriane Leithauser, Brian Steverson and Tyler Wasson
**Saturday, February 22nd (continued)**  
**8:00 AM–9:00 AM**

- **7E**  
  Atlanta 5  
  - Sustainable Development as a Social Commitment: Deriving a Rights-based Argument from Amartya Sen  
    Kazi Huda  
  - A Brief (Philosophical) History of Protest  
    Jennifer Kling

**9:30 AM–10:30 AM**

- **8A**  
  Atlanta 1  
  - An Ethical Framework for the Nonprofit Sector  
    Erwin de Leon and Sameer Ladha

- **8C**  
  Atlanta 3  
  - Pathways to Professional Social Responsibility: The Development of Personal and Professional Values in Undergraduates  
    Daniel Schiff, Emma Logevall, Jason Borenstein, Wendy Newstetter, Colin Potts and Ellen Zegura  
  - No Tinker-ing Around: Student Protest and Disruption in Higher Education  
    Timothy Shiell

- **8F**  
  Georgia 12  
  - The Perils of Partnership: Industry Influence, Institutional Integrity, and Public Health  
    Jonathan Marks

- **8I**  
  Georgia 11  
  - Against Conception in the Abortion Debate  
    Matt Stolick  
  - The Feminized, Sex, and Genuine Consent  
    Lillian Perkins

**10:45 AM–11:45 AM**

- **9A**  
  Atlanta 1  
  - A Learning Zeitgeist: Learning Methodology Through Technology, Art, and Philosophy  
    Thomas Creely and Isabel Lopes

- **9C**  
  Atlanta 3  
  - Picking College Students Brains About Ethical & Societal Issues of Technology  
    Raquel Diaz-Sprague and Alan Sprague  
  - The Reflect! platform: Teaching people to cope with ethical challenges of wicked problems and to develop consensus on fundamental disagreements  
    Michael Hoffmann

- **9E**  
  Atlanta 5  
  - Punishing Treatment(s)  
    Elizabeth Rhodes  
  - I’ve Heard This Joke Before...Am I Going to Hell?  
    Connor Kianpour

- **9F**  
  Georgia 7  
  - War Refugees: Risk, Justice, and Moral Responsibility  
    Jennifer Kling, Peter B. Barry - Critic, Andrew Hill - Critic and Steven Swartzer

- **9G**  
  Georgia 5  
  - Clinical Research as Basic Structure & the Ethics of Health Research Priority-Setting  
    Danielle Wenner
  - Cultivating Foundations for Responsible Innovation  
    Mark Bourgeois

- **9H**  
  Georgia 12  
  - Artificial Intelligence and Racial Injustice: A Case Study on Algorithms in Criminal Sentencing  
    Justin Biddle

- **9I**  
  Georgia 3  
  - Balancing Paternalism and Empowerment in Sexual Misconduct Cases  
    Cynthia Jones and Florence Nocar  
  - Epistemic Refusal after Sexual Violence  
    Sarah Miller
Saturday, February 22nd

1:15 PM–2:15 PM

10D
Atlanta 5
- Come to the Movies: Teaching Moral Rationalization through Film
  Brad Agle

10E
Georgia 11
- The Toolbox approach: A flexible model of professional education
  Stephanie Cargill

10F
Georgia 3
- Acceptable Risk in the Pursuit of Athletic Excellence: Reflections on Alex Honnold’s Free Solo Climb
  Melissa Fahmy
- Harmful Sports: Nonparticipants’ Obligations
  Earl Spurgin

2:30 PM–3:30 PM

11B
Georgia 9
- NHSEB, 7 Years Later: The State and Future of High School Ethics Bowl in the U.S.
  Alex Richardson and Steve Swartzer

11C
Atlanta 3
- Cyber Security, Information Deception, and Fake News Security in the Cyber World: An Anticipatory Ethical Analysis
  Richard Wilson and Alfred Guy

11E
Atlanta 1
- Humanity’s Inescapable Gaze in the Digital Age: Do Animals Have a Right to Privacy?
  Joel MacClellan
- Child Animal Cruelty?
  Walter Riker

11F
Georgia 3
- Child-Robot Interaction, Well-Being, and Privacy
  Yvette Pearson
- A State of Hypocrisy: Paid Parental Leave in the United States
  Parker Rose

4:00 PM–5:30 PM

11G
Georgia 5
- On the Lexical Superiority Response to the Repugnant Conclusion: An Essay in Population Ethics
  Leonard Kahn

12D
Georgia 7
- The Ethical, Social and Legal Implications of Open-Source Intelligence Gathering
  Barton Moffatt, David May, Mike Potter, Megan Stubbs-Richardson, Audrey Reid, William Bonduris, Dylan Smith and Shelby Gilbreath

12E
Atlanta 5
- Justice in Engineering (Ethics) Education
  J Britt Holbrook, Elliot Douglas, Yvonne Lewis and Wenda Bauchspies
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Annual Drive Donors (2019-2020)

We recognize this year’s donors to-date in the context of their life-long contributions to the Association, by means of the Societies listed below. Each category designates lifetime contributions.

**Henry Sidgwick Society ($5,000+)**
Edward C. Carr

**Chairman’s Society ($2,500—$4,999)**
Leonard and Naomi Block
Elizabeth Heitman
Gretchen A. Winter

**Board’s Society ($1,000—$2,499)**
Dennis Cooley
Lisa M. Lee
Daniel Wueste

**Director’s Society ($500—$999)**
Andrew I. Cohen
Karin Ellison
Trisha Phillips
Julie Pedroni

**Friends Society (Up to $499)**
Thomas Creely
Nanette Elster
Dena Plemmons

We appreciate the support of all our retired Lifetime Members, Supporting and Sustaining Individual Members, and Institutional Partners and would like to take this opportunity to give special acknowledgement to them.

**Lifetime Members**
Charles Edward Harris
Lisa H. Newton
Brian Simmons
Rosemarie Tong
Dennis Thompson
Stuart Yoak

**Supporting and Sustaining Individual Members**

**Sustaining Individual Members**
Robert F. Ladenson
Sarah K.A. Pfatteicher

**Supporting Individual Members**
Andrew J. Feldman
Stephen R. Latham
Paul S. McAuliffe
Jennifer Merton
Daniel E. Wueste
Organizational Sponsor

Members
Center for Professional Responsibility in Business and Society, University of Illinois
Gies College of Business
University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign
Gretchen A. Winter, Executive Director

The Janet Prindle Institute for Ethics
DePauw University
Andrew Cullison, Director

Siemens Digital Industries Software
Edward Carr, Corporate Ethics and Compliance Officer

Sustaining Institutional Members
American University
Department of Philosophy and Religion
Asia Ferrin

Center for Ethics
Emory University
Paul Root Wolpe, Director

Center for Professional and Applied Ethics
University of North Carolina, Charlotte
Gordon Hull, Director

Center for Engineering Ethics
Purdue University
Andrew O. Brightman

Krause Center for Leadership and Ethics
The Citadel
Grant Goodrich

Markkula Center for Applied Ethics
Santa Clara University
Kirk O. Hanson, Executive Director

Northern Plains Ethics Institute
North Dakota State University
Dennis R. Cooley, Director

St. Philip’s College
Student Engagement and Success
Paul Machen II

James Madison University
The Madison Collaborative: Ethical Reasoning in Action
William Hawk, Director

Supporting Institutional Members
American Psychological Association
Science Directorate
Sangeeta Panicker

BB&T Center for Ethical Leadership
University of North Georgia
Rose Procter, Director

Center for Bioethics and Health Law
University of Pittsburgh
Dr. Lisa S. Parker, Director

Center for Leadership and Ethics
Virginia Military Institute
David Gray, Director

Center for the Study of Ethics in the Professions
Illinois Institute of Technology
Elisabeth Hildt, Director

Dr. James Dale Ethics Center
Youngstown State University
Mark C. Vopat, Director

Recognitions
Dundon-Berchtold Institute for Moral Formation and Applied Ethics
University of Portland
Daniel M. McGinty, Director

Inamori International Center for Ethics and Excellence
Case Western Reserve University
Dr. Shannon E. French, Director

Kegley Institute of Ethics
California State University, Bakersfield
Dr. Michael Burroughs, Executive Director

Kenan Institute for Ethics
Duke University
Dr. Suzanne Shanahan, Director

TRACE
Alexandra Wrage, President and Founder

TTU Ethics Center
Texas Tech University
Dr. Ralph Ferguson, Director

Ukleja Center for Ethical Leadership
California State University, Long Beach
Jane Roeder, Interim Director

United States Office of Government Ethics
Patrick Shepherd

University of Central Florida
Department of Philosophy
Dr. Michael Strawser

University of Rochester
Department of Philosophy
Professor Randall Curren, Chair

Virginia Commonwealth University
Office of Research
Francis L. Macrina, Director

Center for Leadership and Ethics
Virginia Military Institute
Dr. David Gray
In Memoriam

APPE Member: 1992 – 1997

Daniel Callahan, a pioneer of the field of bioethics, died at the age of 88. Callahan cofounded The Hastings Center, the world’s first bioethics research institute, in 1969. He served as its director from 1969 to 1983, president from 1984 to 1996, and president emeritus.

Callahan was one of the world’s preeminent bioethics scholars and his work was timely and timeless. He brought attention to many turbulent issues through his tenure including civil rights, women’s rights, rapid medical advances, abortion, and more. The topics of his research and writing were wide-ranging, beginning with Catholic thought and proceeding to the morality of abortion, the nature of doctor-patient relationship, the good and bad of new technologies, the issue of high health care costs, the medical and social challenges of aging, the dilemma of physician assisted suicide, and the meaning of death.

Callahan served as a member of the APPE Board from 1993 – 1997.

APPE Member: 2000–2019

Dr. Robert D. Newton, longtime APPE member and APPE Intercollegiate Ethics Bowl coach, died on February 4, 2020 in Greencastle, Indiana at the age of 92. He arrived at DePauw University in 1956 and retired in 2008 as a Professor of Philosophy. A lifelong scholar, Dr. Newton received a bachelor of arts degree from Yale in 1950, a bachelor of divinity degree in 1953 from Union Theological Seminary and his doctorate from Columbia University in 1960. While at DePauw, Dr. Newton was awarded the Tucker Prize in 1989 as an Outstanding Faculty Member and was the inaugural holder of the Blair Anderson and Martha Caroline Rieth professor of applied ethics from 1992 to 2008. He began co-coaching DePauw University’s APPE Intercollegiate Ethics Bowl team in 1999, continuing on through this current season. During that time, he guided DePauw to the national competition finals twelve times and claimed the national championship in 2013.
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Glen Miller and Laura Grossenbacher

Ethics Center Directors Summit Planning Committee
Brad Agle, Ralph Ferguson, Rose Procter, and Janey Roeder

APPE Member: 2003 - 2019

**Daniel R. Vasgird**, Emeritus Director of Compliance Services in the Office of Research Integrity and Compliance at West Virginia University, died on January 30, 2020. He had been an active member of APPE since 2003 and participated in many of the APPE Annual Conferences.

Dr. Vasgird conceived and developed a widely-used 6 segment web-based RCR training program for the federal Office of Research Integrity and Columbia University. In addition, he was a Lecturer at Columbia University’s School of Public Health and an Associate Professor in the Department of Preventive Medicine and Community Health at SUNY Downstate Health Sciences Center. He was the chair of the International Society of Research Administrators' (SRA) RCR Special Interest Group, participated in a number of NIH peer review panels dealing with research ethics issues, and was a member of the CITI Development Group and also its Executive Advisory Committee focusing on RCR issues. Formerly he directed the Office for Responsible Conduct of Research (ORCR) for Columbia University and the Office of Research Conduct for the City University of New York.

For over a decade, Dr. Vasgird was the IRB Chair and Health Research Training Program Director for the New York City Department of Health where he was also responsible for distance learning development among other education and training duties.

APPE Member: 1992 – 1997

**Professor Emeritus Stephen E. Kalish** died December 18, 2019. Elected to the APPE Board in its second year, Kalish served on the board from 1993 to 1997 and was an active member of APPE until his retirement in 2005.

Kalish received his B.A., J.D, and LL.M degrees from Harvard University and upon graduation from law school, he clerked for Judge L. P. Moore, United States Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit. He practiced law in Los Angeles for a law firm and the Western Center for Law and Poverty before joining the faculty of the University of Nebraska College of Law in 1971 where he taught Legal Process, Legal History, Legal Profession, Corporations, and Advanced Corporations. He also served as the director of the Center for the Teaching and Study of Applied Ethics. While at the College, he served as a Fellow in Law and Humanities at Harvard, a Fellow in Law and Economics at the University of Miami, an academic visitor at the London School of Economics, and a scholar in residence at King’s College, London.
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The APPE Intercollegiate Ethics Bowl (APPE IEB) competition combines the excitement and fun of a competitive tournament with an innovative approach to education in practical and professional ethics for undergraduate students. Thirty-six teams have been selected from the twelve APPE IEB regional competitions, last fall. These teams will compete in a tiered competition, with the final two teams competing in the final round at 5:30 pm on Sunday.

The teams participate in civil debate, where team members argue and defend their moral assessment of some of the most troubling and complex ethical issues facing society today. The competition focuses on selected cases developed by APPE ethics faculty, researchers, and professionals; covering a wide range of disciplines, including but not limited to, business, engineering, journalism, law, medicine, and social work. In the competitions students demonstrate their ability (1) understand the facts of the case, (2) articulate the ethical principles involved in the case, (3) present an effective argument on how the case should be resolved, and (4) respond effectively to challenges put forth by the opposing team as well as the panel of expert judges.

Former APPE Intercollegiate Ethics Bowl students consider this competition experience as one of their most important college activities and one that they carry forward into their professional and personal lives.

Please, join us in watching this exciting event!
The APPE Intercollegiate Ethics Bowl℠ (APPE IEBSm) competition combines the excitement and fun of a competitive tournament with an innovative approach to education in practical and professional ethics for undergraduate students. Thirty-six teams have been selected from the twelve APPE IEBSm regional competitions, last fall. These teams will compete in a tiered competition, with the final two teams competing in the final round at 5:30 pm on Sunday.

The teams participate in civil debate, where team members argue and defend their moral assessment of some of the most troubling and complex ethical issues facing society today.

The competition focuses on selected cases developed by APPE ethics faculty, researchers, and professionals; covering a wide range of disciplines, including but not limited to, business, engineering, journalism, law, medicine, and social work. In the competitions students demonstrate their ability to (1) understand the facts of the case, (2) articulate the ethical principles involved in the case, (3) present an effective argument on how the case should be resolved, and (4) respond effectively to challenges put forth by the opposing team as well as the panel of expert judges.

Former APPE Intercollegiate Ethics Bowl℠ students consider this competition experience as one of their most important college activities and one that they carry forward into their professional and personal lives.

Please, join us in watching this exciting event!
Qualifying Teams

**Northeast** – (Winner) University of Rochester, Tufts University, Villanova University, US Military Academy West Point

**Mid-Atlantic** – (Winner) University of Mississippi, Samford University, University of Central Florida, Wake Forest University

**Southeast** – (Winner) University of Baltimore, Seton Hall University, US Naval Academy, The Citadel

**Great Lakes** - (Winner) Oakland University, Grand Valley State University

**Upper Midwest** – (Winner) Macalester College, University of Wisconsin Madison, Yale University

**Central States** – (Winner) Youngstown State University, DePauw University, Taylor University

**Rocky Mountain** – (Winner) Colorado School of Mines, University of Northern Colorado

**Wasatch** – (Winner) Utah Valley University, Utah State

**Texas** – (Winner) Oklahoma Christian University, University of the Incarnate Word, Sam Houston State University, Shreiner University

**Northwest** – (Winner) Seattle University, Whitworth University

**California** – (Winner) Santa Clara University, University of California San Diego, Stanford University, University of California Santa Barbara, Arizona State University

**Two Year College APPE IEB™ National Champion** – Santa Fe College
### Twenty-fourth APPE Intercollegiate Ethics Bowl℠ National Competition Schedule

**Saturday, February 22, 2020**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Time</th>
<th>Room</th>
<th>Event</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2:30 – 3:30 pm</td>
<td>Georgia 12</td>
<td>APPE IEB℠ Ethics Bowl Input Session</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4:00 – 6:00 pm</td>
<td>Georgia Atrium</td>
<td>APPE IEB℠ Registration and Team Check-In</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6:00 – 7:15 pm</td>
<td>Georgia 2</td>
<td>APPE IEB℠ Judges and Moderators Training and light refreshments</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7:00 – 7:15 pm</td>
<td>Capitol South</td>
<td>APPE IEB℠ Plenary</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**The APPE Intercollegiate Ethics Bowl℠ preliminary competition will be held in the following rooms:**

**Atlanta 1-5, Georgia 2-14, Conference Room 121, 123, 125, 127, and 129**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Time</th>
<th>Event</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>7:10 – 8:25 pm</td>
<td>First Set of Matches</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8:35 – 9:50 pm</td>
<td>Second Set of Matches</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Sunday, February 23, 2020**

**The APPE Intercollegiate Ethics Bowl℠ preliminary competition will be held in the following rooms:**

**Atlanta 1-5, Georgia 2-7, 10-11, 13-14, Conference Room 121, 123, 125, 127, and 129**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Time</th>
<th>Event</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>9:00 am – 5:00 pm</td>
<td>Judges’ Room</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9:00 – 10:15 am</td>
<td>Third Set of Matches</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10:25 – 11:40 am</td>
<td>Fourth Set of Matches</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11:45 am – 1:15 pm</td>
<td>Lunch and Career Fair</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11:15 am – 12:00 pm</td>
<td>Ladenson Award Ballots Drop Off</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1:30 pm</td>
<td>Announcement of teams participating in the Quarterfinals</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2:30 – 3:45 pm</td>
<td>Quarterfinal Matches</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
4:00 – 5:15 pm  
Atlanta 1 and 3  
**Semifinal Matches**

5:30 – 6:45 pm  
Capitol North  
**APPE Intercollegiate Ethics Bowl™ Finals – Championship Match**

7:00 – 8:30 p.m.  
Atlanta 3, 4, and 5  
**APPE IEB™ Reception**

Monday, February 24, 2020

8:30 a.m.  
Georgia 4  
**APPE IEB™ Regional Reps and Committee Meeting**

---

**APPE Intercollegiate Ethics Bowl™ Acknowledgments**

A special thanks to **TRACE**  
Sponsor of the 2020 APPE Intercollegiate Ethics Bowl™

**APPE Intercollegiate Ethics Bowl™ Committee Members**

**APPE Intercollegiate Ethics Bowl™ Board**

John Garcia, Interim Chair  
Karen Spear  
Joanne Gavin  
Mike Ingram  
Michael Jordan  
Lisa Campbell  
Kelly Laas  
Michael A. Popich  
Rose Procter  
George Sherman  
Robert Boyd Skipper  
Sandy Woodson  
Gregory Wright  
Central States Regional Bowl  
Northeast Regional Bowl  
Northwest Regional Bowl  
California Regional Bowl  
Great Lakes Regional Bowl  
Upper Midwest Regional Bowl  
Wasatch Regional Bowl  
Mid-Atlantic Regional Bowl  
Southeast Regional Bowl  
Texas Regional Bowl  
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ASSOCIATION FOR PRACTICAL AND PROFESSIONAL ETHICS
Origin
Former NAE president Wm. A. Wulf encouraged the NAE to address the social responsibilities of engineering in the face of increasing complexity, environmental and societal change, and innovation. In collaboration with the founder of the Online Ethics Center, Dr. Caroline Whitbeck, Dr. Wulf transferred the OEC to the National Academy of Engineering and, thanks to the generosity of NAE member Harry E. Bovay Jr., the NAE established CEES in 2007. The funds allowed CEES to establish an advisory group, initiate activities, and begin managing the OEC. With funding from the National Science Foundation (NSF), CEES has organized workshops and published proceedings on a number of topics, and improved and expanded the OEC.

The Center for Engineering Ethics and Society (CEES) at the National Academy of Engineering (NAE) focuses the talents of the nation on addressing the ethical and social dimensions of engineering as both a profession and an agent of innovation. CEES organizes studies, workshops, and other activities to address topical questions, share knowledge, and expand perspectives about ethics and science, engineering, and technology. The work of the Center is guided by an external advisory group, which also provides oversight for the CEES Online Ethics Center for Engineering and Science (OEC).

Online Ethics Center for Engineering and Science
The OEC mission is to provide engineers, scientists, faculty, and students with resources for understanding and addressing ethically significant issues, whether they arise in scientific and engineering practice or from developments in science and engineering. The center also curates resources for those who promote learning and advance understanding of responsible research and practice in engineering and science. The OEC is monitored by CEES with guidance from the OEC Advisory Group and Editorial Board.

Learn more about CEES at www.nae.edu/CEES
CENTER FOR ETHICS EDUCATION PRESENTS:
MASTER OF ARTS IN ETHICS & SOCIETY

ENGAGE CRITICALLY AND COMPASSIONATELY
with the most pressing moral, social, political, and environmental issues of our time.

PROGRAM BASICS
- 10 course curriculum
- Can be completed in one year on a full-time basis (part-time study and evening courses also available)
- Practicum opportunities available in New York City
- Classes offered at both Rose Hill and Lincoln Center campuses

ETHICS AND SOCIETY PRACTICUM
Students undertaking the practicum spend one day per week shadowing professionals who are engaged in services that require ethical decision-making, undertake an independent project, and meet with other practicum students for weekly discussions. Current practicum sites include:
- Global Bioethics Initiative
- St. Barnabas Hospital
- Fordham University Institutional Review Board
- Generation Citizen
- Harlem United
- Families and Work Institute
- National Jewish Center for Learning and Leadership

AREAS OF SPECIALIZATION
AND CAREER PATHS
Our flexible curriculum and personalized advising provide students with foundational ethics knowledge and analytical skills combined with courses tailored to their unique interests and career goals through our areas of specialization:
- Bioethics and Health Science
- Environmental Ethics
- Globalization and Human Rights
- Ethics and Law Policy
- Race, Gender, and Class

Recommended deadline for merit-based funding:
January 3, 2020
Final deadline for merit-based funding:
April 6, 2020

For more information and complete details about our program, visit fordham.edu/ethicsandsociety and contact Associate Director for Academic Programs, Steve Swartz, Ph.D., at ethics@fordham.edu
The Jean Beer Blumenfeld Center for Ethics fosters fruitful engagement with the whole range of ethical questions, from those that concern the private life of the individual to those that confront all of humanity. It provides innovative programs to stakeholders in the University, the humanities and social sciences, and the wider community.

The Jean Beer Blumenfeld Center for Ethics is:

• A cross-disciplinary research center: promoting cutting edge research in ethics and political theory through national and international conferences, manuscript workshops, and topical symposia and colloquia. 30+ faculty affiliates include scholars and educators from 7 disciplines.

• A resource for students: providing programs for growth, ethical reflection, and scholarship.

• A community resource: providing moral leadership as a generator for topical programming and a resource for media, consulting, and local professional groups.

Andrew I. Cohen, Director aicohen@gsu.edu
Andrew Altman, Director of Research, Emeritus aaltman@gsu.edu

ethics.gsu.edu
Looking for an IRB that...

- adds a fresh, collaborative, values-based perspective to ethical and regulatory oversight?
- works to understand and support your individual needs and goals, and build personal relationships?

Created as an independent IRB in 2017, Prime serves as the IRB of record for human subjects research.

- Social, educational, behavioral, biomedical review capacity
- Timely and efficient reviews
- Consultation on study design, participant recruitment, and consent processes
Getting Ethics TO WORK

Give us your workplace moral dilemma and we might use it on the show!

Fill in the information below and deliver it to our conference table, or visit prindleinstitute.org/dilemma and submit your dilemma digitally.

Name __________________ Email __________________

Your moral dilemma

__________________________________________________________________________________________________________

__________________________________________________________________________________________________________

__________________________________________________________________________________________________________

__________________________________________________________________________________________________________
The purpose of the Society for Ethics Across the Curriculum (SEAC) is to stimulate scholarship on ethics and the teaching of ethics in all academic disciplines and to afford an opportunity for the exchange of research.

The Annual Society for Ethics Across the Curriculum Conference is the preeminent opportunity for those of us working in ethics education, and in integrating ethics into the broader curriculum, to gather to share ideas, present our latest research, demonstrate pedagogical experiments, and network with each other, all in the spirit of conviviality. New members and graduate students are most welcome, as is anyone interested in this important work.

The Society's journal, *Teaching Ethics*, is published twice a year. The journal examines ethical issues across the curriculum with particular attention to pedagogical methodology and practice in both academic inquiry and professional practice. The journal’s editorial focus is on ethics as a dimension of all academic inquiry rather than as an isolated philosophical discipline. Its primary mission is to provide a peer-reviewed forum for academic dialogue in ethics instruction across disciplines such as business, medicine, trades, technology, law, science, and other areas of liberal education.

SEAC members receive a print subscription to *Teaching Ethics*, as well as online access to other publications treating of ethics in the professions. Membership is facilitated by the Philosophy Documentation Center: [https://www.pdcnet.org/seac/Society-for-Ethics-Across-the-Curriculum- (SEAC)]. Institutions may join at a sponsoring level which will include additional benefits: print and online access to *Teaching Ethics*, 3-5 individual designees for conference registration, SEAC website presence, and recognition on the conference program.

More information can be found on the SEAC website: [https://www.seac-online.org/](https://www.seac-online.org/)

SEAC is a proud sponsor of the 2020 APPE Conference!
The graduate certificate in professional ethics will help you engage more fully with ethical issues in your professional life. This 12-hour certificate program will enhance your abilities to analyze arguments, your capacities to reason and express yourself clearly, your leadership skills, and your awareness of the ethical dimensions of work and public life. The certificate is available online or face-to-face and is open to all interested persons who hold a bachelor’s degree with a 3.0 minimum GPA.

The certificate, offered through the Department of Philosophy at Texas State University, is a response to a wide and growing interest in the ethical dimensions of professional and public life. Participants strengthen their understanding of ethics and enhance their ability to recognize and respond to ethical issues in a wide variety of settings. The program emphasizes advanced critical thinking and writing skills, in-depth knowledge of the history, theory, principles and concepts of ethics, the ability to recognize and resolve ethical dilemmas, and the knowledge and skills necessary for ethical leadership.

txstate.edu/philosophy

Texas State University, to the extent not in conflict with federal or state law, prohibits discrimination or harassment on the basis of race, color, national origin, age, sex, religion, disability, veterans’ status, sexual orientation, gender identity or expression. Texas State University is a tobacco-free campus. 20-159 10/19
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The University of Central Florida’s graduate certificate in Theoretical and Applied Ethics focuses on the application of ethical theories and principles to complex contemporary cases. Building on students’ previous academic or professional experience, the program can be tailored to individual interests, including humanities, the arts, sciences, health care, business, education, criminal justice, public administration, public relations, journalism, politics and more.

UCF’s program is a key stepping stone to bigger things, done better.

Benefits to the program include:

• Online classes
• Only 12 credit hours (2 required courses + 2 electives)
• Start any semester
• Easy to add onto an existing graduate course load

“Ethics is about building engagement in public dialogue about what we value and why. The theories, principles and arguments that ground that work are at the heart of our program.”

Dr. Jonathan Beever, director

CONTACT
philosophy.cah.ucf.edu/ethicscert
philosophy@ucf.edu
407-823-6658

DO WELL. BE BETTER.

Get a graduate certificate in ethics to be better in any profession.
The Poe Business Ethics Center’s work is premised on the idea that:

Business ethics lies at the core of a productive market system.

A prosperous and just society presumes that people accept responsibility and discharge duties.

Leaders honor commitments, deal honestly with others, and respect the dignity and integrity of fellow human beings.

warrington.ufl.edu/Poe
Call for Papers

THE INTERNATIONAL JOURNAL OF ETHICAL LEADERSHIP

The International Journal of Ethical Leadership (IJEL) is an academic journal that expands the interdisciplinary, international conversation on what ethical leadership requires. We are seeking articles (2,000 to 5,000 words) relevant to theoretical and practical approaches to ethical leadership from diverse perspectives.

Submissions must be received as a single document in PDF format in English by March 15, 2020.

Previously published works will also be considered for submission if the prior publisher grants permission.

Please send all inquiries and submissions to Beth Trecasa, Associate Director, Inamori Center, and Managing Editor, IJEL, at beth.trecasa@case.edu.

To learn more, visit bit.ly/CWRU-Inamori-IJEL

INAMORI INTERNATIONAL CENTER FOR ETHICS AND EXCELLENCE
Speak fluent ethics in business, engineering, accounting, and other professional and personal situations.

Noggin is My Guide

Grounded in long-standing ethical and religious traditions, and in contemporary philosophy, psychology, and neuroscience. Easily remembered terminology and totems in an interactive and adaptive on-line learning environment will maximize understanding and retention.