

PHIL 330: Ethics

Location:	Evening
Address:	1001 Rogers Street Columbia, MO 65216
Section:	19FALL1/PHIL/330/EVA
Semester Credit Hours:	3
Class Day(s) and Time(s):	Wednesday 5:30 PM - 9:30 PM from August 26, 2019 to October 19, 2019

☰ Syllabus Contents

- [Course Information](#)
- [Textbooks](#)
- [Technology Requirements](#)
- [Course Learning Outcomes](#)
- [Grading](#)
- [Schedule of Due Dates](#)
- [Assignment Overview](#)
- [Course Outline](#)
- [Additional Resources](#)
- [Columbia College Policies & Procedures](#)

📘 Course Information

Catalog Description

An examination of the foundations of moral philosophy and a careful study of the three main ethical theories, i.e., consequentialism, deontology, and virtue theory.

📖 Textbooks

As part of TruitionSM, students will receive their course materials automatically as described below.

- 📖 Korsgaard, Christine M.; Gregor, Mary; Timmermann, Jens . (2012). *Groundwork of the Metaphysic of Morals* (2nd). Cambridge University Press . *eText*
- 📖 Aristotle (translated by Terence Irwin). (1999). *Nicomachean Ethics* (2nd). Hackett Publishing Company. *eText*
- 📖 Mill/Sher. (2002). *Utilitarianism* (2nd). Hackett Publishing Company. *eText*

Bookstore Information

Visit <https://www.ccis.edu/bookstore.aspx> for details.

eText Information

If a course uses an eText, (see textbook information above) the book will be available directly in Desire2Learn (D2L) seven days before the session begins, if registered for courses prior to that date. Upon first login to VitalSource, students should use their CougarMail email address; alternate email addresses cannot be used. More information about how to use the VitalSource platform, including offline access to eTexts, can be found in D2L.

Physical Course Materials Information

Students enrolled in courses that require physical materials will receive these materials automatically at the shipping address on file with Columbia College. Delivery date of physical materials is dependent on registration date and shipping location. Please refer to confirmation emails sent from Columbia College for more details on shipping status.

Returns: Students who drop a class are responsible for returning any physical course materials that were shipped. To initiate a return, visit [Ingram Returns](#) to generate a pre-paid return label. Materials from dropped courses must be returned within 30-days of receipt. **Failure to return physical items from a dropped course will result in a charge to the student account for all unreturned items.**

Note: Students who opt-out of having their books provided as part of [TuitionSM](#) are responsible for purchasing their own course materials.

Technology Requirements

THIS IS A TECHNOLOGY-ENRICHED COURSE WHICH COMBINES IN-SEAT INSTRUCTION WITH ONLINE LEARNING.

Participation in this course will require the basic technology for all classes at Columbia College:

- A computer with reliable internet access
- A web browser
- Acrobat Reader
- Microsoft Office or another word processor such as Open Office

For more information, see [technical requirements](#).

Course Learning Outcomes

1. Student critically evaluates philosophical arguments from moral philosophy for soundness and validity
2. Student formulates sound and valid philosophical arguments dealing with moral philosophy
3. Student critically analyzes philosophical arguments, issues, and problems from moral philosophy
4. Student draws upon a broad familiarity and understanding of the literature of moral philosophy in order to pose compelling philosophical questions.
5. Student cogently expresses both philosophical problems found in moral philosophy and plausible solutions to those problems in accord with best philosophical practices

Grading

Grading Scale

Grade	Points	Percent
A	900 - 1000	90-100%
B	800 - 899	80-89%
C	700 - 799	70-79%
D	600 - 699	60-69%
F	0 - 599	0-59%

Grade Weights

Assignment Category	Points	Percent
Online Learning Activity	150	15%
Reading Questions	150	15%
Exams	450	45%
Papers	150	15%
Attendance	100	10%
Total	1000	100%

Schedule of Due Dates

Week 1		
Assignment	Points	Due
Week 2		
Assignment	Points	Due
Online Discussion	25	Sunday 8 September
Reading Questions 1	25	Wednesday 4 September
Week 3		
Assignment	Points	Due
Online Discussion	25	Sunday 15 September
Reading Questions 2	25	Wednesday 11 September
Paper 1	75	Wednesday 11 September
Exam 1	150	Wednesday 11 September
Week 4		
Assignment	Points	Due
Readings for Week 4	--	Wednesday 18 September
Readings Questions 3	25	Wednesday 18 September
Week 5		
Assignment	Points	Due
Online Discussion	25	Sunday 29 September
Readings for Week 5	--	Wednesday 25 September
Reading Questions 4	25	Wednesday 25 September
Exam 2	150	Wednesday 25 September
Week 6		
Assignment	Points	Due
Online Discussion	25	Sunday 6 October
Readings for Week 6	--	Wednesday 2 October
Reading Questions 5	25	Wednesday 2 October
Week 7		
Assignment	Points	Due
Online Discussion	25	Sunday 13 October
Readings for Week 7	--	Wednesday 9 October
Reading Questions 6	25	Wednesday 9 October
Week 8		
Assignment	Points	Due
Online Discussion	25	Saturday 19 October
Readings for Week 8	--	Wednesday 16 October
Paper 2	75	Wednesday 16 October

Assignment	Points	Due
Attendance	100	Tuesday 16 October Assigned weekly
Total Points: 1000		

Assignment Overview

Online Learning Activity

In weeks 2, 3, 5, 6, 7, and 8 there is one online discussion required. You are required to make at least three posts for each prompt: one initial post that addresses the prompt, and two response posts that address other students' posts. You are unable to view the posts of your classmates until you have submitted your initial post. Initial posts present others with reasons to adopt one's own position, rather than just listing things that you happen to believe, but don't really care if others believe it or not. They explain issues, provide new perspectives, effectively question, or meaningfully elaborate on topic.

Response posts are elaborate, contradict, modify, or explain the original message. All prompts should be addressed only after you have done the readings for the week. You must use your own words (no quotes), but if paraphrasing another source, give citation information. Max word count is 300 (no minimum, though your post must adequately address all questions). Question is worth 25 points, 15 points for original post and 10 points for responses. You will be assessed on the *quality* of your postings and not the *quantity* (I'm **not** looking for simply "I agree/disagree" or "I think this is right/wrong" – you must elaborate and give *reasons* for your position).

Assignments

In weeks 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, and 7, I will post sets of reading questions over the readings for that week. All questions should be answered in complete sentences, referencing the appropriate readings. This assignment is designed to ensure that students are keeping up with the readings, as well as to let students review some important passages/concepts. There will be six reading question sets, each worth 25 points for a total of 150 points.

Students will be required to write two short (3-page) papers on assigned topics. Papers are to be no less than three pages in length, typed, double-spaced, with 1-inch margins and in a reasonably-sized (e.g., 12-point Times New Roman) font. Papers should be in APA format. Papers will be worth 75 points each, and will be due in weeks 3 and 8.

Attendance requirement: Students are expected to attend all lectures for each registered class and to complete all work assigned by the instructor. Due to the relationship between class attendance and final course grades, each class will be worth 12.5 points toward the total grade. There will be no distinction between excused/unexcused absences; since attendance is an integral part of participation/discussion, and participation/discussion is necessary for doing philosophy, you will receive attendance points for attending/participating, and will be deducted 12.5 points for non-attendance, regardless of reason.

Examinations

There will be three exams for the course, each worth 150 points, for a total of 450 points. Exams will be held in the first half of the class on exam day, with the last half comprising work on the next section of the course. Exams will be held in weeks 3, 5, and 8.

Course Outline

Click on each week to view details about the activities scheduled for that week.

Week 1:

Readings for Week 1

Handouts on philosophical methodology and challenges to ethics, including relativism and psychological egoism. I will also hand out an excerpt of Louis Pojman's article "A Critique of Ethical Relativism". We may start Aristotle's *Nicomachean Ethics*, Book I, Sections 1-5 (p. 1-5), 7-8 (p. 7-11), and 13 (p. 16-18).

Week 2:

Online Discussion

Eudemonia and the Function of a Human Being

Discussion Introduction:

A good cook is a cook that prepares meals well. A good knife is a knife that cuts well. A good pianist is a musician that plays the piano well. Could a good human just be a human that performs the essential human function well? This is what Aristotle thought. For humans to flourish—to attain what Aristotle called eudemonia— humans must perform their essential function well. But what is the essential function of a human? Aristotle considered a variety of functions that humans perform: we eat and grow (vegetative function), we try to get stuff that we want (appetitive function), and we think and reason (rational function). But to be an essential function of humans, Aristotle says that it must be a function that's shared by all humans while also shared only by humans. But since plants and non-human animals also share in the vegetative and appetitive functions, this leaves only one function that could be the essential function of a human: the rational function. Thus, Aristotle concludes, a good human is a human that reasons well.

Discussion Prompt:

What do you think about the idea of humans having an essential function? Do you think we have a function just like cooks or knives or pianists? If not, why not—in what ways do we differ? And what do you think of Aristotle's argument that the essential human function must be to reason? Do you agree? Do you think a human could live a flourishing life without reasoning well? Use your original post to defend your answer to these questions, then use your two reply posts to critique the arguments given by other students or to defend your own answer from the critiques of others.

Readings for Week 2

If we did not start Aristotle on Week 1, we will read *Nicomachean Ethics*, Book I, Sections 1-5 (p. 1-5), 7-8 (p. 7-11), and 13 (p. 16-18); Book II (p. 18-30)), Book III (section 1-5, p. 30-40), and Book X (sections 1-6. p. 153-162)

Reading Questions 1

Answer each of the reading questions in a typed document. You may cite passages in the required readings to bolster your arguments.

Week 3:

Online Discussion

Is Our Moral Behavior the Result of Our Character or the Situation?

Discussion Introduction:

Aristotle's notions of virtue and vice have common sense appeal—we all naturally use these character judgments to explain other peoples' behavior. For example, when someone stops to help you pick up some papers you just dropped, you might think to yourself "oh she is such a kind person!" In this case, you are attributing the virtue kindness to this person as an explanation of her behavior. But, as plausible as this explanation may seem, there's evidence from contemporary moral psychology that situational factors can play a more important role than one's character in explaining behavior. Consider our example again: suppose that, prior to helping you pick up your dropped papers, the woman luckily found a dime left in the coin-return of a vending machine. How could finding ten cents have any effect on whether a stranger helps you pick up your dropped papers? Aristotle would likely predict that it wouldn't! But when this study was actually ran, participants that found the dime were far more likely to help a person who had just dropped their papers than participants that didn't find the dime!¹

Discussion Prompt:

So what best explains our moral behavior? Is it our character that determines how we will behave in any situation, as Aristotle argues (e.g., an honest person will be honest in all circumstances)? Or do the situations we find ourselves in have more influence over how we will act (e.g., you are faithful to your partner, but you cheat on exams)? And how might Aristotle respond to the results of the dime study discussed above? Use your original post to defend your answer to these questions, then use your two reply posts to critique the arguments given by other students or to defend your own answer from the critiques of others.

¹ Isen, A.M., & Levin, P.F. Effect of feeling good on helping: cookies and kindness. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 1972, 21, 384-388. The study actually uses a phone booth instead of a vending machine.

Readings for Week 3

Mill's *Utilitarianism*, Ch. I (p. 1-5), Ch. II (p. 6-12. and 17- 26), Ch III (p. 27-34), and Ch. IV (p. 35-41).

Reading Questions 2

Answer each of the questions in a typed document.

Paper 1

Papers are to be typed, between 750-100 words (3-4 pages in length), in a reasonably sized font (e.g. Times New Roman

12-point), and reasonably sized margins (1 inch per side). The topic will be circulated on the LMS in week 2.

Exam 1

To be taken in class.

Week 4:

Readings for Week 4

Same as Week 3: Mill's Utilitarianism, Ch. I (p. 1-5), Ch. II (p. 6-12. and 17- 26), Ch III (p. 27-34), and Ch. IV (p. 35-41).

Readings Questions 3

Answer each of the reading questions in a typed document.

Week 5:

Online Discussion

Mill's Hedonism and Foot's Lobotomy

Discussion Introduction:

You have probably heard people who have children say the following: "All I want is for my kids to be happy." Perhaps you have said this to your own kids, or perhaps your parents have said this to you. Mill can explain this parental desire quite easily—an essential part of Mill's utilitarianism is the notion that happiness is the only thing that's intrinsically valuable (i.e., valuable for its own sake). This view is called hedonism. On this view, our life is going well if we are happy and only if we are happy. While this view might seem obviously true, it's important to consider why some philosophers reject hedonism.² Suppose that there is a lobotomy procedure that results in the lobotomized patient being completely happy from very simple activities, such as pouring water into cups over and over again. If hedonism is correct—if happiness is all that matters—then shouldn't parents want to have their loved ones undergo this lobotomy procedure? After all, once the procedure is completed, ensuring that one's children are happy will now be as easy as keeping plenty of cups and water available! But something has gone wrong—surely no loving parent would ever want their (cognitively normal) child to undergo such a procedure. So can we then conclude that hedonism doesn't capture everything that parents want for their children? What else is there besides happiness?

Discussion Prompt:

What role does hedonism play in Mill's utilitarianism? Do you agree with hedonists that happiness is, at the end of the day, all that matters? What do you think of Foot's lobotomy procedure—would a child that undergoes this procedure be missing a better life even if they were in fact completely happy? What might Mill say in response to this challenge from Foot? Can hedonism survive this argument? Use your original post to defend your answer to these questions, then use your two reply posts to critique the arguments given by other students or to defend your own answer from the critiques of others.

²The following material is drawn from Russ Shafer-Landau's discussion of Philippa Foot's comments concerning hedonism and a possible case of prefrontal lobotomy, found in *The Fundamentals of Ethics*, 4th Edition, Oxford UP; p.30 (2018).

Readings for Week 5

Immanuel Kant, *Groundwork of the Metaphysics of Morals*: Preface, p. 3-8; First Section, p. 9-20; Second Section, p. 21-43, p. 51-55.

Reading Questions 4

Answer each question in a typed document.

Exam 2

Exam over utilitarianism/consequentialism.

Week 6:

Online Discussion

The Principle of Utility and the Trolley Problem

Discussion Introduction:

Imagine that you come across a run-away trolley, speeding along the track uncontrollably. If it stays on its current track, you see that it will end up hitting and killing five innocent people who have been tied to the track. But as it happens, you are standing next to a switch that, when pulled, will cause the trolley to move to a nearby track. This second track only has one innocent person tied to it. If you pull the switch, you can prevent the five innocent people from being hit and killed by the trolley, though the trolley will then unfortunately hit the one innocent person tied to the nearby track. When given this switch

case, most people say that it would be morally okay to pull the switch. And Mill's principle of utility can easily explain why it's okay to do this: if the only two actions available to you are to pull the switch or to leave things as they are, presumably pulling the switch will do the most to promote happiness over misery (i.e., preventing five innocent deaths at the expense of one). But now imagine another scenario—same run-away trolley that's about to hit and kill five innocent people tied to the track. But this time there's only the one track: there's no second track or switch-lever to use to alter the trolley's direction. But the track does go underneath a footbridge before it reaches the five innocent people, and there is an extremely large (though completely innocent) man on this footbridge. This man is so large that you realize you could use his mass to stop the trolley, preventing it from hitting and killing the five people. If you push this large man over the footbridge (against his will, it should be added), he will land in front of the trolley, stopping it, but killing him in the process. When given this footbridge case, most people say that it would be morally wrong to push the large man. This result isn't easily explained by Mill's principle of utility: if the only two actions available to you are to push the large man or to leave things as they are, and if pulling the switch was morally okay because it would prevent five innocent deaths at the expense of one, then how can it be wrong to push the large man when this is also the only way to prevent five innocent deaths?³

Discussion Prompt:

Do you agree with the common responses to these cases? If so, why? If not, why not? The Trolley Problem has been used by philosophers as a way to challenge the principle of utility—how might Mill respond? Finally, if you think pushing the large man is the right thing to do, why do you think so many people regard this action as morally wrong? Use your original post to defend your answer to these questions, then use your two reply posts to critique the arguments given by other students or to defend your own answer from the critiques of others.

³ Both the switch case and the footbridge case were first presented by the philosopher Judith Jarvis Thomson in her 1985 paper "The Trolley Problem." The switch case is itself a variation on a different trolley case first presented by the philosopher Philippa Foot in her 1967 paper "The Problem of Abortion and the Doctrine of the Double Effect."

Readings for Week 6

Immanuel Kant, *Groundwork of the Metaphysics of Morals*: Preface, p. 3-8; First Section, p. 9-20; Second Section, p. 21-43, p. 51-55. Same as Week 5.

Reading Questions 5

Answer each of the questions in a typed document.

Week 7:

Online Discussion

Which Came First—Moral Parable or Moral Knowledge?

Discussion Introduction:

It might seem quite natural to think that we first learn what's morally right and wrong by way of example. After all, virtually every culture uses moral parables: stories specifically designed to highlight or contrast good behavior from bad. Perhaps one of the most well-known parables in Western society is Jesus' story of the good Samaritan: an injured man is in desperate need of help on the side of the road, but the righteous, wealthy and well-respected people all pass him by. Yet a Samaritan man—a man who is part of a community shunned by people like this injured man, and thus has perhaps the most reason to pass him by—instead stops to help, ultimately taking the injured man to an inn and paying whatever was needed to heal him and care for him. Didn't this parable teach us that helping people is good? Kant says no! Kant thinks this explanation gets things entirely backwards! Kant argues that just observing the Samaritan's behavior in the story wouldn't have been enough to teach us right from wrong. After all, we also observed the other people pass the injured man without helping him—what prevented us from concluding that keeping to our own business is the morally right thing to do, thus judging the Samaritan's behavior as wrong? Kant has an answer: we were able to determine that the Samaritan's behavior is good because we already *knew* what's good and what's bad *before* we ever heard the parable. On Kant's view, moral truth is something we know *a priori* (i.e., before experience; from the understanding alone).

Discussion Prompt:

Do you think that we must first watch other people, or read stories or listen to parables, in order to know right from wrong? Is morality a case of "monkey see, monkey do"? Or do you agree with Kant that this gets things backwards—that we actually already have knowledge of what's good and evil before we ever hear our first parable? And how does Kant's view here compare to Mill's on determining what's morally right? Use your original post to defend your answer to these questions, then use your two reply posts to critique the arguments given by other students or to defend your own answer from the critiques of others.

Readings for Week 7

These readings will be TBA, and will address one or two contemporary moral issues. Possible issues include war, euthanasia, abortion, animal rights, moral obligations related to famine relief, homosexuality, reparations for slavery, affirmative action, capital punishment, torture, redistributive taxation, and global warming. We will decide as a class which

issues we wish to discuss.

Reading Questions 6

Answer each of the questions in a typed document.

Week 8:

Online Discussion

Kantian Ethics and the Problem of Moral Luck

Discussion Introduction:

On Kant's view, the results of our actions are morally irrelevant because the moral worth of actions is only to be found in the autonomous willing of the act.⁴ But it is this feature that leads the Kantian view to deny the existence of moral luck – cases where the morality of an action seems to depend on factors outside of our control. Here are some common examples of moral luck: (1) an otherwise good parent shaking their baby, and (2) an otherwise good driver succumbing to negligent driving. If the baby dies due to the shaking, we may judge this parent quite severely. If the driver's negligence results in the death of an innocent pedestrian, we may judge this driver quite severely. But notice that we don't usually make similar judgments of such parents or drivers if the bad consequences don't occur (i.e., the shaking doesn't harm the baby, or the negligent driving doesn't result in a pedestrian's death). We usually treat the unlucky case differently from the lucky case despite the fact that the behavior in both cases was exactly the same.

Discussion Prompt:

What do you think about the idea of moral luck? Are we perhaps holding a moral double standard in the above cases – letting the lucky parent/driver off the moral hook while holding the unlucky parent/driver to a harsher standard? Should we perhaps remove this double standard by either being less harsh on the unlucky parent/driver or more severe with the lucky parent/driver? Or do you think—contra Kant's view—that such a double-standard is actually justified? Use your original post to defend your answer to these questions, using the parent or the driver example, then use your two reply posts to critique the arguments given by other students or to defend your own answer from the critiques of others.

⁴ The following material, including the two examples of moral luck, is drawn from Russ Shafer-Landau's *The Fundamentals of Ethics*, 4th Edition, Oxford UP; p.188-9 (2018).

Readings for Week 8

TBA.

Paper 2

Papers are to be typed, between 750-100 words (3-4 pages in length), in a reasonably sized font (e.g. Times New Roman 12-point), and reasonably sized margins (1 inch per side). The topic will be circulated on the LMS in week 7.

Exam 3

Exam over Kantian deontology and the moral issues we covered since the second exam.

Attendance

+ Additional Resources

Online databases are available at library.ccis.edu. You may access them using your CougarTrack login and password when prompted.

Technical Support

If you have problems accessing the course or posting your assignments, contact your instructor, the Columbia College Technology Solutions Center, or the D2L Helpdesk for assistance. If you have technical problems with the VitalSource eText reader, please contact VitalSource. Contact information is also available within the online course environment.

- Columbia College Technology Solutions Center: CCHelpDesk@ccis.edu, 800-231-2391 ex. 4357
- D2L Helpdesk: helpdesk@d2l.com, 877-325-7778
- VitalSource: support@vitalsource.com, 1-855-200-4146

Online Tutoring

Smarthinking is a free online tutoring service available to all Columbia College students. Smarthinking provides real-time online tutoring and homework help for Math, English, and Writing. Smarthinking also provides access to live tutorials in writing and math, as well as a full range of study resources, including writing manuals, sample problems, and study skills manuals. You can

access the service from wherever you have a connection to the Internet. I encourage you to take advantage of this free service provided by the college.

Access Smarthinking through CougarTrack at [Students -> Academics -> Resources](#).

Columbia College Policies and Procedures

The policies set forth in the [Policy Library](#) are the current official versions of College policies and supersede and replace any other existing or conflicting policies covering the same subject matter. For more information on policies applicable to students, see [Student Policies](#). For more information on policies applicable to the entire Columbia College community, see [College-Wide Policies](#).

Students are expected to read and abide by the College policies. Policies of particular interest to students include, but not limited to the following:

- Graduate Grading Policy
- Undergraduate Grading Policy
- Registration Policy and Procedures
- Withdrawal Policy
- Alcohol and Other Drugs Policy
- Family Educational Rights and Privacy Act (FERPA)

Additional Policies:

Academic Integrity and Plagiarism

Academic integrity is a cumulative process that begins with the first college learning opportunity. Students are responsible for knowing and abiding by the [Academic Integrity Policy and Procedures](#) and may not use ignorance of either as an excuse for academic misconduct. Additionally, all required papers may be submitted for textual similarity review to Turnitin.com for the detection of plagiarism. All submitted papers may be included in the Turnitin.com reference database for the purpose of detecting plagiarism. This service is subject to the Terms and Conditions of Use posted on the Turnitin.com site.

Disability Resources

If you have a disability that requires an accommodation, please speak with the instructor and consult the [Student Accessibility Resources](#) office. Student Accessibility Resources staff will determine appropriate accommodations and will work with your instructor to make sure these are available to you. To find additional information, see our [ADA and Section 504 Policy for Students](#).

Notice of Non-Discrimination and Equal Opportunity:

The College has a process through which students, faculty, staff and community members who have experienced or witnessed incidents of discrimination, harassment, or retaliation on the basis of protected status, can report their experiences to a College official. For more information, see our [Non-Discrimination and Equal Opportunity Policy and Complaint Resolution Procedure](#).

Title IX and Sexual Misconduct

The College is committed to addressing the issues of discrimination, harassment and sexual misconduct in the educational and workplace landscape and will continue to modify policies, procedures and prevention efforts as needed. For more information, see the College's [Title IX and Sexual Misconduct Policy](#).

Course Policies and Procedures:

Attendance Policy

Columbia College students are expected to attend all classes and laboratory periods for which they are enrolled.

For classes with an online component, attendance for a week includes submitting any assigned online activity. Assigned activities are scheduled prior to the course commencing. Assigned activity due dates are subject to change based on actual course progression and will be adjusted as necessary. Attendance for the week is based upon the date work is submitted. A class week is defined as the period of time between Monday and Sunday (except for week 8, when the work and the course will end at 11:59 PM Central Time on Saturday.) The course and system deadlines are based on the Central Time Zone.

Students are directly responsible to instructors for class attendance and work missed during an absence for any cause. If absences jeopardize progress in a course, the College reserves the right to drop or withdraw students from classes. For additional information, see the Administrative Withdrawal for Non-Attendance heading in the [Withdrawal Policy](#).

CougarMail

All students are provided a CougarMail account when they enroll in classes at Columbia College. You are responsible for monitoring email from that account for important messages from the College and from your instructor.

Students should use email for private messages to the instructor and other students. The class discussions are for public messages so the class members can each see what others have to say about any given topic and respond.

Late Assignment Policy

All classes rely on participation and a commitment to your instructor and your classmates to regularly engage in the reading, discussion and writing assignments. You must keep up with the schedule of reading and writing to successfully complete the class.

No late assignments will be accepted without the prior approval of the instructor.

Acceptance of a late assignment is at the discretion of the instructor.

Make-up examinations may be authorized for students who miss regularly-scheduled examinations due to circumstances beyond their control. Make-up examinations must be administered as soon as possible after the regularly scheduled examination period and must be administered in a controlled environment.

Student Conduct

All Columbia College students, whether enrolled in a land-based or online course, are responsible for behaving in a manner consistent with Columbia College's **Student Conduct Code** and **Acceptable Computing Use Policy**. Students violating these policies or any other College policy will be referred to the office of Student Affairs and/or the office of Academic Affairs for possible disciplinary action. The Student Code of Conduct, the **Student Behavioral Misconduct Policy and Procedures**, and the Acceptable Computing Use Policy can be found in the Policy Library at ccis.edu/policies. The adjunct faculty member maintains the right to manage a positive learning environment all students must adhere to the conventions of online etiquette when enrolled in a course with an online component.