

## COURSE OUTLINE

The course description is online @ <http://camosun.ca/learn/calendar/current/web/phil.html>

Ω Please note: the College electronically stores this outline for five (5) years only.  
It is **strongly recommended** you keep a copy of this outline with your academic records.  
You will need this outline for any future application/s for transfer credit/s to other colleges/universities.

### 1. Instructor Information

(a)	Instructor:	Megan Shelstad		
(b)	Office Hours:	1:45 - 2:15 pm Monday and Wednesday		
(c)	Location:	CC118A (Interurban) and Y312 (Lansdowne)		
(d)	Phone:	370-3950	Alternative Phone:	
(e)	Email:	shelstad@camosun.bc.ca		

### 2. Intended Learning Outcomes

Upon completion of this course the student will be able to:

1. Summarize and evaluate central problems in business ethics.
2. Critically examine classical and contemporary solutions to these problems.
3. Make comparisons between various philosophical/ethical positions and have an overall sense of the history of ethics in general.
4. Take a philosophical/ethical position and support that position with good reasons (evidence).
5. Explain the relevance of ethics to everyday problems in business concerning beliefs and values, knowledge and justification.
6. Describe and critically assess specific cases and alternative solutions to contemporary ethical problems in business.

### 3. Required Materials

- (a) Texts: Shaw, W., Barry, V. and Panagiotou, S. 2010. *Moral Issues in Business*. First Canadian edition. Thomson Wadsworth.

### 4. Course Content and Schedule

**Lectures: Wednesdays – 2:30 – 4:20 p.m. with 10 minute break (CC 121)**

**Seminars: Mondays: Group A – 2:30 – 3:20 p.m. Group B – 3:30 – 4:20 p.m. (CC 121)** “

### 5. Basis of Student Assessment (Weighting)

- (a) Assignments: 20% - argument analysis essay (approx. 1000 – 1250 words), returned at the final exam
- (b) Quizzes: 10% - 6 quizzes (2% each, best 5, **no make-ups**)
- (c) Exams: 20% - midterm test  
30% - final test (in the exam period)
- (d) Other: 10% - seminar participation  
10% - case study homework (10 written seminar assignments - **no make-ups**)  
- use the “**CASE STUDY TEMPLATE**” included in this outline except where instructions say otherwise (there are 3 such occasions so **CHECK YOUR READING SCHEDULE**)

## 6. Grading System

(No changes are to be made to this section unless the Approved Course Description has been forwarded through the Education Council of Camosun College for approval.)

### Standard Grading System (GPA)

Percentage	Grade	Description	Grade Point Equivalency
90-100	A+		9
85-89	A		8
80-84	A-		7
77-79	B+		6
73-76	B		5
70-72	B-		4
65-69	C+		3
60-64	C		2
50-59	D	Minimum level of achievement for which credit is granted; a course with a "D" grade cannot be used as a prerequisite.	1
0-49	F	Minimum level has not been achieved.	0

### Temporary Grades

Temporary grades are assigned for specific circumstances and will convert to a final grade according to the grading scheme being used in the course. See Grading Policy E-1.5 at [camosun.ca](http://camosun.ca) for information on conversion to final grades, and for additional information on student record and transcript notations.

Temporary Grade	Description
I	<i>Incomplete:</i> A temporary grade assigned when the requirements of a course have not yet been completed due to hardship or extenuating circumstances, such as illness or death in the family.
IP	<i>In progress:</i> A temporary grade assigned for courses that, due to design may require a further enrollment in the same course. No more than two IP grades will be assigned for the same course. (For these courses a final grade will be assigned to either the 3 <sup>rd</sup> course attempt or at the point of course completion.)
CW	<i>Compulsory Withdrawal:</i> A temporary grade assigned by a Dean when an instructor, after documenting the prescriptive strategies applied and consulting with peers, deems that a student is unsafe to self or others and must be removed from the lab, practicum, worksite, or field placement.

## 7. Recommended Materials or Services to Assist Students to Succeed Throughout the Course

### LEARNING SUPPORT AND SERVICES FOR STUDENTS

There are a variety of services available for students to assist them throughout their learning. This information is available in the College calendar, at Student Services, or the College web site at [camosun.ca](http://camosun.ca).

### STUDENT CONDUCT POLICY

There is a Student Conduct Policy **which includes plagiarism**. It is the student's responsibility to become familiar with the content of this policy. The policy is available in each School Administration Office, at Student Services, and the College web site in the Policy Section.

ADDITIONAL COMMENTS AS APPROPRIATE OR AS REQUIRED

**Phil 330-001 Reading Schedule (from the class text) to be done BEFORE class**  
(schedule subject to change if necessary)

Week 1 (Jan. 9, 11): *Seminar: exercise and survey*

Lecture: Introduction to ethics and the philosophical approach (not in text)

Week 2 (Jan. 16, 18): *Seminar: Case 8.4, "Ethically dubious practices" (295)*  
*answer questions 1 and 3 – 7 at the end of the case (99)*\*\*\*

Lecture: Ch. 1 – The Nature of Morality (2 – 19), QUIZ 1

Week 3 (Jan. 23, 25): *Seminar: Case 1.1 "Made in USACan - dumped elsewhere" (20)*

Lecture: Ch. 1 cont'd., Kohlberg, arguments (lecture, not in text)\*\*\* QUIZ 2

Week 4 (Jan. 30, Feb. 1): *Seminar: Argument analysis: Solomon (23 - 29)*, \*\*USE OUTLINE GUIDE\*\*

Lecture: Ch. 2 – Normative Theories of Ethics (46 – 63)

Week 5 (Feb. 6, 8): *Seminar: Case 2.1 "The Ford Pinto" (p. 64)*

Lecture: Ch. 2 cont'd., QUIZ 3

Week 6 (Feb. 13, 15): *Seminar: Case 2.2 "The Confused Network Administrator" (66)*

Wed. Feb. 15 \*\* MIDTERM TEST \*\* (lecture, ch. 1 & 2, Solomon, arguments)

Week 7 (Feb. 20, 22): *Seminar: Case 3.2 "Battling over bottled water" (97)*

Lecture: 3 fallacies, Ch. 3 – Justice & Economic Distribution (80 – 95)

Week 8 (Feb. 27, 29): *Seminar: Case 3.3 "Poverty in Canada" (98)*  
*answer the 5 questions at the end of the case (99)*\*\*\*

Lecture: 2 fallacies, Ch. 3 cont'd., QUIZ 4

Week 9 (Mar. 5, 7): *Seminar: Case 4.1 "Licensing and laissez-faire" (127)*

Lecture: 3 fallacies, Ch. 4 – The Nature of Capitalism (114 – 126)

Week 10 (Mar. 12, 14): *Seminar: Case 4.2 "Hucksters in the classroom" (129)*

Lecture: 2 fallacies, Ch. 4 cont'd., QUIZ 5

Week 11 (Mar. 19, 21): *Seminar: Case 4.3 "Immigrant workers in Canada" (130)*  
*answer the 4 questions at the end of the case (132)*\*\*\*

Lecture: 3 fallacies, Schumacher (134 - 136)

Week 12 (Mar. 26, 28): *Seminar: Case 5.1 "Selling infant formula overseas" (168)*

Lecture: 3 fallacies, Ch. 5 – Corporations (150 – 165), QUIZ 6

Week 13 (Apr. 2, 4): *Seminar: Seminar: Case 5.3 "Free speech or false advertising?" (171)*

Lecture: Ch. 5 cont'd., Cassidy (174)

\*\* ARGUMENT ANALYSIS DUE APR. 4 IN CLASS (returned at the final exam)\*\*

Week 14 (Apr. 11): NO seminar (Easter Monday)

Lecture: general review (esp. fallacies) and loose ends

\*\*FINAL EXAM (lecture, Ch. 3, 4 and 5, Schumacher, Cassidy and Logic notes in exam period)\*\*

## **A). CASE STUDY TEMPLATE**

### **Manuel Velasquez' 7-Step model for evaluating and resolving an actual or potential moral problem**

- 1. What are the relevant facts?**
- 2. What are the ethical issues?**
- 3. Who are the primary stakeholders?**
- 4. What are the possible alternatives?**
- 5. What are the ethics of the alternatives?**
- 6. What are the practical constraints?**
- 7. What action(s) should be taken?**

## **B). ARGUMENT ANALYSIS TEMPLATE (summary & evaluation)**

- 1. What is the author's main point(s)?**
- 2. What main reasons (premises) does the author offer in support of the main point? Are these good reasons? Why? Are these reasons relevant to the author's conclusion? Be specific when answering these questions.**
- 3. What evidence is offered in support of those reasons (premises)? Is the evidence good? Why? Is the evidence relevant to the author's reasons and/or conclusion? Be specific when answering these questions.**
- 4. Does the author's argument(s) depend on specific principles? What are they (again, be specific)?**
- 5. Does the author's argument(s) depend on any key beliefs or assumptions? Are these assumptions warranted or unwarranted? Explain why (again, be specific)?**
- 6. What objections can you think of (use the textbook) to the author's claims or arguments? Are they good objections? Are they relevant?**

## PHILOSOPHY 330 – LOGIC NOTES

### DEFINITIONS

**Statement** – a sentence with a truth-value (true or false).

**Argument** – a set of statements one of which (the conclusion) allegedly follows from the others (the premises).

An argument is **deductive** if the conclusion follows **necessarily** (that is, if the premises are true the conclusion **must** be true).

Deductive arguments are evaluated as **valid** (the structure is such that if the premises are true the conclusion **must** be true – necessarily) and **sound** (the argument is valid **and** the premises are true).

An argument is **inductive** if the conclusion follows **probably** from the premises. Some types of inductive arguments are 1) **statistical** 2) arguments from **analogy** (making a claim about something you don't know based on its similarity to something you do know) 3) arguments from **example** (making a claim about a whole class of things based on one or more individual cases).

Inductive arguments are evaluated as **weak** or **strong** and **cogent** (premises are **relevant, reliable** and **sufficient**).

### INFORMAL FALLACIES – errors in reasoning

These alleged “arguments” are fallacious because they misuse language and mislead us.

**Appeal to the majority** – arguing that because something is popular it is true or good.

---

**Begging the question (circular)** – implicitly using your conclusion as a premise.

---

**False alternatives or false dilemma** – excluding relevant possibilities.

---

**Complex (“loaded”) question** – posing a question/issue in such a way that a person cannot agree or disagree without committing to some other claim you wish to promote.

---

**Ad personem (ad hominem), “to the person”** – using a negative trait of a speaker or their circumstances as evidence that their statement is false or their argument is weak.

---

**Straw person (man)** – trying to refute one proposition by arguing against another or characterizing the opposing view in such a way that it's easy to refute.

---

**Slippery slope** – distorts the opposing view by claiming that the view has inevitable “bad” consequences.

---

**Appeal to tradition** – arguing that because something has been done a certain way for a long time it shouldn't be changed.

---

**Half-truth** – leaving out relevant facts, lifting out of context.

---

**Appeal to ignorance** – arguing that a claim is true because it has not been proven false.

---

**Appeal to pity** – using an emotional appeal to argue for the truth of a claim.

---

**Hasty generalization** – using individual characteristics and applying them to the “whole,” for example, stereotyping.

---

**Appeal to force** – based on threat or coercion.

---

**Appeal to authority** – testimonial evidence used when credibility or expertise has not been established.

---

**Post hoc ergo propter hoc (“after this therefore because of this”)** – inferring a cause from a temporal connection.

---

**Equivocation** – using the same word but with two different meanings.

---

Philosophy 330 – Diagnostic survey

Your Name: \_\_\_\_\_ Your program area: \_\_\_\_\_

1. Would you rather work for a company (A) that welcomed input from employees and allowed you to speak your mind at meetings, etc. or at a company (B) that has a “top-down” approach where employees are expected to follow the direction of the leader or employer and only offer input through indirect channels?

2. A toy puck and a hockey stick cost \$1.10 in total. The stick costs \$1 more than the puck. How much does the puck cost?

3. Name someone that you admire a great deal for their moral character or behaviour (famous or not). Why do you admire this person? (try not to choose your parents)

4. Is ethics fundamentally different for the business world than it is for other areas of life? Why or why not?

5. Are there some things that are absolutely morally wrong no matter what? Name one.

6. Name a behaviour that you think is unethical but not illegal.

7. Approximately how much annual income do you need to be happy? (numerical estimate) Why?

8. Is everyone's morality just as good as everyone else's? Why or why not?

9. What would you do if your boss told you to do something you thought was unethical? Can you think of an example?

10. Should there be limits on CEO's salaries? Why or why not?

11. What do you want most for your children's lives? (if you have them, if you plan on having them or, if you don't plan on having children, use your imagination)

12. If it takes five machines five minutes to make five widgets, how long would it take 100 machines to make 100 widgets?

13. What sorts of things (if any) would you include as part of the "common good"?

14. Does morality only apply to human beings? Why or why not? If not, what else does it apply to?

15. What is a "code of ethics"? Why do companies and institutions have them?

16. Are people naturally morally good or does it have to be learned?

