Semester Project / Final Exam – Session 1 CS 3162.052/054 Spring 2019

InstructorDr. Klyne SmithOffice LocationECSS 2.718Office Phone(972) 533-6460

Email Address Klyne.smith@utdallas.edu

Due Dates:

Essays

Debate – week of February 25th, Essay due on March 1st (7pm)

Debate – March 8th, Essay due on March 8th (7pm)

Project Debate (CS3162.052): February 25th and February 27th (9 pairs each day) Project Debate (CS3162.051): February 26th and February 28th (9 pairs each day) Project Debate (CS3162.052 & 054): March 8th 9am-1045am ECSW 1.315

Purpose

To take a deep dive into ethics and professional responsibility for software engineers and computer scientists. To discuss, debate, and analyze an ethical issue from multiple angles.

Assignment

The Project Paper

- 1. Select a Topic listed on eLearning, get approved by professor
- 2. Write two (2) 300-word essays on the argument "for" and "against" the selected topic. Essays must contain the following:
 - a. Opinion your opinion about the ethical decision (real or fictional)
 - b. Trend your opinion of the future trend of your chosen issue
 - c. Impact show how your decision will affect the public (pro or con)
 - d. Minimum of two (2) references

Class Presentation / Debate

You will be given the "for" or "against" option to debate with a classmate during the class. Each student will be given 2 minutes to provide the Opinion, Trend, and Impact. Each student will then have 30 seconds to provide a summary on the topic and selected angle. Each student can bring one index card with <u>bullet list of items</u> "for" on one side; "against" on the other side.

Grading

The entire project is worth 20% of your total grade. The written essays account for 30% of your project grade and the in-class debate accounts for 70% of your project grade.

Notes

There is no "right" or "wrong" but your score is based on your depth of thought beyond classroom knowledge, readability, creativity, and completeness. You must provide references. Plagiarism is not acceptable and will result in score of 0

The Topics (Your topic MUST be approved by me prior to the start of your work)

- 1. **Self-Driving Cars** should the software engineers and computer scientists be held liable for crashes due to software defects
- **2. Security Protocols** should a small company be able to provide a subpar security system for customer database access that <u>meets project objectives</u>?
- 3. Hacking Should a computer programmer hack into the company records to expose an employee that has been found internally guilty by a company of a company defined crime, so they can expose to other managers or outside sources how the company is protecting this employee and firing other employees who committed like company crimes?
- **4. Programming Help** a developer realizes that they need help solving a complex problem for work. They do not want to ask people in the company because of the negative connotation and potential job impacts for poor performance. Should the person ask the "open source" community for specific help to get pass the problem?
- 5. **Artificial Intelligence and Sentencing** should a judge be able to use AI technology to determine length of time in jail once found guilty or innocent for a defendant?
- 6. **Artificial Intelligence and Conviction** should a judge be able to use AI technology to determine if a defendant is guilty or innocent of a crime?
- 7. **Social Media Restrictions** should companies, such as FB, Instagram, Snapchat, and others restrict content and usage by users?
- 8. Peer to Peer Technical Solutions (For / Against)
- 9. National ID / Surveillance (For / Against)
- 10. Privacy Should we abandon Privacy online? "Those who would give up essential Liberty to purchase a little temporary Safety," Benjamin Franklin once said, "deserve neither Liberty nor Safety." But if Franklin were alive today, where would he draw the line? Is the freedom to send an encrypted text message essential? How about the right to keep our browsing history private? What is the sweet spot between our need to be left alone and our desire to keep potential criminals from communicating in secret?
- 11. Should we give robots the right to kill? Hot-headed, irrational and swayed by emotion who'd want a human in control? If we could build machines capable of making tough choices for us, surely, we should. That's the line taken by people like roboticist Ron Arkin at the Georgia Institute of Technology in Atlanta. For Arkin, autonomous weapons or killer robots that remain rational under fire and behave exactly as they were trained to would be more humane than human soldiers in a war situation and would save lives. We therefore have a moral imperative to create them.