Policy Brief - Assignment Instructions

Length: 1200-1500 Words

This assignment is worth **20%** of your final grade in the course. Assignments **must** be submitted electronically in Microsoft Word format on Brightspace by **2:20pm, February 12**. Assignments must contain your full name and student number in the header, you must indicate which of the policy proposals you are addressing, and your assignment must be **double-spaced using a standard 12-point font**. Late assignments will be penalized 10% per day with no exceptions.

To succeed in this assignment, students must:

   A. Describe features of a particular kind of AI that is relevant to the chosen policy proposal.
   B. Identify and clearly explain **two** ethical implications, drawn from and supported by **specific course readings**, which would foreseeably result if the Canadian government were to follow through with its proposal.
   C. Argue in favour of **two** normative recommendations based on the ethical implications identified in (B).
   D. Describe and respond to **one** possible objection to one of your normative recommendations from (C).

*Policy Proposals You Can Choose From (**Choose only 1**)*

   1. This government proposes to put an Alexa in every home. (You must refer to the arguments made in the course readings on Privacy and Deception)
   2. This government proposes to replace all Supreme Court judges with AI by 2030. (You must refer to the arguments made in the course readings on Fairness and Bias)
   3. This government proposes to make Deep Learning the preferred AI technique for all medical decision-making by 2030. (You must refer to the arguments made in the course readings on Interpretability, Explainability and Understandability)

Assignment Instructions

Choose **ONE** of the three policy proposals outlined in the list above. That policy proposal will be the focus of your assignment.

Here's the scenario you are addressing: The government has asked you, an AI ethics expert, to evaluate their policy proposal. You must generate a document (1200-1500

words) with the following sections and content **(Note: you should format your assignment into four sections, I, II, III, IV and use the section headings below)**:

I. Background and Description of the AI in Question:
   a. In this section, give a description of the AI that is the focus of the policy proposal, providing enough detail to educate the reader about it, and to support the social implications, recommendations, and objection/response you will discuss in Sections II and III and IV. The AI you describe in this section can be fictional (this is a hypothetical scenario), but should draw directly from AI features described in the relevant course readings. Be sure to include all of the relevant details to make your case.

II. Ethical Implications of the Policy Proposal:
   a. Identify and clearly explain **two** specific ethical issues that could foreseeably result if the government follows through with its policy proposal. The ethical issues **must** be drawn from and supported by course readings, and you must provide references to those course readings, along with quotes, to support your claims. **Be as specific as possible** when describing the ethical issues. For example, if you are interested in talking about "privacy concerns" that might arise due to the policy proposal, you will need to describe **specific** privacy concerns (use the course readings for this). Please note that the ethical issues could be harms or benefits depending on your analysis of the proposal.

III. Normative Recommendations:
   a. Provide **two** separate normative (*ought*) recommendations to the government on what they ought to do with their proposal to address the ethical issues you identified in Section II. You **must** provide an argument why they ought to follow each of your two recommendations. Each of your recommendations can take the form of: arguing for or against the government's proposal; or identifying and arguing in favour of specific changes or additions to the policy proposal. For example, if in section II you identify privacy concerns that arise if the proposal were implemented, you could argue in this section that, "The government ought to put in place legislation to protect against the *specific* privacy concerns as identified clearly in Section II". Then you **must** provide an argument why following the recommendation to put in place privacy protections would be the right thing to do, which should consist mainly of explaining how the recommendation will address/correct/counteract/promote either or both of the ethical

issues you raise in Section II. **You must use course readings** (quotes and citations) to support your argument.

IV. Possible Objection and Response:
   a. In this section pick **ONE** of the recommendations you argued for in Section III and provide a possible objection to it (in other words, imagine you are someone who disagrees with your recommendation). Clearly articulate the objection **and** then provide a clear response to it. The response should not just be a restatement of your original argument. Be sure not to commit fallacies (Slippery Slopes, Appeals to General Belief, Straw Men, etc.,) in generating your objection! Be generous to your hypothetical detractors!

Notes:

Be sure to identify which policy proposal you are addressing on your title page.

Be sure to avoid fallacies like the Slippery Slopes, Appeals to General Belief, Straw Men, etc., in all of your arguments.

You **must** draw from the assigned course readings in this assignment. You may also draw from additional sources outside of the course material if you think it will help to clarify your argument/objection/response.

The 1200-1500 word limit does NOT include title page or Bibliographic text.

I would expect you to reference 5-10 sources for this assignment, some of which must be course readings.

Policy Brief – Grading Rubric

Spelling & Grammar (5% overall)	(Mark = 0-1) Assignment contains numerous spelling mistakes and grammatical errors.	(Mark = 2-3) Assignment contains some spelling mistakes and grammatical errors.	(Mark = 4-5) Assignment contains no spelling mistakes or grammatical errors.
Quotes & Citations (5% overall)	(Mark = 0-1) No quotes are used accurately or effectively; and/or no quotes/citations used; and/or most citations are poorly formatted.	(Mark = 2-3) Some quotes are used accurately and effectively; and/or few quotes/citations used; and/or some citations are poorly formatted.	(Mark = 4-5) All quotes used accurately and effectively; and several quotes/citations used; and all citations are properly formatted.
Overall Clarity (10% overall)	(Mark = 0-3) Writing is generally unclear.	(Mark = 4-7) Writing is generally clear.	(Mark = 8-10) Writing is very clear.
Background and Description of AI (15% overall)	(Mark = 0-5) No background or description provided; and/or description does not support Sections II, III, IV.	(Mark = 6-11) Brief background and description are provided; and/or description somewhat support Sections II, III, IV.	(Mark = 12-15) Background and description clearly support Sections II, III, IV.
Identification of Ethical Implications (25% overall)	(Mark = 0-8) No ethical implications identified; and/or no course readings used in support; and/or course reading cited do not support the ethical implications.	(Mark = 9-18) Student identifies only one ethical implication; and/or ethical implications are not specific and somewhat vague; and/or some course readings cited support the ethical implications.	(Mark = 19-25) Student identifies two ethical implications; and ethical implications very specific; and course readings cited clearly support ethical implications.
Recommendations & Argument (25% overall)	(Mark = 0-8) No recommendations made; and/or no supporting arguments provided; and/or no course readings used to support recommendations/arguments.	(Mark = 9-18) Only one recommendation made; and/or supporting argument only relates to one recommendation; and/or course readings used somewhat support recommendations/arguments; and/or recommendation somewhat addresses the ethical issue(s).	(Mark = 19-25) Both recommendations and supporting arguments are well supported by course readings; and recommendations clearly address the ethical issue(s).
Objection & Response (15% overall)	(Mark = 0-5) No objection considered; and/or no response considered; and/or response is just a restatement of initial argument from section III; and/or response is completely fallacious.	(Mark = 9-11) Objection is somewhat unclear; and/or response is somewhat unclear; and/or response is mostly a restatement of initial argument from section III; and/or objection is somewhat fallacious.	(Mark = 12-15) Objection is clear and contains no fallacies; and response is clear and adds to the original argument.