CS 200 - Group Project - Spring 2017

1 Deadlines

Timeline and proposal - 4/3
Rough draft - 4/16
Preview draft - 4/28
Presentations - 5/1–5/5
Final draft - 5/5
Group evaluation - 5/12

2 Topic

"L'enfer, c'est les autres."
–Jean-Paul Sartre, *Huis Clos*, 1944.
Computer history is filled with questions of individual rights, property, and freedom. This project will ask each group of 3–4 students to tackle a specific aspect of these broader societal issues. Over a several week period the teams will develop the different issues, creating and presenting a whitepaper document that outline the issues. The document will be a group document that broadly discusses the issue, but also has sections authored by each individual presenting a specific subsection of our society. These subsections will breakout to: consequentialist-policy, non-consequentialist-policy, consequentialist-public, and non-consequentialist-public. Consequentialist/non-consequentialist can also be interpreted as conservative/liberal, and/or policy/public can also be interpreted as governmental/electorate.

The goal of this project is to come to a nuanced understanding of these issues, but also understand how they relate to other similar issues. Additionally, we'll gain an appreciation of how both government and members of the electorate (or members of a similar two-tiered societal relationship) view these decisions.

Each group will cover one of the following topics: privacy, freedom of speech, intellectual property, crime, or international conflict.

3 Format

The overall document will need to be minimally 2,500 words, with one fifth of this document to be a specific individuals contribution focusing on one of the four possible subsections. (This contribution should be identified as developed by a specific individual.) The remaining document should be a collective effort. The presentation should capture the whitepaper document, with each member of the group contributing to the presentation.

Each group will be evaluated by a different group based on the whitepaper submitted on 4/24 and the groups presentation during 5/1–5/5. This evaluation should be submitted no later than 5/12. The quality of this evaluation will contribute to the evaluators grade for this project.

The audience for your whitepaper and presentation is the CS 200 class. You should assume a basic understanding of the material covered throughout the semester. Strive for clarity and succinctness in your writing.

You must cite enough references to cover the material in your whitepaper. These may be books or articles from academic journals, major newspapers, or established magazines. Blogs and websites like Wikipedia may be used to discover sources, but they are not to be cited from and will not count towards your number of references.

You'll start with a timeline of the major events for your topic and a brief proposal for how your group will organize the whitepaper and presentation. This will be worth 5% of the paper grade.

A rough draft will be due 4/16, providing ample time for your WA conference. This peer revision is extremely helpful in fine-tuning your draft so that you end up with a final product you can be proud of. Remember that your WA's time is valuable. The conference is required and influences the rough draft portion of your grade. In total, the rough draft and WA meeting count for 10% of the paper grade.

A preview of the final draft is due 4/28. This will be provided to the group evaluating your presentation to help them prepare. Timely submission of the preview draft is worth 10% of the paper grade.

Evaluation of another group is due 5/12 and counts 10% of the paper grade. Details are below.

The drafts and final whitepaper should be submitted in PDF. Your references must be appropriately cited. No specific reference format is required, but enough information must be provided for finding any source you use. Plagiarism is unacceptable. The full paper must be at least 2500 words. This word count does not count your references.

4   Group evaluation

- Read through the pre-final draft whitepaper, either individually or as a group. Depending on time, you might even discuss things collectively over email to see where the reviewing groups perception is of the submitted work.

- Watch the presentation considering the following:

  1. Did the group present the materials to further synthesize the ideas and not just read the pre-draft?
  2. Did the group give a good background of the topic to frame the different viewpoints?
  3. Did the group adequately present the different competing viewpoints such that one can see how these different points of view interact?

- Meet as a group and try to come to a common agreement on these three points, identified above.

- Develop a document that captures the reviewing groups opinion about the presented work and provides advice what could have been done better. If one or members disagrees or wishes to extend the advice, they should also include an additional paragraph describing their alternate perspective. Note, if no one can agree, then everyone should be writing a separate paragraph. (This does not need to be a long document, but it should be complete.)

- Submit your review to the Moodle item Evaluation of Other Group.