



Syllabus in GE 703 (Ethics)
2nd Semester S.Y. 2024-2025

UNIVERSITY VISION

A leading university that advances scholarly innovation, multi-cultural convergence, and responsive public service in a borderless region.

UNIVERSITY MISSION

The University shall primarily provide advance instruction and professional training in science and technology, agriculture, fisheries, education and other related field of study. It shall undertake research and extension services, and provide progressive leadership in its area of specialization.

UNIVERSITY GOAL

1. Deliver quality services to stakeholders to address current and future needs in the instruction, research, extension, and production.
2. Observe strict implementation of the laws as well as the policies and regulations of the university.
3. Acquire with urgency state-of-the-art resources for its services areas.

4. Bolster the relationship of the university with its local and international customers and partners.
5. Leverage the qualifications and responsiveness of the university system and process.

UNIVERSITY OBJECTIVES

- a. Enhance competency development, commitment, professionalism, unity and true spirit of service for public accountability, transparency and delivery of quality services;
- b. Provide relevant programs and professional trainings that will respond to the development needs of the region;
- c. Strengthen local and international collaborations and partnerships for borderless programs;
- d. Develop a research culture among faculty and students;
- e. Develop and promote environmentally-sound and market-driven knowledge and technologies at par with international standards;
- f. Promote research-based information and technologies for sustainable development;
- g. Enhance resource generation and mobilization to sustain financial viability of the university

Program Objectives and its relationship to University Objectives:

PROGRAM OBJECTIVES (PO)	UNIVERSITY OBJECTIVES						
	a	b	c	d	e	f	G
A graduate of BS in Information Technology (BSIT) can:							
A. Innovate technological concept and ideas underpinning desired IT solutions;	/	/	/	/	/	/	/
B. Administer competently the computer networks, system development, software application, hardware and maintenance;	/	/	/	/	/	/	/
C. Design industry-based application, infrastructures and technologies that will promote the	/	/	/	/	/	/	/

advancement and development of the community;							
D. Adopt to various national and international industries standards in the practice of the profession; and	/	/	/	/	/	/	/
E. Demonstrate professionalism in the social, environmental and legal aspects of information technology.	/	/	/	/	/	/	/

- 1. **Course Code** : GE 703
- 2. **Course Title** : Ethics
- 3. **Prerequisite** : None
- 4. **Credits** : 3 UNITS

5. **Course Description:**

Ethics deals with principles of ethical behavior in modern society at the level of the person, society, and in interaction with the environment and other shared resources. (CMO 20 s 2013)

Morality pertains to the standards of right and wrong that an individual picks up from the community. The course discusses the context and principles of ethical behavior in modern society at the level of individual, society, and in the interaction with the environment and other shared resources. The course also teaches the students to make moral decisions by using dominant moral frameworks and by applying a seven-step moral reasoning model to analyze and solve moral dilemmas.

6 **COURSE LEARNING OUTCOMES (CLO) AND ITS RELATIONSHIPS TO PROGRAM OUTCOMES**

Course Learning Outcomes (CLO)
At the end of the course, a student can:
a.
b.
c.
d.
e.
f.

7 **COURSE CONTENTS**

WEEK	CONTENT	INTENDED LEARNING OUTCOMES(ILOs)	TEACHING AND LEARNING ACTIVITIES (TLA)	OUTCOMES-BASED ASSESSMENT (OBA)	COURSE LEARNING OUTCOMES (CLOs)
------	---------	-----------------------------------	--	---------------------------------	---------------------------------

1					
2					
3					
3					
4					
5				a.	
6	Probability and Counting Rules a. Sample Spaces and b. Probability c. Union and Intersection of sets/events	At the end of the week, the pre-service teacher (PST) can: a. define Probability and Sample Space b. differentiate between union and intersection of events c. find the probability of union and intersection of events sets	a. Visual Representation b. Group Problem Solving: Students are paired with another student and will be given different tasks to work on. After some time, they will be asked to exchange paper and answer the problem after which they are now asked to compare and explain	a. 4-Square Graphic Map b. Written Works: c. Problem-Solution	

	d. The Addition Rules for Probability e. The Multiplication Rules and Conditional Probability	d. find the probability of an event using classical probability and empirical probability e. find the probability of compound events using addition rules and multiplication rules	their solutions and answer to the problems.		
7					
8					
9	MIDTERM EXAM				
10					
11					
12					

13					
14					
15					
16					
17					
18	FINAL EXAMINATION				

Total No. of Hours : 54

8. Course Evaluation
Course Requirements: One minute paper, reflection, case analysis class debate and uploaded reflection.

9. Grading System:

MIDTERM AND FINAL TERM

Mid Term/Final Exam	-50%
Quizzes Assignment and recitation	-20%
Attendance	-10%
Class Participation (Reporting)	-20%
	100%

10. Rubrics:

Group/Class Discussion

Exemplary (16-20)	Effective (11-15)	Minimal (6-10)	Unsatisfactory (1-5)
<div><input type="checkbox"/> Contributes to class activities by offering quality ideas and asking appropriate questions on a regular basis.</div> <div><input type="checkbox"/> Constructively challenges the accuracy and relevance of statements made.</div> <div><input type="checkbox"/> Accurately expresses foundational knowledge pertaining to issues raised during the discussion.</div> <div><input type="checkbox"/> Always supportive of other students' ideas.</div>	<div><input type="checkbox"/> Contributes to class activities by offering ideas and asking questions on a regular basis.</div> <div><input type="checkbox"/> Challenges the accuracy and relevance of statements made.</div> <div><input type="checkbox"/> Expresses basic foundational knowledge pertaining to class discussions.</div> <div><input type="checkbox"/> Often supportive of other students' ideas</div>	<div><input type="checkbox"/> Occasionally contributes to class activities by offering ideas and asking questions.</div> <div><input type="checkbox"/> Sometimes has an understanding of main points</div> <div><input type="checkbox"/> Expresses limited foundational knowledge pertaining to class discussions.</div> <div><input type="checkbox"/> Sometimes supportive of other students' ideas.</div>	<div><input type="checkbox"/> Fails to contribute to class activities.</div> <div><input type="checkbox"/> Demonstrates little understanding of main points.</div> <div><input type="checkbox"/> Expresses no relevant foundational knowledge.</div> <div><input type="checkbox"/> Occasional disruptive behavior.</div>

Reflection:

Exemplary (46-60)	Sufficient (31-45)	Minimal (16-30)	Unsatisfactory (1-15)
-------------------	--------------------	-----------------	-----------------------

<input type="checkbox"/> Viewpoints and interpretations are insightful and well supported. Clear, detailed examples are provided, as applicable. <input type="checkbox"/> There are no more than three spelling, grammar, or syntax errors per page of writing. <input type="checkbox"/> Response shows strong evidence of synthesis of ideas presented and insights gained throughout the entire course.	<input type="checkbox"/> Viewpoints and interpretations are supported. Appropriate examples are provided, as applicable. <input type="checkbox"/> There are no more than five spelling, grammar, or syntax errors per page of writing. <input type="checkbox"/> Response shows evidence of synthesis of ideas presented and insights gained throughout the entire course.	<input type="checkbox"/> Viewpoints and interpretations are unsupported or supported with flawed arguments. Examples, when applicable, are not provided or are irrelevant to the assignment. <input type="checkbox"/> There are more than five spelling, grammar, or syntax errors per page of writing. <input type="checkbox"/> Response shows little evidence of synthesis of ideas presented and insights gained throughout the entire course.	<input type="checkbox"/> Response demonstrates a lack of reflection on, or personalization of, the theories, concepts, and/or strategies presented in the course materials to date. <input type="checkbox"/> There are numerous spelling, grammar, or syntax errors throughout the response. <input type="checkbox"/> Response shows no evidence of synthesis of ideas presented and insights gained throughout the entire course.
---	---	---	--

Role Playing

Exceptional (31-40)	Admirable (21-30)	Acceptable (11-20)	Attempted (1-10)
<input type="checkbox"/> Factual information is accurate. <input type="checkbox"/> All members contribute. <input type="checkbox"/> Entertaining; engages audience. <input type="checkbox"/> Speaks loudly and clearly. <input type="checkbox"/> Appropriate use of body language.	<input type="checkbox"/> Factual information is mostly accurate. <input type="checkbox"/> Some members contribute. <input type="checkbox"/> Engages audience. <input type="checkbox"/> Can be heard. <input type="checkbox"/> Some use of body language.	<input type="checkbox"/> Factual information is somewhat accurate. <input type="checkbox"/> Few members contribute. <input type="checkbox"/> Engages audience intermittently. <input type="checkbox"/> Hard to hear. <input type="checkbox"/> Some movement.	<input type="checkbox"/> Information is inaccurate. <input type="checkbox"/> One person does all the work. <input type="checkbox"/> Audience bored. <input type="checkbox"/> Mumbles. <input type="checkbox"/> Body language is lacking; inappropriate.

Postcard

Distinguished (16-20)	Proficient (11-15)	Apprentice (6-10)	Novice (1-5)
<input type="checkbox"/> Design was unique and interesting. <input type="checkbox"/> Used more than five	<input type="checkbox"/> Design was original. <input type="checkbox"/> Used three to five original artifacts.	<input type="checkbox"/> Made a few changes to background or layout. <input type="checkbox"/> Used one or two original	<input type="checkbox"/> Used only design templates. <input type="checkbox"/> Artifacts were not original

<p>original artifacts.</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Used the same colorful background for the entire project.</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Graphics made ideas in the project easy to understand.</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Writing had quality details which were interesting and supported the main idea.</p>	<p><input type="checkbox"/> Used the same background for the entire project.</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Used graphics that match the topic.</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Writing had many details that supported the main idea.</p>	<p>artifacts.</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Used too many different backgrounds.</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> One or two graphics did not match the topic.</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Writing had few details that supported the main idea.</p>	<p><input type="checkbox"/> Did not use backgrounds.</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Graphics did not match the topic.</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Writing had no details.</p>
---	---	---	--

Debate

	Levels of Performance			
Criteria	Poor 1	Fair 2	Good 3	Excellent 4
<p>1. Organization and Clarity:</p> <p>Viewpoints and responses are outlined both clearly and orderly.</p>	Unclear in most parts, arguments not tied well to an idea.	All arguments were clearly tied to an idea but the organization was sometimes not clear or logical	Most arguments were clearly tied to an idea and organized in a tight, logical fashion.	All arguments were clearly tied to an idea and organized in a tight, logical fashion.
<p>2. Use of Arguments:</p> <p>Reasons are given to support viewpoint.</p>	Few or no relevant reasons given	Some relevant reasons given	Most reasons given: most relevant	Most relevant reasons given in support
<p>3. Use of Examples and Facts:</p> <p>Examples and facts are given to support reasons.</p>	Some points were supported well, others were not.	Every major point was supported with facts, statistics and/or examples, but the relevance of some was questionable.	Every major point was adequately supported with relevant facts, statistics and/or examples.	Every major point was well supported with several relevant facts, statistics and/or examples.

4. Use of Rebuttal: Arguments made are created to deal with first viewpoint effectively.	No effective counter-arguments made	Few effective counter-arguments made	Some effective counter-arguments made	Many effective counter-arguments made
5. Relevance to Unit	Barely makes a connection to the unit. Touches on one point from the unit.	The connection is weak, but there are parts of the book that are connected.	There is a connection to the unit. Connects with book material.	Strong connection to the unit, that goes above material in the book/classroom.

Total _____ x 5 = _____

Case Analysis

Criteria	1	2	3
1. Identification of Issues	Failed to identify all major ethical, factual and conceptual issues.	Identified most but not all of the major issues.	Identified all major issues and stakeholders and the relation to technology.
2. Identification of Options	Failed to identify all of the relevant and practical options.	Identified most of the relevant practical options, but overlooked some related conceptual problems and issues.	Correctly identified all of the relevant practical options and all of the related conceptual problems and issues.
3. Construction of Ethical Arguments	Failed to apply moral standards and principles correctly.	Applied some moral standards and principles correctly, but overlooked others that are also relevant or misapplied some ethical principles.	Correctly applied all of the relevant moral standards and ethical principles that are relevant to the case.
4. Evaluation of Arguments	Failed to provide weightings of various ethical arguments and reasons.	Provided some evaluation of reasons and arguments, but overlooked important factual or logical errors in some reasons.	Provided appropriate and defensible evaluations for all relevant arguments noting wherever necessary factual assumptions, logical errors, or conceptual confusions.
5. Ethical Decision	Decision reached is not justified by the arguments and reasons used.	Decision reached is justified by ethical arguments and reasons, but failed to identify and respond to	Decisions reached is justified by arguments and reasons used and care is taken in responding to

		reasonable arguments.	ethical	counter-	reasonable counter-arguments.
--	--	-----------------------	---------	----------	-------------------------------

Schedule of Examination:

Midterm	-
Final Term	-
Classes End	-

References:

1. Student Handbook
2. Rachels, James. "What is Morality?" Chap. 1 in *Elements of Moral Philosophy*, 1-15. 4th ed. New York: McGraw-Hill College 2004.
3. Palma-Angeles, Antonette, and Rowena Azada-Palacios. *Medicine Prices, Price Controls, and the Philippine Pharmaceutical industry*. Makati: Ateneo Graduate School of Business, 2011.
4. Rachels, James. "The Challenge of Cultural Relativism" Chap. 2 in *Elements of Moral Philosophy*, 16-31. 4th ed. New York: McGraw-Hill College 2004.
5. Elemia, Camille. "Political Dynasties in PH" *9News Philippines*, October 1, 2012. <https://youtu.be/FXYK4fKIkIM>.
6. Licuanan, Patricia et al. "A Moral Recovery Program: Building a People-Building Nation." In *Values in Philippine Culture and Education: Philippine Philosophical Studies I*, edited by Manuel B. Dy Jr.,31-48. Washington, DC: The Council for Research in Values and Philosophy, 1994.\
7. Palma-Angeles, Antonette. "Cultural Divers of Corruption in Business and Governance." In *Business Ethics in Asia: Issues and Cases*, edited by Oscar G. Bulalong Jr., Ike Janita Dewi, and J. Sedfrey Santiago, 20-36. Quezon City: Ateneo de Manila University Press, 2014.
8. Kohlberg, Lawrence. *Essays on Moral Development*. Vol. 1 of *The Philosophy of Moral Development: Moral Stages and the Idea of Justice*. San Francisco, CA: Harper & Row, 1981.
9. Rae, Scott B., and Kenman L. Wong. "A Model for Moral Decision Making." Chap. 16 in *Beyond Integrity: A Judeo-Christian Approach to Business Ethics*. Grand Rapids, MI: Zondervan, 1996.
10. Que, Nemesio S., S.J. "Notes on Moral Deliberation." Introduction to course notes for PH104: Foundations of Moral Value. Ateneo de Manila University.
11. Werhane, Patricia H. *Moral Imagination and Management Decision Making*. New York: Oxford University Press, 1999.
12. Aristotle. Books I-II in the *Nicomachean Ethics*. Trnslated by Martin Oswald. Indianapolis: Bobbs-Merrill Educational Publishing, 1983.
13. Aquinas, Thomas. On law, eternal law and natural law. *Summa Theologiae*, vol 28, edited by Thomas Gilby, 5-97. Cambridge: Blackfriars, in conjunction with McGraw-Hill Book Company, New York, 1996.
14. Kant, Immanuel. "Categorical Imperative." In *Groundwork of the Metaphysic of Morals*, translated by H.J. Paton, 162-76. New York: Harper and Row Publishers, Inc., 1964.
15. Rawls, John. "A Theory of Justice." In *Reason at Work: Introductory Readings in Philosophy*, edited by Steven M. Cahn and George Sher. 262-76. Fort Worth, TX: Harcourt Brace College Publishers, 1996.
16. Friedman, Thomas. *The Lexus and the Olive Tree: Understanding Globalization*. 1st ed. New York: Anchor Books 2000.
17. Beauchamp, T, and Pinkard, T., *Ethics and Public Policy. An Introduction to Ethics*.2nd ed. New Jersey: Prentice-Hall , Inc., 1983.
18. Winter, G. and Marty, M., *Social Ethics: Issues in Ethics and Society*. New York: Harper and Row Publishers Inc., 1968.
19. McGann SJ., T. *Ethics: Theory and Practice* USA.: Loyola University Press, 1971.

20. Reyes, Ramon Castillo. "Relation between ethics and Religious Belief." In *The Moral Dimension: Essays in Honor Of Ramon Castillo Reyes*, edited by Nemesio S. Que, S.J., Oscar G. Bulaong Jr., and Michael Ner E. Mariano, 107-12. Quezon Cirty, Ph: Office of Research and publications, Ateneo de Manila University, 2003.

Prepared by:

EDRALIN D. MESIAS, PhD
Instructor

Reviewed by:

CIRILO B. RUBIN, MIT
Program Head, BSIT

Approved by:

ELBREN O. ANTONIO. DIT
Dean, College of Computer Studies