**Data Science W231: Legal, Policy, and Ethical Considerations for Data Scientists**

**Course Description:**

This course provides an introduction to the legal, policy, and ethical implications of data. The course will examine legal, policy, and ethical issues that arise throughout the full life cycle of data science from collection, to storage, processing, analysis and use including, privacy, surveillance, security, classification, discrimination, decisional-autonomy, and duties to warn or act. Case studies will be used to explore these issues across various domains such as criminal justice, national security, health, marketing, politics, education, automotive, employment, athletics, and development. Attention will be paid to legal and policy constraints and considerations that attach to specific domains as well as particular data-types, collection methods, and institutions. Technical, legal, and market approaches to mitigating and managing discrete and compound sets of concerns will be introduced, and the strengths and benefits of competing and complementary approaches will be explored.

**Prerequisites:**

Students must have completed courses 201 and 203 in the MIDS program before enrolling in this course.

**Office Hours:**

Dr. Hoffmann - Wednesdays 2-4 PM PST (online)

**Course Evaluation:**

* Assignments (40%)
  + Assignment 1 (8%)
  + Assignment 2 (8%)
  + Peer Feedback Assignment (8%)
  + Assignment 3 (16%)
* Participation (25%)
  + Synchronous session discussion (15%)
  + Asynchronous questions (10%)
* Final Project (35%)
  + Final project outline (5%)
  + Final project (30%)

Individual and group assignment(s) will include a short reflection piece, brief presentations on case studies, and in-class debates. These individual and small group projects will give students an opportunity to wrestle with the complex of ethical, legal, and policy questions in a contemporary context.

The Final Project will vary depending upon the student’s educational objectives. They may for example consider the range of legal, policy, and ethical concerns presented by a particular data set. They may be in the midst of research with a data set (collecting, analyzing, storing etc.) and instead benefit from the opportunity to develop a game plan to lower the risks presented by their project. They could do a comparative analysis of existing impact assessment tools, and/or propose a new tool or methodology.

Deliverables will vary according to their plans. Students may work in teams, or alone.

**Readings:**

Readings will include legal text; scholarship from computer science, law, information and communication technology ethics, and values in design; and, popular press. Unless otherwise noted, students are instructed to complete reading assignments prior to watching the asynchronous session videos.

**List of Topics by Week:**

\*\*Below each topic week you will find instructor names and session days/dates. The date indicated alongside your session day is the day you can expect to address that week’s content. For example, underneath Week 1 is: “Monday 01/12 (Good); Tuesday 01/13 (Hoffmann).” This means Monday sections can expect to go through Week 1 material on 01/12 while Tuesday sections can expect to cover it on 01/13.\*\*

**SECTION I – THE LIFECYCLE OF DATA**

**Week 1 – Introduction: Setting the Stage**

Monday 01/12 (Good); Tuesday 01/13 (Hoffmann)

* Henrietta Lacks
  + Skloot, Rebecca. 2013. “The Immortal Life of Henrietta Lacks, the Sequel.” The New York Times. <http://www.nytimes.com/2013/03/24/opinion/sunday/the-immortal-life-of-henrietta-lacks-the-sequel.html>.
  + “The Henrietta Lacks Foundation.” 2014. http://henriettalacksfoundation.org/.
* boyd, danah, and Kate Crawford. 2012. “Critical Questions for Big Data.” Information, Communication & Society 15 (5): 662–79. doi:10.1080/1369118X.2012.678878.
* Big Data Panel 1: Values and Governance, Values at stake, Values in tension: Privacy and Beyond

**Week 2 – Introduction: Key Concepts**

Monday 01/26 (Hoffmann); Tuesday 01/20 (Hoffmann)

* Harding, S. (1991). *Whose Science? Whose Knoweldge? Thinking from Women’s Lives*. (Ch. 1)
* Jurgenson, N. (2014). “The View from Nowhere.” *The New Inquiry*. <http://thenewinquiry.com/essays/view-from-nowhere/>
* National Commission for the Protection of Human Subjects of Biomedical and Behavioral Research (1979). Ethical principles and guidelines for the protection of human subjects of research [The Belmont Report]. Department of Health, Education, and Welfare. The National Commission for the Protection of Human Subjects of Biomedical and Behavioral Research. 1979. The Belmont Report - Office of the Secretary, Ethical Principles and Guidelines for the Protection of Human Subjects Research. Washington, DC. <http://www.hhs.gov/ohrp/humansubjects/guidance/belmont.html>.
* Crawford, Kate. 2013. “The Hidden Biases in Big Data.” Harvard Business Review. <http://blogs.hbr.org/2013/04/the-hidden-biases-in-big-data/>.
  + Davila, Florangela. 2002. “USDA Disqualifies Three Somalian Markets from Accepting Federal Food Stamps.” The Seattle Times. <http://community.seattletimes.nwsource.com/archive/?date=20020410&slug=somalis10m>.
  + Boston pothole reporter app: <http://www.streetbump.org/>.

**Week 3 – Data Collection: sources and methods, legal constraints, norms, and institutional obligations**

Monday 02/02 (Good); Tuesday 01/27 (Hoffmann)

* Secretary’s Advisory Committee on Automated Personal Data Systems. 1973. Records Computers and the Rights of Citizens. Washington, DC. <http://www.justice.gov/sites/default/files/opcl/docs/rec-com-rights.pdf>.
  + Read Chapter 3 (p33-47) and Chapter 4 (p 48-75)
* OECD. 2013. “Recommendation of the Council Concerning Guidelines Governing the Protection of Privacy and Transborder Flows of Personal Data ( 2013 )”, 11–37.
* Bond, Carol S, Osman Hassan Ahmed, Martin Hind, Bronwen Thomas, and Jaqui Hewitt-Taylor. 2013. “The Conceptual and Practical Ethical Dilemmas of Using Health Discussion Board Posts as Research Data.” Journal of Medical Internet Research 15 (6): e112. doi:10.2196/jmir.2435.
* Hayden, Erika Check. 2013. “THE GENOME.” Nature 497: 172–74. <http://www.nature.com/polopoly_fs/1.12940!/menu/main/topColumns/topLeftColumn/pdf/497172a.pdf>.
* Rothstein, Mark A., and Abigail B. Shoben. 2013. “Does Consent Bias Research.” American Journal of Bioethics 13.<http://papers.ssrn.com/sol3/papers.cfm?abstract_id=2244990>.
* Facebook Contagion Study
  + Kramer, Adam D I, Jamie E Guillory, and Jeffrey T Hancock. 2014. “Experimental Evidence of Massive-Scale Emotional Contagion through Social Networks.” Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences of the United States of America 111 (24): 8788–90. doi:10.1073/pnas.1320040111.
  + Tufekci, Z.: Facebook & Engineering the public <https://medium.com/message/engineering-the-public-289c91390225>
  + Tufekci, Z.: Engineering the Public: Big Data, Surveillance and Computational Politics (forthcoming in First Monday) <http://technosociology.org/wp-content/uploads/2014/06/Zeynep-Computational-Politics-and-Engineering-the-Public.pdf> *(OPTIONAL ADDITIONAL READING)*
  + Grimmelmann, J.: “Illegal, Immoral, & Mood-Altering” - <https://medium.com/@JamesGrimmelmann/illegal-unethical-and-mood-altering-8b93af772688> *(OPTIONAL ADDITIONAL READING)*

*Assignment 1:*

Consider one of the following case studies through the lens of the Belmont Report. Write a response explaining how you think the Belmont Report relates to these ethical situations involving data. Feel free to incorporate other readings, and the response should be no more than 1 page single spaced, size 12 font.

* Terrorist Watch List:<https://firstlook.org/theintercept/article/2014/08/05/watch-commander/>
* OkCupid Experiments:<http://blog.okcupid.com/index.php/we-experiment-on-human-beings/>
* John Oliver and Native Advertising:<https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=E_F5GxCwizc>

**Week 4 – PII, public availability and publicity**

Monday 02/09 (Good); Tuesday 02/03 (Good)

* 16 CFR Part 312 - Children’s Online Privacy Protection Rule. USA. http://www.law.cornell.edu/cfr/text/16/part-312.
* John Kropf, Public Information and Privacy in a Global Society, BNA Privacy & Security Law Report, March, 24, 2014 <http://privacylaw.bna.com/pvrc/7057/split_display.adp?fedfid=43383440&vname=pvlrnotallissues&wsn=499496500&searchid=22477163&doctypeid=6&type=oadate4news&mode=doc&split=0&scm=7057&pg=0>
* Health and Human Services. 2003. OCR HIPAA Privacy-Research. Vol. 512. Washington, DC. http://www.hhs.gov/ocr/privacy/hipaa/understanding/special/research/research.pdf.
* 45 CFR 164.514 - OTHER REQUIREMENTS RELATING TO USES AND DISCLOSURES OF PROTECTED HEALTH INFORMATION. USA. http://www.law.cornell.edu/cfr/text/45/164.514 .
* In re GOOGLE INC. STREET VIEW ELECTRONIC COMMUNICATIONS LITIGATION. 2011 794 F. Supp. 2d 1067 (N.D. CA).<http://www.leagle.com/decision/In%20FDCO%2020110630A55.xml/IN%20RE%20GOOGLE%20INC.%20STREET%20VIEW%20ELECTRONIC%20COMM>
  + Kravets, David. 2013. “Google ’s Wi-Fi Sniffing Might Break Wiretap Law, Appeals Court Rules.” Wired. <http://www.wired.com/2013/09/googles-wifi-wiretapping/>.
  + Kravets, David. 2012. “An Intentional Mistake : The Anatomy of Google’s Wi-Fi Sniffing Debacle.” Wired. <http://www.wired.com/2012/05/google-wifi-fcc-investigation/>.
  + Ohm, Paul. 2014. “Should Sniffing Wi-Fi Be Illegal ?” IEEE On the Horizon 12 (1): 73–76. <http://ieeexplore.ieee.org/stamp/stamp.jsp?arnumber=06756905>.
  + boyd, danah, and Alice Marwick. 2011. “Social Privacy in Networked Publics : Teens ’ Attitudes , Practices , and Strategies”, 1–29. <http://papers.ssrn.com/sol3/papers.cfm?abstract_id=1925128>.

**Week 5 – Deidentification and limits on deidentification**

Monday 02/23 (Good); Tuesday 02/10 (Hoffmann)

* Schwartz, Paul M, and Daniel J Solove. 2013. “Reconciling Personal Information in the United States and European Union”, 877–916. http://dx.doi.org/10.2139/ssrn.2271442 . (excerpt pp. 6-12)
* Narayanan, Arvind, and Vitaly Shmatikov. 2009. “De-Anonymizing Social Networks.” IEEE S&P. http://www.cs.utexas.edu/~shmat/shmat\_oak09.pdf.
* Jernigan, Carter, and Behram Mistree. 2009. “Gaydar: Facebook Friendships Expose Sexual Orientation.” First Monday 14 (10). http://firstmonday.org/article/view/2611/2302.
* Berkeley, UC. 2011. “Committee for Protection of Human Subjects -- Informed Consent.”<http://cphs.berkeley.edu/consent.pdf>. [Skim]
* “UC Berkeley Research Administration and Compliance -- Human Research Protection Program.” <http://cphs.berkeley.edu/review.html>.
* Zimmer, Michael. 2010. ‘‘’But the data is already public’’: On the Ethics of Research in Facebook.” *Ethics and Information Technology* 12: 313–325.

*Preparation for Synchronous Live Session:*

Underwood, Marion K., et al. "The BlackBerry project: capturing the content of adolescents' text messaging." Developmental psychology 48.2 (2012): 295.

* http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pmc/articles/PMC3289770/
* <http://www.forbes.com/sites/kashmirhill/2012/04/18/a-texas-universitys-mind-boggling-database-of-teens-daily-text-messages-emails-and-ims-over-four-years/>
* http://www.michaelzimmer.org/2012/04/25/research-ethics-and-the-blackberry-project/
* Certificates of Confidentiality http://grants.nih.gov/grants/policy/coc/index.htm

*Assignment 2:*

In groups of 3 or 4, find a public data set and see what sleuthing you can do to find more information about the population of interest. Email your findings to the course instructors. If you are unable to find anything interesting, submit a log of which data sets you examined, what you looked for, and what tools might have impacted your ability to glean additional information. Be prepared to discuss your findings in class.

A few examples to get you started:

* <http://us-city.census.okfn.org/about/>
* <https://aws.amazon.com/datasets>
* <https://pslcdatashop.web.cmu.edu/>
* <http://data.vancouver.ca>
* <http://stats.oecd.org/index.aspx>
* <http://data.un.org/Explorer.aspx>
* <http://mdgs.un.org/unsd/mdg/Data.aspx>
* <http://robjhyndman.com/TSDL>
* <http://www.ngdc.noaa.gov/ngdc.html>
* <http://www.data.gov>
* <http://www.data.gov.uk>
* <http://data.worldbank.org>)

**SECTION II– BIASES, RIGHTS OF INDIVIDUALS, AND NEW KNOWLEDGE**

**Week 6 – Countervailing Forces: Openness, Opportunities, and Challenges**

Monday 03/02 (Good); Tuesday 02/17 (Hoffmann)

* Molloy, Jennifer C. 2011. “The Open Knowledge Foundation: Open Data Means Better Science.” PLoS Biology 9 (12): e1001195.<http://www.pubmedcentral.nih.gov/articlerender.fcgi?artid=3232214&tool=pmcentrez&rendertype=abstract>.
* Janssen, Marijn, Yannis Charalabidis, and Anneke Zuiderwijk. 2012. “Benefits, Adoption Barriers and Myths of Open Data and Open Government.” Information Systems Management 29 (4): 258–68. http://www.tandfonline.com/doi/abs/10.1080/10580530.2012.716740.
* Big Data Panel II: Deep dive on new opportunities and challenges in health and education

*Preparation for Synchronous Live Session:*

Planet lab http://www.planet-lab.org/<http://www.cs.princeton.edu/~llp/policy.pdf>

*Assignment 2 (cont’d):*

Consider the following questions and prepare a short presentation (5-10 minutes) to report on interesting findings from Week 5’s assignment.

“Should the use of Open Data be governed by a code of conduct or subject to a review process before being released? In order to enhance citizen privacy, should governments develop guidelines to release sampled or perturbed data, instead of entire datasets? When datasets contain potentially identifiable information, should there be a notice-and-comment proceeding that includes proposed technological solutions to anonymize, de-identify or otherwise perturb the data?”

**Week 7 – Data subjects rights, rights of others, and institutional obligations**

Monday 03/09 (Good); Tuesday 02/24 (Good)

* CHAPTER 22.1. Privacy Rights for California Minors in the Digital World [22580 - 22582]. 2014. State of California.<http://leginfo.legislature.ca.gov/faces/codes_displaySection.xhtml?lawCode=BPC&sectionNum=22581>.
* California Office of Privacy Protection. 2012. “Recommended Practices on Notice of Security Breach Involving Personal Information January 2012.”<http://oag.ca.gov/sites/all/files/agweb/pdfs/privacy/recom_breach_prac.pdf>. (excerpt pp. 5-15)
* Perlroth, Nicole. 2014. “Hackers Lurking in Vents and Soda Machines.” New York Times, 18–21. http://www.nytimes.com/2014/04/08/technology/the-spy-in-the-soda-machine.html.
* US Department of Health and Human Services Office of Civil Rights. 2010. “Annual Report to Congress on Breaches of Unsecured Protected Health Information For Calendar Years 2009 and 2010 As Required by the Health Information Technology for Economic and Clinical.” http://www.hhs.gov/ocr/privacy/hipaa/administrative/breachnotificationrule/breachrept.pdf.
* In re Facebook, Complaint, FTC File No. 092 3184 [[PDF](http://www.ftc.gov/sites/default/files/documents/cases/2012/08/120810facebookcmpt.pdf)]
* In the Matter of Eli Lilly [[PDF](http://blogs.ischool.berkeley.edu/i205s11/files/2011/01/elililly.pdf)]

**Week 8 – New Knowledge and Learning Systems**

Monday 03/16 (Good); Tuesday 03/03 (Hoffmann)

* Faden, Ruth R, Nancy E Kass, Steven N Goodman, Peter Pronovost, Sean Tunis, and Tom L Beauchamp. 2013. “An Ethics Framework for a Learning Health Care System: A Departure from Traditional Research Ethics and Clinical Ethics.” The Hastings Center Report Spec No (February): S16–27. doi:10.1002/hast.134. <http://onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/10.1002/hast.134/abstract>
* Willis, James E., John P. Campbell, and Matthew D. Pistilli. 2013. “Ethics, Big Data, and Analytics: A Model for Application.” EDUCAUSE Review 48 (3). http://www.educause.edu/ero/article/ethics-big-data-and-analytics-model-application.
* Stephens-Davidowitz, Seth. 2013. “UNREPORTED VICTIMS OF AN ECONOMIC.” http://static.squarespace.com/static/51d894bee4b01caf88ccb4f3/t/51e22f38e4b0502fe211fab7/1373777720363/childabusepaper13.pdf.

*Preparation for Synchronous Live Session:*

* Jane Robbins, The Ethics of MOOCs, Inside Higher Ed March 25, 2013<http://www.insidehighered.com/blogs/sounding-board/ethics-moocs>
* The Asilomar Convention for Learning Research in Higher Education<http://asilomar-highered.info/>
* Wen, Miaomiao, Diyi Yang, and Carolyn Penstein Rosé. “Sentiment Analysis in MOOC Discussion Forums : What Does It Tell Us ?” Proceedings of Educational Data Mining. http://www.cs.cmu.edu/~mwen/papers/edm2014-camera-ready.pdf.

**Week 9 - Data Interrogation I: algorithms, classifying, mining, and limits of data**

Monday 03/23 (Hoffmann); Tuesday 03/10 (Hoffmann)

* Gillespie, Tarleton. “The Relevance of Algorithms.” In Media Technologies, edited by Tarleton Gillespie, Pablo Boczkowski, and Kirsten Foot. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press. http://www.tarletongillespie.org/essays/Gillespie - The Relevance of Algorithms.pdf.
* Ziewitz, Malte. 2011. How to think about an algorithm: Notes from a not quite random walk. http://zwtz.org/files/ziewitz\_algorithm.pdf
* Barocas, Hood, and Ziewitz. 2013. Governing Algorithms: A Provocation Piece. <http://governingalgorithms.org/resources/provocation-piece/>
* Kraemer, Felicitas, Kees Overveld, and Martin Peterson. 2010. “Is There an Ethics of Algorithms?” Ethics and Information Technology 13 (3): 251–60. doi:10.1007/s10676-010-9233-7.<http://link.springer.com/10.1007/s10676-010-9233-7>
* The Constitution Project. 2010. “Principles for Government Data Mining Preserving Civil Liberties in the Information Age.” http://www.constitutionproject.org/wp-content/uploads/2012/09/DataMiningPublication.pdf.
* Stuart, G., "Databases, Felons, and Voting: Errors and Bias in the Florida Felons Exclusion List in the 2000 Presidential Elections" (September 2002). KSG Working Paper Series RWP 02-041. Read pp. 22-40
* United States of America (for the Federal Trade Comm'n) v. Spokeo Inc., Civ. No. CV12-05001 (C.D. Cal. June 12, 2012).
  + The complaint,<http://www.ftc.gov/sites/default/files/documents/cases/2012/06/120612spokeocmpt.pdf>
  + Stipulation<http://www.ftc.gov/sites/default/files/documents/cases/2012/06/120612spokeostip.pdf>
  + The Consent Decree<http://www.ftc.gov/sites/default/files/documents/cases/2012/06/120612spokeoorder.pdfhttp://www.ftc.gov/sites/default/files/documents/cases/2012/06/120612spokeoorder.pdf>

**Week 10 - Data Interrogation II: models, secrets in data, normalization, and tails**

Monday 03/30 (Good); Tuesday 03/17 (Hoffmann)

* The Leadership Conference. 2014. “Civil Rights Principles for the Era of Big Data.” http://www.civilrights.org/press/2014/civil-rights-principles-big-data.html.
* Barocas & Selbst - “Big Data’s Disparate Impact” <http://papers.ssrn.com/sol3/papers.cfm?abstract_id=2477899>
* Gandy, Oscar H. 2009. “Engaging Rational Discrimination: Exploring Reasons for Placing Regulatory Constraints on Decision Support Systems.” Ethics and Information Technology 12 (1): 29–42. doi:10.1007/s10676-009-9198-6.<http://link.springer.com/10.1007/s10676-009-9198-6>
* Center for Media Justice. 2013. Consumers , Big Data , and Online Tracking in the Retail Industry A CASE STUDY OF WALMART.<http://centerformediajustice.org/wp-content/files/WALMART_PRIVACY_.pdf>.
* Dwork, Cynthia, and Deirdre K Mulligan. 2013. “It’s Not Privacy, and It's Not Fair”, 35–40. http://www.stanfordlawreview.org/sites/default/files/online/topics/DworkMullliganSLR.pdf.
* Calo, Ryan. 2013. “CONSUMER SUBJECT REVIEW BOARDS: A THOUGHT EXPERIMENT.” Stanford Law Review Online, 97–102. http://www.stanfordlawreview.org/sites/default/files/online/topics/Calo.pdf.
* Lerman, Jonas. 2013. “Big Data and Its Exclusions.” Stanford Law Review Online, 55–63. <http://www.stanfordlawreview.org/sites/default/files/online/topics/66_stanlrevonline_55_lerman.pdf>.
* Chalabi “Why We Don’t Know The Size of the Transgender Population” <http://fivethirtyeight.com/features/why-we-dont-know-the-size-of-the-transgender-population/>

**Week 11: Big Data, Due Process, and Transparency**

Monday 04/06 (Good); Tuesday 03/31 (Hoffmann)

* Crawford, Kate, and Jason Schultz. 2013. “Big Data and Due Process: Toward a Framework to Redress Predictive Privacy Harms.” Boston College Law Review 55 (1).<http://papers.ssrn.com/sol3/papers.cfm?abstract_id=2325784&download=yes>.
* Citron, Danielle Keats. 2007. “Technical Due Process.” Washington University Law Review 86: 1249–1313. http://papers.ssrn.com/sol3/papers.cfm?abstract\_id=1012360.
* Big Data Panel III Algorithms: Transparency, Accountability, Values and Discretion

*Assignment 3*

Civic Engagement on Big Data Issues\*

Details forthcoming on this assignment that incorporates civic engagement practices with issues in big data applications or policy. Example: last semester, students watched a Federal Trade Commission’s (FTC) workshop event, “Big Data: Tool for Inclusion or Exclusion?,” and composed a response to the issue in the form of a public comment. Work will be shared in class.

**SECTION III - MITIGATION AND MANAGEMENT**

**Week 12 - Organizations and Data: professionals, tools, processes, and self-help**

Monday 04/13 (Good); Tuesday 04/07 (Hoffmann)

* Global Network Initiative Principles http://globalnetworkinitiative.org/principles/index.php and Implementation Guidelines http://globalnetworkinitiative.org/implementationguidelines/index.php
* Big Data Panel IV: Governance Roundtable
* C. Raab and D. Wright, Surveillance: Extending the Limits of Privacy Impact Assessments, in Privacy Impact Assessment, (D. Wright and P. DeHert eds) Springer 2012. §§17.2.6 through end
* DHS Privacy Threshold Analysis pp. 3-7 Department of Homeland Security Privacy Office. “Privacy Threshold Analysis (PTA).”<http://www.dhs.gov/sites/default/files/publications/privacy-dhs-pta-template-20140123.pdf>. (Pages 5-19)
* Series of Readings on “Do Not Track”
  + <http://www.techpolicy.com/Blog/June-2012/If-you-choose-not-to-decide,-your-web-browser-will.aspx>
  + <http://blog.mozilla.org/privacy/2012/05/31/do-not-track-its-the-users-voice-that-matters/>
  + <http://www.w3.org/TR/tracking-dnt/>
  + <http://www.law360.com/articles/531445/do-not-track-group-finally-nails-down-tech-standard>
  + <http://www.law360.com/articles/531445/do-not-track-group-finally-nails-down-tech-standard:>
* Series of Readings on Tesla
  + <http://www.teslamotors.com/blog/most-peculiar-test-drive>
  + <http://www.forbes.com/sites/kashmirhill/2013/02/19/the-big-privacy-takeaway-from-tesla-vs-the-new-york-times/><https://www.privacyassociation.org/privacy_perspectives/post/the_strange_and_unmarked_road_ahead_for_privacy><http://www.teslamotors.com/sites/default/files/pdfs/tmi_privacy_statement_external_6-14-2013_v2.pdf>
  + <http://www.teslamotors.com/sites/default/files/pdfs/tmi_privacy_statement_external_6-14-2013_v2.pdf>

**Week 13: Other Legal Issues**

Monday 04/20 (Good); Tuesday 04/14 (Hoffmann)

* Feist v. Rural, 499 U.S. 340 (1991) [[HTML](http://supreme.justia.com/us/499/340/case.html)]
* Pro-CD v. Zeidenberg, 86 F.3d 1447 (1996) [[HTML](http://www.law.cornell.edu/copyright/cases/86_F3d_1447.htm)]

**Week 14: Course Wrap up**

Monday 04/27 (Good); Tuesday 04/21 (Hoffmann)

Presentation of Final Projects

Executive Office of the President. 2014. “BIG DATA : SEIZING OPPORTUNITIES, PRESERVING VALUES.” <http://www.whitehouse.gov/issues/technology/big-data-review>.

**Week 15: Course Wrap up**

Monday 05/04 (Good); Tuesday 04/28 (Hoffmann)

Presentation of Final Projects\*

\*The Final Project will vary depending upon the student’s educational objectives. They may for example consider the range of legal, policy, and ethical concerns presented by a particular data set. They may be in the midst of research with a data set (collecting, analyzing, storing etc.) and instead benefit from the opportunity to develop a game plan to lower the risks presented by their project. They could do a comparative analysis of existing impact assessment tools, and/or propose a new tool or methodology.

Deliverables will vary according to their plans. Students may work in teams, or alone.

Proposals for the final project will be due toward Week 9 of the semester. More information forthcoming from the instructor.