Performance Task 1 Team Journal

To what extent does affirmative action affect the professional opportunity of statistically overrepresented minority groups?

Aadi Shah (Historical/Political), Jacob Horne (Economic), Joel Mathew (Social/Cultural), Pranav Golla (Ethical)

AP Seminar (Sunkara P4)

## **[TEMPLATE] 01 January 2023 / Meeting Duration: 100 min**

ATTENDEES

| Aadi Shah | Jacob Horne | Joel Mathew | Pranav Golla |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| ✅ | ✅ | ✅ | ✅ |

AGENDA

* TEMPLATE

WORK ACCOMPLISHED

* TEMPLATE

NEXT MEETING’S AGENDA

* TEMPLATE

## **25 January 2023 / Meeting Duration: 100 min**

ATTENDEES

| Aadi Shah | Jacob Horne | Joel Mathew | Pranav Golla |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| ✅ | ✅ | ✅ | ✅ |

AGENDA

* Independently work on finding sources for our Annotated Bibliographies and IRRs
* Compare sources in case some are better suited for other lenses or if they have multiple perspectives in different lenses and can be used for multiple lenses

WORK ACCOMPLISHED

* Edited Research Question: Not enough information for the Economic Lens so research question changed from “To what extent does affirmative action affect statistically overrepresented minorities as a result of holistic admissions practices?” to **“To what extent does affirmative action affect the erudite opportunity of statistically overrepresented minorities as a result of preferential treatment programs?”**
* Annotated Bibliographies

| Aadi Shah - Annotated Bibliography (for Historical/Political Lens) |
| --- |
| Jacob Horne - Annotated Bibliography (for Economic Lens) |
| Joel Mathew - Annotated Bibliography (for Social/Cultural Lens) |
| Pranav Golla - Annotated Bibliography (for Ethical Lens) |

NEXT MEETING’S AGENDA

* Finish Annotated Bibliography (by next meeting)
* Begin working on the IRR

## **23 January 2023 / Meeting Duration: 50 min**

ATTENDEES

| Aadi Shah | Jacob Horne | Joel Mathew | Pranav Golla |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| ✅ | ✅ | ✅ | ✅ |

AGENDA

* Gain feedback for Research Question
* Repeatedly review and revise Research Question

WORK ACCOMPLISHED

* Got feedback, then reviewed and rewrote RQ multiple times
* Original: To what extent does affirmative action hinder statistically overrepresented minorities during holistic admissions processes?
* Update 1: To what extent does affirmative action hinder statistically overrepresented minorities as a result of holistic admissions processes
  + Anushka Rala
* This question might be too specific so it would be beneficial to make sure beforehand if this issue has enough research for all four of the team members' lenses. It is definitely a unique question that will do well if there is a lot of ongoing debate surrounding it.
  + - Valid; we have done some preliminary research and believe that there are enough sources for the topics we plan to discuss, but will widen the scope by modifying the research question, if necessary.
  + Jonathan Garnica:
* Could specify which overrepresented minorities
  + - We feel like this defeats the purpose, as the issue affects all overrepresented minorities, not specifically Asians or Indians, even though they are the primary affected groups.
* What new perspectives will be brought to the conversation? Feels as if this question is leading to a conclusion which simply confirms that affirmative action does, to an extent, hinder minorities, but I don’t know if this is something that has not already been talked about by many.
  + - The research question can’t be answered with a simple yes or no. It’s highly debatable due to the sheer number of perspectives describing the involvement of affirmative action in the holistic admissions decisions of universities and other benefactors of higher education.
    - Of course, there are some people that believe that affirmative action does not affect overrepresented minorities, but again, that’s not the question here, as it is widely believed that there is an effect.
    - The question is really how these groups are affected, how much they are affected, and why they are affected— in other words, the question is really about the “extent” to which these overrepresented minorities are affected.
* Be more specific, your words contradicted each other before you explained it to us
  + - We don’t even know how to respond to this, as this question calls our ability to discuss a topic into question, not the research question itself. If the research question appears contradictory, what part of it is contradictory? We don’t know, and others do not, either.
* The word “hinder” makes the question seem slightly biased. If it is replaced with the word “affect”, it invites more perspectives and makes the question seem more neutral.
  + - This is a valid point; we will likely change the use of the word “hinder” in the research question to “affect” in order to decrease the possibility of premeditated bias before we do any research.
* Update 2: To what extent does affirmative action affect statistically overrepresented minorities due to holistic admissions processes?
  + Ethan Louie:
* For over represented minorities you can consider rewording that to just asians.
  + - As stated before, we feel like this defeats the purpose, as the issue affects all overrepresented minorities, not specifically Asians or Indians, even though they are the primary affected groups.
* **Final Update: To what extent does affirmative action affect statistically overrepresented minorities as a result of holistic admissions practices?**

NEXT MEETING’S AGENDA

* Independently work on finding sources for our Annotated Bibliographies and IRRs

## 

## **20 January 2023 / Meeting Duration: 100 min**

ATTENDEES

| Aadi Shah | Jacob Horne | Joel Mathew | Pranav Golla |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| ✅ | ✅ |  | ✅ |

AGENDA

* Complete finalizing topic selection
  + **Affirmative Action** ~~or Fracking~~
* Come up with 5-10 questions on finalized topic (each)

WORK ACCOMPLISHED

| Aadi (Historical/Political Lens):   1. To what extent has affirmative action affected the modern workforce due to the effects of stratified sampling? 2. How did affirmative action gain support despite the anti-bias policies in place due to racial/ethnic profiling? 3. Why does affirmative action continue to have support despite the clear view of its presence as a form of targeted racism in today’s society? 4. How has affirmative action led to a culturally diverse community in places where it has been used? 5. Why does affirmative action appeal to a large number of people, even if they are a part of the exact overrepresented cultural minority that is targeted through affirmative action? 6. What factors led to the induction of affirmative action in the deciding factors within holistic admissions practices in universities? 7. To what extent does affirmative action help statistically underrepresented majorities during holistic admissions processes? 8. How might affirmative action be compared to stratified selection rather than stratified sampling? 9. Why might this “stratified selection” process make it far more difficult for those of culturally overrepresented minorities to gain recognition? 10. Why are certain cultural minorities statistically overrepresented in the applicant pools of higher education? 11. To what extent does affirmative action hinder statistically overrepresented minorities during holistic admissions processes? |
| --- |
| Jacob (either Economic or Futuristic Lens):   1. How have affirmative action policies affected non-minorities economically? 2. To what extent has affirmative action in the field of engineering been successful in providing women with more stem job opportunities? 3. ~~To what extent are minorities that benefit from affirmative action less qualified to work jobs?~~ 4. ~~What costs have been levied on society as a result of affirmative action programs?~~ 5. To what extent has the economy been weakened due to employers not always picking the best for the job? 6. ~~Should a company hire you based on your qualifications or based on affirmative action policy?~~ 7. ~~How has affirmative action strengthened the economy?~~ 8. ~~To what extent are affirmative action policies still necessary in today's society?~~ |
| Pranav (Ethical Lens):   1. To what extent is affarmative action a modern-day form of indirect racism? 2. ~~Can the overall decrease in employee merit as a result of hiring partially based on race or gender be justified from a company’s standpoint?~~ 3. Does the disproportionately negative effect of affarmative action on majority populations raise a serious concern? 4. How do institutions and organizations justify considering race in the admissions process to investors and economic stakeholders to whom the burden of lowered talent and merit is falling? 5. Is it the government’s place to pursue supporting or banning a policy of affarmative action? 6. To what extent should companies’ perception be reliant on choosing to implement or disregard policies that support affirmative action? 7. Can the decreased merit(in context to the rest of the population) be justified to accommodate/alleviate previous injustices that may have taken place against certain groups? 8. Does affarmative action only apply to jobs and positions of a certain level (i.e. lower paying/dangerous jobs) or are the policies always applicable? |
| Joel (Social/Cultural Lens):   1. To what extent has affirmative action affected cultural diversity in workplaces and college campuses? 2. How does the overrepresentation of a cultural group affect its societal standing and how society views members of that group? 3. Should affirmative action be viewed as a form of racial profiling? 4. To what extent has affirmative action created a sense of stigma or inferiority in its recipients? 5. Has affirmative action instead caused more hate or prejudice against the now overrepresented communities? |

NEXT MEETING’S AGENDA

* Finalize Research Question and continue to refine lenses

## **14 January 2023 / Meeting Duration: 100 min**

ATTENDEES

| Aadi Shah | Jacob Horne | Joel Mathew | Pranav Golla |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| ✅ | ✅ | ✅ | ✅ |

AGENDA

* Gain more information about topics (context, perspectives, debatable?)
* Narrow down topic ideas
* Created much more organized, “clean” looking template for future work
  + Organized previous work into template

WORK ACCOMPLISHED

| **Topic:** Usage of ChatGPT and other AI Creation Tools in Industry |
| --- |
| **Context:**   * This topic is relevant today as the ChatGPT chatbot was released 6 weeks ago online. Other similar chatbots and AI creation tools have also been implemented very recently. Many people have taken advantage of these tools for a variety of purposes in numerous fields, including education and the industry. |
| **Perspectives:** Scientific, Futuristic, Historical, Ethical, Economic   * The economic lens of this topic is important as the introduction of AI and chatbots such as chatgpt could lead to many jobs being lost in the near future. For example, chatbots are already being used in customer support jobs and could easily extend to journalism and low-level writing jobs. The stakeholders would be people in these jobs currently who are at risk of losing them to AI in the near future. * The scientific lens of this topic is important as the introduction of AI and chatbots such as ChatGPT is the direct result of many, many years of data collection regarding language. ChatGPT itself is a large language model (LLM), a model created using language data about how we speak and write fluently, and this data has to come from somewhere. In terms of what we see in ChatGPT, the data used is from consumers, not just of software such as LLMs but who have consented to their data being used freely. This itself poses numerous implications for data usage. In addition, beyond issues surrounding data collection, ChatGPT also has other potential scientific implications due to its usage. As of right now, many are using it in the field of education and in numerous fields in industry, but it can expand, and be used in healthcare or therapy, potentially offering new treatments to patients who need a listening ear. * The ethical lens of this topic is important as the introduction of AI and chatbots such as chatgpt provide students with powerful tools which can easily be used to do homework for them, write papers for them, and produce work that is not their own. Upon researching this further, we discovered that many teachers and school systems are arguing against tools like this because it provides students with ways to cheat and not do the work themselves. This raises ethical concerns regarding the usage of ChatGPT as it is disrupting the education system and the learning experience of students. Stakeholders are teachers, school officials, parents of students, students. * The futuristic lens of this topic has many perspectives as the world transitions to further use AI in products and services that affect both consumers and employees of industries this new integration will be effecting. Companies stand to make huge profits if they are able to harness this technology and a dystopian like economy/situation could occur as a byproduct of this massive shift in power and industry control. Many argue that AI has the power to eventually replace humans and eventually become the world’s new superpower. There is also the argument that AI can be used for good in markets like healthcare service and safety like Tesla is doing in the autonomous vehicle sector. |
| **Debatable?** Yes. This topic is definitely debatable and is currently being debated as well. Some people argue that it is damaging education by allowing students to simply tell ChatGPT and other AI Creation Tools to do their homework for them, usually producing work better than anything they could have done. Others argue that ChatGPT and other AI Creation Tools are very helpful as they can produce immediate results to help dissolve confusion and answer questions, something that is very useful for other companies to implement. |
| **‘Q’ in Quest:**  The context of this issue is very important because it allows us to fully understand the problem and how it is affecting our world today. This helps us interpret the issue on a more personal level which would give us more passion on the subject. Differing perspectives, some calling for the regulation of ChatGPT and others calling for its implementation, would definitely see this issue differently. For example, by banning ChatGPT’s use, it severely hinders the possible detrimental implications of its use/the preceding factors that are necessitated for its use, but by allowing it, advancement is possible, and can lead to beneficial effects. Those are not the only two options, however, as a middle ground may be reached with loose or strict regulations that can allow for the best of both scenarios. We need information from a variety of sources and perspectives that all paint a picture of this issue and the arguments for or against it. In doing research, we hope to learn about this issue through numerous viewpoints and lenses in the hopes of settling this discussion by presenting facts and weighing the pros and cons of possible regulations for ChatGPT’s use. |

| **Topic: Banning Fracking** |
| --- |
| **Context:**   * Fracking originally began in the US in 1947 but had a significant boom during the Obama administration and has recently been banned under the Biden administration. Fracking also has the potential to greatly benefit the economy but also has destructive environmental effects on local communities, making it an important topic to discuss. |
| **Perspectives: Historical, Political, Ethical, Economic, Futuristic, Scientific, Environmental**   * The economic lens of fracking is very important as it used to heavily benefit the U.S. prior to its ban. In just three years, fracking was able to produce $400 million of oil and natural gas and had also significantly increased salaries, housing prices, and employment rates in the same time frame. Before the ban in 2020, 95% of U.S. wells used fracking to drill for oil and shale. In recent years under the Trump administration, the U.S. was also the largest producer of oil. A study showed that a ban on fracking would cost 7.5 million American jobs and a loss of $7.5 trillion by 2030. The different perspectives would be oil and shale drilling companies and the workers who have lost their jobs from the recent ban. * Fracking is a very controversial topic due to its simultaneous prevalence and known detriment to the environment. However, due to the investment that we have in it, it continues, and is unlikely to stop any time soon. Beyond economic, environmental, or ethical implications of fracking, both the continuance or removal of fracking can have unintended and perhaps even devastating effects in the future, which makes it reasonable to view the problem through a futuristic lens. From numerous avenues of research, it is clear that leaving the fracking industry as is is only continuing our future on its path, allowing for exceedingly detrimental implications such as pollution and greenhouse gas emissions. However, ending the fracking industry could cause other issues, particularly due to the absence of its use as a resource. * Looking at the problem from an ethical lens, we see many perspectives on the issue. Fracking companies, local, state and federal governments, environmentalists and political leaders are all major stakeholders and have something to lose or gain from the process of banning or limiting fracking. The main issue from fracking is the release of greenhouse elements like methane and the contamination of underground freshwater. This is definitely a very heated and loaded topic with major consequences as the result of any action taken place. All of the perspectives for the ethical lens have very relevant and justifiable solutions/policies. * Looking at the problem through an environmental lens, we can see many arguments on this issue, many calling for the banning of fracking. Major stakeholders on this issue include environmentalists, federal government, political leaders, and anyone who wants to keep the environment safe. The process of fracking has been linked to a number of environmental issues, such as air and water pollution and increased greenhouse gas emissions. Additionally, fracking can also cause seismic activity and can contaminate groundwater. Many of the arguments through an environmental lens argue that a ban on fracking would help to mitigate these environmental impacts and reduce our dependence on fossil fuels. |
| **Debatable?**  Yes. The topic of fracking and its pros and cons have long been debated, with people arguing that it is helping to provide a cheap source of energy and arguing for its use, and others arguing that it is releasing potent greenhouse gasses, such as methane, into the atmosphere, arguing for it to be banned. |
| **‘Q’ in Quest:**  The context of this issue is very important because it allows us to fully understand the problem and how it is affecting our world today. This helps us interpret the issue on a more personal level which would give us more passion on the subject. Differing perspectives, some calling for the banning of fracking and others calling for its implementation, would definitely see this issue differently. We need information from a variety of sources and perspectives that all paint a picture of this issue and the arguments for or against it. In doing research, we hope to learn about this issue through numerous viewpoints and lenses in the hopes of settling this discussion by presenting facts and weighing the pros and cons of fracking. |

| **Topic:** Affirmative Action |
| --- |
| **Context:** As diversity and representation are being considered more in all aspects of society from college admissions to the workplace, it is important to understand the effects and byproducts of regulation that supports this growing push, especially people whose merit no longer has as much significance when it comes to getting hired or picked at colleges, especially selective ones. |
| **Perspectives:** Historical/Political, Ethical, Economic/Futuristic, Social/Cultural.   * Looking at the issue from the ethical lens, we see multiple arguments emerge. Some suggest that it is a modern, justified form of inequality against majority race and gender groups while others say these policies are necessary to negate the effects of historically oppressive laws and regulations. * The social and cultural lens is also important as affirmative action in college places leads to more cultural diversity on college campuses. However on average, the amount of minorities (African American or Latino) exceeded the amount in years before the ban in states such as California. Banning affirmative action also leads to colleges looking more at socioeconomic status instead of race or ethnicity meaning that more of poorer social standing could have access to higher education. Stakeholders of this would be minority students wanting to go to college. Other stakeholders include students of disproportionately dominant races (Whites or Asians) as on average less of them go to more competitive colleges after affirmative action. * The potential economic implications of affirmative action are far-reaching, but are likely not direct. Affirmative action acts to affect minorities who are statistically overrepresented in certain ways, such as when applying to college. Historically, for example, the asian minority is overrepresented when applying for STEM majors. Affirmative action cuts down on this disparity by allowing for other majorities/minorities to gain that chance. However, this not only cuts off many Asian applicants who have more well-refined, distinctive profiles than non-Asian applicants, but can also cause future economic implications after the batch of college applicants become a part of the workforce. Assuming that the selection criteria by which colleges determine if students are capable is valid, it would apply in ensuring that college acceptances are sent to those who are likely to not only succeed academically, but also in the workforce. Thus, by utilizing affirmative action, colleges deprive the workforce of students who are likely to succeed to a further extent, simply due to their race, a factor which they cannot control. * Looking at this issue from a historical and political lens, we can see a main theme emerge. Research shows that President John F. Kennedy, in 1961, issued an executive order that required government contractors to "take affirmative action to ensure that applicants are employed, and employees are treated during employment, without regard to their race, creed, color, or national origin." This marked the first time the term "affirmative action" was used in relation to employment. In the following years, affirmative action expanded to include other underrepresented groups, such as women and people with disabilities. It also expanded to be used in many college admissions decisions. However, it is also very politically divisive, shown in how a few states have banned the use of race-based preferences in college admissions decisions. There is much debate on this topic, which can be seen through a political and historical lens. Some stakeholders on this topic might be political leaders, college admissions officers, and government officials. |
| **Debatable?**  Yes. People have long debated the usefulness and equality of policies. This issue is very polarized and arguments range from modern forms of racism and sexism to a necessary step that negates the effect of historically repressive policies. It is a very relevant discussion that affects everything from workplaces to college admissions and financial aid. |
| **‘Q’ in Quest:** The context of this issue is very important because it helps us understand the situation and reflects how the problem is currently being addressed. In the case of affirmative action, we see that majorities and minorities are being affected in different ways, especially when it comes to the most selective and difficult organizations like ivy league colleges and industry leaders like Goldman Sachs or apple. |

NEXT MEETING’S AGENDA

* Isolate specific topic to focus on
* Narrow down topic to stakeholders, perspectives, etc
  + Formulate possible research questions

## 

## **11 January 2023 / Meeting Duration: 100 min**

ATTENDEES

| Aadi Shah | Jacob Horne | Joel Mathew | Pranav Golla |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| ✅ | ✅ | ✅ | ✅ |

AGENDA

* Continue working on identifying five to ten pursuable topics
* Continue finding at least two sources for each topic
  + Include notes taken from each source

WORK ACCOMPLISHED

| **Topic:** Usage of ChatGPT and other AI Creation Tools in Industry |
| --- |
| [**Source 1**](https://www.researchgate.net/profile/Dr-K-Wagh/publication/347902940_Chatbot_for_Education_System/links/5fe64808a6fdccdcb8009aff/Chatbot-for-Education-System.pdf)**:** This source discusses the use of chat bots from a futuristic perspective of industry, and particularly educators who may hope to better the learning quality and experience of their system for their students. The source proposes the use of AI chat bots to improve navigation and marketing via a recommender system within the bot analyzing the user’s current location. Similarly, other potential examples of chat bots would be chat bots in the medical industry providing free counseling to patients, suggesting medicinal products, providing psychiatric counseling via emotion recognition, and more. In terms of education, chatbots can provide students with a medium to gain the information they need in an efficient, comfortable manner. Each of these are examples of possible avenues of innovation that chatbots and other forms of AI can be taken in the future, so we can use these to explore an economic lens and find out how chatbots may influence the economy. |
| [**Source 2**](https://ieeexplore.ieee.org/abstract/document/9368339)**:** This source discusses the range of possibility for AI chatbots to be used in industry and their effects on our collective work experience. The source discusses how AI chatbots have been used historically to benefit or detriment our lives, so there is a historical lens to explore. The source also discusses how AI chatbots are created and why they are able to do what they do, so there is a possible scientific lens, although its strength may vary. In addition, we can take a look at the possible prevalence of each of these avenues and the benefits and drawbacks they have to offer, as well as the implications of such developments on our lives (and possibly in our workplace). Thus, the ethical implications are another lens that could be explored, as apart from the definitive effects that impact how we will work in the future, chatbots may affect our lives in other ways, such as by influencing our medium of communication or affecting job opportunity, which can have many other effects. Even in specific industries, chatbots can have a perceived benefit/detriment to users. For example, students using chatbots may use them to formulate arguments and thus miss out on the opportunity to develop and refine one of their own. |
| **Possible Lenses:** Scientific, Futuristic, Historical, Ethical, Economic |

| **Topic:** Use of Personal (User) Data in Public Datasets |
| --- |
| [**Source 1**](https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pmc/articles/PMC6781855/)**:** This source discusses the current use of personal/user data in the health sciences and the broader implications this has on scientific discovery and advancement. There are historical and scientific lens to explore, as the source specifically discusses how the use of “open” data has been prevalent in the past and possible ways it has been used. Apart from specifically medical science, open data has been a factor in many large databases, especially when those databases are linked to research done at a previous date. This makes this research verifiable and allows for others to use the data and see if they can generate similar results. Note the historical and scientific lenses may be too similar to distinguish as individual lenses. In addition, this also makes the data available to be used in other fields. Beyond the historical lens, the economic lens also takes precedence. Because of the use of open data in a variety of systems, both technological and research-intensive, open data is a primary factor of the success of many of these systems. There are many aspects of technological and medical advancement depending solely (or near-solely) on the reliability of open data, so without it, their effectiveness may wither. |
| [**Source 2**](https://journals.plos.org/plosone/article?id=10.1371/journal.pone.0237875)**:** This source discusses the implications of making personal/user data available publicly. It contains an ethical lens as it focuses specifically on the online patient community to highlight the level of concern that the ethical issues caused by maintaining digital data pertaining to digital users incite. The author discusses how users of social media platforms and other spaces are often not motivated to read the terms of use, which makes it exceedingly easy for them to gain access to your information for collection purposes. This data, after being collected, can be used in a variety of ways unbeknownst to the user. Generally, data is considered to belong to who it came from, unless it is freely/willingly given or sold, which is what occurs when one consents to that clause in the terms of service. However, because the actual use for this data is made unclear, and many are unwilling to read the terms of service, this leads to a moral dilemma regarding whether or not this truly counts as consent from users. Apart from the ethical lens, there is also a futuristic lens, as the source discusses how this data could be used. In the future, we may have new innovation as a direct result of the freely given data of the 21st century, but we may also be in a dystopia, where our behaviors are tracked, modelled, and influenced by a series of algorithms developed by large corporations whose goals align with “making more money” rather than assisting society’s development. |
| **Possible Lenses:** Scientific, Futuristic, Historical, Ethical, Economic |

| **Topic:** Genetically Modified Food |
| --- |
| [**Source 1**](https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pmc/articles/PMC3791249/)**:** This source delves deep in discussing the safety, concerns, and health hazards that come with genetically modifying food. It discusses the history of genetically modified foods and the tests done on them to ensure that they are fit for human consumption. This source also discusses the process of genetically modifying food through a scientific lens, which can help provide context for the issue. It then discusses the results of a survey, conducted in 2009, that analyzed the effects of genetically modified foods on human volunteers following consumption. This piece of information is really important as it can be used as evidence of whether genetically modified foods have an effect on humans. The source then discusses the implications that genetically modified foods have for the future, through a futuristic lens. All in all, this source discusses genetically modified food through a scientific and a futuristic lens. |
| [**Source 2**](https://environmentalevidencejournal.biomedcentral.com/articles/10.1186/2047-2382-3-24)**:** This source discusses the controversy surrounding genetically modified food and crops and the socio-economic effects that they have. It first discusses the motivations for farmers adopting GM crops. One of these reasons is an economic motivation which is discussed in the article through a economic lens. The source also discusses the cultural effects of GM crops. It says how the traditional practice of trade of seeds between indigenous farmers would be disrupted as GM seeds would need to be bought. The source also discusses the social effects of GM crops on farmers as there might develop a divide between farmers that do use GM crops and farmers that don’t. All in all, this source is really useful in discussing the effects of the use of genetically modified crops on farmers and what might motivate them to do so. This research helps to shed some light on the controversy surrounding the genetic modification of crops and food. |
| **Possible Lenses:** Futuristic, Scientific, Economic, Cultural, Social |

| **Topic:** Use of Pesticides on Crops |
| --- |
| [**Source 1**](https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pmc/articles/PMC7908628/)**:** This source first discusses the benefits in food production that the use of pesticides brings. This helps to introduce the controversy surrounding the use of pesticides and why so many people support it. This source discusses the reasons for using pesticides and the effect that it has on the environment. It discusses the use of pesticides contributes to environmental pollution and how it can be harmful to other animals and plants. It also discusses the scientific aspects of the use of pesticides on plants and the way in which they are made and affect the environment. All in all, this source is very good for understanding the issue of the use of pesticides on crops and why there is controversy surrounding it. |
| [**Source 2**](https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pmc/articles/PMC7663108/)**:** This source discusses pesticide use from an economic perspective, shedding some light on the economic effects that it has. It also introduces the vicious cycle of pesticides where pests become resistant leading to more pesticide use. This is where it discusses the future implications of this finding on other aspects of society. This source is very good at discussing the futuristic effects of pesticides use and how many people, despite innovations in that field, still use chemical pesticides which leads to the vicious cycle discussed previously. All in all, we would use this source to go in depth regarding pesticide use through an economic and futuristic lenses. |
| **Possible Lenses:** Environmental, Scientific, Futuristic, Economic |

| **Topic:** Fracking |
| --- |
| [**Source 1**](https://earth.org/bidens-fracking-ban/)**:** This source extensively covers much of the historical aspect of fracking in the U.S., explaining that it originally began in the 1950s and the large boom in fracking began during the Obama administration. It also can be used for the economic aspect, giving important statistics such as at least 2 million oil and up to 95% wells in 2013 had been hydraulically fractured. It also cites credible sources that show that the U.S. is the world’s largest producer and second-largest exporter of gas thanks to the recent boom. Furthermore, this source can be used for the ethical lens as it explains that the recent ban on fracking during the Biden administration was due to its unethicality as fracking included causing tremors which disrupted local towns and dumped heavy metals, radioactive material, and other toxic chemicals into the ground, which eventually led to many cases of contaminated water supplies. |
| [**Source 2**](https://www.bbc.com/news/uk-14432401)**:** This source mainly focuses on the futuristic lens of fracking as it looks at the implications that restarting fracking in areas such as the U.K. could have on energy bills and gas supply. The source states that there are many in the U.K. who believe using only 10% of the shale deposits in the U.K. could supply the U.K.’s energy demand for the next 50 years. However, many other energy experts disagree with this analysis and instead they believe that restarting fracking would have no real effect on European prices and instead shouldn’t be brought back due to many problems with ethicality. Although the source isn’t very thorough and extensive, it does provide important insight and other nation’s thoughts and views on a problem that America has been faced with as well. |
| **Possible Lenses:** Historical, Political, Ethical, Economic, Futuristic, Scientific |

| **Topic:** U.S. Universal Health Care |
| --- |
| [**Source 1**](https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pmc/articles/PMC2137072/)**:** This source mainly focuses on the social aspect of U.S. healthcare. For example, it cites credible studies that show that the amount of people who lack health care have been increasing each year in the millions and that healthcare premiums have ended up growing faster than current inflation rates, leading to a society in which most will be unable to afford basic healthcare coverage if no change were to be made to the current system. The source also talks about a crisis in the primary care system of the U.S. as primary care doctors are retiring early, leaving less and less doctors available to deal with the current failings of the healthcare system. Less access to doctors is available to all and more primary care doctors and related professionals are needed to ensure a working and safe society. |
| [**Source 2**](https://www.aafp.org/about/policies/all/health-care-for-all.html)**:** This source looks mostly at the futuristic lens. It states that change must be made in order to have a future society which would be capable of providing equal access to age-appropriate health care services. It also states that such changes to the current healthcare system would lead to better quality of care overall and lower utilization rates (days spent in the ICU and physician visits). This source also offers possible solutions and provides implications and limitations. For example, it explains how certain healthcare proposals which give everyone primary care physicians and medical homes will reflect at least a doubling of the percentage of healthcare spending invested in primary care. It also goes on to state that more federal and private funding would be required to create a healthcare workforce that would be sufficient to implement this solution. |
| **Possible Lenses:** Ethical, Social, Economic, Futuristic, Political |

| **Topic:** Ethics of Affirmative Action |
| --- |
| [**Source 1**](https://www.newyorker.com/magazine/2020/01/20/have-we-outgrown-the-need-for-affirmative-action)**:** This source covers a lot of the history behind the implementation of affirmative action and the origins of the policy. The author covers the policy’s goal both in the past and the present. We can analyze the issue through the political lens because there are a lot of appeals going to certain communities and races when these policies are put in place in something like a government workplace which can raise a certain party’s favor with a group. It is also an ongoing issue that stands to have major consequences. We can also look at this issue ethically as arguments on both sides are valid that discrimination has led to a lot of the problems we face today and affarmative action could help mitigate the effect of prior discrimination. Finally, businesses and workplaces have placed a larger focus on diversity and inclusion which could ultimately effect the economics of businesses as a byproduct of hiring employees who do not hit the same standards as those who are already statistically overrepresented. |
| [**Source 2**](https://www.usnews.com/education/best-colleges/applying/articles/how-does-affirmative-action-affect-college-admissions#:~:text=What%20Is%20Affirmative%20Action%3F,whether%20to%20admit%20an%20applicant.)**:** This source covers the specifics of Affirmative Action’s effect on college admissions and also covers recent political movement in the field. The author focuses mainly on certain instances and uses evidence from admissions rates and graduation rates of select minority groups to explain the issue. This source clearly outlines the ethical lens because it presents a counterargument to the well-accepted claim that affirmative action curbs the effects of racism by saying discriminating by race is leading to more racism to solve the initial problem. The author then looks through the social lens by comparing data from the high school graduation rates of minority students and the percentage of them who pursued higher education compared to non-minority students. This all lays the groundwork for an argument in the social lens that helps explain how the issue is socially constructed and there are may arguments that can be made to support either side. |
| **Possible Lenses:** Historical, Political, Ethical, Economic, Social |

| **Topic:** Decriminalization/Legalization of Drugs |
| --- |
| [**Source 1**](https://www.nytimes.com/2022/01/26/opinion/oregon-drug-decriminalization-addiction.html)**:** This article sums up the problem and provides interesting information and commentary on the argument. The author narrates the story through the perspective of a drug user who now helps distribute and use funding to mitigate prison and jail time for people who are caught with drugs of personal use size. We mainly see the social and economic lenses in this article and we can tell the difference perspectives people have like those who say people need to be frightened by the law and those who say addiction should be treated like a disease and not a crime. We also see the implication of these two different routes being discussed in the context of an “experiment” in Oregon. The source also goes over the political implications and the effect that voting locally or by state to legalize drugs and other substances could have on addiction rates/usage and criminalizations. |
| [**Source 2**](https://www.nytimes.com/2022/04/24/briefing/drug-legalization-opioid-crisis-week-ahead.html)**:** This article covers the political, historical and economic perspectives of drug usage over the years and the effect that legalization may have. The article goes in depth on the history of how the drug pandemic started and how pharmaceutical companies caused the problem by getting people addicted to painkillers although they had faulty and insufficient data to ensure the drug’s safety. This is then continued with the introductino of the effect that legalization would have and goes deep into the possible implications of keeping the ownership or use of drugs illegal versus making it illegal. The article also has a sense of urgency with the use of data and facts that show the urgency of the issue. The author then switches back to a political and economic view by blaming pharmaceticals and politicians for not taking appropriate action to address the issue and fix the catastrophe that was created through pure greed and lack of oversight from the government. This article definitely gave me a more wholistic and advanced view on the topic and let me understand the entire situation as a whole. |
| **Possible Lenses:** Social, Political, Economic, Ethical, Historical |

NEXT MEETING’S AGENDA

* Gain more information about topics (context, perspectives, debatable?)
* Narrow down topic ideas

## **08 January 2023 / Meeting Duration: 90 min**

ATTENDEES

| Aadi Shah | Jacob Horne | Joel Mathew | Pranav Golla |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| ✅ | ✅ | ✅ | ✅ |

AGENDA

* Identify five to ten pursuable topics
* Find at least two sources for each topic
  + Include notes taken from each source

WORK ACCOMPLISHED

* Discovered Topics/Possible Avenues of Research (sources not listed):
  + Data science
    - Data collection
    - ChatGPT
  + Ethnic Bias
    - Affirmative Action
  + Food industry
    - Genetically Modified Food
    - Pesticides in Crops
  + Drug Problem
    - Decriminalization
    - Legalization
  + Detrimental Effects of Energy Search
    - Fracking
    - Fossil Fuels
  + Healthcare
    - Free healthcare

NEXT MEETING’S AGENDA

* Continue working on identifying five to ten pursuable topics
* Continue finding at least two sources for each topic
  + Include notes taken from each source