

Curriculum Proposal Cover Sheet - University-Wide Undergraduate Curriculum Committee

Contact Person(s) Rives, B., Rubenstein, E.	Email Address rives; erubens
Proposing Department/Unit PHIL	Phone x2310

Check all appropriate lines and complete all information. Use a separate cover sheet for each course proposal and/or program proposal.

1. Course Proposals (check all that apply)

<input type="checkbox"/> New Course	<input type="checkbox"/> Course Prefix Change	<input type="checkbox"/> Course Deletion
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Course Revision	<input type="checkbox"/> Course Number and/or Title Change	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Catalog Description Change

Current course prefix, number and full title: PHIL 222 Ethics

Proposed course prefix, number and full title, if changing: _____

2. Liberal Studies Course Designations, as appropriate
 This course is also proposed as a Liberal Studies Course (please mark the appropriate categories below)

<input type="checkbox"/> Learning Skills	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Knowledge Area	<input type="checkbox"/> Global and Multicultural Awareness	<input type="checkbox"/> Writing Across the Curriculum (W Course)
------------------------------------------	----------------------------------------------------	-------------------------------------------------------------	-------------------------------------------------------------------

Liberal Studies Elective (please mark the designation(s) that applies – must meet at least one)

<input type="checkbox"/> Global Citizenship	<input type="checkbox"/> Information Literacy	<input type="checkbox"/> Oral Communication
<input type="checkbox"/> Quantitative Reasoning	<input type="checkbox"/> Scientific Literacy	<input type="checkbox"/> Technological Literacy

3. Other Designations, as appropriate

<input type="checkbox"/> Honors College Course	<input type="checkbox"/> Other: (e.g. Women's Studies, Pan African)
------------------------------------------------	---------------------------------------------------------------------

4. Program Proposals

<input type="checkbox"/> Catalog Description Change	<input type="checkbox"/> Program Revision	<input type="checkbox"/> Program Title Change	<input type="checkbox"/> New Track
<input type="checkbox"/> New Degree Program	<input type="checkbox"/> New Minor Program	<input type="checkbox"/> Liberal Studies Requirement Changes	<input type="checkbox"/> Other

Current program name: _____

Proposed program name, if changing: _____

5. Approvals	Signature	Date
Department Curriculum Committee Chair(s)	<i>Eric Rubenstein</i>	12/1/11
Department Chairperson(s)	<i>Man...</i>	12/1/11
College Curriculum Committee Chair	<i>...</i>	12/13/11
College Dean	<i>...</i>	12/26/12
Director of Liberal Studies (as needed)	<i>...</i>	2/29/12
Director of Honors College (as needed)		
Provost (as needed)		
Additional signature (with title) as appropriate		
UWUCC Co-Chairs	<i>Gail Schriest</i>	3/6/12

Received

FEB 23 2012

Received

JAN 27 2012

PHIL 222—Ethics: New Syllabus of Record

Overview of changes from original syllabus of record:

1. The course description has been slightly revised.
2. The course objectives have been changed so that they are aligned with the Expected Undergraduate Student Learning Outcomes.
3. Bibliography has been updated.
4. Minor changes made to "Course Analysis Questionnaire."

Current Catalog Description:

PHIL 222 Ethics

An investigation of efforts to rationally justify moral judgment. Deals with fundamental issues such as: What is morality? Are moral notions cultural, rational, divine, or innate in origin? Are they relative or absolute? Are they freely chosen or determined by genetics and/or environment? Covers a variety of ethical theories significant both historically and contemporarily and applies those theories to current issues which involve moral dilemmas.

Proposed Catalog Description:

Examines attempts to answer foundational questions of ethics, including the following. Why should we be moral? What do morally correct actions have in common? Are there objective moral standards, or are moral codes relative to individual societies? Does morality require religion? Diverse moral theories will be applied to contemporary debates and controversies, such as environmental ethics, abortion, capital punishment, affirmative action, and animal rights. Readings will draw on historical and contemporary figures.

Rationale: The basic elements of the proposed catalog description are the same as those in the current description. The changes are primarily stylistic, but also reflect a slight change in emphasis in how present faculty are teaching the course.

Syllabus of Record: Ethics PHIL 222

I. Catalogue Description

PHIL 222 Ethics

3 class hours, 0 lab hours, 3 credits (3c- 0l-3cr)

Prerequisites: None

Examines attempts to answer foundational questions of ethics, including the following. Why should we be moral? What do morally correct actions have in common? Are there objective moral standards, or are moral codes relative to individual societies? Does morality require religion? Diverse moral theories will be applied to contemporary debates and controversies, such as environmental ethics, abortion, capital punishment, affirmative action, and animal rights. Readings will draw on historical and contemporary figures.

II. Course Outcomes

Objective 1:

Demonstrate knowledge and understanding of key concepts, questions, and debates in moral philosophy.

Expected Student Learning Outcomes 1

Informed Learners

Rationale:

This course introduces students to an important branch of philosophy, namely ethics. Various foundational issues are explored concerning the nature of right and wrong and whether there are universal, objective truths about the moral status of individual actions and social policies. After providing a grounding in the major competing theories of morality, students are asked to apply those theories to contemporary issues and debates. Assignments range from true/false and multiple choice questions to short answer and essays, all designed to test students comprehension of basic terms, distinctions, and questions that are foundational to the area of philosophy known as Ethics.

Objective 2:

Demonstrate knowledge and understanding of past and present moral controversies from historical and philosophical perspectives.

Expected Student Learning Outcomes 1 and 3

Informed and Responsible Learners

Rationale:

Assignments will require students to demonstrate knowledge of different positions taken on a range of moral debates and controversies, including the strengths and weaknesses of each position. This will happen through short-answer questions and short papers, and where possible, in exam questions. (EUSLO 1)

Based on the course setup outlined below, students will gain an appreciation of the historical roots of different moral theories and their ongoing relevance to present-day concerns. The issues we discuss in this class will also have connections with other disciplines- such as issues raised in anthropology about cultural mores, in political science about fairness and justice, etc, and thus the Responsible Learner outcome will also be met. Assignments will address these

issues by requiring students to demonstrate understanding of such distinctions as between ethical and cultural relativism; relative vs. absolute poverty; utilitarian vs. deontological conceptions of justice and its implementation, all of which can be accomplished in a multitude of assignment types. (EUSLO 3)

Objective 3:

Demonstrate effective oral and written communication abilities.

Expected Student Learning Outcomes 2

Empowered Learners

Rationale:

Short writing assignments and short papers will focus on discussion and debating of contemporary moral controversies, as well as the short writing assignments that will be done, are all in service of meeting the Empowered Learner outcome. So will in-class discussions, which can serve as the subject matter for short-writing assignments as well.

Objective 4:

Demonstrate critical-thinking skills including analysis of diverse theories, and the ability to apply those moral theories to contemporary debates and controversies.

Expected Student Learning Outcomes 2

Empowered Learners

Rationale:

Assignments will require students to raise objections and defenses for both to own positions and for ones they disagree with (in short writing assignments and a short papers, and where possible, in exam questions.) This will be in service of enhancing critical thinking skills, which is the hallmark of Philosophy. The focus on critical thinking skills is particularly emphasized in our introductory level courses, where students are taught explicitly about the nature of good reasoning (according to the different standards appropriate to what kind of argument is being used) and how to assess such reasoning/arguments.

Objective 5:

Demonstrate understanding of the demands for social justice and equality as articulated by different authors.

Expected Student Learning Outcomes 3

Responsible Learners

Rationale:

Concerns about social justice are explicitly addressed in various course components- such as the units on World Hunger and Poverty, Gender Equality, Abortion, etc. Assignments will test students comprehension of the different debates and the various positions that have been endorsed by various authors.

Objective 6:

Demonstrate an understanding of the implications of accepting particular moral philosophies both in one's behavior and that of society in general.

Expected Student Learning Outcomes 3

Responsible Learners

Rationale:

This course combines theoretical and practical concerns about how one should act and what type of person one should strive to be. Writing assignments and class discussions will emphasize how theories of morality have practical implications for behavior-- and having students work through what those implications are-- are important goals for this course.

III. Detailed Course Outline

Week 1-2 *Introduction to Philosophy and Ethics* (6 Hours)

- a. What is Moral Philosophy?
- b. The Connection Between Ethics and Religion
- c. The Divine Command Theory
- d. The "Euthyphro Objection"

Week 3: *The Threat of Relativism* (3 Hours)

- a. Cultural Relativism
- b. Normative Relativism
- c. Evaluating Arguments for and against Relativism

Week 5: *Egoism* (3 Hours)

- a. Psychological vs. Ethical Egoism
- b. Evaluating Arguments for and against Egoism

Exam One: (1 Hour)

Week 6-7: *Utilitarianism* (5 Hours)

- a. Mill's Theory of 'The Good' and 'The Right'
- b. The 'maximization of happiness' principle
- b. Act vs. Rule Utilitarianism
- c. Assessing the merits of Utilitarianism

Week 8-9: *Kant's Deontology* (5 Hours)

- a. Human Motivation: Desire and Reason
- b. Duties and Obligations
- c. Categorical and Hypothetical Imperatives
- d. The Humanity Formulation of the Categorical Imperative

Week 10: *The Moral Status of Animals* (4 Hours)

- a. Singer and Utilitarian Arguments
- b. Regan and Kantian Arguments
- c. The Ethics of Animals in Medical Research

Exam Two: 1 Hour

Week 11: *The Ethics of Euthanasia* (4 Hours)

- a. Legal vs. Philosophical Issues
- a. Voluntary vs. Non-Voluntary Euthanasia

- b. Active vs. Passive Euthanasia
- c. Doctor Assisted Suicide

Week 12: *Gender Equality* (4 Hours)

- a. Sexism and Oppression
- b. Affirmative Action Policies: Legal and Philosophical Issues
- c. The Moral Status of Pornography

Week 13: *The Abortion Controversy* (4 Hours)

- a. Distinguishing Legal from Ethical Issues
- b. Traditional 'Right to Life' Positions
- c. Traditional 'Right to Choice' Positions
- d. Judith Jarvis Thompson's Unique Arguments and Critique

Week 14: *World Hunger and Poverty* (3 Hours)

- a. "Life-boat Ethics"
- b. Singer's distinctions between absolute poverty and relative poverty
- c. Debates about whether we have obligations first to those closest to us (including relatives and fellow-citizens), or, instead, obligations to those who are suffering the most.
- c. Is charity morally required?

Final Exam: (2 Hours)

IV. Evaluation Methods

Evaluation methods will vary among instructors. A sample Evaluation Methods follows for the syllabus above:

- Multiple, short, in-class writings: 10%
- 2 Short Papers (2 pages): 20%
- Two Exams (Short answer; True/False; Multiple Choice): 45%
- Final (Comprehensive) Exam: 25%

V. Example Grading Scale

90-100% A, 80-89% B, 70-79% C, 60-69% D, 59% or less F.

VI. Undergraduate Course Attendance Policy

Individual faculty members will develop their own policy in compliance with the university attendance policy.

VII. Required Texts:

Cahn, S. *Exploring Ethics: An Introductory Anthology*. 2nd edition. (Oxford University Press, 2010).

This text contains primary sources, in addition to some commentary and overview by the authors.

Supplemental Texts:

Blackburn, S. *Being Good*. (Oxford University Press, 2003).
McGinn. C. *Moral Literacy*. (Hackett Publishing, 1993).

For particular moral debates, the following well-known articles may be drawn upon (most of which are anthologized in numerous volumes), or available as individually published articles).

Animal Rights

Singer, excerpts *Animal Liberation*
Regan, "The Case for Animal Rights"
Cohen, "The Case for the Use of Animals in Biomedical Research"

Environmental Ethics

Hardin, "The Tragedy of the Commons"
Stroup and Baden, "Property Rights: The Real Issue"

Abortion

Warren, "On the Moral and Legal Status of Abortion"
Thompson, "A Defense of Abortion"
Marquis, "Why Abortion Is Immoral"

Euthanasia

Williams, "The Wrongfulness of Euthanasia"
Rachels, "The Morality of Euthanasia"
Dworkin, et al., "The Brief of the Amici Curiae"

Affirmative Action

Powell, Majority Opinion in Regents of the University of California v. Bakke,
Boxill, excerpts from *Blacks and Social Justice*

Gender Equality

Jaggar, "Sexual Difference and Sexual Equality"
Frye, "Sexism"; "Oppression", from *The Politics of Reality*
Littleton, "Reconstructing Sexual Equality"
MacKinnon, "Pornography, Civil Rights, and Speech"
Okin, excerpts from, *Justice, Gender, and the Family*
Okin, "Is Multiculturalism Bad for Women?"

VIII. Special Resource Requirements

None.

IX. Bibliography

Annas, J., *The Morality of Happiness*. (Oxford University Press, 1993)

Arthur, J. and Scalet, S., *Morality and Moral Controversies: Readings in Moral, Social and Political Philosophy*. (Prentice Hall, 2008).

Darwall, S., ed. *Consequentialism*. (Blackwell, 2003).

Foot, P., "Utilitarianism and the Virtues". *Mind*, 1985, vol. 94: pp. 107-123.

Foot, P., *Virtues and Vices*. (Blackwell, 1978).

Kant, I., *Groundwork for the Metaphysics of Morals*. J. Ladd, Trans. (Hackett Pub. Co, 1995)

MacIntyre, A., *After Virtue*. (Duckworth, 1985).

Mill, J. S., *Utilitarianism*. (Oxford University Press, 1998).

Nussbaum, M., *Women and Human Development: The Capabilities Approach*. (Cambridge University Press, 2000).

Parfit, D., *Reasons and Persons*. (Clarendon Press, 1984).

Rawls, J., *A Theory of Justice*. (Harvard University Press, 1971).

Singer, M., "Actual Consequence Utilitarianism," *Mind*, 1977, vol. 86: pp. 67-77.

Timmons, M., *Conduct and Character*. (Wadsworth Publishing, 2005).

White, J., *Contemporary Moral Problems*. (Wadsworth Publishing, 2011).

Williams, B., "A Critique of Utilitarianism" in *Utilitarianism: For and Against*. J.J.C. Smart and B. Williams (Cambridge University Press, 1973), pp. 77-150.

Williams, B., *Ethics and the Limits of Philosophy*. (Harvard University Press, 1985).

SAMPLE ASSIGNMENT (ESSAY) FOR LIBERAL STUDIES COURSE: PHIL 222

For this writing assignment you are to answer the following question:

How does Rule Utilitarianism differ from Act utilitarianism?

For this paper, I am interested in a careful and detailed summary of the two versions of Utilitarianism. Later in the semester there will be opportunities for you to defend your own views. For now I want you to focus on clearly explaining the positions in question.

In particular, you should take great care to explain what the two versions of Utilitarianism have in common, and where they differ. Don't worry about trying to argue for one being better than the other. Just explain the positions and how they differ- just as you would if you were the professor trying to teach students about this moral theory. That means, as well, that I want to see how YOU explain it. I don't want you to merely recite what so-and-so at this or that website thinks. I want to see how well you understand the material, which requires you to explain it in your own words. In fact, I highly recommend avoiding the internet for help entirely. The text and my lectures/study guides should be all that you need.

Students often wonder how much material can be presupposed and how much needs to be made explicit. I recommend the following: Imagine that you are going to read the finished paper out-loud to a roommate, one who has taken no Philosophy. If this person is going to understand your paper, you must carefully explain any technical terms and important concepts. As well, by imagining the paper is going to be read aloud, you will force yourself to keep your sentences relatively simple and straightforward; otherwise a listener wouldn't be able to follow you. The goal is to get your ideas across.

* *

This essay should be approximately 2 pages, typed, double-spaced, with 1" margins and 12 point fonts. It is due _____.

* *

Please carefully read the following statement regarding plagiarism:

Academic honesty is an essential component of intellectual development. And it is a vital element in the mission of this University. As such, you should familiarize yourself with IUP's policy on academic honesty, found in the Student Handbook. I will not tolerate any violations of this policy. If you have any questions about the policy or more generally about what counts as plagiarism, please do not hesitate to contact me.

Grading Criteria for 'Act v. Rule Utilitarianism' Essay:

A papers generally meet the following criteria:

- Are well-written, with a minimum of typographical, grammatical, and spelling errors.
- Demonstrate an understanding of what the two positions have in common, and why both are versions of Utilitarianism.
- Clearly demonstrate a comprehension of the difference between the two versions of Utilitarianism..
- Accurately explain how Rule Utilitarianism is still a form of utilitarianism, and makes clear what is it that is maximized by Rule Utilitarianism versus what is maximized by Act

Utilitarianism. A good, original example can suffice to meet this requirement.

B papers generally meet the following criteria:

- Demonstrate an understanding of what utilitarianism is general is.
- Demonstrate an understanding of what the two versions of utilitarianism have in common, but lacks clarity on how they differ (or vice versa).
- Are well-written, with only a few writing mistakes.

C papers generally:

- Are not clearly organized.
- Do not show a clear understanding of what the two views have in common nor how they really differ.
- Do show at least an understanding of what utilitarianism in general is.

D papers generally:

- Are poorly written.
- Demonstrate minimal understanding of utilitarianism in general.
- Demonstrate no understanding that there can be different versions of utilitarianism.

F papers generally:

- Make use of material found online that is simply cut/pasted into the document, without any attempt to explain the material.
- Fail to properly cite quoted material (serious failures will trigger an investigation into whether standards of academic honesty were violated).
- Are far too short, and poorly written.
- Demonstrate complete lack of effort on the part of the student.

Answers to Liberal Studies Questions

1. Typically there will be several sections offered per semester, with different faculty teaching the course in different semesters. By relying on the syllabus of record, as well as through regular meetings and discussions about the goals of our lower-level, introductory type courses, we will be able to ensure that a similar range of topics are being taught, and that all who teach this class will share in the same objectives and learning outcomes. This is a practice we already have in place, to both ensure a high degree of uniformity across different sections and faculty.

2. Care will be taken to include, whenever appropriate, discussions and arguments concerning issues related to women and minorities. In the sample course content provided above, examples include debates about abortion, and also ones concerning racial and gender equity. Given that this course will include both an introduction to moral theories, and application of those different theories to various ethical problems, some instructors may choose to include a section on Affirmative Action and/or one on Pornography. As for particular authors, the section on Gender Equality can draw from a wide range of works by women authors, such as Marilyn Frye, Allison Jagger, Catherine McKinnon, and Susan Okin, to name a few. On the subject of abortion, students will read a famous paper by the philosopher Judith Jarvis Thomson. The combination of emphasis on topics that concern minorities and women, along with writings by individuals from those groups, we believe, is sufficient to satisfy this requirement.

3. Instructors of this course will typically use an anthology of primary texts. In addition students will read particular essays and opinion pieces on various topics not found in the anthology of choice. The combination of the two will ensure that this requirement is met.

4. As Philosophy courses aren't typically offered in high schools, most students have no exposure to the discipline prior to college. Given this, we, like most Philosophy departments, don't offer introductory courses designed for majors, as the vast majority of our majors declare after taking an introductory course. All of our knowledge area courses are thus designed to introduce the discipline to students, whomever they are. Students who decide to major in Philosophy will simply build on what they have learned in this general introductory course.

COURSE ANALYSIS QUESTIONNAIRE

A. Details of the Course

- A1. The course will be open to all IUP students.
- A2. This course does not require changes in any existing Philosophy department courses.
- A3. This course has not been offered on a trial basis.
- A4. This is not a dual-level course.
- A5. This course may not be taken for variable credit.
- A6. Introductory-level Ethics courses, including ones that are problem based, are a staple of American undergraduate Philosophy programs. The following are representative:

Franklin and Marshall College: PHIL 122 Introduction to Moral Philosophy
(<http://www.fandm.edu/x1669.xml>)

University of Massachusetts: Philosophy H160: Honors Introduction to Ethics
(<http://people.umass.edu/mayae/ethics/syllabus.pdf>)

Washington and Lee University: Philosophy 101: Problems of Philosophy
(<http://web.ku.edu/~utile/courses/ethics6/syllabus.html>)

- A7. This specific course is not required by the American Philosophical Association (APA). In general the APA does not provide recommendations for undergraduate curriculum content.

B. Interdisciplinary Implications

- B1. This course will be taught by only one instructor, and always by the Philosophy Department.
- B2. This course does not duplicate or affect courses offered by other departments.
- B3. This course will not be cross-listed.
- B4. This course will be open to all enrolled undergraduate students, with no prerequisites in place. No seats will be set aside in particular for Continuing Education students, though they are welcome to register.

C. Implementation

- C1. The department can work this course into its rotation of courses.

- C2. No additional space, equipment, supplies, or library materials are needed.
- C3. None of the resources for this course are based on a grant.
- C4. The course will usually be offered every semester.
- C5. We expect to offer between one and four sections each semester the course is offered.
- C6. Our enrollment caps for lower-level classes are set by our College, and are presently at approximately 55 students.
- C7. The American Philosophical Association does not recommend maximum enrollments for this type of course.
- C8. This is also offered as a distance education course. The course was recently approved as such, and we have been advised that we need not resubmit the paperwork for that approval.

D. Miscellaneous

None.

COURSE SYLLABUS

I. CATALOG DESCRIPTION

PH ~~130~~²²² ETHICS

3 Credits
3 Lecture Hours

An investigation of efforts to rationally justify moral judgment. Deals with fundamental issues such as: What is morality?; Are moral notions cultural, rational, divine, or innate in origin?; Are they relative or absolute?; Are they freely chosen or determined by genetics and/or environment? Covers a variety of ethical theories significant both historically and contemporarily and applies those theories to current issues which involve moral dilemmas. No prerequisite.

II. COURSE OBJECTIVES

1. To introduce students to some of the great moral philosophers of western civilization (across gender, ethnic and racial boundaries where appropriate and feasible) within the area of ethics. Included would be a variety of relevant epistemological and metaphysical issues. And the material covered has both historical and contemporary significance.
2. To enhance students' abilities to think critically and responsibly about ongoing matters of value by way of an understanding of those philosophical concepts and methods of analysis that are central to the area of ethics and by application of those concepts and methods to selected contemporary moral issues.

III. COURSE OUTLINE*

- A. Values and Human Nature
 1. Epistemological issues such as the nature of proof and evidence, the difference between facts and values, relativism and absolutism.
 2. Metaphysical issues such as the nature of a person, free will and determinism, the nature-nurture controversy.
- B. Ethical Theories
 1. Various theories in the history of ethics which remain significant today such as: egoism, utilitarianism, Kantian ethics, social contact theories.
 2. An examination of the controversy between Lawrence Kohlberg and Carol Gilligan as to whether or not moral development and moral reasoning vary with gender.

C. Application To Contemporary Moral Issues

1. In depth focus on one issue or an examination of several important issues such as sexism, racism, world hunger, abortion, euthanasia, animal rights, war, capital punishment.

*NOTE: The above outline is typical but actual outlines will vary from instructor to instructor.

IV. EVALUATION METHODS

Actual methods of evaluation will vary from instructor to instructor, but will include at least some of the following:

1. Objective Tests (true/false, multiple choice and/or matching).
2. Essay Examinations.
3. Short Answer Examinations.
4. Papers.

V. REQUIRED TEXTBOOKS: varies with instructor and includes at least some of the following but definitely #2:

1. Any one out of a number of currently available anthologies focusing on theoretical selections and/or articles or on a combination of theoretical and applied articles such as VICE AND VIRTUE IN EVERYDAY LIFE, Christina Hoff Sommers (ed.), Harcourt Brace Jovanovich, 1985.
2. Mill, UTILITARIANISM or a similar book-length work.
3. Possible supplemental textbook focusing on applied articles such as WORLD HUNGER AND MORAL OBLIGATION, William Aiken & Hugh LaFollette (eds.), Prentice-Hall, 1977.
4. Possible handouts related to course material.

VI. BIBLIOGRAPHY*

Aristotle, Nicomachean Ethics, The Library of Liberal Arts #75, The Bobbs-Merrill Company, Inc., 1962.

Jeremy Bentham, The Principles of Morals and Legislation, The Haffner Library of Classics #6, Haffner Publishing Company, 1948.

Carol Gilligan, In A Different Voice, Harvard University Press, 1982.

Thomas Hobbes, Leviathan, Penguin Books, 1968.

Immanuel Kant, Fundamental Principles of the Metaphysic of Morals, The Library of Liberal Arts #16, The Bobbs-Merrill Company, Inc., 1949.

Immanuel Kant, The Metaphysical Elements of Justice, The Library of Liberal Arts #72, The Bobbs-Merrill Company, Inc., 1965.

- Immanuel Kant, Prolegomena To Any Future Metaphysics, The Library of Liberal Arts #27, The Bobbs-Merrill Company, Inc., 1950.
- Eva Feder Kittay and Diana T. Meyers, eds., Women and Moral Theory, Rowman & Littlefield, Barnes and Noble Books, 1987.
- Lawrence Kohlberg, Essays on Moral Development, Vol. One: The Philosophy of Moral Development, Harper & Row, 1981.
- Lawrence Kohlberg, Essays on Moral Development, Vol. Two: The Psychology of Moral Development, Harper & Row, 1984.
- C.I. Lewis, An Analysis of Knowledge and Valuation, The Open Court Publishing Company, 1946.
- C.I. Lewis, The Ground and Nature of the Right, Columbia University Press, 1955.
- John Stuart Mill, On Liberty, The Library of Liberal Arts #61, The Bobbs-Merrill Company, 1956.
- John Stuart Mill, Utilitarianism, The Library of Liberal Arts #1, The Bobbs-Merrill Company, 1957.
- Robert Nozick, Anarchy, State and Utopia, Basic Books, Inc., 1974.
- Plato, The Republic, Loeb Classical Library, 1930.
- John Rawls, A Theory of Justice, Harvard University Press, 1971.

*NOTE: The above bibliography is suggestive only and will vary from instructor to instructor. Actually, each instructor will draw on the entire history of ethics as well as on many works in the history of epistemology and the history of metaphysics.