

LDST 450: Leadership Ethics

Professor: Dr. Sam Director

Email: sdirecto@richmond.edu

Office Hours: (insert hours) [Link to scheduling](#).

Office Location: Jepson Hall 119D

Class time: Monday/Wednesday (10:30am-11:45am)

Class Location: Jepson 120

Course Description: here is the catalog description of our course: “Application of moral theory to the values and assumptions of leadership, focusing especially on the ethical challenges of leaders past and present, group behavior, and leadership theory. Topics include self-interest, power, charisma, duty, obedience, and the greater good.” More generally, the goal of this course is to analyze the ethical challenges facing leaders and moral agents more generally.

This course is intended as a capstone to your Jepson experience; you’ve learned about what leadership has looked like in the past, what leadership looks like in the present, and now it’s your chance to think about what leadership *should* look like.

We will begin very briefly with **Unit 1**, a discussion of meta-ethics, wherein we will ask whether claims about morality and ethics are objectively true or not. After all, for there to be a leadership ethics, we need to establish that there is something about ethics that is real and which authoritatively binds our behavior.

After this brief unit, **Unit 2** will discuss the three historically dominant approaches to normative ethics: consequentialism, deontology, and virtue ethics. We will have two goals in this unit. First, we will investigate these ethical theories in the abstract, trying to determine what the nature of the good is and what the content of our obligation(s) are. Second, we will ask how these theories apply to leaders.

Unit 3 will focus on issues in applied ethics that are relevant to leadership and which affect leaders uniquely. For example, leaders are in a position of influence over those they lead, and influence poses unique ethical problems.

The units so far have focused on questions in interpersonal ethics-how should we treat other people we interact with in our lives. Leaders are not just faced with interpersonal decisions; they are often embedded in *political* contexts. This naturally leads to **Unit 4**, an investigation of applied issues in the ethics of political leadership. Here, we are asking the question of what just leadership looks like. When leaders are engaged in projects that go beyond interpersonal connections, they need to act justly. Of course, justice is a part of morality generally. On one influential view, justice is the part of morality that may be coercively enforced. We will discuss specific issues in the politics of leadership

and specific roles that leaders occupy. We will examine ethical issues facing public health officials, elected officials, and more.

We will conclude with **Unit 5**, which concerns the intersection of leadership and the good life/the meaning of life. An important question in ethics concerns what it means to live well and to have a good life. For those occupied in leadership positions, these positions should be connected to their goal of living well. And, as people who will be leaders or followers, we all want to live a good life.

Note: although this class is about leadership ethics, it is not a current events class. The syllabus does not change to reflect what leaders are doing in the months leading up to the class. Our course is about the timeless issues at the intersection of leadership and ethics. Current events can be useful examples to illustrate these classic issues, but I would be doing you a disservice if our class were to become a debate about whether the left-wing or right-wing leaders in the country are acting morally or not. You are always free to bring up examples that involve current events and to write your paper on something that is currently happening. I only mean to emphasize that the content of our class is not fundamentally about leadership in 2026 in America. It's about issues in the ethics of leadership that will be applicable from 2026 all the way through the long foreseeable future.

Learning Outcomes:

By the end of this class, my goal is that you will have made significant progress toward achieving the following outcomes:

Writing Outcomes:

1. Students will produce written work that reflects disciplinary conventions and attention to audience and situation.
2. Students will produce written work with a clear perspective and, where appropriate, forward claims supported by evidence, and cite sources responsibly.
3. Students will produce written work undergoing an iterative process, where content evolves (creation, drafting, and revision) and improves based on feedback from the faculty member.
4. Students will compose written work with clarity, cohesion, concision, and minimal error.

PEIC Outcomes:

1. Students will analyze the origins and dynamics of structural inequities and power imbalances in specific societal contexts.
2. Students will analyze how attitudes, experiences, and/or beliefs are shaped both by context and/or cultural identity.
3. Students will demonstrate knowledge of the effects of inequities and power imbalances on a society, and the historical or current efforts, successful and unsuccessful, used to reduce such effects.

Course Structure: This class will involve a mix of lecture and discussion. On a typical day in class, you will have done a pre-assigned reading on a topic, and I will begin with a summary of that reading and the crucial issues involved in it. At many points in my lecture, we will pause for discussion and

questions. The goal is for lecture to take up about 40% of each class with discussion being the remaining 60% of the class.

Course Materials: All of our assigned readings will be excerpts from books or journal articles. Each reading will be posted to Canvas. You do not need to buy any books for this class. I post all of the slides from class on Canvas as well. They will be available after that day in class.

Grading:

I grade on the following scale, and **I do not round grades up:**

- 100-99 (A+)
- 98.9- 95 (A)
- 94.9 - 90 (A-)
- 89.9 - 87 (B+)
- 86.9 - 85 (B)
- 84.9 - 80 (B-)
- 79.9 - 77 (C+)
- 76.9-75 (C)
- Etc.

Your grade will be determined by the following categories:

- Exam 1 (20%)
- Exam 2 (20%)
- Quizzes (10%)
- Term Paper First Attempt (25%)
- Revised Term Paper (20%)
- Term Paper Presentation and Defense (5%)

I realize that there are extenuating circumstances each semester for many people. If you find yourself in an extreme situation that affects your ability to perform well in this class, please talk to me about it. I cannot guarantee that I will be able to accommodate you, but I may be able to.

Assignments:

Exams: there will be two exams. The goal of these exams is to test how well you understand the material covered in class by seeing if you can **explain and apply** (in your own words) what we have covered in class and in readings. I see exams as a means to the end of incentivizing careful reflection and reading.

Term Paper: we will write a longer paper (10-12 pages) that takes an issue of your choosing in leadership ethics and that takes a stance on it. This will be a research paper that requires you to engage with peer-reviewed literature. The term paper will be evaluated in **two graded portions**. You will write your best first attempt at the paper and will then receive feedback from me, with which you will revise the paper for a final version. To be very clear, this first attempt is not a first draft or an outline. It is meant to be your best first attempt at the completed paper.

Term Paper Presentation and Defense: after you have written your revised term paper in light of my comments, you will submit it. Additionally, you will present your argument to the class and will have to defend it from objections. The presentation of your paper should be 5-10 minutes long, and you will be cross-examined by myself and your classmates.

Quizzes: on most days in class, we will have a short reading quiz. I will not tell you in advance which days will have quizzes. These will be short quizzes that ask questions intended to see if you have done the reading. The goal of these quizzes is to give you an incentive to do every reading.

Class Policies:

- *Plagiarism:*
 - As student at the University of Richmond, you are bound by the Honor Code. The Honor Code prohibits the use of any unauthorized assistance. For this course, the use of text-generating artificial intelligence tools (such as, but not limited to, ChatGPT) will be considered unauthorized assistance. This includes the use of generative AI for any stage of the work from conception to completion. To clarify my AI policy: I consider ***any use at all of AI to be prohibited***. This includes asking AI to find sources, come up with arguments, format your paper, etc. I realize that the private sector (including many of your internships) uses generative AI a lot. I myself have even published research defending the potential uses of AI in medicine. I say this to show that I'm not against AI. I just think it has its proper place. In the private sector, as long as you are not breaking the law, your boss probably doesn't care about *how* you produced your work. In education, I care a lot about *how* you produce your work. Learning how to produce your own ideas and synthesize them is one of the key values achieved by a liberal arts education. Using AI to write your papers clearly conflicts with this goal.
 - Also, consider the practical benefit to yourself. Students across the country are using AI to cheat in college. While this may get them a degree, it will rob them of developing strong writing and critical thinking skills. Think of how much more successful you will be if you spend the time now to invest in your soft skills. I would wager a lot of money that the students who invest the time now in traditional college education will outperform the students who rely on AI.
 - The use of AI to produce your work is also deeply personally hurtful to me. I care very deeply about students becoming the best thinkers they can be. To that end, I spend a long time reading your papers and giving you detailed feedback. If all I'm commenting on is what Chat-GPT says about your topic, this is deeply disrespectful to me and my time.
- *Attendance:*
 - Attendance in class is mandatory.
 - Of course, if you have some incredibly extenuating circumstance that requires you to miss class, please let me know. For example, if you are on a university athletics team that travels frequently, have a severe illness, etc., we can figure out a solution. Missing class for reasons other than personal tragedy, illness, or university approved events or travel will not be allowed.

- If you miss a quiz on the day of your absence, it is your responsibility to come to my office hours and take an alternate quiz. These missed quizzes will default to zeroes until you come take them in my office.
 - Please do not come to class if you are sick. I will excuse your absence.
- *Participation:*
 - Our goal is to get closer to the truth. We do this by discussing the issues with each other. So, it's very important that we all actively participate in the discussion.
 - I do not grade your participation. I don't think there is a way to do this that would accurately reflect your true participation without becoming incredibly burdensome for both you and me. For example, if I were to require you to make at least one comment per class, I would need to be marking that down while we are discussing (which would feel a little awkward and unnatural), and there may be days where you are just soaking in the discussion and don't have something to say. This tally keeping could be avoided if I were to grade your participation on my memory of how often you contributed during the semester. However, I don't trust my memory well enough to accurately assess participation in this way. I think that participation is something we do as the bare minimum for class, so I don't think people should need an incentive to participate.
- *Discussion Etiquette:*
 - We will be discussing important and often controversial issues. Given this, we should try to be charitable to our fellow classmates and not jump to harsh conclusions about their views. If a fellow classmate says something that strikes you as false, *or even offensive*, try to interpret his or her claim in the best possible light. The same goes for the authors that we will be reading.
 - However, even though we should be charitable to our classmates and authors, we should still voice disagreement with each other. In a college classroom, it is not rude to disagree with someone; to disagree with someone's reasoning is to acknowledge that person as a peer who is worthy of being debated. Disagreeing with someone does not mean that you are dismissing their views. Rather, it means that you are engaging with their views. **This policy extends to me. I heavily encourage you to disagree with me.**
 - More generally, my policy is to make the classroom a place of open expression and dialogue. I care a lot about *why* you believe what you believe (much more so than I care about *what* anyone believes). This course is a chance to explore ideas and to see where you think the truth leads. If you leave the course with all of the same beliefs about ethics that you entered with, that is completely fine with me, so long as you critically examined your reasons for your beliefs. Obviously, if you find that your reasons do not support your beliefs, then you either need to find better reasons or adopt new beliefs. I have no agenda, and there is no particular view advocated by the course. Of course, I do have many strongly held views, but my goal is not that you adopt my beliefs, and you certainly are not graded based on adherence to those beliefs. There will never be a case where you are graded purely on the content of your views or whether they align with my personal views. You will only ever be graded on the strength of the arguments you offer in defense of your views.
 - If the goal of this class is to allow free exploration of ideas in the pursuit of truth, none of us can constrain the speech or thought of others. It is difficult to test an idea if we don't discuss and analyze it. For this reason, I affirm a strong policy in favor of free expression in the classroom. This, of course, entails a strong policy in favor of

debate, criticism, and examination of each other's beliefs and arguments. The goal is that iron can sharpen iron in the discussion. As college students, it is extremely unlikely that you have made up your minds about most issues of social importance, and the classroom cannot be a place of intellectual exploration if you fear social sanctions from your peers for expressing your views. Again, this still means that we can, and should, vigorously disagree and debate views that our peers endorse.

- If you are concerned that your view will be offensive to me or your classmates, I encourage you to still express your view (in the most diplomatic and persuasive way possible). I can guarantee that you won't offend me.
- Another general policy relating to discussion etiquette is that we should never assume to know what each other's views are based on what anyone says in class. For example, (although abortion is unlikely to come up in class), you can be pro-choice in your views but still think that a particular pro-choice argument is bad. If you criticize that pro-choice argument, nobody should infer that you are pro-life and vice versa with a pro-life person who finds a particular pro-life argument implausible. More generally, we can separate people from propositions that people say. There will be many times that I say things in class that I do not believe, and you should not infer that I hold those views. If someone, myself included, says something in class, we should only infer that they think their claim is worthy of discussion, not that they believe their claim.
- See also: [UR's statement on freedom of speech and expression](#).
- *Bringing Your Whole Self to the Classroom:*
 - I want you to be able to be fully yourself in my classroom. I view this as part of having a robust culture of freedom of expression and academic freedom. Also, your education is supposed to be about helping *you* learn, so it would be odd if I asked you to leave parts of your identity behind when you enter the classroom. So, if you are an atheist, I want you to feel fully able to be an atheist in my classroom; if you are a Christian, I want you to feel fully able to be a Christian in my classroom; etc. The same goes for any view on any topic; religion is just a useful example. If you are strongly committed to any world view or -ism (be it political, philosophical, or otherwise), I want you to be able to express that in the classroom. You should feel free to reason in the following way, "as a [insert view], I think X, because of reasons Y." For example, if you are religious and think that humans are obligated (not just permitted) to forgive all wrongs done to them, you should be free to express that view and be honest about your reasons for that view; if you are a socialist, you should be able to claim that we should nationalize all productive property; if you are a libertarian and think that non-consensual taxation amounts to coerced labor, you should be able to say that; etc. In some cases, you may only believe what you believe because of private evidence, and that's okay. We all draw our beliefs from diverse pools of evidence, and we can all assess whether other people's evidence is plausible to us. One goal of this class is for you to think about what you believe about ethics *given the evidence you find plausible*, and another goal of the class is to learn how to discuss and possibly persuade others on issues of ethics by appealing to *evidence they find plausible*. Additionally, I hope that you have the chance to evaluate if the evidence you find plausible is, actually, plausible after all. Overall, everyone is free to express their views and state their **actual reasons** for their views, and the rest of us can all critique each other on two levels: (1) whether our beliefs really follow from our evidence and (2) whether we are basing our beliefs on the appropriate evidence to begin with. For example, if

the topic of abortion were to come up (which is not very likely in our class), a religious person should feel free to say that they think abortion is morally wrong because they interpret their particular inspired text as saying that God ensouls the fetus at conception, making it a person with the right to life. People who don't find that sacred text plausible can reply by either stating reasons they don't find the text to be authoritative or by trying to argue that the text doesn't actually support the view that fetuses are ensouled by God at conception. A non-religious person should also feel free to defend abortion on the grounds that there is nothing special about human beings that makes us have the right to life at conception. A religious person could respond by re-asserting the authority of Scripture or by trying to engage with the non-religious person on her own terms, perhaps by arguing that there are compelling secular reasons for believing that personhood begins at or close to conception.

- One clarification: I do not mean the preceding discussion to preclude the possibility that some people are wrong or to preclude the possibility that you may change your mind as a result of this class. One result of being honest about your reasons for your views is that you may realize that your views are not based on very good reasons and that you need to reject your initial view!
- *Dr. Director's Views on the Topics from Class:*
 - Students often want to know what I, as the professor think about the various issues that we talk about in class. I often have very strongly held views about the topics from class, but my policy is to remain as neutral as possible in my capacity as the teacher of this course. I do this for a variety of reasons, but it's mainly because I think that discussion goes best when we separate people from their beliefs as much as possible. Additionally, I want students to be able to explore all ideas without feeling concerned about having to disagree with the professor's views. Also, while I aspire to have very well thought out views on all topics in philosophy, the fact that I hold one view over the other should not settle the matter for you.
 - I am trying something new this semester for the final unit, which is about leadership and the good life. I've decided to drop the neutrality principle for this unit. I do not mean that I will be advocating for a particular view which you must endorse; I only mean that I plan to retain the option to be open about my own views of what the good life is. For a number of reasons, I've come to the view that we cannot have a serious discussion and debate about the good life and the purpose of humanity without putting all of our cards on the table.
 - However, on the last day of class, we will have an ask me anything session where you can ask me what I think about any issues from class or ethics and philosophy generally.
- *Technology:*
 - Laptops, cellphones, etc. will not be allowed in class. There is lots of evidence that we (and the people around us) learn better when technology is absent and when we have to write things by hand. Phones cannot be out on your desk. They need to be hidden from sight in a bag or in your pocket.
 - If you have a disability accommodation that allows you to use technology in class, I am happy to accommodate this.
 - If you receive an urgent phone call, please feel free to step out of class to take it.
 - Recording of class will not be allowed, largely to aid in the goal of creating a space of free expression in the classroom.
- *Office Hours:*

- The scheduling link to my office hours is listed above. If you would like to talk about material from or adjacent to class, clarify a point from class, get help with an assignment, talk about your grade, etc., feel free to make an appointment with me. I also genuinely want to get to know you as my students. You are always welcome to come say hello while I'm in my office.
- *Late Work:*
 - My policy is that for every day that your assignment is late, you will lose a full letter grade on it. If an assignment is due at 12:00, I consider 12:01 to be a full day late.

Course Schedule:

A note on the spacing of assignments: I have done my best to spread the assignments evenly across the semester. Your term paper topic is due 3 weeks into the term. The first exam is 7 weeks into the term (and covers 11 days of content). The first attempt of the term paper is due 10 weeks into the class (so there is a 3-week gap between the exam and the term paper first due date). My expectation is that you are working on the term paper for the duration of the semester, not just in the 3 weeks between the exam and the term paper due date. Exam 2 is 15 weeks into the semester and covers. 12 days of material). There is a 5-week gap between the term paper first attempt due date and this exam. The term paper revisions are also due 15 weeks into the term. This is the same week as the second exam, but there is ample time to do your revisions and study for the exam. You will have close to a month with your comments from me on your first attempt.

Date	Topic	Assigned Reading	Assignment Due
8/24	Introduction to the class and discussion of syllabus.	None.	
Unit 1: Metaethics			
8/26	Discussion of AI and Discussion of Metaethics	Patrick Lin. "Why We Are Not Using AI in This Course, Despite Its Obvious Benefits." Plato. <i>The Republic</i> (The Ring of Gyges). James Rachels. "The Challenge of Cultural Relativism." In <i>The Elements of Moral Philosophy</i> . 1-10.	
Unit 2: Normative Ethics			
8/31	Normative Ethics: Utilitarianism/Consequentialism	James Rachels, "The Debate Over Utilitarianism." In <i>The Elements of Moral Philosophy</i> . 110-124.	

9/2	Normative Ethics: Absolute Deontology	Robert Nozick, <i>Anarchy, State, and Utopia</i> (26-33). O’Norra O’Neill. “Kant’s Ethics.” In <i>A Companion to Ethics</i> . 107-112.	
9/7	Normative Ethics: Moderate Deontology	W.D. Ross, <i>The Right and The Good</i> (16-33, 34-42).	
9/9	Normative Ethics: Virtue Ethics	Linda Zagzebski. Virtue Ethics. <i>Think</i> : 15-21. Julia Annas. "Being Virtuous and Doing the Right Thing." <i>Proceedings and Addresses of the American Philosophical Association</i> : 61-75. Rosalind Hursthouse. “Normative Virtue Ethics.” From <i>How Should One Live? Essays on the Virtues</i> . 19-33.	Term paper topic must be submitted and approved via email or conversation.
Unit 3: Applied Ethical Issues in Leadership			
9/14	Leaders and nudging	Selections from Richard Thaler and Cass Sunstein. <i>Nudge</i> . Andreas Schmidt and Bart Engelen. “The ethics of nudging: An overview.” <i>Philosophy Compass</i> .	
9/16	Leaders and Coercing	Selections from Elizabeth Anderson, <i>Private Government: How Employers Control Our Lives</i> . 2017.	
9/21	Leaders and Deception/Transparency	Thomas Carson. “The Range of Reasonable Views about the Morality of Lying.” In <i>Lying: Language, Knowledge, Ethics, and Politics</i> . 145-160. Jennifer Saul. “Just Go Ahead and Lie.” <i>Analysis</i> : 3–9.	
9/23	Leaders and Equality Within Organizations	Elizabeth Anderson. “Equality and Freedom in the Workplace.” <i>Social Philosophy & Policy</i> (2015): 48-69.	

		<i>We will also discuss how to do research in philosophy. Please read the writing guides and research guides on Canvas.</i>	
9/28	Leadership in a Disaster	Matt Zwolinski. "The Ethics of Price Gouging." <i>Business Ethics Quarterly</i> : 347–378.	
9/30	Leadership and Dirty Hands	Jessica Flanigan. "Sweatshop Regulation and Workers' Choices." <i>Journal of Business Ethics</i> : 79–94.	Exam review session will take place at a time that works outside of class.
10/5	Exam 1 (<i>covers units 1, 2, and up to this point far in unit 3. That is 11 days of material.</i>)		
10/7	Leadership and Corporate Stances on Social Issues	Jill Fisch and Jeff Schwartz. "How Did Corporations Get Stuck in Politics and Can They Escape?" Working Paper: 1-37.	<u>Complete anonymous instructor midterm evaluation.</u>
Fall Break (10/10-10/13)			
10/14	Leadership and Offense in the Workplace	Possible papers: "The emotion(s) of offense and victimhood culture" Macalester Bell RINI R. How to Take Offense: Responding to Microaggression. <i>Journal of the American Philosophical Association</i>. 2018;4(3):332-351. doi:10.1017/apa.2018.23 Sher, G. (2020), Debate: Taking Offense. <i>Journal of Political Philosophy</i>, 28: 332-342. https://doi.org/10.1111/jopp.12228	
Unit 4: Ethical Issues			

in Political Leadership			
10/19	Leadership and Political Authority	Selections from Michael Huemer. <i>The Problem of Political Authority</i> .	
10/21	Public Health Leaders and Coercion	Nuffield Council on Bioethics. "The Nuffield Ladder." Kalle Grill and Kristin Voigt. "The Case for Banning Cigarettes." <i>Journal of Medical Ethics</i>: 293-301. Jessica Flanigan. "Double Standards and Arguments for Tobacco Regulation." <i>Journal of Medical Ethics</i>: 305-311.	
10/26	Leadership and the Distribution of Scarce Resources	Govind Persad, Alan Wertheimer, and Ezekiel Emanuel. "Principles for allocation of scarce medical interventions." <i>The Lancet</i> : 423-431.	
10/28	Leadership and Promoting Procreation	JY Lee. "Towards an ethics of pro-natalism in South Korea (and beyond)." <i>Journal of Medical Ethics</i> : 371-375.	Term paper first attempt due on Canvas at 11:59PM.
11/2	Political Leaders and Uncertainty	Rebecca Brown, Mícheál de Barra, & Brian Earp. "Broad Medical Uncertainty and the ethical obligation for openness." <i>Synthese</i> : 1-29.	
Unit 5: Leadership and the Good Life			
11/4	The Meaning of Life/The Good Life/Happiness	Roger Crisp. "Pleasure is all that Matters." <i>Think</i>: 21-30. Julia Annas. "Happiness as Achievement." <i>Daedalus</i>: 44-51. Optional: Thaddeus Metz. "The Meaning of Life." <i>The Stanford Encyclopedia of Philosophy</i>.	Complete <i>The Death Clock</i> and <i>Your Life in Weeks</i> (links on Canvas). You should come with a description of what you

		Optional: GEM Anscombe. "Modern Moral Philosophy." Optional: Dan Haybron. "Happiness." <i>The Stanford Encyclopedia of Philosophy</i>.	think the good life is.
11/9	The Good Life and Work	Anca Gheaus and Lisa Herzog. "The Goods of Work (Other Than Money!)." <i>Journal of Social Philosophy</i>: 70-89. Optional: watch <i>Office Space</i>. I will arrange for a screening on campus.	
11/11	The Good Life, Romantic Relationships, and Family	Possible readings: Selections from Brad Wilcox. <i>Get Married</i>. Selections from Bryan Caplan. <i>Selfish Reasons to Have More Kids</i>. Claudia Card. "Against Marriage and Motherhood." <i>Hypatia</i>: 1-23. Anca Gheaus. "The (Dis)value of Commitment to One's Spouse." In <i>After Marriage</i>: 1-21. Kyle York. "Why Monogamy is Morally Permissible: A Defense of Some Common Justifications for Monogamy." <i>Journal of Value Inquiry</i>: 539-552.	
11/16	The Good Life and Community (Friendship and Home)	Nancy Sherman. "Aristotle on Friendship and the Shared Life." <i>Philosophy and Phenomenological Research</i>: 589-613. Christopher Toner. "Home as a Central Concept in Eudaimonistic Virtue Ethics." <i>Journal of Ethics</i>: 1-24.	

11/18	Does Your Life Matter Cosmically?	Guy Kahane. "Our Cosmic Insignificance." <i>Nous</i> : 745-772.	
Thanksgiving Break (11/21-11/29)			
11/30	Exam 2 (covers second half of unit 3, unit 4, and unit 5. That is 12 days of material.)		Exam re-view session will take place at a time that works outside of class.
12/2	Ask me anything session with Dr. Director, recap of the semester, and potentially 2 final presentations depending on how many people are in the class.		Term paper revised version due on Canvas by midnight on 12/1.
12/7	Final Presentations		
	Remaining final presentations will take place during our final exam period.		

UR's Final Exam Schedule: <https://registrar.richmond.edu/planning/schedule/exam.html>

Syllabus Statements

AI and the Honor Code

All assignments are expected to be the student's original work. The Jepson School follows the provisions of the Honor System as outlined by the School of Arts and Sciences. This means that no student is to use, rely on or turn in work that was paid-for, copied, excessively summarized without citation, created in collaboration (without permission), produced by AI, or is otherwise not the original work of the student for the specific assignment (without explicit permission).

Disability Services

The University of Richmond's office of Disability Services strives to ensure that students with disabilities and/or temporary conditions (i.e., concussions & injuries) are provided opportunity for full participation and equal access. Students who are approved for academic accommodations must complete the following steps to implement their accommodations in each class:

- 1) Submit their Disability Accommodation Notice (DAN) to each of their professors via the Disability Services Student Portal available at this link: sl.richmond.edu/be.
- 2) Request a meeting with each professor to create an accommodation implementation plan. Disability Services is available to assist, as needed.

It is important to complete these steps as soon as possible because accommodations are never retroactive, and professors are permitted a reasonable amount of time for implementation. Students who are experiencing a barrier to access due to a disability and/or temporary condition are encouraged to apply for accommodations by visiting disability.richmond.edu. Disability Services can be reached at disability@richmond.edu or 804-662-5001.

Awarding of Credit

To be successful in this course, a student should expect to devote 10-14 hours each week, including class time and time spent on course-related activities.

registrar.richmond.edu/services/policies/academic-credit.html Links to an external site.

Disability Accommodations

Students with a Disability Accommodation Notice should contact their instructors as early in the semester as possible to discuss arrangements for completing course assignments and exams.

disability.richmond.edu/ Links to an external site.

Honor System

The Jepson School supports the provisions of the Honor System. The shortened version of the honor pledge is: "I pledge that I have neither received nor given unauthorized assistance during the completion of this work."

<https://studentdevelopment.richmond.edu/student-handbook/honor/index.html> Links to an external site.

Religious Observance

Students should notify their instructors within the first two weeks of classes if they will need accommodations for religious observance.

registrar.richmond.edu/planning/religiousobs.html [Links to an external site.](#)

Academic Skills Center (asc.richmond.edu [Links to an external site.](#)): Assists students in assessing their academic strengths and weaknesses; honing their academic skills through teaching effective test preparation, critical reading and thinking, information conceptualization, concentration, and related techniques; working on specific subject areas (e.g., calculus, chemistry, accounting, etc.); and encouraging campus and community involvement. Tutors will be available virtually. The on-call peer-tutors available for these appointments are listed in the Box file: [On-Call Online Tutors](https://richmond.box.com/s/dpe37chr2zodr3o1amtj8omjk72v2ktb) [Links to an external site.](#) (<https://richmond.box.com/s/dpe37chr2zodr3o1amtj8omjk72v2ktb> [Links to an external site.](#)). **Email** Roger Mancastropa (rmancast@richmond.edu) and Marco Ortiz (marco.ortiz@richmond.edu) for appointments in academic and life skills to request a Zoom conference.

Boatwright Library Research Librarians: (library.richmond.edu/help/ask/ [Links to an external site.](#) or 289-8876): Research librarians help students with all steps of their research, from identifying or narrowing a topic, to locating, accessing, evaluating, and citing information resources. Librarians support students in their classes across the curriculum and provide library instruction, tutorials, research guides, and individual help. All research support will be provided online or by appointment and students can contact a librarian for help via email (library@richmond.edu), text (804-277-9ASK), chat, or Zoom (by appointment).

Career Services: (careerservices.richmond.edu [Links to an external site.](#) or 289-8547): Can assist you in exploring your interests and abilities, choosing a major or course of study, connecting with internships and jobs, and investigating graduate and professional school options. We encourage you to schedule an appointment with a career advisor early in your time at UR.

Counseling and Psychological Services (caps.richmond.edu [Links to an external site.](#) or 289-8119): Assists currently enrolled, full-time, degree-seeking students in improving their mental health and well-being, and in handling challenges that may impede their growth and development. Services include brief consultations, short-term counseling and psychotherapy, skills-building classes, crisis intervention, psychiatric consultation, and related services.

Disability Services (disability.richmond.edu [Links to an external site.](#)) The Office of Disability Services works to ensure that qualified students with a

disability (whether incoming or current) are provided with reasonable accommodations that enable students to

participate fully in activities, programs, services and benefits provided to all students. Please let your professors know

as soon as possible if you have an accommodation that requires academic coordination and planning.

Speech Center (speech.richmond.edu [Links to an external site.](#) or 289-6409): Assists with preparation and practice in the pursuit of excellence in

public expression. Recording, playback, coaching and critique sessions offered by teams of student consultants trained to

assist in developing ideas, arranging key points for more effective organization, improving style and delivery, and handling

multimedia aids for individual and group presentations. Remote practice sessions can be arranged; we look forward to

meeting your public speaking needs.

Writing Center (writing.richmond.edu [Links to an external site.](#) or 289-8263): Assists writers at all levels of experience, across all majors. Students can schedule appointments with trained writing consultants who offer friendly critiques of written work.

Weinstein Learning Center

The Center integrates, amplifies, and co-locates Speech Studio, Writing Studio, Quantitative and Programming Support, Content Tutoring, Academic Coaching, English Language and Culture, and Technology Studio services. The WLC aims to provide next-level academic support, transforming our students' development in integrated and innovative ways and complementing our robust curricular and co-curricular offerings. 1 <https://wlc.richmond.edu/>