Question 1:

Recently, some Silicon Valley companies have started to consider building data practice ethics into the data science interviewing process. The idea is to add a few questions mixed in with the standard technical interview, and paying attention to the responses. Let’s say the following three questions\textsuperscript{1} are asked to an interviewee (you).

A. You are working on a model for consumer access to a financial service. Race is a significant feature in your model. Would you use the race variable in your model? If you are disallowed from using it, what would you do?

B. You are asked to use network traffic data to offer loans to small businesses. It turns out that the available data does not rigorously inform credit risk and estimates are relatively poorer for certain groups. What do you do?

C. You are talking to a new potential client who wants you to use public profile photos on the web to get age and race for “inclusion” in their recruiting. Would you consider this request? Justify your reasoning.

Use the ChatGPT\textsuperscript{2} interface to see how the chatbot would answer each question (simply copy paste the individual questions [A-C] into the interface’s prompt).

Q1. Do you agree or disagree with each answer from the chatbot? Why or why not; describe your rationale for each? (21 points; 7 points for each case)

Q2. Are the answers that the chatbot provides in each case grounded in any particular ethical theory we covered in the course? Describe if so or if not, how you might ground them in an appropriate ethical theory. (18 points; 6 points for each case)

\textsuperscript{1} Acknowledgments to Hilary Mason (@hmason; Founder & CEO of Fast Forward Labs + Data Scientist in Residence at Accel Partners) for suggesting questions of this flavor

\textsuperscript{2} https://chat.openai.com/
Q3. You are now asked to improve the answers of the chatbot; describe what you might add or change to the chatbot’s answers in each case (24 points; 8 points for each case)

Question 2:

A faculty member has taught a senior-level course in quantum mechanics for several years and has developed an extensive set of notes that she plans to convert into a new textbook as soon as she can find the time. She is close to the end of the term for this year’s course when she makes a rather alarming discovery—a student in her class has been selling the notes for her class at a small profit to the other students. The notes are an expanded version of her lectures and contain material from her visual aids, as well as diagrams copied from the textbook.

The student claims that he is only helping the other students learn a very difficult subject and that the profit barely covers his expenses. However, it soon comes to light that he has been doing the same thing for several other courses and actually hires students to take notes in other classes, which he then develops into a sellable form.

The faculty member is very upset. Not only is her lecture material being sold without her permission, but the student has also copyrighted it. Her university's policy clearly states that such traditional academic work product belongs to the faculty member.

a) (15 points) Identify and discuss the nature of the intellectual property violation in the case study.

b) (22 points) Could this intellectual property violation have been avoided? If so, suggest an alternative scenario where both the faculty and the student could have met their desired goals. Make assumptions as appropriate for your answer.