

Phil 4336: Applied Ethics for the Health Sciences

Fall 2017

Marquette University

Section 703: Tuesday 4:00-5:40 (Johnston Hall 338)

Instructor: Robert K. Whitaker

Office Hours: Tuesday, 2:00-3:30; Friday, 3:00-4:30; or by appointment (Marquette Hall 449)

Email: robert.whitaker@marquette.edu

Course Description

This course introduces students to issues in professional ethics for students in the College of Health Sciences. The course is designed to provide a bridge to ethical topics covered in the professional phase of study. We will explore a wide variety of topics including dignity of life, codes of medical ethics; the nature of the patient-medical provider relationship, confidentiality, the determination of patient competence, critical patient care, and justice in health care.

Prerequisites: enrolled in Health Sciences, junior standing, PHIL 2310.

Required Texts

- § Rosemarie Tong, *New Perspectives in Health Care Ethics: An Interdisciplinary and Crosscultural Approach*. Upper Saddle River, NJ: Pearson Prentice Hall, 2007.
- § Additional readings will be available electronically on Ares and/or D2L.

Course Objectives and Assessment

By the end of the course:

- (1) The student will be able to present and discuss principles relating to the rights of patients (e.g. autonomy and informed consent, beneficence and non-maleficence, confidentiality and truthfulness), the obligations these generate for medical providers, and possible limitations of these principles.
- (2) The student will be able to present, discuss, and provide reasons for and against prominent models and conceptions of the nature of the patient-medical provider relationship.
- (3) The student will be able to present, discuss and provide reasons for and against positions taken regarding a number of ethical problems relating to the issue of the dignity of life (e.g. end of life care, euthanasia, physician-assisted suicide, abortion).
- (4) The student will be able to present, discuss, and provide reasons for and against different views regarding the putative goals of healthcare, as informed by several essential concepts (e.g., health and disease, wellness and illness, curing and healing).

These objectives will be assessed via two written exams, a paper, discussion posts, and in-class discussion.

Course Requirements

Course Composition:

Discussion Posts	20%
Midterm Exam	20%
Final Exam	20%
Paper	30%
Participation	10%

The grading scale is as follows:

A	94 – 100	C	73 – 76.9
A-	90 – 93.9	C-	70 – 72.9
B+	87 – 89.9	D+	67 – 69.9
B	83 – 86.9	D	60 – 66.9
B-	80 – 82.9	F	... – 59.9
C+	77 – 79.9		

Discussion Posts: You will be responsible for submitting **5 discussion posts** and **5 responses** to your classmates' discussion posts to D2L in the "Discussions" section. Each discussion post, and each response to a classmate's post, is worth 2 points, for a total of 20 points, or **20%** of your final course grade. The purpose of these posts is to generate class discussion on the basis of the reading. Discussion posts and responses should be crafted as follows:

Content: The goal of a discussion post is to raise a point for class discussion **based on the reading for the day**. This might take any of the following forms:

- a question
- a point of confusion or need for clarification
- a suggestion for how to interpret a text or how to resolve an issue we've been grappling with
- an insight prompted by the text that might advance our thinking as a class about the issue under investigation

The goal of a response to a classmate's discussion post is to civilly engage with their content in a way that:

- attempts an answer to their question, or else complicates it in an interesting way
- resolves expressed confusion or provides clarification
- provides an alternative interpretation of the text or issue under consideration
- takes issue with a stated argument or point raised

Structure: The discussion post should be **two paragraphs** in length:

- The first paragraph should briefly summarize the part of the reading on which you are focusing.
- The second paragraph should contain a brief explication of your point for discussion. In

this paragraph you need to either pose a question or set of questions about the reading, or take a position of either agreement or disagreement with a part of the reading and explain your reasons, or identify aspects of the reading that are confusing or challenging and indicate why, try out a possible interpretation, etc.

The response to a classmate's discussion post should be **one paragraph** in length, and does not need to restate the issue from the text, unless one is disagreeing with a classmate's interpretation of the reading.

Evaluation: In order to receive full credit, a discussion post and/or response must:

- adhere to the length requirements.
- demonstrate serious engagement with the reading for class, and with the thoughts of your classmates. For example, in a discussion post, it is not sufficient to merely write a summary, just as in a response, it is not sufficient to merely ask a question.
- contain no serious grammatical errors, typos, etc. which affect the meaning and readability of the post (be sure to proofread!).

Procedure for Submitting: Discussion posts may be submitted for any of the readings in the schedule beginning with the second week (maximum 1 post per week). Responses may be made to any of your classmates' posts (maximum 1 response per week), and there is no limit to how many responses there can be to a single post. You may choose when to submit your discussion posts and responses with the following qualifications:

- (1) **The post must be submitted no less than 48 hours prior to the class in which we cover the reading you discuss.**
- (2) **Responses to classmates must be made no less than 24 hours prior to the class in which we cover the reading being discussed.**
- (3) The reason for 1 & 2 is that I may integrate your reactions into the lecture and use your questions and comments to help guide our discussions. Spacing the posts out in this way ensures that all students will have a day to read the submitted posts and comment on one if they wish, and I will have a day to incorporate them into the lecture. **I will not accept late responses, and there are no "make-up" responses. This is non-negotiable.**
- (4) In order for your post to count, **you must attend the class for which it is submitted.**

Midterm Exam: There will be a midterm exam on **Tuesday, September 26**. The exam will include multiple choice and short answer questions.

Final Exam: There will be a (non-comprehensive) final exam on **Tuesday, October 17**. The exam will include multiple choice and short answer questions.

Paper: The paper may take one of two forms:

Case Study

- You find a specific case study which is morally controversial, and either defend or reject the action(s) taken in this specific case. You must **argue for** (not merely assert) the correct moral response to the specific case given what you take to be the most relevant and important moral criteria.

Moral Issue

- You address a moral issue which transcends one particular case. For example, “the moral permissibility of abortion” or “the necessity of truth-telling in medical treatment” are possible topics. For this style of paper, you will address some argument(s) from at least one of our assigned readings. If you wish, you may supplement these arguments with outside sources, such as other philosophical articles, position papers from medical journals or textbooks, or even editorial/opinion pieces from a newspaper or magazine (pending my approval), but this is not required.

The paper is **due in the D2L dropbox Tuesday, October 17, by 11:59 pm**. A grading rubric will be posted on D2L.

Specifications: 4-6 pages in length, double-spaced, 12-point Times New Roman font, with 1-inch margins, correct grammar, and proper citation.*

* I do not care what citation style you use, so long as whatever style you choose is consistent throughout, and so long as all sources, quotations, and borrowed ideas are properly cited (see below regarding academic honesty). No cover page is necessary. Footnotes are preferred over endnotes.

Participation: Participation involves two things: 1. class involvement, and 2. at least one 1-on-1 meeting with me. **Class involvement:** your involvement is essential to the success of this class and to your success in this class. This means that a) active listening and note-taking, b) open questioning, and c) creative discussion are expected of you. Note that all of these things require attendance; thus, if your attendance drops below the required minimum, your participation grade will suffer. Class involvement constitutes **9%** of your final grade (though excessive absences will result in a greater than 9% grade reduction—see below). **Individual meeting:** you are responsible for meeting with me at least once during office hours (or by appointment) **before October 10**. This meeting may be in relation to your paper, but this is not necessary. Stopping by for a 10-15 minute chat about confusions you might have had in class or anything related to the topic of the course fulfills this requirement. Please do not procrastinate, as I cannot guarantee extra office hours by appointment. The individual meeting constitutes **1%** of your final grade.

Attendance: Attendance is required. From the University Attendance Policy:

“Students are responsible for attending all class meetings for courses in which they are registered. Any absence, regardless of the reason, prevents students from getting the full benefit of the course and as such, no distinction is made between excused and unexcused absences, with the following exceptions:

1. Absences resulting from legal obligations (such as jury duty).
2. Absences due to religious observances.
3. Absences resulting from university sanctioned activities and related travel.”

For more info, see: <http://bulletin.marquette.edu/undergrad/academicregulations/#attendance>.

For a 1 day/week, half-semester course such as this, any unexcused absences beyond **one** will result in a lowering of your grade. 2 unexcused absences will result in the loss of **4** participation points. 3 unexcused absences will result in the loss of **9** participation points. More than 3 unexcused absences will result in the loss of 9 participation points, plus a further **4 percentage points** off the **final course grade** per absence over 3. Please discuss any planned absences with me long in advance. Additionally, punctuality is expected; if you come to class late, it is your responsibility to make sure I know you are there, preferably by seeing me at the end of class so I can mark you on the attendance sheet.

Late Work Policy: Five percentage points will be deducted from the student's assignment grade for each late day (including weekends).

Extra Credit: I have included several **recommended resources** in the schedule. These are clearly marked as "Recommended" and appear in a slightly smaller font size. These may be extra readings, videos, or podcasts, all available on D2L. You are not required to review these for class, but if you choose, you may do so and write a short (2 paragraphs) response summarizing the article/video/podcast, and critically engaging with it. These should be similar in style to a normal discussion post, and each will be worth a maximum of **1 final percentage point**. You may write up to **two** of these during the semester. These may be turned in any time prior to the last day of class (please bring a hard copy to class).

Writing: Good writing is a basic skill in any professional field, and I expect you to put in the necessary effort to make sure that your paper and discussion posts are lucid and well organized. **A document called "Tips for Writing Philosophy Papers" will be posted on D2L.** Please use it. If you need additional help with this, the Ott Memorial Writing Center, located on the second floor of Raynor Library, offers comprehensive guidance in writing for the entire Marquette community. In one-on-one sessions, tutors assist writers in identifying topics, revising, and creating final drafts. Appointments can be made by calling (414) 288-5542 or visiting <https://marquette.mywconline.com/>.

Cell Phones and Computers: Unless a legitimate reason is provided, mobile phones are to be off and put away for the duration of the class. Texting, or any other form of electronic communication, is strictly prohibited. Use of computers, tablets, etc. for note-taking is permitted.

Academic Dishonesty: The College of Arts and Sciences and the Philosophy Department policies on academic dishonesty will be enforced. *Ignorance is not an excuse.* Please refer to these policies for more details or contact me with particular questions in order to avoid any problems. The College's policies can be found in the Undergraduate Bulletin and online here:

<http://bulletin.marquette.edu/undergrad/academicregulations/#academichonestypolicy>

More information on what counts as academic dishonesty as well as tips on how to avoid it can be found here: <http://libguides.marquette.edu/plagiarism>. This is also a helpful website: <http://www.plagiarism.org/>.

*A useful, but not foolproof, rule of thumb: When in doubt, err on the side of over-citing.

In this course you will be required to submit written assignments in electronic form to a plagiarism detection

website called Turnitin (this is done automatically via the D2L dropbox). Your assignments become a permanent part of the Turnitin database, but will not be used for any other purpose than checking for plagiarism.

Disabilities: Students with physical or learning disabilities wishing to have special accommodations should contact me as soon as possible. All discussions are confidential, and I will do anything I can to assist you. In addition, the Office of Disability Services is available to assist you. They can be reached by phone at (414) 288-1645 or online here: <http://www.marquette.edu/disability-services/>.

Food and Drink: Please do everything possible to avoid bringing food into the classroom. However, in the exceptional case, choose being engaged in class while eating a snack over not eating and being unable to focus. Beverages in closed containers are welcome.

Conduct: Disagreement is a basic feature of philosophy and all other academic discourse. In this class, we will be discussing important and controversial issues. We will be engaging in discussions which may challenge some of our most deeply held beliefs, and disagreement is sure to arise. For this reason, it is vital for each student, and myself, to always conduct ourselves with the utmost generosity and sensitivity toward our fellow students and our authors. I reserve the right to steer discussions in whatever way I deem most appropriate to the day's lesson, and I will not tolerate rude, disrespectful, or offensive comments. If you are unsure whether something you plan to say or do could possibly be offensive, always talk to me before sharing it with the class.

Reading: The reading for this course is difficult. Despite this, it is crucial that you keep up with the reading schedule and engage the material (especially since the lectures, discussions, exams, and written assignments are all based on the readings). This means setting aside adequate time to engage the material *before class*. I have tried to keep the assigned readings to a length that allows you to wrestle with the ideas without getting overwhelmed.

Tentative Schedule

All readings should be completed by the date assigned.

Introduction		Page #
Week 1 (8/29)	Intro to course Tong: Chapters 1-2: "Introduction" & "Ethical Theories and Principles in Health Care"	1-24
The Healthcare Professional - Patient Relationship		
Week 2 (9/5)	Tong: Chapter 2 (Continued) Tong: Chapter 3: "The Health Care Professional-Patient Relationship" The Hippocratic Oath Goldman: "The Refutation of Medical Paternalism" <i>Recommended:</i> Emanuel and Emanuel: "Four Models of the Physician-Patient Relationship" <i>Recommended:</i> Ackerman: "Why Doctors Should Intervene" <i>Recommended:</i> Radiolab Episode: "The Buried Bodies Case"	24-34 38-59 61 62-70 78-86 73-77
Autonomy, Truth-telling, & Informed Consent		
Week 3 (9/12)	Blackhall, et al: "Bioethics in a Different Tongue: The Case of Truth-Telling" Scheman: "Narrative, Complexity, and Context: Autonomy as an Epistemic Virtue" <i>Recommended:</i> Arras: "Antihypertensives and the Risk of Temporary Impotence: A Case Study in Informed Consent" <i>Recommended:</i> O'Neill: "Some Limits of Informed Consent"	101-109 106-124 87-88 4-6
Health and Disease		
Week 4 (9/19)	Tong: Chapter 4: "Biological Givens or Social Constructions?" Amundson: "Against Normal Function" <i>Recommended:</i> Rachel Cooper: "What's Special about Mental Health and Disorder"	61-78 471-486 487-497
Competency, Deciding for Others		
Week 5 (9/26)	Burton: "A Chronicle: Dax's Case as It Happened" Buchanan and Brock: "Deciding for Others: Competency" Lindemann: "Holding on to Edmund: The Relational Work of Identity" <i>Recommended:</i> Dresser and Robertson, "Quality of Life and Non-Treatment Decisions for Incompetent Patients: A Critique of the Orthodox Approach" <i>Recommended:</i> <i>Star Trek: Next Generation</i> Episode: "Ethics" <i>Recommended:</i> Boudreau & Somerville: "Euthanasia and Assisted Suicide: A Physician's and Ethicist's Perspectives"	379-383 368-378 65-79 436-447 1-11
Exam 1		
Euthanasia, Assisted Suicide, and Palliative Care		

<p>Week 6 (10/3)</p>	<p>Tong: Chapter 11: “Euthanasia, Assisted Suicide, and Palliative Care” “A Life-or-Death Situation” & “Choosing to Die After a Struggle With Life,” <i>New York Times</i> articles “On Love and Dignity and Dying” from <i>The Jesuit Post</i> <i>Recommended:</i> U.S. Bishops’ Pro-Life Committee: “Nutrition and Hydration: Moral and Pastoral Reflections” <i>Recommended:</i> Arras: “Physician-Assisted Suicide: A Tragic View” <i>Recommended:</i> Quill: “Death and Dignity: A Case of Individualized Decision Making”</p>	<p>262-285 429-435 477-483 473-476</p>
<p>Genetic Testing</p>		
<p>Week 7 (10/10)</p>	<p>Tong: Chapter 8: “Genetic Screening, Counseling, and Therapy” Pinker: “The Designer Baby Myth”</p>	<p>177-208 1-4</p>
<p>Organ Transplants / Final Exam</p>		
<p>Week 8 (10/17)</p>	<p>Radcliffe-Richards, at al.: “The Case for Allowing Kidney Sales”; Erin & Harris: “An Ethical Market in Human Organs”; Joralemon & Cox: “Body Values: The Case Against Compensating for Transplant Organs” Cha: “Inequality in U.S. Organ Transplants: Researchers Detail How the Wealthy Game the System” <p style="text-align: center;">*Exam 2* *Paper Due*</p> </p>	<p>297-306 1-2</p>