

School of Arts & Science
Humanities
Phil 250, Section 1
Healthcare Ethics
Winter 2012
COURSE OUTLINE

Ω Please note: This outline will not be kept indefinitely. It is recommended students keep this outline for their records.

Instructor Information

Instructor: Karen Shirley

Office hours: Mon, Thurs and Fri.: 11:30 – 12:20; Tues: 11:30 – 1:20

Location: Y320

Phone: 370 3518 Home: 383 8164

Email: shirleyk@camosun.bc.ca

Intended Learning Outcomes

At the end of the course, students will be able to

- 1) Describe and evaluate traditional ethical theories in relation to ethical practice in healthcare and nursing.
- 2) Identify the theoretical underpinnings and consequences people's positions on ethical issues.
- 3) Develop skills in ethical reasoning and judgment.
- 4) Describe the relationship between the CAN Code of Ethics and ethical theories, including an understanding of the role of professional values in ethical decision making.
- 5) Describe how ethical decision making is enacted in professional practice.
- 6) Through discussion and writing, resolve ethical dilemmas that arise in nursing practice.

Required Materials

Texts; *Philosophy 250 Handout* (Available in the bookstore)

If your grammar needs work, you may wish to purchase a small style guide with a section on common errors in grammar and usage.

Basis of Student Assessment

Summary

2 exams, one of which will be held in the final exam period - PLAN YOUR HOLIDAYS ACCORDINGLY!!.....	65%
Debate.....	20%
Critical thinking homework.....	10%
Verbal participation in debate question periods.....	5%
Bonus critical thinking questions on exams.....	4%

Formatting Assignments and Exams

1. Put the following information on each assignment:

a) your **student number**; b) your **section number**

2. **Write on both sides of the page**, where more than one page is required, and **double-space**.

Note: Keep all marked assignments in case there is a discrepancy between your record of your marks and my record of your marks.

Course Content and Schedule

Jan. 13

Administration and metaethics

Jan. 20

Readings: p. 25A – 25R and A - F

Study Q

1. You will be asked to describe an ethical or a meta-ethical theory which I pick out of a hat at the beginning of the exam. The metaethical theories are emotivism, subjectivism, relativism and objectivism; the ethical theories are Kantianism, religious ethics, W.D. Ross's theory and the four principles approach. (The aforementioned theories are deontological.) Here are the teleological theories: ethical egoism (as opposed to psychological egoism) and utilitarianism. And last, virtue ethics.

HW: An example of a valid argument with true premises.

Jan. 27

Readings: p. 26 - 67 and reread A – F again

Study Q

2. Does nursing need a unique moral theory? Explain.

HW: An example of a strong inductive argument.

Debate: Therapeutic touch should be an insured procedure.

Feb. 3

Readings: p. 85 – 102 and G - I

Study Q

3. Present and defend a prescriptive definition of 'healthy'.

HW: lexical, a prescriptive and a persuasive definition of 'professional'.

Debate: Pedophiles are not morally responsible for their illegal sexual behaviour with children.

Feb. 10

Readings: p. 118 – 131 and I - L

Study Q

4. Using a principle of distributive justice, explain what types of procedures should and shouldn't be covered by the MSP. Ensure that you acknowledge and defend any controversial consequences of your position. Examples of *types* of procedures are cosmetic procedures, procedures required as a result of dangerous choices (for example, smoking or careless lifting), reproduction-related procedures, etc..

HW: An example of an argument that commits the fallacy of *argumentum ad hominem* and another one that commits the fallacy of appeal to authority.

Debate: Canada should give more money to needy people in other parts of the world, *even if* that means putting less money into the Canadian health care system.

Feb. 24 Midterm

Mar. 2

Readings: p. 109 - 117 and fallacies 3 and 4

Study Q

1. Compare and contrast the doctrine of double effect and the equivalence thesis.

HW: Fallacies 3 and 4

Debate: Whoever helped Sue Rodriguez to die acted immorally.

Mar. 9

Readings: 191 – 201 and fallacies 5 and 6

Study Q

2. Do health care workers have a duty to force feed anorexics when doing so is required to save their lives?

HW: Fallacies 5 and 6

Debate: An anencephalic newborn is not morally considerable..

Mar. 16

Readings: p. 164 – 174 and fallacies 5 and 6

Study Q

3. Present and defend a position on the moral standing of the human fetus.

HW: An argument that commits the fallacy of *argumentum ad populum* and one that argues from ignorance.

Debate: Paying someone more than her expenses to be a surrogate mother is immoral.

Mar. 23

Readings: p. 202 and 207 - 217 and fallacy 8 and 9

Study Q

4. When, if ever, is the circumcision of a baby boy morally acceptable?

HW: An example of an argument that commits the fallacy of *Post Hoc Ergo Propter Hoc* and one that is an appeal to pity.

Debate: Winnipeg's Riverview Health Centre did the morally right thing when it imposed a DNR order on Andrew Sawatzky, against his wife's wishes.

Mar. 30

Readings: p. 238 - 254 and fallacy 10

Study Q

5. Under what circumstances is it morally acceptable for a nurse to tell one person that another person that the first person has had contact with, or will have contact with, is HIV positive? Why?

HW: An argument that presents a fallacious slippery slope.

Debate: If, after persistent efforts to deter an HIV positive sex worker from working, the worker continues to do so without notifying customers of his or her condition and without engaging in safe sex, then it is morally acceptable for the police to incarcerate the sex worker against his or her will. Note: the incarceration need not take place in jail.

Ap. 13

Readings: CNA Code of Ethics, which is right before the fallacies, and fallacy 11

Study Q

6. Suggest one change to the CNA Code of Ethics which would improve the Code. Explain why the change is an improvement. (A trivial change will get a trivial mark!)

HW: Confusing correlation with causation.

Debate: Ontario nurses who didn't show up for their shifts (by faking being sick, etc.) during the SARS epidemic behaved immorally.

Details of Evaluation

Exams: There will be two exams; the midterm is worth 30% and the final is worth 35%. The exams are closed-book. However, you are encouraged to bring a dictionary and/or style guide. Each exam will consist of one of the study questions from the relevant section below. There will also be a bonus question based on the critical thinking section of the handout. It is worth 2%. Thus, it is theoretically possible for a student to end up with 104% at the end of the course.

Homework: These assignments are intended to help you to hone your critical thinking skills. Students do not need to do them all. Each homework assignment is marked out of 2% of your final grade. You may do them all if you want to in order to try to get a total of 10% or you may be lucky and get 10% after doing 5 assignments. You may pick which homework assignments you wish to do but they must be handed in *within five minutes of the class starting* on the day they are listed on the schedule below. Given the number of homework assignments you can do, there is no acceptable excuse for handing in late homework assignments. If you are skipping a class, you may submit your homework by email *before* the class in which it is due.

The subject of the homework assignment must be a nursing issue. You are also encouraged to make these assignments witty.

Debates: You are required to participate in a debate (during the second hour of class) which is worth 20% of your final grade.

During the first class, students will be divided into groups of two to four people. One or two people in each group will take either the pro or con position on a chosen topic. Each group will be given a topic and a date upon which the group will debate the topic in the seminar period.

You and your interlocutor may wish to get together to debate the topic ahead of time so that you have an opportunity to refine your objections and responses. However, in my experience, debates in which the pro and con sides script the debate beforehand suffer as a result. You will be graded on the strength of your arguments, the knowledge you show on the topic and your ability to present your arguments in a way that helps other students understand the relevant facts and arguments.

Do not read out your part of the debate. If you do read, you will automatically lose 20%. You may *occasionally* refer to notes.

Handouts are forbidden.

If you are at a loss as to what arguments have been made on the topic, see references at the end of relevant papers in the text. The online *Stanford Encyclopedia of Philosophy* may also be of some help. If you use the internet, be careful to verify any factual claims made by biased sites. Once you have an idea of what issues are at stake and of some of the arguments that have been presented on the topic, you should spend time *thinking for yourself* on the topic. What do *you* think the truth of the matter is? What are the best justifications of your position?

Structure of Debates

Concision is a virtue in philosophy.

First,

1. Pro side: *one strong* argument in favour of the claim. (Speak for up to two minutes.)
2. Con side: objection to the above argument. (Speak for up to thirty seconds.)
3. Pro side: response to the above objection. (Speak for up to thirty seconds.)
4. Con side: objection to above response or a second objection to the pro side's original argument. (Speak for up to thirty seconds.)
5. Pro side: response to the second objection. (Speak for up to thirty seconds.)

Second,

6. Repeat steps one through five above, beginning with the con side this time.

Third,

7. Pro and con sides now answer questions and consider remarks made by their class.

You may lose marks for making the following mistakes on exams

1. Do not use the first or second person. Here are two examples of the first person: “**We** cannot pass students who cannot use the English language adequately,” and “**I** cannot pass students who cannot use the English language adequately.” Here is an example of the second person: “**You** don't realise that it is not our fault that we were not taught how to write in high school.” The following are examples of sentences written in the third person. “**People** cannot pass the buck forever.” “**One** will find that a style guide is essential in university.”
2. Do not use a pronoun which disagrees with the noun it refers to. (Students often make this mistake when they are trying to use gender neutral language - something you are advised to try to use.) You are advised that in many cases, pronoun disagreement can be avoided through the use of plural nouns. Here is an example of a sentence in which the pronoun disagrees with the noun: “**A philosopher** should not be so picky about English; **they** are not English teachers.” Here is the corrected version: “**Philosophers** should not be so picky about English; **they** are not English teachers.”
3. Do not use abbreviations or contradictions. For instance, do not use “e. g.,” “i.e.,” or “etc..”
4. Do not ask rhetorical questions.
5. Do not add “ly” to “first,” “second” and so on.
6. Do not say “moral *and* ethical” because we are using the two words as synonyms.
7. Do not say you ‘feel’ something when that thing is a thought, a belief or, synonymously, an opinion.
8. Avoid using the following words or define them when you use them: balance, equilibrium, appropriate.

Marking Notation

3rd p = you were supposed to be writing in the 3rd person

pd = pronoun disagreement

punct = punctuation

ss = sentence structure is incorrect

cap = you used capital or lower case letters incorrectly

ab = you used an abbreviation

rhet ? = rhetorical question

run on = sentence needs to be divided up

sp = incorrect spelling

gr = error in grammar

dm = dangling modifier

ww = wrong word

rep = repetition

frag = sentence fragment

cl = clarity

Grading System

Percentage	Grade	Grade Point Equivalency
90-100	A+	9
85-89	A	8
80-84	A-	7
77-79	B+	6
73-76	B	5
70-72	B-	4

65-69	C+	3
60-64	C	2
50-59	D	1
0-49	F	0

Temporary grades are assigned for specific circumstances and will convert to a final grade according to the grading scheme being used in the course. See Grading Policy E-1.5 at camosun.ca for information on conversion to final grades, and for additional information on student record and transcript notations.

LEARNING SUPPORT AND SERVICES FOR STUDENTS

There are a variety of services available for students to assist them throughout their learning. This information is available in the College Calendar, at Student Services or the College web site at camosun.ca

STUDENT CONDUCT POLICY

There is a Student Conduct Policy **which includes plagiarism**. It is the student's responsibility to become familiar with the content of this policy. The policy is available in each School Administration Office, at Student Services, and on the College web site in the Policy Section.