

**Philosophy 2810.01**  
**Ethics and Health Care: Social Policy**

TR 10:05-11:25  
Winter 2007  
Killam Library MACME

---

Instructor: Meredith Schwartz  
Telephone: 494-7004  
e-mail: meredith.schwartz@dal.ca (best way to contact me)  
Office: FASS 2024  
Office Hours: Thursdays 12:00-2:00; other times by appointment

---

This class will focus on ethical questions at the level of social policy associated with health and health care. We don't always think of policy as a moral endeavor; however, what we decide to fund or not to fund will constrain a person's autonomy. In setting health care policy we are deciding *for others* about which health care services will be provided. Health care is of moral importance because it protects our opportunities to pursue goals, avoid pain and suffering, and prevent premature loss of life. Health care policy manifests "public values" surrounding health issues. In particular, we will explore ethical dimensions of the provision of health care, resource allocation, research involving humans, reproduction, and genetics.

**Required Texts:**

*Health Care Ethics in Canada, 2<sup>nd</sup> edition.* Francoise Baylis, Jocelyn Downie, Barry Hoffmaster, and Susan Sherwin, eds. (Toronto: Thomson Nelson 2004)

**NB:** It is important to get the 2<sup>nd</sup> edition. There are many changes from the first.

**Evaluation:**

Students are expected to attend class regularly and to keep up with the assigned readings.

Two in-class exams (20% each)	40%
Short Summary of the Argument for the Term Paper	05%
Short Summary of the Counterargument for the Term Paper	05%
Term Paper	40%
Participation	10%

Grading Scale

Grade	A+	A	A-	B+	B	B-	C+	C	C-	D	F
/100	100-91	90-85	84-80	79-77	76-74	73-70	69-67	66-64	63-60	60-50	49-0

### **The Class:**

There will be weekly reading-assignments. You must read the assigned sections *before* you come to class. Reading questions will be posted and it is strongly advised that students think about these questions as they do the readings. You should bring your text to class and be prepared to discuss the material covered. Class discussion is strongly encouraged.

### **Missed Tests and Late Assignments:**

Consistent with section 16.8 of the Academic Regulations in the Calendar, students will only be allowed to write missed tests under extraordinary circumstances. For all such circumstances the appropriate documentation is required.

Except under extraordinary circumstances, late assignments will be penalized. Late work will be penalized 5% per *working* day up to a maximum of seven days, after which it will not be accepted.

If you predict that there may be circumstances forcing you to miss an exam or a deadline you should contact the instructor immediately. Talking about a problem before it arises is strongly encouraged.

### **Course website (BLS CE):**

There will be a website for this course at <http://ilocluster.ucis.dal.ca/webct/entryPageIns.dowebct> It is meant to be a study aid. It is not a replacement for the lectures and presentations. Students are responsible for knowing the material in the readings, and the lectures.

### **Email policy:**

Please keep emails brief and to the point. No emails about the content of the course will be answered by email (except under exceptional circumstances, such as a prolonged absence due to sickness). Questions about the course material should be raised in class or during office hours. If you are in search of information about the course (readings, examination formats, etc) please check the class website first. If you inquire after information that is on the website you will be directed to the website.

### **Students with Disabilities:**

If you have (or suspect you may have) a disability that negatively affects your ability to meet the course requirements you should get in touch with Student Accessibility Services immediately. Appropriate accommodations for students with disabilities will only be made for those students who have gone through this office.

## **Plagiarism:**

Please attend to the following excerpt from the Dalhousie Calendar (go to <<http://www.registrar.dal.ca/calendar/ug/UREG.htm>> and click on [Intellectual Honesty](#))

Dalhousie University defines plagiarism as the presentation of the work of another author in such a way as to give one's reader reason to think it to be one's own. Plagiarism is a form of academic fraud.

Plagiarism is considered a serious academic offence which may lead to the assignment of a failing grade, suspension or expulsion from the University, or even the withdrawal of a degree previously awarded. Some examples of plagiarism are:

- the use of a paper purchased from a commercial research corporation or prepared by any person other than the individual claiming to be the author;
- copying, without giving credit to the author, from another's published or non-published works, another's computer codes/programmes, another's artistic or architectural works, another's scientific project, including material found on the internet;
- submitting a paper that you have written for two or more classes (self-plagiarism); if you want to write the same paper for two classes you *must* get the permission of both professors *first*.

The University attaches great importance to the contribution of original thought to learning and scholarship. It attaches equal importance to the appropriate acknowledgement of sources from which facts and opinions have been obtained.

The proper use of footnotes and other methods of acknowledgement vary from one field of study to another. Failure to cite sources as required in the particular field of study in the preparation of essays, term papers and dissertations or theses may, in some cases, be considered to be plagiarism.

Students who are in any doubt about how to acknowledge sources should discuss the matter in advance with the faculty members for whom they are preparing assignments. In many academic departments, written statements on matters of this kind are made available as a matter of routine or can be obtained on request.

Plagiarism is a serious academic offence and will be dealt with severely in this course. For more information please see <http://plagiarism.dal.ca> and the link listed above.

### **Phil 2810 and Turnitin service:**

Dalhousie University now subscribes to Turnitin.com, a computer based service which checks for originality in submitted papers. Any paper submitted by a student at Dalhousie University may be checked for originality to confirm that the student has not plagiarized from other sources. Plagiarism is considered a serious academic offence which may lead to loss of credit, suspension or expulsion from the University, or even the revocation of a degree. It is essential that there be correct attribution of authorities from which facts and opinions have been derived.

The Senate has affirmed the right of any instructor to require that student papers be submitted in both written and computer readable format, and to submit any paper to a check such as that performed by Turnitin.com. Copies of student papers checked by this process will be retained by Turnitin.com.

In this class, students are required to submit an electronic copy of their essays to Turnitin.com for an originality report. They are also required to submit a hard (paper) copy of their essays to the instructor by the designated due date.

Please note that after the due date, the paper is entered in the database and revised versions will be reported as not original even when the original draft was written by the same student.

For more information about this service, go to <http://plagiarism.dal.ca/turnitin/index.html>  
To participate, follow the link on the class webpage "Turnitin.com" and follow the instructions on the page. For more information and technical assistance go to <http://www.turnitin.com>

## **Phil 2810 Explanations of Class Requirements and Grading:**

1. **Participation** in class discussion, regular attendance, completing the weekly readings, discussion on BLS CE discussion board and frequent case-discussions in small in-class groups. Part of the grade will be determined by submitted reports from group discussions. NB: This component requires regular class attendance and participation. Students who are uncomfortable speaking in class should come see the instructor during office hours to discuss alternative arrangements for this grade. Grade: **10%**
2. **In-class exams.** These exams will test students' understanding of the theoretical material covered in the relevant portion of the term and their ability to apply theoretical ideas to practical issues. They will be evaluated in terms of depth of understanding, effectiveness of explanation, accuracy of interpretation, appropriateness of theory applications, and clarity of expression. Students unable to attend class on a scheduled test day must notify the professor as soon as possible as to the difficulty, provide a written excuse for their absence, and arrange a time for a make-up test. Grade: **20% each, for a total of 40%**
3. **Short Argument.** Students will give a brief summary of the position they intend to argue in their term paper. Students do not need to go into detail, but should provide an outline of what they intend to argue. Grade: **5%**
4. **Short Counterargument.** Students will think of at least one counterargument to the position they intend to argue in their term paper. The student must also suggest how they will deal with this counterargument in his or her term paper. The student must hand in the graded Short Argument with this assignment. Grade: **5%**
5. **Term paper.** Students will chose one question from a set of assigned topics and write a critical essay of approximately 8-10 typed, double-spaced pages in which they (1) explore the issue in question, (2) reflect understanding of **key readings** from the course plus at least **two additional scholarly sources** (*not* Wikipedia) found through independent research, and (3) present and defend their own position on the topic, explaining how and why they differ from the authors discussed (or why they agree). Papers will be evaluated in terms of appropriate selection of authors (relative to the topic), accuracy of interpretation, quality of argument, evidence of original thought, clarity of expression (including organization of ideas), and grammatical accuracy. See instructions and topics for term papers for detailed information. Papers are due **March 15**. They must be submitted in hard copy to the instructor (in class, or in the instructor's drop box in the Philosophy Department, room 1142 in the FASS building) **and also** submitted electronically to turnitin.com. (Late papers without an appropriate excuse will be penalized.) Grade: **40%**

**Note:** Students with permanent or temporary disabilities who would like to discuss course requirements and classroom accommodations are asked to come and see me as soon as possible.

**Philosophy 2810**  
**Tentative Reading Schedule:**

**Winter 2007**

All readings should be done *before* the class in which they are to be discussed. Unless otherwise specified, the readings are from the assigned text, *Health Care Ethics in Canada, 2<sup>nd</sup> edition* (HCEC). Journal articles (in **bold**) are available on-line for Dal students through the Dal Library website (look under electronic journals, see the instructor if you have questions).

DATE	TOPIC	READINGS
Jan. 4	Introduction; Canadian Health Care System	<b>Gordon Guyatt and Edwin Coffee, "The Case for Private Care," <i>Medical Post</i>, Jul 19, 2005: 11.</b> [Resource on class BLS CE site]
Jan. 9	Ethics lenses	<b>Susan Sherwin. "Foundations, Frameworks, Lenses: The Role of Theories in Bioethics" <i>Bioethics</i>, July 1999, 13(3, 4): 198-205.</b> Ruth Faden, Tom Beauchamp and Nancy King "Foundations in moral Theory" <i>HCEC</i> : 6-16
Jan. 11	Ethical theories and informed consent	Peter Singer "Practical Ethics" <i>HCEC</i> : 3-5 Margaret Olivia Little "Why a Feminist Approach to Bioethics?" <i>HCEC</i> :30-40 Benjamin Freedman "A Moral Theory of Informed Consent," <i>HCEC</i> : 214-223
Jan. 16	Research involving humans	<b>The Nuremberg Code (BLS CE site).</b> <b>The Belmont Report (BLS CE site).</b> {Recommended: Canadian Tri-Council Policy Statement on Ethic Conduct for Research Involving Humans: Context of an Ethics Framework, Section 1 and Section 2}
Jan. 18	Consent to research	Case Description "Halushka v. University of Saskatchewan" <i>HCEC</i> : 345; <b>Christine Grady, "Money for Research Participation," <i>The American Journal of Bioethics</i> 1(2) Spring 2001: 40-44;</b> <b>David Orentlicher, "Making Research a Requirement for Treatment," <i>Hastings Center Report</i> 35(5) Sept-Oct 2005: 20-28</b>
Jan. 23	Noncompetent subjects	Barry Brown "Proxy Consent for Research on the Incompetent Elderly" <i>HCEC</i> : 318-325; <b>Should Children Decide Whether They are Enrolled in Nonbeneficial Research?</b> <b>David Wendler and Seema Shah, <i>The American Journal of Bioethics</i> 3(4), 2003: 1-7</b>
Jan. 25	Clinical equipoise	Charles Weijer "Placebo Controlled Trials in Schizophrenia: Are the Ethical? Are they Necessary?" <i>HCEC</i> : 303--306 Franklin Miller and Howard Brody" A Critique of Clinical Equipoise: Therapeutic Misconception in the Ethics of Clinical Trials" <i>HCEC</i> : 306-318
Jan. 30	Shifting patterns	<b>Rebecca Dresser, "Wanted: Single, White Male for Medical Research," <i>Hastings Center Report</i>, 22 (1): 24-29, Jan-Feb 1992;</b> Anna Mastroianni and Jeffrey Kahn "Swinging on the Pendulum: Shifting Views of Justice in Human Research Subjects" <i>HCEC</i> : 325-331.
Feb. 1	Research in the developing world; sponsored research	<b>D.B. Resnik, "The Ethics of HIV Research in Developing Nations." <i>Bioethics</i> 12 (4) October 1998: 286-306.</b> Steven Lewis et al. "Dancing with the Porcupine: Rules for Governing the University-Industry Relationship" <i>HCEC</i> : 340-344.
Feb. 6	Canadian Medicare	Roy Romanow "Sustaining Medicare: The Commission on the Future of Health Care in Canada" <i>HCEC</i> : 79-100; <b>S. Lewis, C. Donaldson, C. Mitton, and G. Currie, "The Future of Health Care in Canada," <i>BMJ</i> 2001; 323; 926-29 (Oct. 20) [open access journal]</b>
Feb. 8	What services should be covered? <b>Short Argument DUE</b>	Mita Giacomini et. al. "The Many Meanings of Deinsuring a Health Service: the Case of IVF in Ontario" <i>HCEC</i> 108-128 Case Study "Eldridge v. British Columbia" <i>HCEC</i> : 128-130 Case Study: "Cameron v. Nova Scotia" <i>HCEC</i> : 130-132 Case Study: "Auton v. British Columbia" <i>HCEC</i> : 132-134
Feb. 13	REVIEW	
Feb. 15	<b>FIRST EXAM</b>	

Feb 20-22	Reading Week	
Feb 27	Allocation and rationing <b>Short Counterargument Due</b>	George Annas "The Prostitute, the Playboy, and the Poet: Rationing Schemes for Organ Transportation" <i>HCEC</i> : 135-140 Benjamin Freedman et. al. "Air Support Treatment: A Case Study in the Ethics of Allocating and Expensive Treatment" <i>HCEC</i> : 140-147 Health Services and Review Board "Murray Menkes v. the General Manager, the Ontario Health Insurance plan" <i>HCEC</i> : 147-151
Mar. 1	Rationing cont'd	Barry Hoffmaster "The Ethics of Setting Limits on ICD Therapy" <i>HCEC</i> : 151-159 Norman Daniels "Rationing Fairly: Programmatic Considerations" <i>HCEC</i> : 151-165
Mar. 6	Abortion	L. Wayne Sumner "A Third Way" <i>HCEC</i> : 347-356; Case Study "R. v. Morgentaler" <i>HCEC</i> : 396-398
Mar. 8	Abortion	<b>Abortion, Intimacy and the Duty to Procreate, Margaret Little, <i>Ethical Theory and Moral Practice 2(3): 295-212, 1999;</i></b>
Mar. 13	Selective abortion	Christine Overall "Selective Termination of Pregnancy and Women's Reproductive Autonomy" <i>HCEC</i> : 356-364; <b>Sex Selection: Not obviously wrong. Bonnie Steinbock <i>Hastings Center Report 32(1) Jan-Feb 2002: 23-28</i></b>
Mar. 15	<b>ESSAY DUE</b>	Film: TBA
Mar. 20	AHRs and relational autonomy	Susan Sherwin "Normalizing Reproductive Technologies and the Implication for Autonomy" <i>HCEC</i> : 364-375
Mar. 22	Interventions in pregnancy	Royal Commission on New Reproductive Technologies "Judicial Intervention in Pregnancy and Birth" <i>HCEC</i> : 376-382 Suzanne Rozell Scorsone "Annex: Judicial Intervention in Pregnancy" <i>HCEC</i> : 382-396; Case Study: "Winnipeg Child and Family Services (Northwest Area) v. G. (D. F.)" <i>HCEC</i> : 398-400
Mar. 27	Genetic technologies	Abby Lippman "Prenatal Genetic Testing and Screening: Constructing Needs and Reinforcing Inequities" <i>HCEC</i> : 401-411 Dorothy Wertz and John Fletcher "A Critique of Some Feminist Challenges to Prenatal Diagnosis" <i>HCEC</i> : 411-425 Donald Wilson and Stuart MacLeod "Patenting of Genetic Material: Are the Benefits to Society being Realized?" <i>HCEC</i> : 425-429 Patricia Baird "Will Genetics be Used Wisely?" <i>HCEC</i> : 429-436
Mar. 29	Stem cells and cloning	Francoise Baylis "Human Cloning: Three Mistakes and an Alternative" <i>HCEC</i> : 437-448; Soren Holm "Going to the Root of the Stem Cell Controversy" <i>HCEC</i> : 331-339
Apr.3	Genetic enhancements and REVIEW	Francoise Baylis and Jason Robert, "The Inevitability of Genetic Enhancement Technologies" <i>HCEC</i> : 448-460
Apr. 5	<b>SECOND EXAM</b>	