

**Kinesiology 393: Health Ethics (15186), COLL 400**  
**August 29 – December 07, Fall 2018**  
**Instructor: Professor John M. Charles**  
**Class Meetings: TR 2.00-3.20, Morton Hall 37**  
**Office Hours: 11-12 TR in Adair 114 or by appointment**  
**Contact Information: email – [jmchar@wm.edu](mailto:jmchar@wm.edu), phone : (757) 221 2773**

### **Course Description**

The focus of this course is health-related ethical problems and the nature of ethical decision making in which emphasis will be placed upon applied ethical problem solving of personal, public and environmental health issues. Health Ethics is intended to be a culminating experience for any of the KHS tracks (pre-med, public health, allied health and BA) to consider not just what can be done through technology and science, but also what should be done from a moral perspective. The course is particularly well-suited for KHS majors who are on the pre-med track as it is designed to better prepare them for their future in the health professions, including MCATS, (added a behavioral and social science test module in 2015), medical school interviews, (increasingly focusing on situational and ethical questions), ethics classes (becoming increasingly prevalent in medical schools) and professional practice (issues faced in health careers/life). The course may be taken to fulfill the KHS major writing requirement, the Humanities requirement for ENSP majors, GER 7 and COLL 400.

The COLL 400 criteria are listed below (Acronyms are used to aid in conceptualization):  
1. Take initiative in critical analysis of moral questions in Health Ethics and synthesize solutions using ethical decision-making theories. Questions that relate to Health Ethics to be addressed during the semester include:

- Drawing from cross-cultural wisdom of the past, the nature of society today and from informed predictions of the future, what do we mean by ethics in personal, public and environmental health, where HEALTH is Holistic, Ecological, Attitudinal, Longitudinal, Traditional and Horizontal?
- What are some of the CONCERNS we face as we endeavor to make ethical decisions, where CONCERNS include Calloused Oblivious Negativity, Cultural Ethical Relativity and Nihilistic Skepticism?
- How can we become ethically DECIDED using Debate, Ethical Codes, Identifying with Detectors and Editing with Deflectors?
- How can time-proven ethical approaches help with the detection of the most moral solution to a particular case study when DETECTORS include Deontological Ethics, Teleological Ethics, Communitarian ethics, Traditional virtue ethics, Omni-feminist ethics, Rights-based and Social contract approaches?
- How might situational factors such as personality, predicament and purpose tend to deflect the course of action away from a particular ethical conclusion, when DEFLECTORS include Demography, Education, Feelings, Legacy, Expectations, Conventionality, Truthfulness, Outcome, Reality and Significance?
- How to incorporate experiential learning into our classroom where we go beyond studying ethics to doing ethics in a CASE STUDY where we will Clarify the

- issue, Analyze and Synthesize theory and Enact the best solution in a Scholarly Treatise to Understand and Define You (your principles now, and in the future)
2. Solve problems in the academic setting that relate to cultural difference and health delivery (using The Spirit Catches You and You Fall Down), aging and health care (using Being Mortal) and debate contemporaneous themes in the realms of health.
  3. Create original scholarship through selecting, examining and writing an original case study topic that relates uniquely to each student and a paper section that expands upon existing scholarship by producing a significant analysis of ethical challenges in the future premised upon trend analysis of technological and scientific advances today.
  4. Communicate effectively with a diversity of audiences through preparing documents that incorporate the COLL 400 principles into the CASE study (Clarify the issue through a thorough description of the ethical dilemma, Analyze alternative pathways using DETECTORS, Synthesize the best moral solution using DEFLECTORS and Enact the ultimate course of action through a document written for diverse audiences, ranging from health professionals in the field to politicians who might translate these conclusions into actions). Communicating effectively in KINE 393 entails speaking in different voices, ranging from the written study to oratorical public speaking in required formal debates.

### **Course Requirements and Evaluation**

The requirements are comprehensive in that they include individual and group projects, written and oral assignments. Evaluation will focus on the end product and on the process, on preparation and presentation. The process for every assignment is ongoing until the end of the course. Grades for all of the verbal and written assignments (except the mid-term exam) are incremental throughout the semester: you may continue to work to improve your performance until the last day of class, for instance by participating fully in the discussion period of debates even after you have completed your own. You are encouraged to visit the professor, preferably during office hours, to discuss your ongoing grades and how to improve your performance in the assignments.

Participation in all class sessions should be unequivocal, so the use of laptop computers, phones and other technological equipment will be penalized (unless prior permission has been given by the Professor on a case by case basis on the understanding that students will show class notes to the professor at the end of class) and is prohibited in debates.

### **Verbal assignments (40%)**

1. **Group Power-point presentation/discussion of one of DETECTORS (10%).** Students meet as a group and work together on the complete package – consequently part of this grade is earned on the basis of how the team performs as a unit. Each individual will earn 5% for presenting one of the following aspects of one of the DETECTORS: theoretical overview, strengths that make it a useful approach to ethical analysis, weaknesses that detract from its explanatory power and examples of how it might be used in a personal or public health ethics case study. The other 5% of the grade will be apportioned near the end of the semester when the group revisit the ethical theory they have previously introduced to expand their analysis through an upgraded group power point presentation. The purpose of this review is to show deeper understanding of

underlying concepts, to add scholarly sources and to apply it to an environmental health case study.

## 2. **Two Partner presentations (10%)**

Partners review CONCERNS and conduct critical analysis of a chapter from The Spirit Catches You and You Fall Down (5%) and a section of Being Mortal (5%)

## 3. **Two Debates that you choose pro or con from the syllabus (10% each)**

The format for the debate is 2 teams (which do not collaborate with each other), consisting of 2 members (who do collaborate closely). Each debate team will meet to discuss the prompt in detail, discuss strategy (both offense and defense), to decide who will make the initial presentation for the team and who will second that argument by reinforcing key arguments and disagreeing with the opposition. The first speaker on each team is responsible for making all of the arguments pro or con in a prepared, but not read statement (5-8 minutes). The second speaker has the task of highlighting the main points, defending those that were attacked (damage control) and pointing out the shortcomings of the arguments from the first speaker of the opposing team (5-8 minutes). After these first four presentations, the floor is opened to points of information (not questions, but statements from the audience) that will allow the teams to consolidate their positions, followed by a final statement from each team (1 minute). The audience votes and explains why they were persuaded to vote the way they did – what arguments they liked, did not like, and would have liked if they had been made. Grades will be awarded for unimpeachable supportive arguments. Points will be given for clear and well-researched opening statements that address the basic ethical question of 5-8 minutes length that are presented as persuasive positions, but will be deducted if they do not fit in that time frame, or if the statement is read as a prepared script. Particular debate skills that will be evaluated are clarity in defining each word of the prompt to make your point and in establishing your burden of proof (i.e. persuading the audience what you have to do to win the debate), listening and responding to points made by your opponents and to points of information that are raised by the audience.

**Written assignment – An autobiographical longitudinal 15 page/1.5 spacing/two-part case study: from present case study reality today (10 pages/20%) to future professional projection (5 pages/10%) (Total of 30%)**

The first part should be a blend of introspective analysis and well-researched ethical theory. This case study is the culmination of the class in that you will transcend theory to show your understanding of the ethical skills we have been studying throughout the semester in practice. Given that you will be spending much time researching and writing this case study, I encourage you to select a topic that is meaningful to you now and that might be helpful in your future. You should use 8-10 of the sources that have been put on reserve in Swem Library and/or other philosophical resources for this purpose,.

**Step 1:** Research and select a case study that is **real** and **interesting**, in which **you are a personal stakeholder** and where **you are currently making an ethical decision**. This case may be reactive (a situation you are facing that you have to react to at this time), or proactive (an issue you want to address because it has clear identifiable personal impact, such as how the ethical infrastructure of the current health care system might impact you

and how you might have an impact on it by addressing concerns to a representative). Start to think about this topic early in the course and discuss it with your professor if you are uncertain – the extent to which this choice meets the four criteria in the first sentence above will strongly influence the grade you can receive for this assignment.

**Step 2:** Clarify how this case study meets the above criteria in a 2-page first-person narrative that clearly lays out the ethical dilemma you have chosen **by Fall Break**.

**Step 3:** Analyze and debate ethical options using DETECTORS and ethical codes. Engage all DETECTORS, but show why some have more explanatory power than others.

**Step 4:** Synthesize your previous arguments to resolve the debate about what is your best option using the most appropriate DETECTORS and pertinent DEFLECTORS.

**Step 5:** Enact the ethical decision. This action constitutes the conclusion of the first part of the paper and will usually take the form of a document to diverse audiences, (perhaps a letter, to an individual who can most influence the outcome of the dilemma). It should be preceded by a discussion of possible recipients and a rationale for your final selection.

The second part of the **CASE** study takes the form of a futuristic analysis of the ethical challenges that could arise in your health-related profession by 2050 in a new age of technological enhancement. The purpose of this part of the paper is to help prepare you for the ethical challenges of your future career. Start by **Clarifying** the scenario in which you are the health professional in this technologically transformed environment using a day in the life format complete with futuristic descriptions of your work environment and the changed face of health care by 2050, (build upon and expand the vision of Byron Reese in Infinite Progress). Your task is to describe all of the changes thoroughly with a detailed narrative and then to **Analyze** ethical issues associated with these changes and **Synthesize** how you will **Enact** their resolution. If you are not intending to enter a health-related profession, write this paper from the perspective of a patient or client in a particular health-related specialty or setting. Use 3-5 sources in this section of the paper.

In order to earn Kinesiology Department Writing Credit, the first part of the case study (CASE) will be presented for evaluation as a draft online before Thanksgiving. The completed paper is due the last class session of the semester. Points will be deducted if your paper does not include full citations (APA format) and/or is not submitted on time via email as a Word attachment (final version in hard copy).

**Examination: Mid-term (10%) and Final (20%)**

### **Readings**

#### **Required readings:**

Fadiman, A., 1998, The Spirit Catches You and You Fall Down, Farrar, Straus and Giroux,

Gawande, A., 2014, Being Mortal: Medicine and What Matters in the End, Henry Holt

Charles, J. M., 2009, Health Ethics, Stipes (Available for free use on Swem reserve)

Reese, B., 2013, Infinite Progress, Greenleaf.

**In addition** you should study all sources on Blackboard, especially the class powerpoint.

Read widely from the books on reserve in Swem library (listed at the end of this syllabus) and other scholarly sources you discover to prepare for class discussion and to conduct research for your paper and verbal assignments. You will receive recognition in your grade for skilful selection and use of the ethical arguments and philosophy in these sources, or other written resources of a similar standard that relate to your topics.

## **Course Syllabus**

### **Introduction to Ethical Decision-Making**

#### **Week 1: Course Introduction**

**Thursday Aug 31:** The course outline will be discussed, with emphasis on assignments and expectations.

#### **Week 2: Introduction to Health and Ethical Methodology (read Health Ethics, 1-43)**

**Tuesday Sept 4:** Power-point preview of key class issues, including the meaning of HEALTH, the study of Ethics, the process of CRISIS ethical decision-making and resolution of a CASE STUDY using DETECTORS and DEFLECTORS in the face of CONCERNS. Students will select their assignments during this session.

**Thursday Sept 6:** CONCERNS Introduction: viewing and reviewing The Mystery of Chi

#### **Week 3: Ethical CONCERNS**

**Tuesday Sept 11:** Discussion of cultural relativity, nihilism and moral calluses that reduce compassion in healthy society through partner reviews of The Spirit Catches You.

**Thursday Sept 13:** Moral Callouses, Cultural Relativity and Nihilism. Continued discussion of the ethical problem of cultural relativity as it is represented in The Spirit Catches You and You Fall Down and partner presentations of CONCERNS in ethical case studies with a focus on the ethical responsibility of the public health system in America to cater to diverse populations with different traditions and expectations. Partner Debate: That medical training should incorporate required training in ethics and cross-cultural awareness of how immigrant patients, such as the Hmong, conceptualize health and disease.

#### **Week 4: Being mortal and end of life care**

**Tuesday Sept 18:** Present one chapter of Being Mortal, switching responsibilities from the Fadiman critical analysis, review and CONCERNS with your partner. Discuss the impact of cultural philosophy of aging upon public policy and practice. Consider and critique the role of ethical codes.

**Thursday Sept 20:** Continue and complete Being Mortal presentations and discuss appropriate moral strategies for meeting the demands of the future.

Partner Debate: That the role of the physician should be to help patients who are mature and rational to operationalize their end of life strategies.

#### **Week 5: Group power-point presentations of DETECTORS**

**Tuesday Sept 25:** Discussion of the role and focus of time-proven ethical decision-making theories that are represented in the DETECTORS followed by student group

power-point presentations of deontological, teleological and communitarian decision-making approaches (overview, strengths, weaknesses, application to personal or public health case study). To prepare read appropriate sections of library reserve resources, (eg Arras) and the pages from Health Ethics that relate to your topic: Deontological Ethics (46, 67-82, 109-118, 147-156), Teleological Ethics (47-49, 82-86, 118-122, 156-160) and Communitarian ethics (49-52, 86-93, 122-127, 160-164),

**Thursday Sept 27:** DETECTORS presentations continued - Traditional virtue ethics (52-54, 93-96, 127-133, 160-164) Omni-feminist ethics (54-57, 96-99, 133-137, 168-175) and Rights-based ethics (57-59, 99-103, 137-142, 175-180). This class will feature power-point presentations of traditional virtue, omni-feminist and rights-based ethics and applications in personal or public health case studies.

**Week 6: Social contract theory, DETECTORS compared, DEFLECTOR Analysis.**

**Tuesday Oct 2:** Group power-point presentation to analyze social contract theory and apply it to personal and public health case studies (59-62, 103-109, 142-147, 180-185) Discussion of how DEFLECTORS are significant in case study analysis (63-66). Ethics in America video on the topic Does the Doctor Know Best?

Group Debate: That our DETECTOR has more ethical explanatory power than all others

**Thursday Oct 4:** The Importance of Debate in the Ethical Decision-making process.

The purpose of this session is to introduce the significance of examining nuances and interpretations through the process of debate. In this case we will tackle the apparently straightforward and simple question of honesty in the medical profession.

Debate: That a physician should always tell the truth

**Medical Ethics: Personal Health and Aging; Disease and Doctors**

**Week 7: Codes of conduct**

**Tuesday Oct 9:** Given the shortcomings of ethical codes as guides to moral conduct, what other moral compass should guide ethical behavior? An in-depth discussion of the Blackboard article on compassion and analysis of “first do no harm” as a moral guideline in context of beneficence versus non-maleficence and the sanctity of life versus the quality of life.

Debate: That physician’s should provide compassionate treatment that conforms to the informed choice of patients.

**Thursday Oct 11:** Mid-Term Exam (comprehensive test of all material covered in first half of the semester, including all of both readings, not just the chapter you reviewed).  
**(Case study narrative due today – 2 pages, hard copy)**

**Fall Break: Oct 13-16**

**Public Health Ethics**

**Week 8: Justice and Access to Public Health Care**

**Thursday Oct 18:** Analysis and synthesis of the Michael Moore video entitled “Sicko”

**Week 9: Moral Duty and Disease Prevention**

**Tuesday Oct 23:** Discussion of Health Care delivery models for the U.S., with particular reference to video-related issues, cultural relativity, nihilism, and socialism.

Debate: That we should be trying to create a health care system that focuses more on proactive health promotion than reactive disease treatment.

**Thursday Oct 25:** Analysis of an ethical framework for access to health care in the US and in the field of international public health, the allocation of health care in this country and globally, using Infinite Progress as a resource for discussion.

Debate: That in a capitalist democracy we should let market trends and profit margins dictate the future of health care.

### **Week 10: Ethical Dimensions of scarce resources and Nutrition**

**Tuesday Oct 30:** Discussion of the optimistic vision of Infinite Progress.

Debate: That the Internet and Technology are likely to end disease and hunger

**Thursday Nov 1:** The food industry and promoting health through nutrition.

Review Super Size Me and discuss the ethics of the American way of life it represents.

Analysis of the tensions that may exist between a capitalistic business ethic and the promotion of public wellbeing through the study of Salt Sugar Fat (reading this book, which is on reserve in Swem library, is a prerequisite for this debate)

Debate: That making salt sugar and fat “bliss point” profits should take precedence in US executive business decisions over creating truly healthy alternative nutritional products

### **Week 11: Moral Maturity, the Veil of Ignorance and Public Health**

**Tuesday Nov 6:** Lifestyle Choices, Personal Responsibility and Health Care

Equality and health policy, personal lifestyle choice and responsibility for ill-health (obesity, cancer and liver disease). Review The Obesity Paradox from A Global Health Challenge? Who Plays God? Concerning allocation of organ transplants.

Debate: That if an individual chooses to smoke, society should not be obligated to provide a second lung transplant.

**Thursday Nov 8:** Issues addressed in this class session include the following questions: what should be the relationship of public health practice to the community and the responsibility of the community for its own health? Discussion of how the veil of ignorance (Rawls) could help a community to make ethical choices.

Debate: That government should be able to add chlorine and fluoride to drinking water and impose insurance on the healthy, including those who object to these measures

### **Week 12: Public Health and the challenges of the future**

**Tuesday Nov 13:** Moral Duty and Life Promotion, including the moral obligation of the health practitioner regarding such issues as informed consent, confidentiality and conflicting professional roles and responsibilities.

Debate: That a health professional is morally justified in breaching confidentiality with a patient on the public health premise of having a “duty to warn”.

**Thursday Nov 15:** Contagion: roles, responsibility of public/global health ethics in a worldwide context. A discussion of the concept of moral maturity, as defined by Kohlberg will lead to analysis of our roles and responsibilities on the global health scale.

Debate: That it is ethical to totally isolate, quarantine and avoid all human contact (including by US medical personnel) with a small rural community in a third world

country that has been stricken by a highly contagious killer plague for which there is no current cure, even if this course of action will result in the death of inhabitants.

### **Week 13: Public Responsibility and Health Care**

**Tuesday November 20:** A discussion of ethical problems posed by advances of genetic understanding, now and in the future.

Debate: That genetic testing should be permitted as a part of a high-risk job selection process and that results should become a part of the medical record of the applicant.

### **Thanksgiving break: November 21-25**

### **Environmental Health Ethics**

### **Week 14: Environmental health and the treatment of the earth**

**Tuesday November 27:** Public Health on a global scale

The ethical implications of the impact of genetic research on the environment

Debate: That we should have the right to eat genetically modified organisms without additional government regulation

**Thursday November 29:** Review recent environmental ethics history dating back to the publication of Rachel Carson's Silent Spring and looking forward to ethical implications of ecological stewardship here and in developing third world countries.

Debate: That it is always reasonable to restrict development in order to preserve endangered species.

### **Week 15: Developing a Land Ethic and enhancing DETECTORS**

**Tuesday December 4:** Earth on Edge (Moyers) or Food Inc will provide background information to synthesize a global land ethic, one that is applicable within and beyond the United States of America

Debate: That it is ethical to take action that might be destructive to the land (such as destroying the habitat of the Zika mosquito) or animals (such as animal research) in order to preserve human health .

Start DETECTORS power-point presentations, designed to show enhanced understanding.

**Thursday December 6:** Complete DETECTORS presentations and review the main themes of the class and preview materials in preparation for the final exam

### **University ADA Accommodation Policy**

"William & Mary accommodates students with disabilities in accordance with federal laws and university policy. Any student who feels they may need an accommodation based on the impact of a learning, psychiatric, physical, or chronic health diagnosis should contact Student Accessibility Services staff at 757-221-2512 or at [sas@wm.edu](mailto:sas@wm.edu) to determine if accommodations are warranted and to obtain an official letter of accommodation. For more information, please see <http://www.wm.edu/sas>"

*The following books are available as Reserve Items for KINE393 in SWEM library:*

Aging and ethics: philosophical problems in gerontology  
Animal minds and human morals: the origins of the Western debate  
Animal pragmatism: rethinking human-nonhuman relationships  
Animals and ethics: an overview of the philosophical debate  
An Inconvenient truth [videorecording (DVD)]: a global warning

A river runs through it [videorecording]

Boundaries: a casebook in environmental ethics  
Contagion [videorecording]

Earth ethics: introductory readings on animal rights and environmental ethics  
Environmental ethics: readings in theory and application  
Environmental ethics and law  
Ethical ambition: living a life of meaning and worth  
Ethical issues in modern medicine  
Ethics and sustainability: sustainable development and the moral life  
Ethics and the elderly  
**ETHICS AND THE PRACTICE OF PUBLIC HEALTH**

Ethics in America [videorecording]

First, do no harm  
Food, Inc. [videorecording (DVD)]  
Frontiers of justice: disability, nationality, species membership  
Future medicine: ethical dilemmas, regulatory challenges, and therapeutic pathways to health care and healing in human transformation  
Genetically engineered foods  
Health ethics

Introduction to humans moving: a guide to philosophy in action  
Magpies, monkeys, and morals: what philosophers say about animal liberation  
Medicine and the ethics of care  
My left foot [videorecording]: the story of Christy Brown

Nature, environment and society  
New ethics for the public's health

