

6-2013

## PUBH 570.50: Ethical issues in Public Health

Ann Freeman Cook

*University of Montana - Missoula*, [ann.cook@umontana.edu](mailto:ann.cook@umontana.edu)

Let us know how access to this document benefits you.

Follow this and additional works at: <https://scholarworks.umt.edu/syllabi>

---

### Recommended Citation

Cook, Ann Freeman, "PUBH 570.50: Ethical issues in Public Health" (2013). *Syllabi*. 3080.  
<https://scholarworks.umt.edu/syllabi/3080>

This Syllabus is brought to you for free and open access by the Course Syllabi at ScholarWorks at University of Montana. It has been accepted for inclusion in Syllabi by an authorized administrator of ScholarWorks at University of Montana. For more information, please contact [scholarworks@mso.umt.edu](mailto:scholarworks@mso.umt.edu).

**PUB H**  
**Ethics and Public Health**  
**3 credit hours**  
**Summer, 2013**

- Instructor:** Ann Cook, PhD, Research Professor, Department of Psychology and Director, National Rural Bioethics Project.
- Format:** Online  
For purposes of assignments and class activities, the week starts on Sunday, 12:01 a.m. and ends on Saturday at Midnight.
- Office Hours:** Dr. Cook will be available on the phone, via e-mail, and in her office during scheduled hours. Phone and email contact is welcome.
- Contact Info:** [ann.cook@umontana.edu](mailto:ann.cook@umontana.edu),  
Ann Cook, Ph.D.  
Director, National Rural Bioethics Project  
Research Professor,  
Department of Psychology - Corbin 341  
The University of Montana  
Missoula, MT 59812-7397  
Phone: 406.243.2467  
Fax: 406.243.5748  
<http://www.umt.edu/bioethics>

**Course Description**

This course provides an opportunity to study the values and moral issues that have influenced U.S. public health policies over time. The course begins with a rationale for studying the ethical dimensions of public health and then examines ethical decisionmaking in arenas such as policy development, clinical care, research, environmental health, occupational health, resource allocation, and genetics. The materials used in this class are designed to offer a historical sense of health-related issues and provide experiences in applying ethically informed approaches to the development of public health policy. The materials will also help students examine their own ethical beliefs, appreciate differing ethical perspectives, and demonstrate tolerance for approaches different from their own.

This class offers an ambitious and challenging course of study. The work of a 16 week semester class is compressed into 10 weeks. You should expect to allocate 12-15 hours of work per week to class-related activities. While the investment is sizable, it is hoped that the lessons learned from this class will be helpful, over the years, when you encounter ethically complicated public health problems.

**COURSE OBJECTIVES**

At the end of the course the student should be able to:

- 1) Describe the relevance of ethical theory for examining and resolving major public health problems;
- 2) Develop critical skills for evaluating and articulating moral and philosophical claims, arguments, and goals that accompany public health policy;
- 3) Conduct a review of the ethics literature for analysis of a specified public health issue;
- 4) Formulate, present, and defend ethically informed positions on public health policy issues and communicate these ideas and conclusions, both orally and in writing, to patients, patients' families, colleagues, staff, and other decision makers in society;
- 5) Contribute to Public Health Program and Policy Development
- 6) Communicate in Public Health Settings
- 7) Practice Public Health with People from Diverse Populations
- 8) Collaborate with the Community in the Practice of Public Health
- 9) Base Public Health Practice on Scientific Evidence

- 10) Reflect on and analyze the public health administrator's responsibility to help develop and implement social policies regarding the protection of the public's health;
- 11) Apply ethical theories, principles, and approaches in designing a public health intervention
- 12) Respond to Public Health Issues in Rural Settings

More information about the Course Objectives and the associated UM MPH Competencies can be accessed at the following link:

<http://publichealth.health.umt.edu/sites/publichealth.health.umt.edu/files/documents/CompetenciesStudentVersion.pdf>

### **COURSE FORMAT**

This course will be delivered online with support from UOnline. Assigned readings and case studies will form the basis for review and discussion during the ongoing class postings on the forum/discussion board. Students are expected to complete all readings and meaningfully engage in discussion and application of the course material. The study of ethics involves a dialogue and so active and respectful participation in class discussions is essential. *The failure to meaningfully participate via the Forum/Discussion Board will be reflected in the Final Grade.* Be sure to use the weekly readings – **and the Background Materials** – as you develop your responses.

### **UOnline Preparatory Course**

UOnline provides instruction on how to use Moodle as a student. Since you are enrolled in an online class, you are also automatically enrolled into this introduction class, titled “*Taking an Online Course at UM.*” If you have not taken a course supported by Moodle, completion of this non-credit course or taking an equivalent course on-campus is **required** before the end of the first week of class.

### **Library Resources**

Some assignments, including your final presentation, will require library resources. To access the UM's Mansfield Library resources from off-campus, students will be required to enter their username and password. This is the same ID and password that you use to login to Moodle and use for your official UM e-mail address. According to the UM library web page: “When connecting to licensed library resources from off-campus, users will be prompted to login using the “standard UM-M computer access user ID” and password. This is the same account used for campus wireless accounts and students' email service. Students and employees can now look up their log-in names on [CyberBear](http://web.lib.umt.edu/remotelib.html)” (<http://web.lib.umt.edu/remotelib.html>)

### **Assignments**

The coursework will involve four major assignments. Students are required to:

- Complete the weekly assigned readings including the Background Readings;
- Consistently participate in class discussion of readings and cases via the Forum/Discussion Board;
- Maintain an *Ethics Journal* throughout the summer session;
- Complete and submit a final project.

**The expectations for each assignment are as follows:**

#### **Assigned Readings**

- The assigned readings and other supplemental materials are provided for each week of class. Participation in class activities and discussions necessitates completion of readings by **Sunday** at midnight of each week. As you open each article, you can choose the magnification level that works best and provides the most clarity for you.

#### **Discussion Board**

- A discussion forum can be accessed through the Advanced Forum. There will be a forum for each week of class. The discussion questions, following the weekly case study, reflect issues that are related to the assigned readings. Students should consistently use the assigned readings as reference points for responding to questions and discussing and presenting ideas with one another. Consider how the ideas in the assigned readings complement or conflict



with one another. Be sure to examine the *Discussion Grade Matrix* (see Background Materials in Course Description) to understand how discussion-related activities will be graded. As the discussion evolves, students can extend the dialogue by posting additional questions that may be relevant to the issues and themes under discussion. The discussion should reflect your leadership in recognizing ethical issues and your growing skill in ethical deliberation. Simplistic statements of agreement or disagreement are discouraged.

- All students are required to *meaningfully* participate in online discussions via the Discussion Board *at least four times each week*. Discussions of the readings and responses to specific questions will occur Monday through Friday. Class participation is a proxy for the kind of dialogue that may occur in work-place settings; so while it might initially feel uncomfortable to post your perspectives and comments, you will be honing some valuable skills. Therefore, class participation will be closely monitored and will constitute a significant portion of the grade for this course. **Your postings should show that you are participating in and expanding the discussion throughout the week.** It would be unwise to wait until the end of the week and then make the minimum required four postings. That unfortunate choice would be reflected in your grade. Rather, you should aim for daily postings and your postings should show a growing understanding of the complex issues under discussion.

### **Ethics Journal**

- The journal will be maintained, throughout the course, to record the analysis of the student's evolving perceptions and responses to the materials and the on-line discussions. The Journal provides an opportunity to explore how personal beliefs can influence approaches to ethical decisionmaking. Journal entries will focus on four themes:
  - Identification of the key points or ethical features of issues under discussion during the week;
  - Examination of how one's own life story including how values and preferences influence perceptions/resolutions of issues;
  - Consideration of one's area of expertise in responding to the problems as well as guides or standards that might be relevant when searching for solutions; and
  - Kinds of additional personal or professional ethics-related problems that might be expected, given the topics under discussion and areas for improvement or further consideration.

***The journal will be submitted to the professor via email or on-line by 5:00 pm on July 25th.  
The Journals will not be made available for view by other students enrolled in the course.***

### **Final Project**

- The fourth major assignment involves completion of a final project. In lieu of a traditional final exam, each student will submit a final project/presentation that introduces a public health issue, identifies ethical considerations, and offers approaches for resolution including policy development. Each student should design his or her presentation for a specific audience that needs to understand an important public health problem (e.g., hospital board, county commissioners, employee wellness program, state office of health and human services, other specified audience). The project should show integration of the lessons learned throughout the course. You have the option to creatively design your project in an accessible format that you believe would be effective, given your issue and your target population. The on-line presentation should engage the audience and facilitate the uptake of important information. Public health professionals are routinely expected to give such presentations and this is a good opportunity to demonstrate the knowledge gained through the coursework. ***The on-line presentation of the final project must be submitted by 5:00 pm on Monday, July 23, 2012. After being submitted as an Assignment, all presentations will be uploaded in the Week 10 section and will be available for viewing, analysis, and comment by all students. Viewing, analysis and comments are required.***

### **Grades**

The grading of ethics can pose some difficulties, in part because there can be a considerable disconnect between what one says, what one believes, and what one does. For this class, grades are based on a

student's ability to complete assignments, identify ethical issues, apply traditions, defend positions, and engage in respectful dialogue. Hopefully this course will provide you with resources and approaches that help you respond to public health issues that you may encounter throughout your career. That goal is dependent upon the energy and commitment that you are willing to expend. The discussion matrix and other materials provided as Background Materials Section offer indication of how class participation will be graded. Lessons learned from this class are very much dependent upon the energy expended.

Late assignments will be graded zero unless there are very serious and verifiable extenuating circumstances. Students who wish to request permission to submit an assignment late must contact Dr. Cook well before the assignment deadline.

### **COURSE REQUIREMENTS**

1. Evidence of completion of readings – 25%
2. Consistent participation via the Discussion Board – 30%
3. Completion of other assignments including:
  - ▶ Ethics Journal, a 10-week journal of responses to readings – 20%
  - ▶ Final project to be presented to the class – 25%

This course will use the traditional letter grade option without the use of pluses or minuses. Therefore, final grades will consist of the following: A, B, C, D, F. Grades will be calculated based on the standard formula (90-100% = A; 80-89% = B; 70-79% = C; 60-69% = D; 59% and below = F).

Late assignments including failure to participate via the Discussion Board will be graded zero unless there are serious and verifiable extenuating circumstances.

### **MOODLE COURSE PROCEDURES AND EXPECTATIONS**

Moodle will be used in this class and online activities will be required throughout the semester.

#### **Announcements**

Class announcements will be posted by the instructor. Moodle system administrators will sometimes post announcements about the online system.

#### **Communication**

Communication will take place using e-mail and discussion boards. E-mail should be used for “private” communication with the instructor or other students. *Any questions regarding grades or communication about more personal issues should be handled via email.* Please include PUBHEthics in the subject line for e-mail communication with the instructor.

Discussion boards are appropriate for questions or discussions that would normally occur in the classroom. Remember that the discussion board is public and your classmates can read what you post there!

#### **Course Materials**

Assignments and required readings will be posted on Blackboard in the Learning Units section.

#### **Submitting Assignments Electronically**

All assignments will be submitted electronically through the Assignments option within Blackboard.

Important:

- Assignments are due when specified.
- Save your completed assignments as a Word document with the file name YourLastName\_AssignmentNumber (e.g. Smith\_assignment1.doc.)
- Make sure that your name, the date, and the assignment number are also included at the top of your completed assignment.
- Submit your assignment through the Assignments area on Moodle.

If you need assistance with viewing or submitting your assignments, please call the Help Desk at 406-243-4357 or refer to the UMLearn student resources at <http://umonline.umt.edu/studentsupport/default.htm>.

### **Logging In**

You are expected to log in, *at minimum*, four days per week to read current announcements that have been posted and to participate in class discussions. You may do this at any time of day. More frequent log-ins are encouraged. The Instructor will generally answer e-mails, respond to discussions, etc. during traditional work hours (M-F 8:00 a.m. - 5 p.m.).

### **REQUIRED READINGS**

The required reading materials for each week's classes have been placed in the *sections for each week of class*. A considerable amount of reading is required so students need to plan accordingly.

### **ADDITIONAL NOTES**

In accordance with University of Montana's mission to provide equal educational opportunities for all students, necessary accommodations for students with disabilities will be made whenever possible. If you require accommodations, please provide written information regarding your disability from the Disability Services as soon as possible so that accommodations can be made. This syllabus is subject to change by the instructor. Any changes will be announced in the announcement section of Blackboard.

### **Plagiarism Warning**

All students must practice academic honesty. Academic misconduct is subject to an academic penalty by the course instructor and/or a disciplinary sanction by the University. All students need to be familiar with the Student Conduct Code. The Code is available for review online at <http://www.umt.edu/SA/VPISA/index.cfm/page/1321>.

Plagiarism is the representing of another's work as one's own. It is unethical and unacceptable in the academic community. Students who plagiarize may fail the course and may be remanded to Academic Court for possible suspension or expulsion. (See UM Student Conduct Code).

Students must always be very careful to acknowledge any kind of borrowing that is included in their work. This means not only borrowed wording but also ideas. Acknowledgment of whatever is not one's own original work is the proper and honest use of sources. Failure to acknowledge whatever is not one's own original work is plagiarism. (Source: <http://www2.umt.edu/catalog/acpolpro.htm>)

### **Topics and Reading Schedule**

**Background Materials for Summer Session** (these materials should be accessed throughout the term)

- Moral Rules
- Matrix for Grading Class Discussion
- Decisionmaking Tool
- Fact Sheet: Tradition, Profession, Values
- Fact Sheet: Collective Good and Individual Right
- Fact Sheet: Research with Children
- Dialogue Overview
- Code of Ethics for Public Health
- Ethical Theories Overview
- Medical Professionalism in the New Millennium
- Sugarman, J., Mastroianni, A., & Kahn, J. (1998). Principles of the Nuremberg Code, the Belmont Report, and the Medical Declaration of Helsinki from *Ethics of research with human subjects: selected policies and resources*. Frederick, MD: University Publishing Group: 12-30.

**Week 1: May 27**

Background and rationale for the study of public health ethics including:

- Analysis of the values, morals, principles, and approaches that shape public health policy;
- Examination of processes for analyzing problems and making ethically informed decisions.

Readings/Assignments:

- Cook, A. Lecture Notes/Overview of the Week's Materials
- Rosenberg, C. (1999). Meanings, politics and medicine: On the bioethical enterprise and history. *Daedalus*, 128(4).
- Bergum, V & Dossetor, J. (2005). Situating relational ethics in ethical theory from *Relational ethics: The full meaning of respect*. Maryland: University Publishing Group:1-31.
- Jansen, L. (2003). Ethical issues in case management in T.Cesta & H. Tahan (eds). *The case manager's survival guide: Winning strategies for clinical practice*. St Louis: Mosby Press.
- Cranor, C. (2004). Toward understanding aspects of the precautionary principle. *Journal of Medicine and Philosophy* 29(3): 259-79.
- Resnik, (2004). The precautionary principle and medical decisionmaking. *Journal of Medicine and Philosophy* 29(3): 281-299.
- Skloot, R. (2010). Diagnosis and Treatment and The Birth of HeLa, excerpts from *The Immortal Life of Henrietta Lack*. Crown Publishers.
- Stevens, M. L. T. (2000). Re-defining death in America in *Bioethics in America: Origins and cultural politics*. Baltimore: John Hopkins University Press: 75-108.
- Weinberg, R. (1992). Laying on of hands. *Annals of Internal Medicine* 117:83-84.
- Case Study
- Begin Ethics Journal

## **Week 2: June 3**

The health of the public: Whose voice, Whose Vision?

- Examination of the legacy created by past medical and scientific experiments;
- Examination of relevant issues including vulnerability, use of power, foreseeable risks, exploitation, and other issues that can compromise research and ethical public health interventions.

Readings

- Harper, K. (2000). The Iron mountain from *Give me my father's body*. Vermont: Steerforth Press. 11-20.
- Harper, K. (2000). Arrival in America from *Give me my father's body*. Vermont: Steerforth Press: 21-31.
- Jones, J. (1981). The Joy of my life from. *Bad blood: The Tuskegee syphilis experiment*. London: MacMillan Free Press: 151-170.
- Welsome, E. (1999). The Prologue from *The Plutonium files*. New York: Random House: 1-11.
- Miller, J, Engelberg, S, & Broad, W. (2001). Preface from *Germes, Biological Weapons and America's Secret War*. New York: Simon and Schuster. p 14-33.
- Miller, J, Engelberg, S, & Broad, W. (2001) Warrior from *Germes, Biological Weapons and America's Secret War*. New York: Simon and Schuster. P. 35-65.
- Skloot, R. (2010). Night doctors. Excerpt from *The Immortal Life of Henrietta Lacks*. Crown Publishers.
- Stephens, J. (2000). The body hunters: as drug testing spreads, profits and lives hang in the balance. *The Washington Post*, December 17; A01;
- LaFraniere, S., Flaherty, MP., & Stephens, J. (2000). The dilemma: submit or suffer. *The Washington Post*. December 19; A01.
- Elliot, C. & Abadie, R. (2008). Exploiting a research underclass in Phase 1 clinical trials. *New England Journal of Medicine* 358(22):2316-2317.
- Fisher, J. 2006. Coordinating ethical clinical trials: the role of research coordinators in the contract research industry. *Sociology of Health and Illness* 28(6): 678-694.
- Case Study
- Continue Ethics Journal

### Week 3: June 10

#### The Context of Care: Responsibilities, Relationships, Burdens and Moral Distress

- Overview of the individual, professional, and system conflicts and burdens that can accompany public health decisionmaking.
- Examination of communal responsibilities and relationships that emerge in public health.

#### Readings

- Fadiman, A (1997). Excerpts from *The spirit catches you and you fall down: A Hmong child, her American doctors, and the collision of two cultures*. New York: Farrar, Straus & Giroux. Chapters 1,3, & 5.
- Lock, M. (2001). Situated ethics, culture and brain death in Japan In B. Hoffmaster (ed) *Bioethics in the Social Context*. Philadelphia: Temple University Press: 39-69.
- Weinberg, R. (1995). Communion. *Annals of Internal Medicine* 123:804-805.
- Portmann, J. (2000). A Sentimental patient. *Cambridge Quarterly of Healthcare Ethics* 9: 17-22.
- Mates, S. (1997). Laundry from *The Good Doctor*. Iowa City: University of Iowa Press.
- Hilfiker, D. The Pressure Cooker from *Healing the wounds: A physician looks at his work*. New York: Pantheon Books:19-29.
- Worthley, J. (1997). Power and the healthcare professional: The bad things that we good people do from *The Ethics of the Ordinary in Healthcare*. Chicago: Health Administration Press: 61-79.
- Bergum, V & Dossetor, J. (2005). Ethical relations in healthcare from *Relational ethics: The full meaning of respect*. Maryland: University Publishing Group: 1-31.
- Chen, DT, Miller, F. & Rosenstein, D. (2003). Clinical research and the physician-patient relationship. *Ann Intern Med*, 138: 669-72
- Case Study
- Continue Ethics Journal
- Start to think about Final Project

### Week 4: June 17

#### To Err is Human: Mistakes, Conflicts, Uncertainty and Futility

- Examination of error in the context of public health decisionmaking;
- Examination of the role of disclosure including processes and protocols for engaging the public in public health decisionmaking;

#### Readings

- Groopman, J (2002). Second Opinion in *The New Yorker*, January 24, 2000: 40-50.
- Groopman, J. (2002) A knife in the back in *The New Yorker*, April 8, 2002: 66-73.
- Hilfiker, D. (1998) *Mistakes from Healing the Wounds: A physician looks at his mistakes*. Creighton University Press: 72-87.
- Gawande, A. ( 2002). When doctors make mistakes from *Complications: A surgeon's notes on an imperfect science*. New York: Metropolitan Books: 47-74.
- Gawande, A. ( 2002). When good doctors go bad from *Complications: A surgeon's notes on an imperfect science*. New York: Metropolitan Books: 88-106.
- Cook, a., Hoas, H. & Joyner, J. (2004). An error by any other name. *American Journal of Nursing* 104(6):2-13.
- Gawande, A. (2010). Letting go. *New Yorker*, August 2.
- Bueton, S. (2005). Why the need to reduce errors is not obvious. *Journal of Evaluation in Clinical Practice* 11(1): 53-57
- Gallagher, T. et al., (2006). Choosing your words carefully. *Archives of Internal Medicine* 166: 1583-1591.
- Case Study
- Continue Ethics Journal and work on Final Project



## Week 5: June 24

### Research, Risk, Protection and Informed Consent

- Introduction to research ethics including the examination of processes and protocols designed to ensure protection of human subjects;
- Examination of issues such as the best interests of a population, the good of the community, and rights of individuals;

### Readings

- Kuczewski, M. & McCruden, P. (2001). Informed consent: Does it take a village? The problem of culture and truth telling. *Cambridge Quarterly of Healthcare Ethics*, 10, 34-36
- Elliot, C. (2001). Throwing a bone to the watchdog. *The Hastings Center Report*, 31(2): 9-11.
- Stead, M, Eadie, D. Gordon, D & Angus, K. (2004). Hello, Hello – it's English I speak: A qualitative exploration of patients' understanding of the science of clinical trials. *Journal of Medical Ethics* 31, 664-669.
- Iltis, A. (2006). Lay concepts in informed consent to biomedical research: The capacity to understand and appreciate risk. *Bioethics* 20(4)180-190.
- Skloot, R. (2010). It's Alive. Excerpt from *The Immortal Life of Henrietta Lacks*. Crown Publishers.
- Klein, JE & Fleishman, AR. (2002). The Private Practicing Physician-Investigator: Ethical implications of clinical research in the office setting. *The Hastings Center Report* (July/August).
- Shuchman, M. (2007). Commercializing clinical trials – Risks and benefits of the CRO boom. *New England Journal of Medicine* 357(14); 1365-68.
- Kottow, M.(2009). Clinical and research ethics as moral strangers. *Arch Immuno. Therp. Ex.* 57: 157-164.
- Cook, A. & Hoas, H. (2011) Protecting research subjects: IRBs in a changing research landscape. *IRB: Ethics and Human Research*. March/April:14-19.
- Cook, A & Hoas, H. (2011). Trading places: What the research participant can tell the investigator about informed consent. *Journal of Clinical Research and Bioethics* 2(8):1-7
- Morreim, H. (2009). The dirty little truth: We want them to understand but not really. *American Journal of Bioethics* 9(2)9-22.
- Case Study
- Continue Ethics Journal and work on Final Project

## Week 6: July 1

### The Ethics of Disease Prevention and Control

- Examination of the tensions between individual rights and community protections
- Analysis of the ethics of social marketing and public health efforts to minimize the social effects of risky choices;
- Examination of ethically acceptable restrictions and prohibitions designed to enhance public health and safety.

### Readings

- Gallagher, H. (1995). *By trust betrayed: Patients, physicians, and the license to kill in the Third Reich*. Arlington, VA: Vandemere Press; pgs. 15-42 and 43-64.
- Lyden, J. (1998). *Daughter of the Queen of Sheba*. USA: Penguin Group: 1-38.
- Elliot, C. (2000). Pursued by happiness and beaten senseless: Prozac and the American dream. *Hastings Center Report* 30(2): 7-12.
- Emmanuel, E. & Wertheimer, A (2006). Who should get influenza vaccine when not all can? *Science* 312 (May 12): 854-55.
- Boo, K. (2006) Swamp Nurse. *New Yorker*. February 6: 54-65.
- Murray, C et al. (2006). Eight Americas: Investigating mortality disparities across races, counties, and race-counties in the United States. *PLOS Medicine*, 1513-1524
- Cook, A. & Hoas, H. (2009). The landscape of asbestos: Libby and beyond. *The Journal of Risk Research* 12(1): 105-113.

- Skloot, R. (2010). Illegal, immoral and deplorable. Excerpt from *The Immortal Life of Henrietta Lacks*. Crown Publishers.
- Wynia, M. (2007). Mandating vaccination: What counts as a mandate in public health and when should they be used? *The American Journal of Bioethics* 7(12):2-6.
- Tayman, J. (2005). *The Colony*. New York: A Lisa Drew Book/Scribner: 20-53
- Continue Ethics Journal and work on Final Project

### **Week 7: July 8**

#### The Ethics of Environmental and Occupational Health

- Examination of ways that we assess environmental and occupational risks;
- Examination of environmental/occupational health as it relates to concepts such as protection of vulnerable populations versus maximizing overall welfare;
- Examination of the relationship of scientific facts to ethical protections;
- Analysis of environmental risk, rights to knowledge, and informed consent: how much information does the public need?

#### Readings

- Selzer, R. (1990) Luis from *Imagine a woman and other tales*. New York: Random House:111-152.
- Clark, C.(1997). *Radium girls: Women and industrial health reform, 1910-1935*. Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press: 12-64.
- Peacock, A. (2003). *Libby, Montana: Asbestos and the deadly silence of an American corporation*. Boulder, Co: Johnson Books: 1-19.
- Schneider, A. & McCumber, D. (2004). *An air that kills*. New York: GP Putnam's Sons:6-34; 188-198; 333-348
- Herbert and Landrigan: (2000). Work-related death: A continuing epidemic. *American Journal of Public Health* 90(4): 541-545
- Kamel, F & Hoppin, A. (2004). Association of pesticide exposure with neurologic dysfunction and disease. *Environmental Health Perspectives* 112(9):950-958
- Burton, A. (2006) Human Experimentation: A rule gone awry. *Environmental Health Perspectives* 114(6):361-2.
- Department of Energy. The challenge of genetic information in worker studies. Available at [www.science.doe.gov/ober/humsubj/chapter3.pdf](http://www.science.doe.gov/ober/humsubj/chapter3.pdf)
- Brandt-Rauf, P & Brandt-Rauf, S. (2004). Genetic testing in the workplace: Ethical, legal and social implications. *Annual Review of Public Health* 25: 139-153
- Johnson, B. (2003). Further notes on public response to uncertainty in risks and science. *Risk Analysis* 23(4):781-789.
- Case Study
- Continue Ethics Journal and work on Final Project

### **Week 8: July 15**

#### Resources: Rationing and the Economics of Care

- Examination of the ethics of allocation and rationing

#### Readings

- Belkin, L. (1993). *First do no harm*. New York: Simon & Schuster: 74-88.
- Kuczewski, M. (2002). The gift of life and starfish on the beach: The ethics of organ procurement. *American Journal of Bioethics* 2 (3):53-56.
- Specter, M (2001). India's plague. *New Yorker*, December 17: 74-85.
- Cook, A, Hoas, H & Grayson, C.(2003). Asking for organs: Different needs and different values. *The Journal of Clinical Ethics* 14(1/2):37-48.
- Wilkinson, D.(2011). A life worth giving? The threshold for permissible withdrawal of life support from disabled infants. *The American Journal of Bioethics* 11(2): 20-32.

- Hertzman, C. & Siddiqi, A. (2008). Tortoises 1, Hares 0: How comparative health trends between Canada and the United States support a long term view of policy and health. *Physicians for a National Health Program Newsletter* (Spring).
- Gawande, A. (2009). The Cost conundrum: What a Texas town can teach us about healthcare. *The New Yorker*, June 1:
- Fields, R. (2010). God help you. You're on dialysis. *The Atlantic*. 306(5): 582-92.
- Case Study
- Continue Ethics Journal and work on Final Project

### **Week 9: July 22**

#### Ethics, Genetics, and Biotechnology

- Examination of the role of technology and genetics in public health policies and interventions

#### Readings.

- Johnson, J. & Wasunna, A. (2007). Patents, biomedical research and treatments. *Hastings Center Report*, Jan-Feb:S2-31.
- Midgley, M. (2000). Biotechnology and monstrosity: Why we should pay attention to the “Yuk” factor. *Hastings Center Report* 30(5): 7-15.
- Wexler, A. (1996). *Mapping Fate: A memoir of family, risk, and genetics research*. University of California Press: Excerpts (That Disorder, Fish Dreams, After Wood's Hole).
- Rodriguez, L et al. (2013). The complexities of genomic identifiability. *Science* 339:275-276
- Skloot, R. (2010). Who told you you could sell my spleen? Excerpt from *The Immortal Life of Henrietta Lacks*. Crown Publishers.
- *Washington v. Catalona*, et al. United States District Court, Eastern District of Missouri. (Option for extra credit)
- Andrews, L. (2006). Who owns your body? A patient's perspective on the *Washington University v. Catalona*. *Journal of Law, Medicine and Ethics*, 398-407.
- Knox, R. (2006). Report: Lilly promoted drug under false pretenses. *National Public Radio*, Dec. 15.
- Evans, D., Smith, M., & Willen, L. (2005). Big pharma's shameful secret. *Bloomberg Markets*, Dec.
- Ladenfeld, CS & Steinman, M. (2009). The Neurontin legacy: Marketing through misinformation and manipulation. *The New England Journal of Medicine* 360(2):103-106.
- Cook, a. & Hoas, H. (2011). Exploring the obligation to inform: Disclosing the purpose and benefits of research in an increasingly commercial environment. *AJOB-PR* 2(1): 34-41.
- Mello, M & Wolf, L. (2010). The Havasupai Indian Tribe Case. *New England Journal of Medicine*, July 20.
- Case Study
- Continue Ethics Journal and work on Final Project

### **Week 10: July 29**

#### Student Projects: Lessons Learned

- Submit Final Project on Monday, July 29.
- Submit Journal on Wednesday, July 31.