

COURSE NUMBER	PTC 660
COURSE NAME	Medical Ethics
COURSE STRUCTURE	3 credits
COURSE DESCRIPTION	A graduate level examination of the ethical problems and moral foundations of medicine. Issues explored include: Reproductive rights, sanctity of life and death, resource allocation, ethical dilemmas in healthcare practice, and more
PREREQUISITE(S)	Enrollment in the Masters program of Biology in Health
REQUIRED MATERIALS	Bioethics: An anthology 4 th edition. Udo Schüklenk and Peter Singer ISBN 9781119635116

Student Learning Objectives

Upon successful completion of the course, students will

- have a working understanding of the main principles of medical ethics and be able to apply them in practical situations
- have an appreciation of moral arguments and moral theory and will be able to articulate rational justifications for ethical decisions
- understand better the complexity and multidimensionality of biomedical ethical concerns
- recognize what constitutes an ethical concern in healthcare
- define the main areas of ethical discourse
- demonstrate greater tolerance for ethical disagreements among people and ethical ambiguity in reasoning
- analyze and respond to peer comments regarding ethical and philosophical issues
- Develop the ability to reason through difficult ethical issues both orally and through written work

CLASS TOPICS

5 topics of medical ethics will be discussed throughout the semester. Each topic will span multiple weeks while learning about various subcategories within the broad theme. The topics include:

Abortion/ Reproductive Rights

Life & Death Issues

Resource Allocation

Ethical Issues in Research

Ethical Issues in the Practice of Healthcare

Course Outcomes

- Engage with some of the important literature and complex topics in medical ethics and learn how to think critically and systematically about moral problems in the domain of biomedical research and medical practice
- Develop skills of critical analysis and analytical reasoning required for analyzing cases and dilemmas and forming and defending positions
- Deal with contemporary issues of biomedical ethics and acquire the knowledge and methods required to analyze, discuss, and resolve such issues, especially regarding their scientific, technological, political, cultural, and legal dimensions
- Examine and analyze scholarly research on biomedical ethics with the objective of training students to write their own research-based articles

ACADEMIC INTEGRITY

Academic Integrity is the cornerstone of higher education and is central to the ideals of this course and the university. Cheating is strictly prohibited and devalues the degree that you are working on. As a member of the NJIT community, it is your responsibility to protect your educational investment by knowing and following the academic code of integrity policy that is found at:

<http://www5.njit.edu/policies/sites/policies/files/academic-integrity-code.pdf>.

*Please note that it is my professional obligation and responsibility to report any academic misconduct to the Dean of Students Office. **Any student found in violation of the code by cheating, plagiarizing or using any online software inappropriately will result in disciplinary action. This may include a failing grade of F, and/or suspension or dismissal from the university.** If you have any questions about the code of Academic Integrity, please contact the Dean of Students Office at dos@njit.edu*

Method of Instruction

As this is an online class, each subject will be organized around a program of directed readings and introduced by a brief written description of its importance and key theoretical and practical issues around it. Prerecorded lectures will be available to assist in highlighting the main points for each week. Readings will include selections on ethical theory and contemporary essays by philosophers, physicians, legal scholars, and other writers who argue for positions on controversial issues in biomedical ethics.

CLASS HOURS

Course is offered online

Contact information: ajd8@njit.edu

COURSE OUTLINE

Week	Topic	Subtopic(s)	Readings
1	<i>Abortion/ Reproductive Rights</i>	1. Abortion (43 pages reading total)	Abortion & Infanticide (Tooley) A Defense of Abortion (Thomson) The Wrong of Abortion (Lee, George) <i>Recent Event News Article</i>
2	<i>Abortion/ Reproductive Rights</i>	2. Issues in Reproduction 3. Prenatal Screening, Sex, Selection, and Cloning (20 pages reading total)	The McCaughey Septuplets (Pence) Rights, Interests, and Possible People (Parfit) Sex Selection & Preimplantation Genetic Diagnosis Sex Selection & Preimplantation Genetic Diagnosis: A Response (Savulescu, Dahl) <i>Recent Event News Article</i>
3	<i>Abortion/ Reproductive Rights</i>	4. Genetic Manipulation (38 pages reading total)	Questions about Some Uses of Genetic Engineering (Glover) The Moral Significance of the Therapy-Enhancement

			<p>Distinction in Human Genetics (<i>Resnik</i>)</p> <p>Genome Editing & Assisted Reproduction (<i>Cavaliere</i>)</p> <p>An Ethical Pathway for Gene Editing (<i>Savulescu, Singer</i>)</p> <p><i>Recent Event News Article</i></p>
4	<p><i>Life & Death Issues</i></p> <p><i>Midterm paper peer review due</i></p>	<p>1. Killing vs. Letting Die (20 pages reading total)</p>	<p>Active & Passive Euthanasia (<i>Rachels</i>)</p> <p>The Morality of Killing (<i>Grisez</i>)</p> <p>Is Killing No Worse Than Letting Die? (<i>Nesbitt</i>)</p> <p>Why Killing Is Not Always Worse- and Sometimes Better- Than Letting Die (<i>Kuhse</i>)</p> <p><i>Recent Event News Article</i></p>
5	<i>Life & Death Issues</i>	<p>2. Brain Death 3. Advanced Directives (28 pages reading total)</p>	<p>A Definition of Irreversible Coma</p> <p>The Challenge of Brain Death for the Sanctity of Life Ethics (<i>Singer</i>)</p> <p>An Alternative to Brain Death (<i>McMahan</i>)</p> <p>Life Past Reason (<i>Dworkin</i>)</p> <p><i>Recent Event News Article</i></p>
6	<i>Life & Death Issues</i>	<p>4. Voluntary Euthanasia 5. Medically Assisted Suicide (43 pages reading total)</p>	<p>When Self-Determination Runs Amok (<i>Callahan</i>)</p> <p>When Abstract Moralizing Runs Amok (<i>Lachs</i>)</p> <p>PAS and Severe, Treatment-Resistant Depression (<i>Steinbock</i>)</p> <p>Are Concerns about Irremediableness, Vulnerability, or Competence... (<i>Rooney</i>)</p> <p><i>Recent Event News Article</i></p>
7	<i>Midterm papers/ presentations</i>		
8	<i>Resource Allocation</i>	<p>1. Resource Allocation (27 pages reading total)</p>	<p>In a Pandemic, Should We Still Save Younger Lives? (<i>Singer</i>)</p> <p>Bubbles under the Wallpaper (<i>Beckstead</i>)</p>

			<p>Rescuing Lives: Can't We Count? (<i>Menzel</i>)</p> <p>Should Alcoholics Complete Equally for Liver Transplantation? (<i>Moss</i>)</p> <p><i>Recent Event News Article</i></p>
9	<i>Resource Allocation</i>	2. Obtaining Organs (30 pages reading total)	<p>Organ Donation & Retrieval: Whose Body is it Anyway? (<i>Kluge</i>)</p> <p>The Case for Allowing Kidney Sales (<i>Radcliffe</i>)</p> <p>Ethical Issues in the Supply and Demand of Kidneys (<i>Satz</i>)</p> <p>The Survival Lottery (<i>Harris</i>)</p> <p><i>Recent Event News Article</i></p>
10	<i>Ethical Issues in Research</i>	1. Experimentation with Humans (36 pages reading total)	<p>Scientific Research is a Moral Duty (<i>Harris</i>)</p> <p>Participation in Biomedical Research is an Imperfect Moral Duty: A Response (<i>Shapshay</i>)</p> <p>Unethical Trials of ... (<i>Lurie</i>)</p> <p>We're Trying to Help Our Sickest People, Not Exploit Them (<i>Bagenda</i>)</p> <p>Pandemic Ethics: The Case for Risky Research (<i>Singer</i>)</p> <p>Paying tissue donors: The Legacy of Henrietta Lacks</p>
11	<i>Ethical Issues in Research</i> <i>Final paper peer review due</i>	2. Experimentation with Animals 3. Academic Freedom & Research (29 pages reading total)	<p>Duties towards Animals (<i>Kant</i>)</p> <p>The Harmful, Nontherapeutic Use of Animals in Research is Morally Wrong (<i>Nobis</i>)</p> <p>On Liberty (<i>Mills</i>)</p> <p>Should Some Knowledge Be Forbidden? (<i>Kourany</i>)</p> <p><i>Recent Event News Article</i></p>

12	<i>Ethical Issues in the Practice of Healthcare</i>	1. Public Health Issues (48 pages reading total)	Ethics & Infectious Disease (<i>Selgelid</i>) Clinical Ethics During Covid (<i>Gopichandran</i>) The Moral Obligation to be Vaccinated (<i>Giubilini</i>) Taking Responsibility for Responsibility (<i>Levy</i>) <i>Recent Event News Article</i>
13	<i>Ethical Issues in the Practice of Healthcare</i>	2. Duty to Treat 3. Truth Telling (35 pages total reading)	What Healthcare Professionals Owe Us (<i>Schüklenk</i>) Conscientious Objection in Healthcare (<i>Schüklenk</i>) Should Doctors Tell the Truth? (<i>Collins</i>) On Telling Patients the Truth (<i>Higgs</i>) <i>Recent Event News Article</i>
14	<i>Ethical Issues in the Practice of Healthcare</i>	4. Informed Consent & Patient Autonomy (33 pages reading total)	From Schloendorff v New York Hospital (<i>Cardozo</i>) Informed Consent (<i>Beauchamp</i>) The Doctor-Patient Relationship in Different Cultures (<i>Macklin</i>) Amputees by Choice (<i>Elliot</i>) <i>Recent Event News Article</i>
15	<i>Final Papers & Presentations</i>		

GRADING POLICY

Paper	25 %
Presentation	25 %
Weekly posts and response to peers	25 %
3 Quizzes (8.33% each)	25 %

PAPERS

There will be **two (2)** 1500 word papers required for the course. Each paper will be of the students topic of choice, however the topic should be approved by me. **The topic should be approved by me weeks 3 and 10.** *Failure to meet the minimum length and not getting approval will result in a reduction in grade.*

The paper should cover a **medical ethical dilemma** that is prevalent today and discuss both sides of the argument. You can choose to remain neutral and explain both sides, or if you feel strongly about one side of the debate you can explain why you feel your opinion is correct.

Peer review is assigned at random and is based on the scoring rubric found below. It is both to help the student writing create a better paper and to evaluate the peer reviewer's ability to critically analyze a paper.

Paper Grading Rubric

Rubric for Scoring Research Papers (100 points total)

The paper will be graded based on the quality of writing and content using a four-scale model (Inadequate, Minimal, Adequate, and Excellent.)

Writing (50 points)

- **Organization**
 - **Inadequate** (5 points): No logical organization of essay's content.
 - **Minimal** (10 points): Organization of essay is difficult to follow, with inadequate transitions and/or rambling style.
 - **Adequate** (15 points): Essay is easily followed, with basic transitions and a structured style used.
 - **Above Average** (20 points): Essay is easily followed, with effective transitions and a methodical presentation of information.
 - **Excellent** (25 points): Essay is easily followed, with effective transitions and a methodical presentation of information. Students ties overarching themes of paper together easily.
- **Mechanics/ Grammar & Formatting**
 - **Inadequate** (5 points): Sentences and paragraphs are difficult to read and understand, with poor grammar or mechanics. Missing most basic portions of paper format.
 - **Minimal** (10 points): Essay contains numerous grammatical and mechanical errors. Contains some basic paper format.
 - **Adequate** (15 points): Essay contains multiple minor grammatical or mechanical errors. Contains most basic paper format.
 - **Above Average** (20 points): Very few grammatical errors that do not take away from paper. Has almost all parts of paper formatting correctly.
 - **Excellent** (25 points): Essay is clear and concise and contains no grammatical or mechanical errors. Paper contains title page, page numbers, and correct header stylization. Student uses APA style citations with appropriate in-paper citation.

Content (50 points)

- **Correctness of facts**
 - **Inadequate** (5 points): Most facts are wrong.
 - **Minimal** (10 points): Some facts are wrong. Most sources are reputable.
 - **Adequate** (15 points): Technical details are generally correct. Vast majority of sources are reputable.
 - **Above Average** (20 points): All facts are correct, with some explanation of content. Appropriate, reputable sources are cited.
 - **Excellent** (25 points): All facts are correct, and technical explanation is concise and complete. Appropriate, reputable sources are cited.
- **Completeness**
 - **Inadequate** (5 points): Almost no questions are addressed. Very superficial content.
 - **Minimal** (10 points): Most questions are addressed, but few details are provided.
 - **Adequate** (15 points): Questions are addressed, but some details are left out.
 - **Above Average** (20 points): Questions are addressed and covered in detail. Does not talk about both views.
 - **Excellent** (25 points): Questions are completely addressed. History of

WEEKLY POSTS

dilemma and opposing views thoroughly discussed (and possibly debunked).

Weekly posts

By Sunday of each week students should create a post in Canvas with their reactions to the weeks readings. Each post should be **three (3)** paragraphs (should be minimum 300 words). *Additionally*, students must reply in one short paragraph to another student's response with their thoughts as part of their grade. Late submissions will result in deduction of points.

QUIZZES

Quizzes

There will be three quizzes through the semester based on the textbook readings, individual articles, and news articles that we have reviewed during weeks prior. All quizzes will follow the same format of multiple choice and True/False style questions. Each quiz is worth 8.33% of your grade, totaling 25% towards the overall course grade.

WEEKLY POST GRADING

Criteria	Unacceptable 0 Points	Acceptable 1 Point	Good 2 Points	Excellent 3 Points
Quality of Content	Post is off-topic, incorrect, or irrelevant to readings.	Paraphrases the readings but does not add substantive information to it.	Posts is factually correct; lacks full development of concept or thought.	Posts factually correct, reflective and substantive contribution; Demonstrates understanding of topic.
Reference to Readings and Support for Ideas	Does not specifically reference the readings or adequately supports communicated ideas.	Does not specifically reference the readings but offers personal experience in support of topic covered.	Includes some references from the readings and relevant personal experience.	Includes direct references to the readings. Also quotes from text, or offers relevant personal experience to support comments.
Clarity & Organization	Post is too short or unnecessarily long and unorganized; may contain errors or inappropriate content.	Adequate ideas are resented but lack in clarity or mechanics.	Valuable information is given with minor clarity or mechanics errors.	Clear and concise comment written in an easy to read style that is free of grammatical or spelling errors. 3 paragraphs in length

PRESENTATIONS

Students should give a 10-minute presentation about the topic of both the midterm and final paper. It will be done on **PowerPoint** using a voice over. The following link explains how to create the voice over:

<https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=3uk4CU7uobM&app=desktop>

Should you have issues with creating the voice over, please reach out in a timely manner to have me help you resolve the issue. Shorter presentations, not done in PowerPoint will result in grade deduction.

Presentation Rubric				
	1	2	3	4
Organization	Listener cannot understand presentation because there is no sequence of information.	Listener has difficulty following presentation because student jumps around.	Student presents information in logical sequence which listener can follow.	Student presents information in logical, interesting sequence which listener can follow.
Subject Knowledge	Student does not appear to have grasp of	Student appears uncomfortable with	Student is at ease with information being	Student demonstrates full knowledge of information

	information being conveyed.	information being conveyed.	conveyed.	beyond the average student.
Visuals	Student uses excessive graphics or no graphics at all.	Student occasionally uses graphics that rarely support text and presentation.	Student's graphics relate to text and presentation with most graphics reinforcing information in a new way.	Student's graphics explain and reinforce text and presentation in a new way or offer additional information.
Mechanics	Student's presentation has excessive spelling errors and/or grammatical errors.	Presentation has significant misspellings and/or grammatical errors.	Presentation has some misspellings and/or grammatical errors.	Presentation has no misspellings or grammatical errors with easy to read format.
Delivery	Student mumbles, incorrectly pronounces terms, and speaks too softly to be heard.	Student's voice is low or difficult to understand and incorrectly pronounces terms. Listener has difficulty hearing presentation.	Student's voice is clear and pronounces most words correctly. Listener can hear presentation with some white noise/ background noise.	Student uses a clear voice and correct, precise pronunciation of terms. Student is engaging when talking and listener can hear presentation without background noise.

Lateness: Although late submissions will be graded, maximum grades are 75% of what student would have received if handed in on time.

TENTATIVE GRADING SCALE

A: 90 - 100
 B: 80 – 89.9
 C: 70 – 79.9
 D: 65 – 69.9
 F: 0 – 64.9

Grading scale may be subject to change