COURSE NUMBER	Phil 351
COURSE NAME	Biomedical Ethics
COURSE STRUCTURE	3 credits
COURSE DESCRIPTION	An examination of the ethical problems and moral foundations of medicine. Among the issues explored are the changing nature of the doctor/patient relationship, increased patient autonomy, advance directives, the rationing of care, doctor-assisted suicide, and "the right to die."
PREREQUISITE(S)	HUM 211, HUM 212 and Hist 213 or their equivalents, all with a grade of C or better.
REQUIRED MATERIALS	Biomedical ethics: an anthology 2nd edition. Helga Kuhse and Peter Singer ISBN 1405129484

Student Learning Objectives

Upon successful completion of the course, students will

- have a working understanding of the main principles of biomedical 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; and
- Develop the ability to reason through difficult ethical issues both orally and through written work.

CLASS TOPICS

Medical experimentation, end of life issues, patient control, the health care system

Course Outcomes

- Engage with some of the important literature and complex topics in biomedical ethics and learn how to think critically and systematically about moral problems in the doamain 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 aquire the knowledge and methods required to analyze, discuss and resolve such issues, especially regarding their scientific, technological, political, cultural, and legal dimensions; and
- 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, including using generative AI, 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. 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. The rest of the time allotted for each specific topic, usually a week from its introduction in Moodle, is to discussions and posting of weekly requrements, as needed.

CLASS HOURS

Course is offered online

Contact information: ajd8@njit.edu

COURSE OUTLINE

Week	Date	Topic	Readings
1		Introduction	What Is Bioethics? A Historical Introduction – Kuhse and Singer Dr. Death Episode 1 (Three Days in Dallas)
2		Health care system – universal right	Is There a Right to Health Care and, If So, What Does It Encompass? - Daniels Dr. Death Episode 2 (Chris and Jerry)
3		Health care system – public health	Manifold Restraints: Liberty, Public Health, and the Legacy of *Jacobson v Massachusetts* – Colgrove Human rights and Ebola: the issue of quarantine - Lander Dr. Death Episode 3 (Occam's Razor)
4		Health care system - Capitalism	Paying tissue donors: The legacy of Henrietta Lacks The case for allowing kidney sales – Radcliffe-Richards

			(K&S) Extreme Rise in Some Drug Prices Reaches a Tipping Point - Pianin Dr. Death Episode 4 (Spineless)
5		Paternalism and patient control – informed consent and patient autonomy	On liberty – John Mills (K&S) From Schlerendorff v New York Hospital – Benjamin Cardozo (K&S) Abandoning informed consent – Robert Veatch (K&S) Dr. Death Episode 5 (Free Fall)
6		Paternalism and patient control – confidentiality and truth telling	Confidentiality in medicine: A Decrepit concept – Mark Siegler (K&S) On a supposed right to lie from altruistic motives – Immanuel Kant (K&S) Should doctors tell the truth? – Joseph Collins (K&S) On telling patients the truth – Roger Higgs (K&S) Dr. Death Episode 6 (Closure)
7		Paternalism and patient control – Capacity, competence, an advanced directives	Mental capacity, legal competence and consent to treatment – Buchanan Life past reason – Dworkin (K&S) Dworkin on Dementia: elegant theory, questionable policy – Dresser (K&S) Dr. Death Episode 7 (Update)
8		End of life issues - euthanasia	The sanctity of life – Jonathan Glover (K&S) Is killing no worse than letting die – Winston Nesblitt (K&S)

			Why killing is not always worse – and sometimes better – than letting die – Helga Kuhse (K&S) Active & Passive Euthenasia- James Rachels
9		End of life issues – Deciding between patients	Rescuing lives: Can't we count – Paul Menzel (K&S) Should alcoholics compete equally for liver transplantation? – Moss and Siegler (K&S) How age should matter: Justice as the basis for limiting care to the elderly – Robert Veatch (K&S)
10		End of life issues – Health care budget	Quality of life and resource allocation – Michael Lockwood (K&S) A lifespan approach to health care – Norman Daniels (K&S) Saying No Isn't NICE — The Travails of Britain's National Institute for Health and Clinical Excellence – Steinbrook NEJM
11		Medical experimentation: Adult human subjects	Ethics and clinical research – Beecher (K&S) The Nuremberg code The morality of clinical research – Tannsjo (K&S) Paying tissue donors: The legacy of Henrietta Lacks
12		Medical experimentation: Genetic engineering	Questions about using genetic engineering – Glover (K&S) Ethical issues in manipulating the human germ line – Lappe (K&S) Should we undertake genetic research on intelligence – Newson (K&S)
13		Medical experimentation –	Testing Drugs on the

		The developing world	Developing World –Kelly Unethical trials of interventions to reduce perinatal transmission of the human immunodeficiency virus in developing countries – Lurie (K&S)
14		Papers/ Presentations	
15		Papers/ Presentations	

GRADING POLICY

Paper	25 %
Presentation	25 %
Weekly posts and response to peers	20 %
3 Quizzes (10% each)	30 %

There will be a 1500 word final paper required for the course. The paper will be of the students topic of choice, however the topic should be approved by me. **The topic should be approved by me by the end of week 8**. *Failure to meet the minimum length and not getting approval by week 8 will result in a reduction in grade*. The paper should cover an **biomedical ethical dilemma** that is prevalent today and discuss both sides of the argument. You can chose 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.

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

Weekly posts
By Sunday of each week students should create a post in moodle with their reactions to the weeks readings. Each post should be 1-2 short paragraphs (should be minimum 250 words). *Additionally*, students must reply in short paragraph form to another student's response with their thoughts as part of their grade. Late submissions will result in deduction of points.

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.	Incudes 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 their 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 information being conveyed.	Student appears uncomfortable with information being conveyed.	Student is at ease with information being conveyed.	Student demonstrates full knowledge of information 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 50% of what student would have received if handed in on time.

TENTATIVE GRADING SCALE

A: 88 – 100
B+: 85 – 87.9
B: 80 – 84.9
C+: 75 – 79.9
C: 70 – 74.9
D: 65 – 69.9
F: 0 – 64.9

Grading scale may be subject to change

PAGES FOR READINGS:

Week 4:
The Case For Allowing Kidney Sales (p. 487)

Week 5:
On Liberty (pg. 621)
From Schloendorff v New York Hospital (pg. 624)
Abandoning Informed Consent (pg. 636)

Week 6:
Confidentiality in Medicine (pg. 597)
On a Supposed Right to Lie (pg. 603)
Should Doctors Tell the Truth (pg. 605)
On Telling Patients the Truth (pg. 611)

Week 7:
Life Past Reason (pg. 357)
Working on Dementia (pg. 365)

Week 8:
The sanctity of life (pg. 259)
Is killing no worse than letting die (pg. 292)
Why killing is not always worse (pg. 297)
Active & Passive Euthenasia- (pg. 288)

Week 9:
Rescuing Lives (pg. 407)
Should Alcoholics Compete Equally for Liver Transplantation? (pg. 421)
How Age Should Matter (437)

Week 10:
Quality of Life & Resource Allocation (pg. 451)
Lifespan Approach to Health Care (pg. 465)

Week 11:
Ethics and Clinical Research (pg. 505)
Morality of Clinical Research (pg. 525)

Week 12:
Questions about using genetic engineering (pg. 185)
Ethical issues in manipulating the human germ line (pg. 198)
Should we undertake genetic research on intelligence (pg. 219)

Week 13:
Unethical trials of interventions (pg. 533)