

PUBH 6741, SECTION 321

Ethics in Public Health: Professional Practice and Policy
Spring Semester 2019, Term A

COURSE & CONTACT INFORMATION

Credits: 1 credit

Meeting Day(s): January 22 – March 11, 2019

Meeting Place: [moodle@umn.edu](https://moodle.umn.edu)

Instructor: Joel T. Wu, JD, MPH, MA

Email: wuxx0179@umn.edu

Office Phone: 612-625-6148

Office Hours: By appointment

Office Location: Mayo C-312

TA: Courtney Sarkin

Email: sarki052@umn.edu

Office Hours: By appointment

COURSE DESCRIPTION

This course examines normative frameworks and ethical issues related to public health practice and policy. Public health policy is often the product of controversy. Scientific considerations blend with political and ethical conflicts in public health. Questions of autonomy, liberty, individual rights, power, coercion, justice, discrimination, stigma, community and the common good are central to public health policy and practice – and are therefore the basis for the core ethical challenges in public health.

This seven-week course will introduce students to public health ethics, with a focus on two central ethical tensions shaping public health policy and practice – the allocation of resources and balancing individual and community concerns. In discussing these tensions, we will attend to the important ethical issues of justice and health inequalities. Recognizing that public health graduates will be engaged in policy and practice, the course begins by exploring the ethics of priority setting at both the macro (policy) and micro (practice) levels. The second half of the course will discuss the balancing of individual and community interests as reflected in public health screening, prevention, and health promotion programs; while maintaining the macro (policy) and micro (practice) distinction previously introduced. The course is designed to flexibly accommodate current pressing topics in public health practice and policy, such as health care reform, obesity, pandemic flu, and other emergent issues. While the focus of this course is on *domestic* issues in practice and policy, the frameworks and ethical concepts discussed can be applied to international issues as well.

COURSE PREREQUISITES

Public health [MPH or MHA or certificate] student, or environmental health [MS or PhD] major, or instructor consent.

COURSE GOALS & OBJECTIVES

The main objective of the course is to introduce students to the values and principles that animate public health and examine how ethical principles can be applied to resolve or clarify difficult issues in public health practice and policy.

The key learning objectives are:

- Articulate the values and principles that distinguish public health from medical care, and public health ethics from bioethics.
- Describe different ethical theories relevant to public health, including utilitarianism, deontological theories, rights-based, communitarianism, and social and procedural justice.
- Identify and analyze the ethical arguments for and against public health interventions.
- Practice applying ethical frameworks to be used for resolving resource allocation challenges, with particular attention to the process and outcomes of priority-setting.
- Articulate and apply ethical frameworks for balancing the interests of the individual with community health.
- Communicate justifications for public health decisions that are based on ethical concepts and principles.
- Identify current issues in public health practice and policy that have ethical or moral relevance.

METHODS OF INSTRUCTION AND WORK EXPECTATIONS

Course Workload Expectations

Ethics in Public Health: Professional Practice and Policy is a 1 credit course. The University expects that for each credit, you will spend a minimum of three hours per week attending class or comparable online activity, reading, studying, completing assignments, etc. over the course of a 15-week term. Thus, this course requires approximately 45 hours of effort spread over the seven week course of the term in order to earn an average grade.

Learning Community

School of Public Health courses – and this public health ethics course in particular – asks students to discuss frameworks, theory, policy, and more, often in the context of past and current events and policy debates. Many of our courses also ask students to work in teams or discussion groups. We do not come to our courses with identical backgrounds and experiences and building on what we already know about collaborating, listening, and engaging is critical to successful professional, academic, and scientific engagement with topics.

In this course, students are expected to engage with each other in respectful and thoughtful ways.

In group work, this can mean:

- Setting expectations with your groups about communication and response time during the first week of the semester (or as soon as groups are assigned) and contacting the TA or instructor if scheduling problems cannot be overcome.
- Setting clear deadlines and holding yourself and each other accountable.
- Determining the roles group members need to fulfill to successfully complete the project on time.
- Developing a rapport prior to beginning the project (what prior experience are you bringing to the project, what are your strengths as they apply to the project, what do you like to work on?)

In group discussion, this can mean:

- Respecting the identities and experiences of your classmates.
- Avoid broad statements and generalizations. Group discussions are another form of academic communication and responses to instructor questions in a group discussion are evaluated. Apply the same rigor to crafting discussion posts as you would for a paper.
- Consider your tone and language, especially when communicating in text format, as the lack of other cues can lead to misinterpretation.

Like other work in the course, all student to student communication is covered by the Student Conduct Code (<https://z.umn.edu/studentconduct>).

Online Discussion, Postings, and Assignments

The course is organized into seven lessons. Lessons One through Six include lectures, assigned readings, and exercises, while the key activity for Lesson Seven is the completion of an independent ethics analysis paper. The exercises employ a variety of types of interactions (online class discussion, small group work, and individual writing assignments) because everyone learns in different ways. During weeks 1 and 2, students are required to participate in online discussions through two substantial postings each week to the discussion forum. The first post must be an original contribution to the discussion. The second post is responsive to a classmate's posting. In weeks 3 and 4 you will work together with a team

of two on your posting. In week 5 you will participate in an online debate, in week 6 you will respond to PSAs and in week 7 you will write and submit an individual essay, which is not part of a discussion with the class.

Expectations of Online Discussion

An online course is a **learning community**. This means that communication, collaboration, knowledge creation, sharing, kindness, interaction, engagement, transformation, and hard work will guide us throughout the course. A good posting responds intelligently to questions posed, engages rigorously with the assigned reading and communicates respectfully with others in the course. Think carefully about what you write. Be thoughtful and well-reasoned in your posting and make sure you give the reasons for your position. Acknowledge and address the moral complexity of an issue. Write as clearly and succinctly as possible - more words do not necessarily make a post better. Read and edit your posting before submitting it. Be respectful in your communications. Constructive debate is encouraged and welcomed; personal attacks are never appropriate.

Your initial posting should be original, thought provoking, long enough to respond completely to the question(s), and stimulate further intellectual inquiry and investigation. These are guidelines to encourage critical thinking, careful editing and considered reflection; they are not meant to limit discourse. You will not be penalized for a longer post and are encouraged to post more than the required times each week.

Students will be randomly divided into discussion groups. This will allow a more robust discussion to develop. The postings of all groups will be open to viewing, students will be graded only on postings in their assigned group. Students will receive an individual grade each week (with varying point values). The instructor will provide general feedback on the quality of the postings to the class as a whole. Individual feedback will be provided as needed. Individual grades and discussion group feedback will be provided within approximately **one week** of the assignment due date.

We recommend creating long discussion postings in Word or another word processing program, save them to your computer, and then copy and paste them into the discussion form. To post to a forum, click the "Add a new discussion topic" button and then type your post. You will have 15 minutes to make changes/edits or erase your post.

COURSE TEXT & READINGS

The readings are available on the course website or through the hyperlink to the library reserves site. There is no course textbook. Some of the most influential scholarship in the area of public health ethics was published around 2000-2002. These assigned articles should not be considered "old" or outdated. They are the foundational pieces of scholarship that have defined this developing field. Public health ethics is a large and quickly expanding field. Optional resources are provided on Moodle if you wish to explore a topic in more depth. Optional readings are not required and are *truly optional*.

This course uses journal articles, which are available via the University Libraries' E-Reserves and will be linked from the Moodle course site. It is good practice to use a citation manager to keep track of your readings. More information about citation managers is available on the University Libraries' site: <https://www.lib.umn.edu/pim/citation>.

COURSE OUTLINE/WEEKLY SCHEDULE

Week	Topic	Readings (Required, additional Optional Resources are posted on Course Site)	Activities/Assignments
Week 1 1/22-1/27	Introduction to Public Health Ethics	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Kass, N. E. (2001). An Ethics Framework for Public Health. <i>American Journal of Public Health</i>, 91(11), 1776-82. Baum, N. M., Gollust, S. E., Goold, S. D., & Jacobson, P. D. (2007). Looking Ahead: Addressing Ethical Challenges in Public Health Practice. <i>Journal of Law, Medicine and Ethics</i>, 35(4), 657-667, 513. "Public Health Code of Ethics," <i>Principles of the Ethical Practice of Public Health</i>, Public Health Leadership Society (2002). 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Introductions (due Thursday 1/24) Assignment 1 – Discussion on public health values and frameworks (due Sunday 1/27)
Week 2 1/28-2/3	Theories of Justice and Distribution of Public Health Resources	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Braveman, Paula A., et al. (2011). Health Disparities and Health Equity: The Issue is Justice. <i>American Journal of Public Health</i> 101.S1, S149-S155 Gostin L and Powers, M. (2006). What Does Social Justice Require for the Public's Health? Public Health Ethics and Policy Imperatives. <i>Health Affairs</i>, 25, 1053-1060. Hall MA. (2003). The Scope and Limits of Public Health Law. <i>Perspectives in Biology and Medicine</i>, 46(3), S199-S209. TED Talk "Why your doctor should care about social justice." Mary Bassett, New York City Public Health Commissioner. November, 2015. https://www.ted.com/talks/mary_bassett_why_your_doctor_should_care_about_social_justice?language=en [14 minutes] Advancing Health Equity in Minnesota, Report to the Legislature. (2014). Executive Summary. Available at: http://www.health.state.mn.us/divs/chs/healthequity/ahe_leq_report_020414.pdf. pp. 5-8. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Assignment 2 – Flint Water Crisis Analysis Part 1 (initial post, due Thursday 1/31) Assignment 2 – Flint Water Crisis Part 2 (responsive post, due Sunday 2/3)
Week 3 2/4-2/10	Priority-Setting and Resource Allocation at the Macro Level	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Gruskin S and Daniels N. Justice and Human Rights: Priority Setting and Fair Deliberative Process. Am J Public Health 2008; 98:1573-1577. Essential Health Benefits. <i>Health Affairs</i> Health Policy Brief. May 2, 2013. University of Pennsylvania and RWJ, Essential Health Benefits: 50-State Variations on a Theme, October 2014. If you're not familiar with the Affordable Care Act, you will want to watch this video that explains health insurance changes in health reform, including the essential benefits required To prep for the CHAT exercise assignment, you will also want to take a look at Medicare benefits, if you are not familiar with the Medicare program. Part A To prep for the CHAT exercise assignment, you will also want to take a look at Medicare benefits, if you are not familiar with the Medicare program. Part B 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Assignment 3 – Essential Health Benefits Plan (due Sunday 2/10)

Week 4 2/11-2/17	Priority-Setting and Resource Allocation at the Micro Level	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Baum, N. M., Gollust, S. E., Goold, S. D., & Jacobson, P. D. (2009). Ethical Issues in Public Health Practice in Michigan. <i>American Journal of Public Health</i>, 99(2), 369-374. Vawter, D.E., Gervais K., & Garrett, J.E.. (2007). Allocating Pandemic Influenza Vaccines in Minnesota: Recommendations of the Pandemic Influenza Ethics Work Group. <i>Vaccine</i>, 25, 6522-6536. DeBruin, D.A., Liaschenko, J., Marshall, M.F. (2012) Social Justice in Pandemic Preparedness. <i>American Journal of Public Health</i>, 102(4), 586-591. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Assignment 4 – Allocating Scarce Flu Vaccine (due Sunday 2/17)
Week 5 2/18-2/24	Balancing Individual and Community Interests	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Colgrove, J., & Bayer, R. (2005). Manifold Restraints: Liberty, Public Health, and the Legacy of Jacobson v Massachusetts. <i>American Journal of Public Health</i>, 95(4), 571-6. Omer SB, Salmon DA, Orenstein WA, deHart P, Halsey N. (2009). Vaccine Refusal, Mandatory Immunization, and the Risks of Vaccine-Preventable Diseases. <i>New England Journal of Medicine</i>, 360, 1981-8. Ottenberg AL, Wu JT, Poland GA, Jacobson RM, Koenig BA, Tilburt JC. (2011). Vaccinating Health Care Workers Against Influenza: The Ethical and Legal Rationale for a Mandate. <i>American Journal of Public Health</i>, 101(2), 212-216. Chokshi D, & Stine N (2013) Reconsidering the Politics of Public Health. <i>Journal of the American Medical Association</i>, published online August 22, 2013. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Assignment 5 – Balancing Individuals with the Common Good – HPV Vaccine Debate (two forum/debate posts due by Thursday 2/21, Poll vote and comment due by Sunday 2/24)
Week 6 2/25-3/3	Ethics and Health Promotion	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Adler and Stewart (2009). Reducing Obesity: Motivating Action While Not Blaming the Victim. <i>Milbank Quarterly</i>, 87, 49-70. Bayer, R. (2008). Stigma and the Ethics of Public Health: Not Can We But Should We. <i>Social Science & Medicine</i>, 67(3), 463-472. Burris S. (2008). Stigma, Ethics, and Policy: A Commentary on Bayer's "Stigma and the Ethics of Public Health: Now Can We But Should We", <i>Social Science and Medicine</i> 67: 473-475. Loewenstein, G, Asch DA, Friedman JY, Melichar LA, Volpp KG. (2012) Can Behavioural Economics Make Us Healthier? <i>BMJ</i> 344, e3482. 	Assignment 6 – Evaluating Obesity-Related Communication Campaigns (due Sunday 3/3)
Week 7 3/4-3/10	Putting it All Together, Final Ethics Analysis	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> No readings 	Assignment 7 – Final Ethics Analysis (due Sunday 3/10)

SPH AND UNIVERSITY POLICIES & RESOURCES

The School of Public Health maintains up-to-date information about resources available to students, as well as formal course policies, on our website at www.sph.umn.edu/student-policies/. Students are expected to read and understand all policy information available at this link and are encouraged to make use of the resources available.

The University of Minnesota has official policies, including but not limited to the following:

- Grade definitions
- Scholastic dishonesty
- Makeup work for legitimate absences
- Student conduct code
- Sexual harassment, sexual assault, stalking and relationship violence
- Equity, diversity, equal employment opportunity, and affirmative action
- Disability services
- Academic freedom and responsibility

Resources available for students include:

- Confidential mental health services
- Disability accommodations
- Housing and financial instability resources
- Technology help
- Academic support

EVALUATION & GRADING

Your final grade for the course will be determined by how well you complete course requirements. All students must be evaluated on the basis of the same assignments. You will not be allowed to do "bonus" work to replace missed assignments or improve your grade. Also, you are not allowed to revise or redo assignments to improve your grade. Assignments must be submitted by specified deadlines.

The instructor will **not** review draft version of student assignments, but is available during office hours or otherwise to discuss issues related to assignments.

Item	Total Points / Percent of final grade
Assignment 1 Values Exercise Discussion	0% **
Assignment 2 Discussion about Food Deserts	14%
Assignment 3 Team assignment	14%
Assignment 4 Team assignment	14%
Assignment 5 Online Debate	14%
Assignment 6 Posting	14%
Assignment 7 Final Ethics Analysis Exercise	25%
Participation and Online Engagement **	5%
Total	100%

*****Participation and online engagement score [5 points]***

Participation in Week 1 discussions are required to receive full credit for Participation and Online Engagement. Participation in Week 1 posts are worth 2 points. The remaining 3 points are assessed based on the level of collaboration and engagement demonstrated in the class. Specifically, a failure to responsibly and actively participate in group discussions and team assignments can result in loss of these points. Full credit will be granted for active teamwork in the group and team assignments.

Guidelines and Grading Rubrics for Assignments

Assignment 1 Grading Rubric (Discussion about Public Health Values)

Assignment 1 is not assessed; however, completion of this assignment is required to receive full class participation credit.

Assignment 2 Grading Rubric (Lead Exposure Ethics Analysis) [14 points]

Satisfactory (11-14 points)	Unsatisfactory (1-10 points)
<p>Initial post demonstrates understanding of the readings and case study, and contributes well-developed and thoughtful ideas that have substance and depth. The post stimulates discussion.</p> <p>For full credit the post must address the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">- Identify and appropriately reference ethics frameworks and values- Must apply those ethics values to the facts of the Flint water crisis- Takes an informed position on what should have done to address the crisis. The post is informed by ethics values and appropriately references historical facts and scientific evidence.	<p>Initial post lacks substance and depth, and demonstrates limited understanding of the readings and case study. The post lacks a clear intervention and/or ethical justification. Discussion post does not refer to the readings and entry does not stimulate discussion.</p>
<p>Initial post is completed by 11:55 pm on Thursday, allowing adequate time for colleagues to respond.</p>	<p>Initial post is completed after 11:55 pm on Thursday, allowing limited time for colleagues to respond.</p>
<p>Responsive post demonstrates a critical and thoughtful understanding of the topic and brings the discussion to a higher level of inquiry and investigation. Post is not limited to short comments or praise.</p>	<p>Responsive post demonstrates a basic understanding of the topic and indicates listening to others' positions, ideas and questions. Post is not limited to short comments or praise. Response is limited to brief comments or praise statements with little substance.</p>
<p>Responsive post to one or more colleagues occurs in a timely manner, allowing ample time for colleagues to read and benefit from the postings.</p>	<p>Responsive post is late, incomplete, or lacks substance.</p>

Small Group Discussion Forum Guidelines and Grading Criteria

During weeks 3 and 4, you will work in teams of 2 to explore the issues raised by resource allocation at the macro and micro levels. We work in groups in these lessons because these issues cannot be resolved by a single individual. In the professional world, you will rarely make resource allocation decisions on your own. Hence, it is important to learn how to resolve difficult issues in a group that may or may not include your friends and may include others with very different viewpoints. Group members must cooperate, communicate, delegate and depend on each other. When engaged in small group project work, students are expected to *respectfully and actively participate in the group project*. This means: 1) contributing useful ideas; 2) listening to others; 3) engaging in respectful dialogue with teammates; 4) staying on task and 5) meeting all agreed upon deadlines.

Assignment 3 Grading Rubric [14 points]

Team Exercise (*Both partners receive the same score*)

Satisfactory (11-14 points)	Unsatisfactory (1-10 points)
<p>Post is original, thought-provoking, and fully explains the ethical principles or values used to guide allocation choices, and the reasons for selecting those principles.</p> <p>For full credit the post must address the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">- The discussion must reference ethics concepts or values to justify or explain why allocation choices were made.- Ethics terms and concepts are referenced thoughtfully and correctly.- The post contains thoughtful reflection about the insights from the CHAT game, not merely a description of the exercise or a restatement of allocation choices.	<p>Post does not adequately explain the ethical principles used and the reasons for selecting such principles.</p> <p>Post does not appropriately reference the exercise, or concepts from the literature or lesson.</p> <p>Post is vague, is incomplete, or demonstrates a low level of thinking.</p>
<p>Post includes thorough discussion of changes from each individual plan (compared to the team benefits plan) and a thoughtful discussion of the reasons for those changes.</p>	<p>Post fails to include detailed discussion of changes from each individual plan, and reasons for those changes.</p>
<p>Post includes a well-developed and descriptive discussion of challenges encountered in the process of creating a team benefits plan.</p> <p>There should also be discussion of the resolution of challenges.</p>	<p>Post fails to discuss the challenges encountered in developing a team plan, or the process for developing a consensus plan.</p>
<p>Post includes screen shots or excel sheets of two individual plans, and one team plan.</p>	<p>Screen shot is missing in final group post.</p>

Assignment 4 Grading Rubric [14 points]

Team Exercise (Both partners receive the same score)

Satisfactory (11-14 points)	Unsatisfactory (1-10 points)
<p>Post is original, is thought provoking, and fully explains the morally relevant criteria used in the flu vaccine allocation and the reasons for selecting such criteria.</p> <p>For full credit the post must address the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Demonstrates a critical and thoughtful analysis of reasons and ethical principles justifying or explaining a vaccine prioritization plan. - Ethics terms and concepts are referenced thoughtfully and correctly. 	<p>Demonstrates a undeveloped or incomplete understanding of the reasons or ethical principles to be used to explain to the public; post does not meet requirements stated in the assignment instructions.</p> <p>Prioritization scheme is unclear, and ethics justification or explanation is missing or incomplete.</p> <p>Discussion is merely a description of procedures or unsubstantiated opinions.</p>
The post includes the team's vaccine priority scheme; provides ethics justification for the group's scheme, and; relevant ethics concepts are correctly applied.	Press release fails to include clear description of the allocation plan.
<p>The group's press release models a "real-world" press release; the press release describes the priority scheme and explains the ethical justification.</p> <p>Justification for the plan should be written for the general public.</p>	Post fails to include a well-designed and realistic press release document.
Individual and Team Prioritization plans are included in final group post.	Prioritization plans are missing in final group post.

Assignment 5 Grading Rubric (Online Debate) [14 points, 6 for Part 1 and 8 for Part 2]

Part 1 – Two Individual “Facebook Posts,” [6 points total]

Satisfactory (5-6 points)	Unsatisfactory (1-4 points)
<p>Both posts are original, thought provoking, represent the assigned viewpoint, and fully address both moral and scientific considerations regarding the HPV vaccine mandate.</p> <p>For full credit the post must address the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Thoughtfully addresses the issues of liberty and public welfare in the post. - Post is consistent with persona that is adopted - Post demonstrates meaningful reflection about ethical dimensions of the vaccine mandate. - Post is accurately informed by current science and evidence, and appropriately referenced if necessary 	<p>Post is does not adequately address both moral and scientific considerations regarding the HPV vaccine mandate, or does not represent the assigned viewpoint. Post is vague, is incomplete, or demonstrates a low level of thinking.</p> <p>Post is brief, undeveloped, and fails to meaningfully contribute to the discussion.</p>
Tone of the discussion board post is appropriate.	Tone is inappropriate.
Posts completed by 11:55 pm on Thursday .	Posts completed after 11:55 pm on Thursday .

Part 2 – Poll and Reflective note [8 points]

Satisfactory (6-8 points)	Unsatisfactory (1-5 points)
<p>Participates in the poll on the HPV Vaccine Mandate by 11:55 pm on 10/7.</p>	<p>Fails to participate in the poll on the HPV Vaccine Mandate after 11:55 pm on 10/7.</p>
<p>Demonstrates a critical and thoughtful analysis of reasons or ethical principles in support of the participant's personal position on the HPV vaccine mandate, including reference to the "Facebook" discussion.</p> <p>For full credit the post must address the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Explanation for your vote must be well developed, correctly and appropriately referencing ethics values and principles. - A clear statement of how the facebook discussion affected your views on the vaccine mandate, and whether it changed your mind at all. - A clear statement on whether you believe the individual liberty or community interest arguments are stronger, and why. 	<p>Demonstrates an underdeveloped or uninformed analysis of reasons or ethical principles in support of their vote on the HPV vaccine mandate. Fails to address reasons or principles related to the poll on the HPV vaccine mandate.</p>

Assignment 6 Grading Rubric (Discussion Forum about PSAs) [14 points]

Satisfactory (11-14 points)	Unsatisfactory (1-10 points)
<p>Post is original, is thought-provoking, and stimulates inquiry and investigation. Demonstrates an understanding of the ethics of health communication and the potential for stigmatization in health messages.</p> <p>For full credit the post must address the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Which ads are the most/least stigmatizing and why - Post addresses the ethical implications of stigma in public health practice. - Clear position on the appropriateness of use of stigma in public health, (either for or against, or under what conditions it might be appropriate.) - Position on use of stigma must be justified or supported with appropriate and correct reference to ethics values or frameworks. 	<p>Post does not demonstrate critical and informed reasoning. Post does not refer to ethical issues related to health communication and health promotion or is merely descriptive rather than interpretive. Post is vague, incomplete, or demonstrates a low level of thinking.</p>

Assignment 7 Final Ethics Analysis Exercise

The final assignment will be the Final Ethics Analysis Exercise, worth 25 points, or 25% of the student's grade. There will be no discussion forum during week 7. Instead, students will write a 1000-1500 word essay analyzing an ethical issue in public health that was not discussed previously in class. A complete explanation of the concluding writing assignment will be presented as part of Lesson Five.

Assignment 7 Grading Rubric (Final Ethics Analysis Exercise) [25 points]

Criteria	Maximum points achievable
Not to exceed five double-spaced pages (11 or 12-pt font, 1 inch margins)	1
Identifies the public health problem.	2
Explains why the issue is morally complicated.	3
Identifies the stakeholders and their respective interests in the issue.	4
Recognizes the ethical considerations or values that arise from the problem.	3
Proposes a method or framework for considering the ethics issues.	3
Identifies at least 2 interventions or strategies to address the public health problem.	2
Recommends a course of action and fully supports it with ethical analysis.	4
Clearly written, with thoughts well organized to form an argument, not a scattershot of reactions/ideas; cites course and supplementary material in a consistent style.	3
Total	25

Additional Opportunities for Course Discussion and Engagement

One important theme of this course is that public health ethics is immensely **relevant** to current news events, controversies, and policy decisions. We encourage students to share news articles that relate to course themes on the Moodle site. For Twitter users, we have created a hashtag to categorize articles and commentaries online that deal with course themes and topics. You can view past resources that students and I have labeled, and tag new and emerging ones, using the hashtag **#PubH6741**. This hashtag will then provide us with a catalogue of recent issues that have relevance to our class.

Active and constructive participation in the online forums and in group assignments will be worth an additional 5 points for your final grade. These points are assigned at the discretion of the instructor at the end of the term.

Appropriate Use of Sources

We expect all reaction papers, exercises, and your final paper to be in your own words, to be your own thoughtful integration of ideas. Do not rely heavily (if at all) on quotations from the readings. Do limited summarizing or paraphrasing. If you do use quotations or paraphrasing **you must cite your source**, or else this is considered plagiarism.

We urge all students, no matter how you perceive your background in writing, to take the following tutorial. It should only take you about 30 minutes, and will be well worth it for this class and others throughout your graduate school career.

<https://www.indiana.edu/~academy/firstPrinciples/index.html>

International students may find this presentation from the Writing Center particularly helpful:

<http://writing.umn.edu/sws/assets/pdf/plagpres.pdf>

Grading Scale

The University uses plus and minus grading on a 4.000 cumulative grade point scale in accordance with the following, and you can expect the grade lines to be drawn as follows:

% In Class	Grade	GPA
93 - 100%	A	4.000
90 - 92%	A-	3.667
87 - 89%	B+	3.333
83 - 86%	B	3.000
80 - 82%	B-	2.667
77 - 79%	C+	2.333
73 - 76%	C	2.000
70 - 72%	C-	1.667
67 - 69%	D+	1.333
63 - 66%	D	1.000
< 62%	F	

- A = achievement that is outstanding relative to the level necessary to meet course requirements.
- B = achievement that is significantly above the level necessary to meet course requirements.
- C = achievement that meets the course requirements in every respect.
- D = achievement that is worthy of credit even though it fails to meet fully the course requirements.
- F = failure because work was either (1) completed but at a level of achievement that is not worthy of credit or (2) was not completed and there was no agreement between the instructor and the student that the student would be awarded an I (Incomplete).
- S = achievement that is satisfactory, which is equivalent to a C- or better
- N = achievement that is not satisfactory and signifies that the work was either 1) completed but at a level that is not worthy of credit, or 2) not completed and there was no agreement between the instructor and student that the student would receive an I (Incomplete).

Evaluation/Grading Policy	Evaluation/Grading Policy Description
Scholastic Dishonesty, Plagiarism, Cheating, etc.	<p>You are expected to do your own academic work and cite sources as necessary. Failing to do so is scholastic dishonesty. Scholastic dishonesty means plagiarizing; cheating on assignments or examinations; engaging in unauthorized collaboration on academic work; taking, acquiring, or using test materials without faculty permission; submitting false or incomplete records of academic achievement; acting alone or in cooperation with another to falsify records or to obtain dishonestly grades, honors, awards, or professional endorsement; altering, forging, or misusing a University academic record; or fabricating or falsifying data, research procedures, or data analysis (As defined in the Student Conduct Code). For additional information, please see https://z.umn.edu/dishonesty</p> <p>The Office for Student Conduct and Academic Integrity has compiled a useful list of Frequently Asked Questions pertaining to scholastic dishonesty: https://z.umn.edu/integrity.</p> <p>If you have additional questions, please clarify with your instructor. Your instructor can respond to your specific questions regarding what would constitute scholastic dishonesty in the context of a particular class-e.g., whether collaboration on assignments is permitted, requirements and methods for citing sources, if electronic aids are permitted or prohibited during an exam.</p> <p>Indiana University offers a clear description of plagiarism and an online quiz to check your understanding (http://z.umn.edu/iuplagiarism).</p>
Late Assignments	<p>Late submissions in this course without prior arrangement with the instructor will be given a grade of zero points.</p> <p>If you anticipate having difficulty meeting due dates because of unusual or unavoidable circumstances, make arrangements with the instructor at least 24 hours in advance of the due date to be eligible for full credit. We are flexible with students who have documented disabilities, illnesses, family emergencies or other critical obligations.</p> <p>Voluntary commitments such as work commitments, planned vacations or other events that overlap with an assignment due date are generally not a reason for an extension. Plan ahead and complete the assignment before the planned event in order to avoid late penalties.</p>
Extra Credit	No extra credit will be offered in the class.
Paper drafts	As a policy, the instructor does NOT review and comment on first drafts of papers before submission. I encourage you to reach out to the instructor or grader to discuss any questions you have about your final papers or other assignments in advance.

CEPH COMPETENCIES

Competency	Learning Objectives	Assessment Strategies
12. Discuss multiple dimensions of the policy-making process, including the roles of ethics and evidence.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Articulate different ethical theories relevant to public health, including utilitarianism, deontological theories, rights-based, communitarianism, and justice. • Identify and analyze the ethical arguments for and against public health interventions from the perspective of the ethical theories. • Examine the types of contexts in which health departments and local public health agencies confront issues of allocating scarce resources (supplies, treatments, money, and employees' time) and what values, frameworks and skills are useful in daily micro-level decisions. • Practice applying and communicating ethical frameworks and principles to resolve public health ethical dilemmas in public health practice. • Articulate legal and ethical frameworks for balancing the interests of the individual and community in public health. • Demonstrate how ethical analysis can support successful development of and implementation of interventions to improve population health and advance health equity. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Class participation, (worth 5% of the final grade, assessed over the entire course) • Final paper which is an ethics analysis of a public health topic (Assignment 7, 25% of grade) • Discussion forums on the Flint Water Crisis and vaccine mandates and liberty, (Assignments 2 and 5, 28% of grade) • Team and group assignments on insurance benefits and vaccines (Assignments 3, 4, and 5, 42% of grade) • Individual analysis on the tension between individual liberties and public health goods in public health practice in the context of vaccines, health promotion and stigma, (Assignments 5 and 6, 28% of grade.) • Press release on vaccine shortage and allocation plans (Assignment 4, 14% of grade)
6. Discuss the means by which structural bias, social inequities and racism undermine health and create challenges to achieving health equity at organizational, community, and societal levels.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Describe the relationship between the social determinants of health and justice, and how a broader conception of the predictors of health relates to the scope of public health practice, policy, and law. • Identify the meaning of "structural racism" and its relationship to population health and policy. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Class participation, (worth 5% of the final grade, assessed over the entire course) • Final paper which is an ethics analysis of a public health topic (Assignment 7, 25% of grade) • Discussion forums on the Flint Water Crisis and vaccine mandates and liberty, (Assignments 2 and 5, 28% of grade) • Individual analysis on the tension between individual liberties and public health goods in public health practice in the context of vaccines, health promotion and stigma, (Assignments 5 and 6, 28% of grade.)

8. Apply awareness of cultural values and practices to the design or implementation of public health policies or programs.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Identify the key stakeholders in public health issues and describe how the values of diverse groups shape the design and implementation of public health policies. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Final paper (Assignment 7, 25% of grade, especially stakeholder analysis component) • Class participation, (worth 5% of the final grade, assessed over the entire course) • Vaccine forum discussion (Assignment 5, 14% of grade) • Individual analysis on the tension between individual liberties and public health goods in public health practice in the context of vaccines, health promotion and stigma, (Assignments 5 and 6, 28% of grade.)
14. Advocate for political, social or economic policies and programs that will improve health in diverse populations.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Demonstrate how ethical analysis can support successful development of and implementation of interventions to improve population health and advance health equity. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Class participation, (worth 5% of the final grade, assessed over the entire course) • Discussion forums on the Flint Water Crisis and vaccine mandates and liberty, (Assignments 2 and 5, 28% of grade) • Individual analysis on the tension between individual liberties and public health goods in public health practice in the context of vaccines, health promotion and stigma, (Assignments 5 and 6, 28% of grade.)
15. Evaluate policies for their impact on public health and health equity.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Demonstrate how ethical analysis can support successful development of and implementation of interventions to improve population health and advance health equity. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Class participation, (worth 5% of the final grade, assessed over the entire course) • Final paper (Assignment 7, 25% of grade) • Discussion forums on the Flint Water Crisis and vaccine mandates and liberty, (Assignments 2 and 5, 28% of grade) • Individual analysis on the tension between individual liberties and public health goods in public health practice in the context of vaccines, health promotion and stigma, (Assignments 5 and 6, 28% of grade.)
13. Propose strategies to identify stakeholders and build coalitions and partnerships for influencing public health outcomes.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Identify the key stakeholders in public health issues and describe how the values of diverse groups shape the design and implementation of public health policies • Practice applying methods for allocating resources in public policymaking, with particular attention to the process and outcomes of priority-setting. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Class participation, (worth 5% of the final grade, assessed over the entire course) • Final paper (Assignment 7, 25% of grade) • Discussion forums on the Flint Water Crisis and vaccine mandates and liberty, (Assignments 2 and 5, 28% of grade) • Individual analysis on the tension between individual liberties and public health goods in public health practice in the context of vaccines, health promotion and stigma, (Assignments 5 and 6, 28% of grade.)
19. Communicate audience-appropriate public health content, both in writing and through oral presentation	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Practice applying and communicating ethical frameworks and principles to resolve public health ethical dilemmas in public health practice. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Class participation, (worth 5% of the final grade, assessed over the entire course) • Final paper (Assignment 7, 25% of grade) • Assignment 4 (Team press release, 14% of grade)
21. Perform effectively on interprofessional teams	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Practice applying and communicating ethical frameworks and principles to resolve public health ethical dilemmas in public health practice. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Assignments 3 and 4 (28% of grade); students are assigned to work in groups of 2, constructed as teams across different degree programs. • Class participation, (worth 5% of the final grade, assessed over the entire course)