

SPPH 538: APPLICATION OF ETHICAL THEORIES IN THE PRACTICE OF PUBLIC HEALTH

May 15-July 25, 2017

Instructor

Mike Burgess, Ph.D. Professor, W. Maurice Young Centre for Applied Ethics, School of Population and Public Health, Department of Medical Ethics, Southern medical program, UBC Okanagan

Contact Information

Email: michael.burgess@ubc.ca Phone: 250 807-8216 Mobile 250 300-4943

Office in Kelowna: 236 Reichwald Health Sciences, UBC Okanagan Campus

Class Meetings: 9 am to 5 pm, May 28, June 18, July 16

Class locations:

May 28: SPPH 143, UBC Vancouver

June 18: video linked to Vancouver (SPPH 143): Instructor and Okanagan students on Okanagan campus (RHS 129)

July 16: SPPH 143 video linked to Okanagan (RHS 129) with instructor in Vancouver

Description

This course will survey ethical issues and cases in population and public health, and review related ethical discussions and principles. Although bioethics has a well-developed set of principles, some commentators suggest that population and public health requires ethical principles and frameworks that give higher priority to collective interests. This course will help participants understand these theoretical disputes in the context of ethical issues that are of practical relevance in population and public health. Students will be expected to critically read assigned material, identify additional relevant literature, to work collaboratively and individually on ethical assessments, and to present ethical arguments from diverse points of view, including ones with which you disagree. The appropriate role of experts, patients and publics will also be considered, and students may need to consult with other faculty or practitioners. The overall goal is to increase students' decision-making capacity, and reasoning and analytic capacity in relation to ethical issues in practice, policy, and research.

Texts

- Angus Dawson (Ed) *Public Health Ethics: Key Concepts and Issues in Policy and Practice*. Cambridge, 2011.

- Canadian Institutes of Health Research – Institute of Population and Public Health. (2012). *Population and Public Health Ethics: Cases from Research, Policy, and Practice*. University of Toronto Joint Centre for Bioethics: Toronto, ON. (In the course schedule, this text is referred to as the *CIHR Casebook*.) The CIHR Casebook is Available for free online at: <http://jcb.utoronto.ca/publications/documents/Population-and-Public-Health-Ethics-Casebook-ENGLISH.pdf>
- All other readings are available online (hyperlinked in syllabus) or posted on the course website (www.connect.ubc.ca).

Topics Covered

- The concept of public health and its ethical dimensions
- Moral principles relevant to health care and public health
- Tensions between individual liberty and collective interests in population and public health
- Justice and health inequities
- A survey of public health ethics issues including but not limited to population screening, immunization, use of health records, environmental determinants of public health, allocation of scarce resources.

Course Learning Objectives

- Assess and utilize principles of health care and public health ethics
- Articulate the ethical controversies related to issues in population and public health
- Construct ethical arguments for cases and policies
- Collaborate with colleagues to explore ethical issues
- Incorporate ethics into professional practice

Course activities and expectations

All three course meetings are required. The instructor will host the first and third session on the Vancouver campus and the second on the Okanagan campus, video linked to the Vancouver campus. Students from the Okanagan campus will attend the first session in Vancouver, and, if possible, the third (otherwise they will join by video link). Students from Vancouver will attend all three sessions in Vancouver, but any who are interested are welcome to attend the second session in Kelowna (June 18). *Travel costs are the responsibility of the students.*

The sessions will be held from 9 am to 5 pm on May 28, June 18 and July 16. Active

participation in group discussions and preparations is required. Building reasoned opinions based on the different ethical tools in the course is best done by building cases, or making arguments, for particular conclusions, and by providing and receiving constructive criticism. Conversation, disciplined by careful reasoning, is the best way to hone the ability to see issues from multiple perspectives and identify erroneous as well as reasonable conclusions. Practice with multiple cases and perspectives develops a capacity to recognize and better assess new ethical issues.

Grades:

Participation in Face-to-Face Meetings (10%) Participation is based on coming to the 3 face-to-face meetings prepared to engage in class activities, such as general class discussions, presentations, and group exercises in which you work together with other students to solve problems or examine arguments. It is expected that students will demonstrate understanding based on the articles, chapters, or case studies that are assigned for each meeting. This includes readings during the two weeks between the start of term (May 15) and the first session (May 28), as well as during the 3-4 weeks between the sessions.

Two Group preparations (pass/fail) In addition to readings and preparing papers, you will collaborate with colleagues to produce an ethical analysis of a case. A PowerPoint presentation will be submitted, and groups will be called upon during the 2nd and 3rd sessions to present their arguments, although not everyone will present. You will work in groups of 3-5 to develop an understanding of the controversies and basis for disagreement and then each present an argument in support of a different ethical conclusion. The topic and partners will be assigned at the 1st and 2nd sessions, and the presentations will be in the 2nd and 3rd sessions. The communication and preparation can occur through meetings, email, or online, as each group decides will work best for them.

Papers (90%) Three 4-6-page (double spaced) issue analyses with a brief recommended reading list. The objective of each analysis is to explain the ethical issue(s), the controversies, and to describe what additional information or assessment might help with a final recommendation. The papers will be due one week before the second and third session, and one week after the third session.

June 12: First paper due (20%)

Supervised drug injection sites: What are the ethical arguments and evidence for and against supervised injections sites? Take a position and give reasons in support of it and respond to the critiques of that position.

We will have small group discussions of the case in the first class before you write your own analysis.

July 4: Second paper due (30%)

School based HPV vaccination will be worked up in your small groups between the first and second classes and discussed on June 18 before you write your own analysis.

July 24: Third paper due (40%)

Health Inequities in First nations communities and Canada's response to the H1N1 Influenza pandemic will be worked up in your small groups between the second and third classes and discussed on July 24 before you write your own analysis.

Grading Scale

90-100	A+
85-89	A
80-84	A-
76-79	B+
72-75	B
68-71	B-
64-67	C+
60-63	C

Late papers will be reduced by 5% for each day past deadline.

Course Schedule, readings and activities

May 15 – May 28: (2 weeks)

To make the first meeting productive, it is essential that all students to complete the assigned readings beforehand. The necessary time is estimated to be 10 hours, so please spread the work out over the 2 weeks. The readings are organized to move from a case, to professional codes, an introduction to health ethics, more conceptual approaches to public health ethics and another case preparation for discussion in the session on May 28.

Readings:

1. Supervised drug injection sites (to be discussed on May 28 and topic for paper due June 12)
Dooling and Rachlis, [Vancouver's supervised injection facility challenges Canada's drug laws](#) (2010)
Globe and Mail, [Supreme Court ruling opens doors to drug injection sites across Canada](#) (2011)
[Supreme Court decision in Canada \(Attorney General\) v PHS Community Services Society](#) (2011)
2. Public Health codes of ethics and historical context:
Caplan, A. (2002) When evil intrudes. *Hastings Center Report* 22(6):29-32.
PHAC Core Competencies for Public Health in Canada. http://www.phac-aspc.gc.ca/php-ppsp/ccph-cesp/about_cc-apropos_ce-eng.php (Identify 4 places where ethical principles are helpful)
US National Institutes of Health "A Code of Ethics for Public Health"
<https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pmc/articles/PMC1447186/>
3. Introduction to health ethics
Online iEthics modules Ethics Q1 and Ethics Q2 (about 2 hours); Online access authorization will be provided.
4. Theorizing public health ethics
Public Health Ethics, chapters 1-4 (pp. 1-84)
Dawson, Resetting the parameters: Public health as the foundation for public health ethics
Brulde, Health, disease and the goal of public health
Wilkinson, Selective reproduction, eugenics and public health
John, Risk and precaution

Childress, J, R Faden, R Gaare, L Gostin, J Kahn, R Bonnie, N Kass, A Mastroianni, J Moreno, P Kieburg (2002). Public health ethics: Mapping the terrain. *Journal of Law, Medicine & Ethics* 30: 170-178.

May 28: First session (Vancouver)

9:00 – 9:45: Introductions and course overview: Nazi hygiene and Tuskegee Syphilis as historically important for ethics; justice/advocacy/liberty

9:45 – 10:30: Policy for mothers with drug additions: Patricia Janssen (to be confirmed)

10:30-10:45: Break

10:45-11:15 discussion

11:15-12:00: Case discussion on supervised drug injection sites (small groups)

Noon – 1:00pm: lunch

1:00-2:00 Report back and discussion

2:00 – 2:45:

What is important about the historical context for health ethics? Do we need a separate ethics for public health? What would a code, a relevant set of principles and an ethics framework look like? Would they help with assessing the drug injection site policy?

2:45-3:00 Break

3:00 – 4:15 Bicycling, helmets & ethics in injury prevention (slides from Kay Teschke)

4:15-5:00: Organize case discussion groups; discuss assignments and course.

Optional after class beverages at Mahoney and Sons

May 29-June 18: Paper, case discussions, and paper

1. June 12: First paper due (20%)

Supervised drug injection sites: What are the ethical arguments and evidence for and against supervised injections sites? Take a position and give reasons in support of it and respond to the critiques of that position.

2. Develop Group presentations (pass/fail) for June 18 class

Small group discussion of: assign different positions and develop the supporting arguments.

- a. Set up schedule to discuss, prepare 15-minute presentation that includes all the different positions and their justifications/critiques.
- b. Prepare and submit a group based, 8-12 slide, PowerPoint presentation on June 18.
- c. In the class on June 18, only one presentation will be selected for each position from across the groups.

- d. After discussion on June 18, this will be the case that you write up for submission on July 10. You may find it necessary to do further reading, but focus on building the ethics arguments.

3. Readings

1. Cases

- a. [Population and Public Health Ethics: Cases from Research, Policy, and Practice](#). Thompson & Polzer, School based HPV vaccination for girls in Ontario (103-113)
- b. Briefing book for decisions aids for colon cancer public deliberation in Indiana (will be provided)
- c. CRC Cancer screening and decision aids: [BCCA Screening BC: Colon](#)
- d. Equitable consequences: Issues of evidence, equity and ethics arising from outdoor smoke-free policies. 59-69 in [CIHR Casebook](#)

2. Theoretical concepts:

Public Health Ethics, chapters 5-8 (pp 85-153):

Ashcroft, Smoking, health and ethics

Verweij, Infectious disease control

Ainsley, Population screening

Dawson, Vaccination ethics

Jennings, Bruce (1993). [Health Policy in a New Key: Setting Democratic Priorities](#). *Journal of Social Issues* 49(2): 169-184.

Burgess, MM, H Longstaff & K O'Doherty (2016). Assessing deliberative design of public input on British Columbia biobanks. In *Big Picture Bioethics: Developing Democratic Policy in Contested Domains*. S Dodds & R Ankeny (eds). Springer: 261-276.

Burgess, MM (2014). From 'trust us' to participatory governance: Deliberative publics and science policy. *Public Understanding of Science* 23(1): 48-52.

June 18: Second session (Kelowna and Vancouver)

9:00 – 9:30: Selected (by instructor) presentations on School based HPV vaccination case

9:30 – 10:00: Discussion (large group)

10:00-10:30: Population screening and the case of colon cancer screening

10:30-10:45: Break

10:45-11:15 Small group discussion: What is the (ethical) goal of colon cancer screening? What is the role of consent and decision aids? How can policy reflect diversity of values and risk

tolerance? (small groups)

11:15-noon: Report back and discussion on colon cancer screening

Noon – 1:00pm: lunch

1:00-1:15: Review of papers and presentations (Instructor led discussion)

1:15 – 1:30: Smoke free policies: Should smoking be banned in parks and beaches

1:30-2:30: Small group discussions

2:30-2:45 Break

2:45 – 3:30 Report back and discussion (Large Group)

3:30-4:00: What theoretical tools are helpful?

4:00-4:30: Organize case discussion groups; discuss assignments and course.

June 19-July 16: Paper, case discussions, and paper

1. July 4: Second paper due (20%)

School based HPV vaccination for girls in Ontario: What are the ethical arguments and evidence for and against? Take a position and give reasons in support of it and respond to the critiques of that position.

2. Develop Group presentations (pass/fail) for July 16 class

Small group discussion of Health Inequities in First nations communities and Canada's response to the H1N1 Influenza pandemic ([Case 14 in the CIHR case book](#)): assign different positions and develop the supporting arguments.

- a. Set up schedule to discuss, prepare 15-minute presentation that includes all the different positions and their justifications/critiques.
- b. Prepare and submit a group based, 8-12 slide, PowerPoint presentation on June 18.
- c. In the class on June 18, only one presentation will be selected for each position from across the groups.
- d. After discussion on June 18, this will be the case that you write up for submission on July 10. You may find it necessary to do further reading, but focus on building the ethics arguments.

3. Readings

1. Cases

- a. Health Inequities in First nations communities and Canada's response to the H1N1 Influenza pandemic, in [Population and Public Health Ethics: Cases from](#)

Research, Policy, and Practice.

- b. Drug funding decisions for cancer drugs
 - i. Briefing booklet: download information booklet under quick links at <http://canengage.ca>
 - ii. Cancer dialogues: 20-minute video available on the ARCC website <http://cc-arcc.ca/societal-values-and-public-engagement-2/>

2. Theoretical concepts:

Public Health Ethics, chapters 9-12 (pp. 154-230)

Kessel & Stephens, Environment, ethics and public health: the climate change dilemma

McMillan, Public health research ethics: is non-exploitation the new principle for population-based ethics?

Daniels, Equity and population health toward a broader bioethics agenda

Wilson, Health inequities

Beauchamp, TL, R Faden, N Kass, S Tunis, S Goodman, P Pronovost (2013) An ethics framework for a learning health care system: A departure from traditional research ethics and clinical ethics. *Hastings Centre Report* 43(1): S16-S27.

July 16: Third session (Kelowna and Vancouver)

9:00 – 9:30: Selected (by instructor) presentations on H1N1 Influenza pandemic

9:30 – 10:00: Discussion (large group)

10:00-10:30: Allocation policies and the case of drug funding for cancer drugs

10:30-10:45: Break

10:45-11:15 Small group discussion: What is the (ethical) goal of funding cancer drugs? What are important opportunity costs? How can decision be fair and reflect diversity of values?

11:15-noon: Report back and discussion on funding decisions for cancer drugs

Noon – 1:00pm: lunch

1:00-1:15: Review of papers and presentations (Instructor led discussion)

1:15 – 1:30: Learning health systems: Health system improvement and research

1:30-2:30: Under what conditions is it appropriate to use health data for (a) administrative purposes, (b) research? (small groups)

2:30-2:45 Break

2:45 – 3:30 Report back and discussion (Large Group)

3:30-4:30: What theoretical tools are helpful?

4:30-5:00: Questions about final paper, course assessment.

July 24: Final analysis paper due on H1N1 Influenza pandemic