

**PUBH 6842**  
**DRPH SEMINAR SERIES #2**  
**Historical, conceptual and value foundations of public health, Part II (Ethical Issues in Public Health)**

**1 credit**

**Spring 2018**

Meeting Time: Friday, 8-9:50  
Nighthorse Campbell Building, Room 202

**Instructor:**

Carol W. Runyan, MPH, PhD  
Professor, Epidemiology / Community and Behavioral Health / Pediatrics  
Director, Program for Injury Prevention, Education and Research (PIPER)  
Office: Building 500, Room W-3143; Office phone: 303-724-6499

**OVERVIEW:** This course sequence is intended to introduce DrPH students to the historical, conceptual, and value foundations of public health.

In addition to readings that challenge students' thinking, students will write papers that are shared with the entire class, allowing opportunities for synthesizing new concepts and examining complex practical issues encountered in the field. Throughout, students will participate in seminar discussions, receive feedback on written work, prepare reflective documents to help them consider the progression in their thinking, and develop arguments in support of positions with which they may or may not agree, sharpening their skills in understanding and presenting arguments on different sides of issues.

**Course description:**

This course is designed to facilitate students' critical thinking about public health ethical perspectives.

**Learning objectives:**

**As a result of this seminar, students will be able to:**

- 1) Describe and critically assess selected ethical issues in public health practice.

**Student Participation:**

This is a seminar and, as such, relies on the careful preparation of all participants and willingness to be active in discussion. It is important to remember that for this particular topic there is much ambiguity. Without a willingness to engage in critical thinking and open discussion the seminar may become frustrating for everyone. There are few good or bad questions or right or wrong answers -- but a great deal of opportunity for questioning and searching for answers. It is important that we are willing to be critical of each other's ideas, but not of each other, and accept critiques for greater understanding. All participants share responsibility for the quality of the discussion and the learning process, with discussions throughout the semester building on earlier sessions. Therefore, attendance at all sessions is important. Some thoughts about discussion follow. They may be helpful.

- The success of the discussion (and therefore the class) depends on everyone.
- Silence is an opportunity to think. No need to fill it immediately.

- If you have talked a lot, give others a chance.
- Being quiet does not mean that the person doesn't have ideas or isn't thinking. Be alert to nonverbal cues that someone has an idea, a question, or a disagreement with what is being said. Consider asking them to talk about what they are thinking or bringing a perspective that may be unique to their background. But, be respectful if they choose not to speak when asked.
- Active listening is as important as speaking.
- Try to help keep the discussion on track but allow it to move in new, related directions.
- You need not be firmly committed to an idea before expressing it. In other words, it's OK to change your mind by the end of making a point, or later in the discussion.
- You need not always have a point to make to contribute to the discussion. Sometimes it is more valuable to ask insightful questions of others than to make your own argument.
- Disagreements are essential to a good discussion, but they should be focused on the ideas, not the person.
- If you don't understand the point someone is making, ask him or her to clarify. Or, state back to them what you think they said. Sometimes, they won't be clear about what they are saying either and you can help them think it through more clearly.
- There are no experts on this material (including the instructor), but different people will have more expertise on certain aspects of the material. They should help focus the discussion, but should also remember that this is a discussion, not a lecture.
- Confusion is inevitable and appropriate in this class. The learning comes from the process of trying to overcome confusion. However, no one will be clear about all the issues by the end of the class. One goal is to be clear about what it is you aren't clear about so that you can continue the discovery and thinking process after the semester is over.
- Try to think of imaginative ways to approach the material (e.g. using a practical example, posing a difficult question, stating a polar position for the sake of argument).
- This material is heavy. We need humor from time to time. Be prepared to laugh at yourself and with others.
- Discussion will not always go smoothly. Be tolerant of bumps. We're all learning together about the material and how to discuss it.
- If you have concerns about group process, be sure we address them –perhaps at the end or beginning of class. In raising concerns, think about strategies for improvement.

#### **WRITTEN ASSIGNMENTS:**

Students will prepare five one-page papers and one longer (10-12 page) paper. Because writing is a critical skill that students need to be developing, the instructor will critique the papers not only for the content, but also in terms of form, including grammar and syntax as this is part of presenting good critical arguments.

**Short papers:** For five sessions students will each write a **one page paper (single spaced)** answering specific questions about the readings. It should be organized with paragraphs responding to each question. **PLEASE NOTE THAT THE LIST OF QUESTIONS IS DIFFERENT FOR EACH ASSIGNMENT.** These will be due by Tuesday at 5 PM before the Friday class on CANVAS in the Discussion section. Please submit as word documents. Be sure to include your name on your paper.

**Long paper:** The final paper asks you to imagine that you are in a specific position – e.g., the director of a unit within a public health department, the leader of a specific NGO, a research analyst for a legislative body, etc. – and writing a formal argument for or against the ethics of one of the intervention topics

listed below. First, you will select a potential intervention topic that is not within your main area of expertise. Writing from the vantage point of your identified position, you will briefly introduce the context/nature of the intervention and then explain and critically analyze the ethical issues surrounding the topic in order to support your argument. Finally, you will identify and refute selected ethical counterarguments before concluding.

### Sections:

1. Introduction (~1 page)  
Very briefly describe the nature of the public health intervention; conclude with a **clear thesis statement** that a) argues for/against the intervention as ethically sound (from the vantage point of a specific position) and b) forecasts the key elements of your essay.
2. Central Ethical Issues (~3-5 pages)  
Explain the central ethical issues/dilemmas associated with the intervention. **Critically analyze** the ethicality of each of these issues and connect your analysis to your argumentative thesis statement.
3. Counterarguments (~3-5 pages)  
Identify and thoroughly explain 2-3 **counterarguments** to your own thesis/argument. **Critically analyze and refute** (argue against) each of these counterarguments so that your own argument becomes stronger.
4. Conclusion (~1/2 page)  
Restate your argument in a more complex/evolved version of your thesis statement; **synthesize** your main points; and **extend the overall conversation** related to your chosen intervention with a call for more research/consideration, a call to action, or a hypothesis of results/consequences.
5. Personal reflection (not graded, < ½ page): Reflect, in a few bullet points on: a) how doing this paper advanced your training as a public health professional; and b) what you found most challenging about the task.

### Other/Formatting Requirements

- To support your descriptions, explanations, and analysis, draw upon principles of public health ethics as discussed in the course materials and discussions.
- Use citations wherever appropriate and include a separate References page. You may use either an APA or AMA citation style – just be consistent throughout the paper.
- Write 10-12 double-spaced pages in 11-pt font with half-inch margins. Note that the section page lengths in parentheses are intended as guides, not rigid requirements.
- Use section headings to enhance clarity.
- **NOTE:** *the workshop to be offered early in the term by the Writing Center will address this type of argumentative paper and they helped me create the assignment in a manner consistent with what they will be teaching.*

List of possible topics to choose from:

1. Reporting parents for child abuse if there is evidence of drug use during pregnancy
2. Requiring car manufacturers to install technology that disables cell phones while cars are in motion
3. Banning the sale of marijuana edibles
4. Allowing parents to choose not to immunize their children
5. Banning fracking
6. Restricting salt content in processed food sold in the US

7. Using criminal background checks to screen out violent college applicants as means of reducing campus violence
8. Allowing physician-assisted suicide
9. Accepting money from tobacco companies to support public health research on smoking cessation
10. Requiring all employees and students of the university to get flu shots
11. Banning tackle football in high school
12. Restricting importation of products produced by child laborers in low-income countries
13. Charging higher health insurance rates for people who are obese
14. Requiring restaurants to provide paid sick leave for workers
15. Making available long acting contraceptives to minors without parental consent
16. Banning the sale of assault weapons
17. Providing medically supervised injection sites for drug addicts
18. Restricting access to sugar sweetened beverages in high schools
19. Banning female genital mutilation among immigrants living in the US
20. Repealing Obamacare
21. Requiring HPV vaccination for all adolescents
22. Restricting violent content in video games

**ORAL ASSIGNMENTS:**

There are two graded oral assignments. One is participating in a debate as described below in the syllabus. The second is presenting an oral critique of the final paper of one of your classmates. Plus, you will be graded on your contributions to class discussions (that means you lose points if you don't attend).

**Grades:**

Grades will be determined based on:

- 30% short papers (6% each for 5 papers)
- 20% in class presentations: (10% debate and 10% critique of classmate's paper)
- 30% longer paper
- 20% discussion (attendance and participation in the discussion)

**Criteria for grading:**

Grading in this class is, by definition, subjective. However, the following factors are considered and the grading rubric is explained below.

**Papers:** Logic of arguments; innovativeness; clarity of expression; scholarliness of approach, including appropriate use of references; extent to which the paper addresses the topic of the assignment. Proper grammar is expected. However, students for whom English is not their first language will be given lenience. It does NOT matter if the instructor (or anyone else) agrees with the arguments in your paper – only that they are clearly reasoned, cogently presented, and focused on the assigned topic. Note that while the web is an appropriate source for some types of information (e.g. about governmental organizations), it is not considered an appropriate source for all types of information and should not replace the kind of information gleaned from peer-reviewed papers or books.

**Discussion:** Thoughtfulness of comments, demonstrating evidence of careful preparation and understanding of material; demonstration of ability to understand, appreciate, and critique alternative viewpoints; demonstration of active listening as well as participation; creative approaches to issues; asking insightful questions that help draw out others and/or clarify issues; helping to move the discussion along and keep it on track; being on time. Quality of discussion is much more highly valued than quantity, but everyone is expected to contribute.

**Grading rubric:**

Points	Grade	Description of criteria, short papers
10-11	A or A-	All elements present, clearly explained, original ideas, significant and thoughtful questions that demonstrate understanding of issues in readings (quality of ideas and questions differentiates A from A-).
7-9	B-, B, B+	All elements present, explanation clear but lacking originality or careful thought, moderately interesting questions that demonstrate understanding of issues in the readings (quality of ideas and questions differentiates B-, B, B+).
4-6	C-, C, C+	All elements present, limited clarity in thinking or expression, weak questions that demonstrate less than full understanding of issues in the readings (quality of ideas and questions differentiates C-, C, C+).
1-3	D-, D, D+	Elements missing, lack of clarity in thinking or expression, weak questions that do not demonstrate understanding of issues in the readings (quality of ideas and questions differentiates D-, D, D+).
0	F	No paper turned in on time

Points	Grade	Description of criteria, long papers
11	A	Exceptionally well-reasoned arguments that are on point regarding topic, clearly demonstrates original thinking at a high level of thought, uses knowledge from course and elsewhere, clearly written, proper use of citations, no grammatical errors, no typos
10	A-	Very well-reasoned arguments that are on point regarding topic and draw knowledge from course and elsewhere, demonstrates original thinking, clearly written, proper use of citations, no grammatical errors, no typos
9	B+	Reasoned arguments on point regarding topic, that are presented with clarity, evidence of original thinking proper use of citations, no grammatical errors, no typos
8	B	Clear arguments on point regarding topic, evidence of original thinking, clearly expressed with minimal errors in citation, grammar, no typos
7	B-	Moderately clear arguments, but considerable room for improvement in reasoning or presentation, evidence of original thinking, less clearly written, minimal errors in citation, grammar, typos
6	C+	Limited basis for arguments, limited evidence of original thinking, problems with clarity of expression and/or errors in citation, grammar, typos

5	C	Limited basis for arguments, hard to find evidence of original thinking, problems with clarity of expression and/or errors in citation, grammar, typos
4	C-	Few points well argued, limited evidence of original thinking, problems with clarity of expression and/or significant errors in citation, grammar, typos
3	D+	Poorly argued, little evidence of original thinking, problems with clarity of expression and/or significant errors in citation, grammar, typos
2	D	Poorly argued, almost no evidence of original thinking, significant problems with clarity of expression and/or significant errors in citation, grammar, typos
1	D-	Poorly argued, no evidence of original thinking, significant problems with clarity of expression and/or significant errors in citation, grammar, typos
0	F	Paper not submitted on time, little or no content included, incoherent paper

**Course Materials:**

Available on CANVAS

**Special Needs:**

If you have special needs and wish to request accommodations, please contact the Office of Disability Resources and Services (DRS) located in Building 500, Room W1103. DRS staff will assist in determining reasonable accommodations as well as coordinating the approved accommodations. Contact information: Phone: 303-724-5640; Fax: 303-724-5641; Email: [sherry.holden@cudenver.edu](mailto:sherry.holden@cudenver.edu). Please also talk with the instructor about any needs or concerns.

**Academic Conduct Policy:**

All students are expected to abide the Honor Code of the Colorado School of Public Health. Unless otherwise instructed, all of your work in this course should represent completely independent work. Students are expected to familiarize themselves with the Student Honor Code that can be found at [http://www.ucdenver.edu/academics/colleges/PublicHealth/Academics/academics/Documents/PoliciesHandbooks/CSPH\\_Honor\\_Code.pdf](http://www.ucdenver.edu/academics/colleges/PublicHealth/Academics/academics/Documents/PoliciesHandbooks/CSPH_Honor_Code.pdf) or the Student Resources Section of the CSPH website. Any student found to have committed acts of misconduct (including, but not limited to cheating, plagiarism, misconduct of research, breach of confidentiality, or illegal or unlawful acts) will be subject to the procedures outlined in the CSPH Honor Code.

IMPORTANT DATES	TOPIC / READINGS
<p>SESSION 1 February 2</p>	<p style="text-align: center;"><b>PRINCIPLES OF PUBLIC HEALTH ETHICS</b></p> <p><b><u>OBJECTIVES:</u></b> As a result of this session, students will be able to:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Identify elements of the course;</li> <li>2. Describe differences between principles of medical and public health ethics;</li> <li>3. Explain general ethical principles of public health practice and the code of ethics for public health</li> <li>4. Identify key ethical elements in the case of Jacobsen vs. Massachusetts</li> </ol> <p><b><u>PREPARING FOR CLASS:</u></b></p> <p><b><u>WATCH:</u></b> Three modules of the course, Public Health Ethics (100 minutes total) available at:  <a href="https://nciph.sph.unc.edu/tws/training_list/?mode=view_kw_detail&amp;keyword_id=2641">https://nciph.sph.unc.edu/tws/training_list/?mode=view_kw_detail&amp;keyword_id=2641</a></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <u>Module 1:</u> Distinguishing Public Health Ethics from Medical Ethics (35 minutes)</li> <li>• <u>Module 2:</u> Values and Beliefs Inherent to a Public Health Perspective (30 minutes)</li> <li>• <u>Module 3:</u> The Public Health Code of Ethics (35 minutes)</li> </ul> <p><b><u>NOTE:</u></b> <i>There are additional modules that may be of interest. These are the required ones.</i></p> <p><b><u>READ REQUIRED READINGS:</u></b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Kass N. An Ethics Framework for Public Health. <u>Amer. J. of Public Health</u>. 2001. Vol 91, No. 11: 1776-1781.</li> <li>• Kass NE. Public Health Ethics: From Foundations and Frameworks to Justice and Global Public Health. <u>J. of Law, Medicine and Ethics</u>. 2004; 32: 232-242.</li> </ul> <p><b><u>RECOMMENDED READINGS:</u></b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Thomas J., Sage M, Dillenberg J, Guillory VJ. A Code of Ethics for Public Health. <u>Amer. J. of Public Health</u>. 2002. 92(7): 1057-1059.</li> <li>• <u>Stanford Encyclopedia of Philosophy:</u> <a href="https://plato.stanford.edu/entries/publichealth-ethics/">https://plato.stanford.edu/entries/publichealth-ethics/</a></li> </ul> <p><b><u>IN CLASS:</u></b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Review course outline</li> <li>• Discuss readings and lectures</li> </ul>

<p><b>SHORT PAPER</b></p> <p><b><i>DUE Tuesday, February 13, 5 PM</i></b></p>	<p><b><i>Write a one page paper (single spaced) that answers these questions for this set of readings:</i></b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a) What is the central thesis of the Beauchamp and Gostin papers? Describe IN YOUR OWN WORDS, in no more than a paragraph for each paper. Be sure to identify which statements go with which paper.</li> <li>b) Across the set of readings for this class session, how do the main ideas complement or contradict each other? (1 paragraph)</li> <li>c) Give one example of a public health dilemma you are familiar with and explain how it relates to the issues in the readings, describing the social justice challenges. (1 paragraph)</li> <li>d) Describe at least 1-2 things about these readings that you are questioning in your own thinking.</li> </ul>
<p><b>SESSION 2</b> <b>February 9</b></p>	<p style="text-align: center;"><b>SOCIAL JUSTICE</b></p> <p><b><u>OBJECTIVES:</u></b> As a result of this session, students will be able to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Define and critique the concept of social justice in the context of public health ethics;</li> <li>• Explain the tensions between individual and community goals of public health from an ethical perspective.</li> </ul> <p><b><u>READ REQUIRED READINGS AND STUDENT PAPERS:</u></b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Beauchamp, DE. Public Health as Social Justice. <i>Inquiry</i> XIII; 1976: 6(2): 205-227.</li> <li>• Gostin LO, Powers M. What Does Social Justice Require for the Public’s Health? <i>Public Health Ethics and Policy Imperatives</i>. <i>Health Affairs</i>, 2006, 25(4): 1053-1060.</li> <li>• <u>Case for class discussion:</u> “Black-White Infant Mortality: Disparities, Priorities, and Social Justice” (pages 84-86). In: Barrett DH, Ortmann LW, Dawson A, Saenz C, Reis A, Bolan G (Eds). <u>Public Health Ethics: Cases Spanning the Globe</u>, Springer International Publishing, Geneva, Switzerland, 2016</li> </ul> <p><b><u>RECOMMENDED READINGS:</u></b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>Watch:</b> Michael Marmot speech (50 minutes): <a href="https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=LyV_RSq6UzM">https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=LyV_RSq6UzM</a></li> <li>• Childress JF, Gaare RD, Kahn J, Kass NE, Moreno JD, Nieburg P. Public Health Ethics: Mapping the Terrain. <i>J of Law, Medicine and Ethics</i>, 2002, 30:170-178.</li> <li>• Marmot M. <u>The Health Gap – The Challenge of an Unequal World</u>. NY: Bloomsbury Press, 2015</li> </ul>

	<p><b>IN CLASS:</b> Discussion of: a) student papers and readings b) Case study: (Guest Daniel Goldberg, JD, PhD)</p>
<p><b>SHORT PAPER</b>  <b>DUE: Tuesday, February 27 at 5 PM</b></p>	<p><b>Write a one page paper (single spaced) that answers these questions for this set of readings:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>e) What is the central thesis of each paper? Describe IN YOUR OWN WORDS, in no more than a paragraph for each paper. Be sure to identify which statements go with which paper.</li> <li>f) Across the set of readings for this class session, how do the main ideas complement or contradict each other? (1 short paragraph)</li> <li>g) Describe at least 1-2 things about these readings that you are questioning in your own thinking.</li> </ul> <p>Read the case and think about the discussion questions at the end of the reading (you do not need to write anything about it)</p>
<p><b>SESSION 3</b> <b>March 2</b></p>	<p style="text-align: center;"><b>PATERNALISM</b></p> <p><b><u>OBJECTIVES:</u></b> As a result of this session, students will be able to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Define different perspectives on the issue of paternalism in public health;</li> <li>• Critique examples of public health interventions from a paternalism perspective.</li> </ul> <p><b><u>READ REQUIRED READINGS:</u></b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Gostin LO, Gostin KG. A Broader Liberty: J.S. Mill, Paternalism and the Public’s Health. <u>Public Health</u>. 2009; (123): 214-221.</li> <li>• Purcell M. Raising Healthy Children: Moral and Political Responsibility for Childhood Obesity. <u>J. of Public Health Policy</u>, 2010; 31(4): 433-44.</li> <li>• Gostin LO. Bloomberg’s Health Legacy: Urban Innovator on Meddling Nanny? <u>Hasting Center Report</u>, 2013; 43(5): 19-25.</li> <li>• <u>Case for in-class discussion:</u> “Essential Cases in the Development of Public Health Ethics: Jacobsen vs. Massachusetts” (pages 37-44) In: Barrett DH, Ortmann LW, Dawson A, Saenz C, Reis A, Bolan G (Eds). <u>Public Health Ethics: Cases Spanning the Globe</u>, Springer International Publishing, Geneva, Switzerland, 2016.</li> </ul>

	<p><b>RECOMMENDED READINGS:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Buchanan DR. Autonomy, Paternalism, and Justice: Ethical Priorities in Public Health. <i>American Journal of Public Health</i>. 2008. 98(1) 15-21.</li> <li>• Bayer R. Stigma and the ethics of public health: Not can we but should we. <u><i>Social Science and Medicine</i></u>, 2008. 67 (2008) 463–472.</li> </ul> <p><b>IN CLASS:</b>  Discuss readings and student papers  Discussion of case</p>
<p><b>IN-CLASS PRESENTATION</b></p>	<p><b><u>Prepare for an in-class debate:</u></b> You will be divided into two teams of four. Each team will be assigned one of the propositions listed. As individuals, you will prepare arguments on each side of the proposition to which you are assigned, preparing for an in-class debate. You will not know until you arrive in class which side you will be asked to argue, but you will know which proposition you are assigned. When you come to class you will draw straws for one of these roles: A) Supporting the proposition; B) Opposing the proposition; C) Supporting the proposition and rebuttal to arguments made by the opposition; D) Opposing the proposition and rebuttal of arguments made by those arguing in favor of the proposition. In class, after learning who will play which role, the team members assigned each side of the issue will be able to meet together for 10 minutes to exchange ideas and develop their approach before the debate begins. Each student in Role A will have 2 minutes to present his/her case in support of the proposition. The students assigned Role B, will then have 2 minutes to present the alternative view, followed by two minutes each for roles C and D. After the debate, the other four members of the class and any guests will vote as to which side was most convincing. Then we will discuss the topic and move on to debating the second proposition in the same way, examining the points made about these issues from the perspective of public health ethics. There is no written assignment, though I encourage you to write out bullet points for your arguments so as to facilitate being clear in the two minutes you have.</p> <p><b>Proposition 1:</b> Carrying a gun in public should be prohibited.</p> <p><b>Proposition 2:</b> Public school teachers should be allowed to bring firearms to work.</p>

<p><b>SESSION 4</b> <b>March 16</b></p>	<p style="text-align: center;"><b>ETHICAL ISSUES IN PREVENTING FIREARM VIOLENCE</b></p> <p><b><u>OBJECTIVES:</u></b> As a result of this session, students will be able to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Critically analyze selected ethical dilemmas associated with prevention of firearm violence</li> </ul> <p><b><u>REQUIRED READINGS:</u></b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Vernick, JS. Hodge, JG, Webster, DW. The Ethics of Restrictive Licensing for Handguns: Comparing the United States and Canadian Approaches to Handgun Regulation. <u>The Journal of Law, Medicine &amp; Ethics</u>; Winter 2007; 35, 4.</li> </ul> <p><b><u>RECOMMENDED READINGS:</u></b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Webster D, Vernick J. <u>Reducing Gun Violence in America – Informing Policy with Evidence and Analysis</u>. Johns Hopkins University Press, 2013 (available online for free)</li> <li>• Frattaroli S, McGinty E, Barnhorst A, Greenberg S. Gun Violence Restraining Orders: Alternative or Adjunct to Mental Health-Based Restrictions on Firearms? <u>Behavioral Sciences and the Law</u>. 2015. 33(2-3): 290-307.</li> <li>• Arrigo BA &amp; Acheson A. Concealed carry bans and the American college campus: a law, social sciences, and policy perspective, <u>Contemporary Justice Review</u>. 2015. DOI: 10.1080/10282580.2015.1101688.</li> </ul> <p><b><u>IN CLASS:</u></b> Debate Discuss reading and student debate</p> <p><b><u>Guest judges:</u></b> Daniel Goldberg, JD, PhD Others (TBN)</p>
<p><b>SHORT PAPER</b></p> <p><i>DUE Tuesday, March 13 at 5 PM</i></p>	<p><b><i>Write a one page paper (single-spaced) that answers these questions for this set of readings:</i></b></p> <p>a) What is the central thesis? Describe IN YOUR OWN WORDS, in no more than one paragraph for each paper. Be sure to identify which statements go with which paper.</p>

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>b) Select one of the assigned papers and write a critique of the main argument (1-2 paragraphs)</li> <li>c) Give one example of a public health dilemma not addressed in the papers and explain how it relates to the issues in the readings. (1 short paragraph)</li> <li>d) Describe at least 1-2 things about these readings that you are questioning in your own thinking</li> </ul>
<p><b>SESSION 5</b> <b>March 30</b></p>	<p style="text-align: center;"><b>ETHICAL ISSUES IN HEALTH EDUCATION AND HEALTH PROMOTION</b></p> <p><b><u>OBJECTIVES:</u></b> As a result of this session, students will be able to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Critically analyze the arguments associated with key dilemmas in health education and health promotion for achieving public health goals.</li> </ul> <p><b><u>READ REQUIRED READINGS AND STUDENT PAPERS:</u></b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Faden R. &amp; Faden A. The Ethics of Health Education as Public Health Policy. <i>Health Education and Behavior</i>. 1978; 6: 180-197.</li> <li>• Goldberg D. Social Justice, Health Inequalities and Methodological Individualism in US Health Promotion. <i>Public Health Ethics</i>. 2012</li> <li>• Carter SM, Cribb A, Allegrante JP. How To Think About Health Promotion Ethics. <u><i>Public Health Reviews</i>, 2012</u>. 34(1): 1-23.</li> <li>• <u>Case for discussion:</u> Municipal action on food and beverage marketing (page 153-157). In: Barrett DH, Ortmann LW, Dawson A, Saenz C, Reis A, Bolan G (Eds). <u><i>Public Health Ethics: Cases Spanning the Globe</i></u>, Springer International Publishing, Geneva, Switzerland, 2016</li> </ul> <p><b><u>RECOMMENDED READINGS:</u></b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Schmidt H. Chronic Disease Prevention and Health Promotion (Chapter 5, pages 137-153). In: Barrett DH, Ortmann LW, Dawson A, Saenz C, Reis A, Bolan G (Eds). <u><i>Public Health Ethics: Cases Spanning the Globe</i></u>, Springer International Publishing, Geneva, Switzerland, 2016.</li> <li>• Lieberman L, Golden SD, Earp JA. Approaches to Health Promotion: What Do We Need to Know about Policy and Environmental Change. <i>Health Education and Behavior</i>, 2013; 40:520-525.</li> <li>• Faden R. Ethical Issues in Government Sponsored Public Health Campaigns. <i>Health Educ Behav</i> 1987 14: 27.</li> <li>• Forster JL. A Communitarian Ethical Model for Public Health Interventions: An Alternative to Individual Behavior Change Strategies. <i>J. of Public Health Policy</i>, 1982 3(2): 150-163.</li> </ul>

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Rossi J, Yudell M. The Use of Persuasion in Public Health Communications: An Ethical Critique. Public Health Ethics, 2012, 5(2):192-205.</li> <li>• Tengland PA. Behavior Change or Empowerment On the Ethics of Health Promotion Strategies. Public Health Ethics. 2012, 5(2): 140-153.</li> <li>• Buchanan DR. A New Ethic for Health Promotion: Reflections on a Philosophy of Health Education for the 21<sup>st</sup> Century. Health Education and Behavior, 2006, 33:290-304.</li> </ul> <p><b>IN CLASS:</b> Discuss readings and student papers</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Discuss case study: Municipal action on food and beverage marketing.</li> </ul>
<p><b>SHORT PAPER</b></p> <p><b>DUE: Tuesday, March 27 at 5 PM</b></p>	<p><b>Write one page paper (single spaced) answering these questions:</b></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>What are the central lessons in these two examples? Describe IN YOUR OWN WORDS, in no more than a paragraph for each paper. Be sure to identify which statements go with which paper.</li> <li>What lessons do you derive from these papers about the interplay of research ethics with policy and practice?</li> <li>What issues raised in each paper did you find most challenging from an ethical perspective?</li> <li>Describe at least 1-2 things that you are questioning in your own thinking as a result of these readings.</li> </ol>
<p>Session 6 April 6</p>	<p style="text-align: center;"><b>ETHICAL ISSUES IN ENVIRONMENTAL PUBLIC HEALTH</b></p> <p><b>OBJECTIVES:</b> As a result of this session, students will be able to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Critically analyze selected ethical dilemmas associated with environmental public health.</li> </ul> <p><b>READ REQUIRED READINGS AND STUDENT PAPERS:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Wing S. Environmental Injustice Connects Local Food Environments with Global Food Production. In Morland KB (Ed). <u>Local Food Environments: Food Access in America</u>. Boca Raton, FL: CRC Press, 2014.</li> <li>• Rosner D. Markowitz G. With the Best Intentions: Lead Research and the Challenge to Public Health. <u>Am J Public Health</u>. 2012; 102:e19–e33.</li> </ul> <p><b>RECOMMENDED READINGS:</b></p>

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Beauchamp DE. Community: the neglected tradition of public health. Hastings Center Report, December 1985: 28-36.</li> <li>• Wing S. Social Responsibility and Research Ethics in Community-Driven Studies of Industrialized Hog Production. Environmental Health Perspectives. 2002, 110(5): 437-444.</li> <li>• Weed DL, McKeown RE. Science and Social Responsibility in Public Health. <u>Environmental Health Perspectives</u>. 2003, 111(14): 1804-1808.</li> </ul> <p><b>IN CLASS:</b>  Video: Dr. Wing’s TED Talk  Discuss the situations (cases) described by the papers by Wing and by Rosner</p>
<p><b>SHORT PAPER</b>   <b>DUE: Tuesday,  April 10 at 5 PM</b></p>	<p><b>Write a one page paper (single spaced) that addresses these questions:</b></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a) What principles of public health ethics guide your thinking about the issue of child labor globally?</li> <li>b) How might these principles apply to other global health issues (e.g., infectious disease, chronic disease, reproductive health)?</li> <li>c) What differences, if any, do you see as the public health ethical issues surrounding child labor in US vs. in global practice?</li> <li>d) What else do you feel you need to learn to be effective in addressing the child labor issue as a public health issue in the US or globally?</li> </ol>
<p><b>SESSION 7</b>  <b>April 13</b></p>	<p style="text-align: center;"><b>ETHICS IN GLOBAL PUBLIC HEALTH – CHILD LABOR DILEMMA</b></p> <p><b>OBJECTIVES:</b> As a result of this session, students will be able to:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Critically analyze selected ethical dilemmas associated with global public health generally and child labor in specific.</li> </ol> <p><b>READ REQUIRED READINGS AND STUDENT PAPERS:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• International Labour Office. Accelerating Action Against Child Labour. Geneva: 2010. (pages: xiii – 18).</li> <li>• Pierik R, Houwerzijl M. Western Policies on Child Labor Abroad. Ethics and International Affairs, 2006, 20(2): 193-218.</li> </ul> <p><b>RECOMMENDED:</b></p>

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>Watch:</b> Video on child labor in the chocolate industry (50 minutes): <a href="https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=15dJwA-xaVA">https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=15dJwA-xaVA</a></li> <li>• Liao M, Hon JS. Child labor in the People’s Republic of China: An Ecological Systems Analysis. International Social Work, 2010, 54(4): 565-579.</li> </ul> <p><b>IN CLASS:</b> Video on child labor Discuss readings and video</p>
<p><i>DUE: Saturday, April 28 (11:59 PM)</i></p> <p><i>NOTE DIFFERENT DAY/TIME THAN OTHER PAPERS!</i></p>	<p>Select one of the topics listed above in the syllabus, choosing one that is not in your primary area of expertise. See instructions earlier in the syllabus for the “Long paper”.</p> <p><b>In preparing for class:</b> read all papers and come prepared to discuss them ALL. Each student will be assigned, in advance, one other paper to critique. For critiquing each other’s papers, your task is to consider the arguments made in the paper and, drawing on principles from the course, critique those arguments. Remember, you are not critiquing the student. You are critiquing the logic and cogency of their arguments, whether you agree with their conclusions or not. In class, you will have 3 minutes to present your critique orally. Your critique should include: a) (briefly – state what the main argument is that the paper is making as you understand it; b) critically examine how cogent the arguments of the paper (e.g., what was and was not clear and logical); and c) give one or two counterarguments to the position taken by the author of the paper.</p>
<p><b>FINAL PAPER SESSION 8 May 4</b></p>	<p style="text-align: center;"><b>ETHICAL IMPLICATIONS OF MULTIPLE TOPICS</b></p> <p><b>REQUIRED READINGS:</b> Student papers submitted on April 28, 2018</p> <p><b>IN CLASS:</b> Critique and discuss student papers</p>