

**UNIVERSITY OF LETHBRIDGE  
FACULTY OF HEALTH SCIENCES  
MASTER OF NURSING PROGRAM  
NURSING 5100 – ETHICS, POLICY, & PRACTICE  
COURSE OUTLINE – FALL, 2015**

<b>Instructor:</b>	Dr. Monique Sedgwick, RN
<b>Office:</b>	M3067, Markin Hall, Faculty of Health Sciences
<b>Office Hours:</b>	Wednesday, 1200-1400 through Adobe Connect or by appointment
<b>Phone:</b>	403-332-5254
<b>E-mail:</b>	monique.sedgwick@uleth.ca
<b>Preferred Contact Method:</b>	Please contact the instructor by email. Every effort will be made to respond within 24 hours excluding weekends and/or holidays Please ask questions about assignments in the designated Moodle discussion forum.

**COURSE DESCRIPTION:**

This course uses advanced studies in nursing ethics as a foundation for understanding the nursing profession in the context and politics of the health care system. Critical reasoning will be key to discussions of ethical dilemmas arising from nursing practice. Trends and issues within the nursing profession will be explored in relation to the politics of health care at the micro and macro level. The influence of nursing on social and health policy will be used to inspire student accountability and responsibility within healthcare environments.

**LEARNING OBJECTIVES:**

Upon successful completion of this course, you will be able to:

1. Integrate and apply a critical reasoning framework to various ethical dilemmas;
2. Describe various ethical frameworks that inform ethical decision making and;
3. Analyze from an ethical perspective trends and issues at the micro and macro level within the healthcare system.

**COURSE FORMAT:**

Online with two face-to-face seminars. Face-to-face seminars are scheduled for **September 11 (L1112) and November 12 (TH 241)** at the University of Lethbridge.

**Course Dates:**

Week	Dates	Format
1	Sept 11	<b>Face-to-face</b>
2	Sept 14	Online
3	Sept 21	Online
4	Sept 28	Online
5	Oct 5	Online
6	Oct 12	Online
7	Oct 19	Online

Week	Dates	Format
8	Oct 26	Online
9	Nov 2	Online
10	Nov 12	<b>Face-to-face</b>
11	Nov 16	Online
12	Nov 23	Online
13	Nov 30	Online

**REQUIRED TEXTBOOKS:**

There are no required textbooks for this course. All required resources are online and available through the University of Lethbridge library databases. Note that while these resources are essential in students' learning, it is expected students will read beyond these resources to gain a more in-depth understanding of ethical concepts and their application.

*Optional:*

It is **strongly recommended** that students use a health ethics textbook for reference. The following are possibilities:

1. Baylis, F., Hoffmaster, B., Sherwin, S. & Borgerson, K. (2012). *Health care ethics in Canada* (3<sup>rd</sup> Ed.). Toronto, ON: Nelson Education.
2. Beauchamp, T. L., Walters, L., Kahn, J., & Mastroianni, A. (2014). *Contemporary issues in bioethics* (8<sup>th</sup> Ed.). Belmont, CA: Thomson/Wadsworth.
3. Fisher, J. (2013). *Biomedical ethics: A Canadian focus* (2<sup>nd</sup> Ed.). Don Mills, ON: Oxford University Press.
4. Keatings, M., & Smith, O. (2010). *Ethical & legal issues in Canadian nursing* (3<sup>rd</sup> Ed.). Toronto, ON: Elsevier.
5. Oberle, K., & Raffin, S. (2009). *Ethics in Canadian nursing practice: Navigating the journey*. Toronto, ON: Pearson Education Canada.
6. Storch, J., Rodney, P., & Starzomski, R. (2012). *Toward a moral horizon: Nursing ethics for leadership and practice* (2<sup>nd</sup> Ed.). Toronto, ON: Pearson Education Canada.

**COURSE PROCESS:**

This course is mainly online with two face-to-face seminars. You will require regular and reliable access to the internet. To engage with this online course, you will login to Moodle, the University of Lethbridge's online courseware.

If you have computer problems, please contact the University of Lethbridge computer help desk at 403-329-2490 or email them at [help@uleth.ca](mailto:help@uleth.ca). If you encounter problems with Moodle please contact the Learning Centre at 403-380-1856.

Moodle is like a digital, online classroom; students can only access the courses in which they are enrolled, so each online class is a private space restricted to students in each course. This course is asynchronous, which means that you can login to Moodle when it is convenient for you, and engage with the course materials and processes as you wish. However, due to the use of online discussions as a primary vehicle for engaging with the course material, time limits will be set as to when you should engage with asynchronous discussions, to ensure everyone in the class moves through the content more or less together.

Within Moodle you will find the course content presented in weekly modules. Each module consists of a number of learning resources--articles, videos, online readings, and asynchronous online discussions to help you develop a knowledge base pertaining to ethics. You will also submit assignments, view your grades, and ask questions about assignments within Moodle. Please do not email your assignments to your instructor.

The two face-to-face seminars are required and every effort should be made to attend. The purpose of the seminars is to engage in critical discussions of your developing assignments to enhance your learning and success in this course. If you cannot attend, please let your instructor know as soon as possible.

The first face-to-face seminar will be at the same time as the general overall orientation to the MN program. The intent of this seminar is to provide an orientation to the course and to begin to establish a community of learners. The second face-to-face seminar is tied to one of your assignments. Please let you instructor know as soon as possible if you are unable to attend.

To succeed in this course:

- Read the course outline, particularly the sections on assignments.
- Ask the instructor for clarification if there is anything you do not understand about the course.
- Stay up-to-date in the readings and discussion postings.
- Engage with the topics and discussions by reading widely, accessing the course resources, and consistently applying the critical reasoning framework.

- Fully participate both as an individual learner and as a discussion forum member.
- Engage in Moodle activities **at least three times per week**.
- Set aside 5 hours each week to work on the content and discussions in this course. Please plan ahead for when assignments are due, and budget in extra time to work on the assignments.
- Attend the two face-to-face seminars.
- Check your University of Lethbridge email every few days since this is how the instructor will normally communicate with you.

#### ASSIGNMENTS:

Assignment	Weighting	Due
<b>Discussion Forum:</b> A grade will be given at midterm and final using the posting criteria.	30%	Ongoing
<b>TCPS 2 Tutorial</b>	15%	Submitted at student's discretion but no later than Dec 11
<b>Discussion Facilitation:</b> Lead a discussion on a critical incident arising from your practice	25%	Week 10 (Nov 12, 2015)
<b>Final paper</b>	30%	Dec 7
	<b>100%</b>	

Grades for your assignments are entered into your individual 'grade-book' found in Moodle.

#### Discussion Forum:

Participating in asynchronous discussions is a requirement of this online course. The purpose of discussion forums is to provide you with the opportunity to engage in thoughtful reflection, discussion, and debate about the ethical issues and problems presented in this course. Weekly discussion forums also support the development of a community of learners. Thus, regular and in-depth participation is required to pass this course and to maximize the benefit of the online learning environment.

In preparation for the discussion, you will:

- Read the case and
- Review the video.

**It is expected that you will use the guidelines for 'critical reasoning' outlined in the orientation.**

Throughout the weekly discussion, you will be required to post:

1. One (1) response to the guiding question(s) provided by the instructor. Note that in face-to-face conversations, comments are not repeated. Rather, they advance the conversation. The same is true for online discussions. **Do not** repeat the same information your colleagues have already shared. Instead, provide new insights and understanding. This posting should be **no longer than 250 words** in length and needs to be supported with at least one reference.
2. Responses that reflect at least one aspect of the **critical reasoning framework**.
3. Two (2) responses on two (2) different topics posted by your colleagues. These postings should be **75 words or less** in length and should professionally ***affirm, challenge, and extend*** the initial respondent's thinking. A reference that supports your comments needs to appear in one of these postings.

These requirements represent the ***minimal*** level of participation expected.

**Weekly discussions will begin on Wednesday morning at 0900h, and conclude the following Tuesday evening at 2100h.**

Ground rules for discussion forums: So that in-depth and meaningful discussion might occur, participants must feel safe in presenting their thoughts, feelings, experiences, and opinions. This occurs when:

1. Responses and postings are treated with consideration and respect;
2. Postings are respectfully worded and;
3. The contributions of others are recognized and appreciated.

Disagreement and diversity of opinion are expected and welcomed; however, the discussion forum environment must be accepting and appreciative of these differences.

Respecting Web Space: Educational technology designers advise that the most effective way to post a message is as follows:

- Develop your posting in a Word document before posting. This allows you to check your posting for completeness, clarity, grammar, and tone. You can save a rough draft to your desktop, then copy and paste your words into the discussion forum. If your posting experiences a 'glitch', you haven't just lost all of your ideas and work. Please do not post attachments in the discussion forum.

The length of the message is **critical**. Long messages do not invite the readers' engagement and participation. **The length of each posting should not exceed the requirements listed above.** Re-writing a long message before posting it will help with wordiness.

- Follow an established thread if adding to the existing idea/discussion.
- If introducing a new idea, establish a new thread.
- Briefly state at the beginning of the message what the message is about.

Consent and Confidentiality: All course content, activities, and asynchronous online discussions are **NOT** to be used or shared for any purpose, or with any person not enrolled in NURS 5100. The online class environment needs to have the same "what is said in this classroom stays in this classroom" ethos of a face-to-face course in ethics.

Your registration in this online course constitutes **implied consent** to the terms of confidentiality. Violations of confidentiality may constitute an academic offense and/or issue of professional conduct. Please discuss this with the instructor if you have any concerns.

There are **two** parts to the discussion forum assignment.

1. Self-evaluation (first evaluation is weighted at 5%; second evaluation is weighted at 10% ):

As part of their licensure requirements, the College and Association of Registered Nurses of Alberta (CARNA) require registered nurses to engage in reflective practice. In essence, self-evaluation, which is an outcome of reflection, ensures accountability for actions taken and decisions made.

As a student in this course, you will complete:

- **Two (2) self-evaluations;**
- Your self-evaluation using the appropriate rubric found at the end of the syllabus. Note: the rubrics are slightly different. In the second self-evaluation you will reflect on your learning over the course of the term. You may use the landscape page layout to complete the rubric. Single space using Arial font size 10 is acceptable. Please limit your evaluation to a single page.

2. Postings (first set of postings are weighted at 5%; second set of postings are weighted at 10%):

So that in-depth and meaningful discussion occurs, your postings must: demonstrate consideration and respect; advance the discussion by being thoughtful and insightful; engage others by being posted throughout the discussion period; and meet the minimal level of participation.

The instructor will randomly select three of your postings prior to mid-term, and three of your postings from mid-term to the end of the course. Using the 'posting criteria' rubric, you will receive feedback on the selected postings within a week of each selection timeframe.

### **Tri-Council Policy Statement 2 Tutorial:**

The TCPS 2 Tutorial Course on Research Ethics (CORE) provides an applied approach to understanding and using the Tri-Council Policy Statement. This is an online, self-paced course with eight modules. Each module contains interactive exercises and provides multi-disciplinary examples. Modules vary in length of time to complete. At the end of the course, a certificate of completion is provided.

As members of a healthcare profession, you are required to read, understand, and analyze current research. Foundational to understanding and analyzing research is the appreciation of how ethics influences the research process. Completing this course is intended to help you develop insight into the ethics of conducting research.

You will access the following website and complete the course. Once you have completed the course, send a copy of the certificate to the instructor. You will then be awarded 15% toward your final course grade.

<http://www.ethics.gc.ca/eng/education/tutorial-didacticiel/>

### **Discussion Facilitation:**

The objective of this assignment is to allow you to identify a specific ethical problem (critical incident) arising from your own practice and to engage your peers in a thoughtful exploration and analysis of the issue(s) arising from this incident.

To complete this objective, you will access appropriate ethical literature, apply an ethical theory in delineating the issue, and engage your peers in a discussion pertaining to approaches to resolving the issue(s).

Prior to the discussion facilitation, you will:

- Write a clear description of a specific situation arising from your practice that presents an ethical problem (please omit any identifiers or change any information that may cause someone to be recognized);
- Provide *two* (2) readings/resources that provide a foundation for understanding the ethical problem for your peers to review prior to the discussion and;
- Develop at least two (2) questions that will be addressed in the discussion.

*These items will be posted on Moodle in **Week 8**, before the discussion facilitation.*

The discussion facilitation will occur during the face-to-face meeting in **Week 10**. During this time, you will have *30 minutes* to engage your peers in a discussion. You are encouraged to use creativity when deciding on strategies that will engage your peers. You are also encouraged to use critical thinking by asking questions that stimulate reflection, command of the pertinent literature and ethical framework, and nuances of the issue(s).

Assessment guidelines for this assignment are found at the end of the course syllabus.

### **Final Paper:**

Using the insights gained from the discussion facilitation, relevant ethical literature, and an ethical theory, you will develop an 8-10 page double spaced paper (Time New Roman font 12; excluding references)

that demonstrates your ability to use the critical reasoning framework to resolve the issue(s) arising from your critical incident.

Assessment guidelines for this assignment are found at the end of the course syllabus.

**POLICIES:**

There are policies that guide students and instructors. Only a few of these are discussed below. I encourage you to access through Moodle, Master of Nursing Program – Support site for more extensive discussion of various policies as well as the Master of Nursing Handbook.

**LATE ASSIGNMENTS:**

Marks will be reduced by 5% per day late (weekends and holidays included). An extension will be considered for legitimate reasons at the discretion of the instructor. You are responsible for approaching the instructor at least 48 hours prior to the due date in order for your request to be considered. Documentation from a third party may be required.

Because the online discussion forums are the primary vehicle for learning in this course, late submissions will not be possible for the discussion forums. To keep the class moving along at the same pace, discussion forums will be locked at the end of each posting period. Similarly, the face-to-face seminars cannot be rescheduled.

**ACCOMMODATIONS FOR STUDENTS WITH A DISABILITY:**

Reasonable accommodations are available for students who have a documented disability. If you have been diagnosed with a disability, there is no need to face the challenge of University without support. Please contact the Accommodated Learning Centre to set up an appointment at 403-329-2766 <http://www.uleth.ca/ross/counselling/index.html>. After registering with the Accommodated Learning Centre, your instructor will be notified by a formal letter of any accommodations you require. In addition, students are responsible for requesting accommodations from the instructor at least \*two weeks\* in advance of the evaluation date. The instructor and student are jointly responsible for arranging the resources needed for the evaluation process.

**PLAGIARISM STATEMENT:**

Please be clear on what plagiarism is, and how to avoid it. Essentially, plagiarism is where a person/student represents the words or ideas of another person as his or her own. For example, cutting and pasting a section from an article on the internet and putting it into an academic paper without properly citing it is plagiarism. When in doubt, cite other people's work as theirs, and/or check with your instructor.

Plagiarism is also an academic offense at most Universities, including The University of Lethbridge. Therefore, the prohibition of plagiarism affects all of your assignments in this course, whether the plagiarized material constitutes a part or the entirety of the work submitted. Plagiarism is taken seriously, and if an instructor finds evidence that a student has represented another person's words or ideas as his or her own, the student shall bear the burden of proving that there was no intent to deceive. Please refer to the University of Lethbridge calendar for the procedures pertaining to academic offenses, and please be aware of the potential consequences (anywhere from a written reprimand, to a grade of "F" in the course).

Please also note that the U of L subscribes to Turnitin.com, a plagiarism detection service. Please be advised that student work submitted for credit in this course may be submitted to this system to verify its originality. Best advice: avoid plagiarism to begin with, do your own work, and cite extensively!

**OVERALL GRADES:**

The determination of final grades for courses in the School of Graduate Studies is as follows:

<b>Letter Grade</b>	<b>Comments</b>	<b>GPA</b>	<b>Percent</b>
A+	Outstanding	4.0	97 - 100
A	Excellent	4.0	93 - 96
A-	Commendable	3.7	90 - 92
B+	Very good	3.3	87 - 89
B	Good	3.0	83 - 86
B-	Satisfactory	2.7	80 - 82
<i>NB: Any course with a grade of less than B- cannot be considered for credit in the School of Graduate Studies.</i>			
C+		2.3	77 - 79
C		2.00	73 - 76
C-		1.70	70 - 72
D+		1.30	67 - 69
D		1.00	63 - 66
F		0.00	Less than 63

**NURS 5100: Ethics, Policy & Practice  
Self-Evaluation Form #1**

**Date:** \_\_\_\_\_

**Student:** \_\_\_\_\_

Criterion	Response & Rationale	Supporting Evidence (examples)
<p><b>Preparation:</b> Did I prepare prior to posting and engaging in online discussion? Is it obvious that I understand the concepts of the required readings, video, activities? Did I demonstrate links between the theory, case, and other resources?</p>		
<p><b>Contribution:</b> To what degree did I contribute productively to the forum discussion? Have my postings advanced the discussion? Do my postings reflect thoughtfulness? Do my postings invite dialogue? Are my thoughts clear and succinct? Have I consistently used references to support my comments? Have I contributed to learning by discussing the strengths and limitations of the materials and/or resources I brought into the discussion? What improvements do I need to make in my participation?</p>		
<p><b>Respect:</b> Did I demonstrate respect for others by being courteous, using an appropriate 'tone' and appropriate language in my postings? Are my responses professional, affirming, and challenging aimed at extending the thinking of peers? Do I follow the guidelines regarding Moodle space?</p>		
<p><b>Dedication:</b> Are my postings posted on time? Do I post throughout the discussion forum timelines or are my postings grouped all together? Is it easily apparent that I am engaged in the discussion? Have I responded to two peers on two different topics?</p>		
<p><b>Learning:</b> What assumptions did I have when discussing the case(s)? How have these assumptions changed? Have my points of view changed or remained the same? What insights have I developed?</p>		
<p><b>Total:</b></p>		<b>/5</b>

**NURS 5100: Ethics, Policy & Practice  
Self-Evaluation Form #2**

**Date:** \_\_\_\_\_

**Student:** \_\_\_\_\_

<b>Criterion</b>	<b>Response &amp; Rationale</b>	<b>Supporting Evidence (examples)</b>
<p><b>Preparation:</b> Did I prepare prior to posting and engaging in online discussion? Is it obvious that I understand the concepts of the required readings, video, activities? Did I demonstrate links between the theory, case, and other resources?</p>		
<p><b>Contribution:</b> To what degree did I contribute productively to the forum discussion? Have my postings advanced the discussion? Do my postings reflect thoughtfulness? Do my postings invite dialogue? Are my thoughts clear and succinct? Have I consistently used references to support my comments? Have I contributed to learning by discussing the strengths and limitations of the materials and/or resources I brought into the discussion? How successful have the changes I made been in improving my contribution?</p>		
<p><b>Respect:</b> Did I demonstrate respect for others by being courteous, using an appropriate 'tone' and appropriate language in my postings? Are my responses professional, affirming, and challenging aimed at extending the thinking of peers? Do I follow the guidelines regarding Moodle space?</p>		
<p><b>Dedication:</b> Are my postings posted on time? Do I post throughout the discussion forum timelines or are my postings grouped all together? Is it easily apparent that I am engaged in the discussion? Have I responded to two peers on two different topics?</p>		
<p><b>Learning:</b> What assumptions did I have when discussing the case(s)? How have these assumptions changed? Have my points of view changed or remained the same? What insights have I developed? What have I learned about myself as a student of ethics?</p>		
<b>Total:</b>		<b>/10</b>

**NURS 5100: Ethics, Policy & Practice  
Discussion Forum Posting Criteria #1**

Date: \_\_\_\_\_

Student: \_\_\_\_\_

Criterion	1	2	3
<p><b>Preparation:</b> Did (name of student) prepare prior to posting and engaging in online discussion? Is it obvious that s/he understands the concepts of the required readings, video and activities? Did s/he demonstrate links between the theory, case, and other resources?</p>	<p>Preparation prior to posting is clearly lacking Minimal understanding of the ethical concepts is evident Few links are made between the theory, case, and resources</p>	<p>Satisfactory preparation prior to posting is evident Satisfactory understanding of the ethical concepts is evident Satisfactory links are made between the theory, case and resources</p>	<p>Superior preparation prior to posting is evident Superior understanding of the ethical concepts is evident Superior links are made between the theory, case and resources</p>
<p><b>Contribution:</b> To what degree did (name of student) contribute productively to the forum discussion? Has his/her postings advanced the discussion? Do the postings reflect thoughtfulness? Do the postings invite dialogue? Are his/her thoughts clear and succinct? Has s/he used references to support his/her comments? What improvements to participation did the student indicate s/he needs to make?</p>	<p>Posting minimally contributes to forum discussion No new insights brought forward to advance the discussion All postings simply agree with comments already made Postings inconsistently invite dialogue Thoughts are fragmented and wordy Inconsistent use of references Minimal discussion regarding how to improve performance is provided</p>	<p>Posting clearly contributes to forum discussion New insights are sometimes brought forward that advance the discussion Some postings simply agree with comments already made while others invite further exploration of alternate points of view Most postings invite dialogue through questioning and providing thoughtful comments Thoughts are frequently logical. Postings are frequently succinct Required use of references is often times followed Some discussion regarding how to improve performance is provided</p>	<p>Posting consistently contributes to forum discussion New insights are consistently brought forward and advance the discussion Postings are thoughtful; they invite exploration of alternate points of view Postings consistently invite dialogue by posing relevant questions and comments Thoughts are clear, logical, and succinct Consistently uses references as per guidelines Thorough discussion regarding how to improve performance is provided</p>
<p><b>Respect:</b> Did (name of student) demonstrate respect for others by being courteous, using an appropriate 'tone' and appropriate</p>	<p>Postings at times lack courtesy Tone of postings at times incorporates slang, is</p>	<p>Postings are frequently courteous Tone of postings frequently invites others to respond, i.e.</p>	<p>Postings are always courteous Tone of postings invites others to respond, i.e. professional, clear, and</p>

language in his/her postings? Are the posts professional, affirming and challenging thus extending the respondent's thinking. Is (name of student) following the guidelines regarding Moodle space?	unprofessional, lacks clarity, and does not consider readers' perceptions and experiences. Further, the posting is poorly written with frequent misspellings and/or improper use of terminology Posting does not affirm or challenge the respondent's thinking Posted guidelines for using Moodle are inconsistently followed	professional, clear, and considerate of readers' perceptions and experiences Postings frequently affirm or challenge the respondent's thinking Posted guidelines for using Moodle are frequently followed	considerate of readers' perceptions and experiences Postings consistently affirm or challenge the respondent's thinking Posted guidelines for using Moodle are consistently followed
<b>Dedication:</b> Are (name of student)'s postings posted on time? Does (name of student) post throughout the discussion forum timelines or are his/her postings grouped all together? Is it easily apparent that (name of student) is engaged in the discussion? Has (name of student) responded to two peers on two different topics?	Postings are frequently not on time Selected postings demonstrate low to moderate level of engagement throughout the week Required number of postings per week is frequently not followed Has not responded to two peers on two different topics	Postings are mostly on time Selected postings demonstrate engagement throughout the week Required number of postings per week is frequently followed Frequently responds to two peers on two different topics	Postings are always on time Selected postings demonstrate a high level of engagement throughout the week Required number of postings per week is consistently followed Consistently responds to two peers on two different topics
<b>Learning:</b> Did (name of student) identify his/her assumptions when discussing the case(s)? Has (name of student) discussed how these assumptions have changed? Has (name of student) discussed if his/her points of view have changed or if they have remained the same? Has (name of student) developed new insights throughout the course?	Assumptions are inconsistently identified in the postings Inconsistently identifies and discusses if there are changes in assumptions and points of view Inconsistently identifies new insights in the case(s)	Assumptions are frequently identified in the postings Frequently and discusses if there are changes in assumptions and points of view Frequently identifies new insights in the case(s)	Assumptions are consistently identified in the postings Consistently identifies and discusses if there are changes in assumptions and points of view. Consistently identifies new insights in the case(s)
<b>TOTAL MARK</b>			____/15 x 5% = ____/5

Professor's Comments:

**NURS 5100: Ethics, Policy & Practice  
Discussion Forum Posting Criteria #2**

Date: \_\_\_\_\_

Student: \_\_\_\_\_

Criterion	1	2	3
<p><b>Preparation:</b> Did (name of student) prepare prior to posting and engaging in online discussion? Is it obvious that s/he understands the concepts of the required readings, video and activities? Did s/he demonstrate links between the theory, case, and other resources?</p>	<p>Preparation prior to posting is clearly lacking Minimal understanding of the ethical concepts is evident Few links are made between the theory, case, and resources</p>	<p>Satisfactory preparation prior to posting is evident Satisfactory understanding of the ethical concepts is evident Satisfactory links are made between the theory, case and resources</p>	<p>Superior preparation prior to posting is evident Superior understanding of the ethical concepts is evident Superior links are made between the theory, case and resources</p>
<p><b>Contribution:</b> To what degree did (name of student) contribute productively to the forum discussion? Have his/her postings advanced the discussion? Do the postings reflect thoughtfulness? Do the postings invite dialogue? Are his/her thoughts clear and succinct? Has s/he used references to support his/her comments? How successful in improving contribution have the changes (name of student) made been?</p>	<p>Posting minimally contributes to forum discussion No new insights brought forward to advance the discussion All postings simply agree with comments already made Postings inconsistently invite dialogue Thoughts are fragmented and wordy Inconsistent use of references No changes in how the student engaged in participation were identified No discussion regarding how successful these changes were, were provided</p>	<p>Posting clearly contributes to forum discussion New insights are sometimes brought forward that advance the discussion Some postings simply agree with comments already made while others invite further exploration of alternate points of view Most postings invite dialogue through questioning and providing thoughtful comments Thoughts are frequently logical. Postings are frequently succinct Required use of references is often times followed Some changes in how the student engaged in participation were identified Brief discussion regarding how</p>	<p>Posting consistently contributes to forum discussion New insights are consistently brought forward and advance the discussion Postings are thoughtful; they invite exploration of alternate points of view Postings consistently invite dialogue by posing relevant questions and comments Thoughts are clear, logical, and succinct Consistently uses references as per guidelines Changes made in how the student engaged in participation were identified Thoughtful and comprehensive discussion regarding how successful these</p>

Criterion	1	2	3
		successful these changes were, were provided	changes were, were provided
<p><b>Respect:</b> Did (name of student) demonstrate respect for others by being courteous, using an appropriate 'tone' and appropriate language in his/her postings? Are the posts professional, affirming and challenging thus extending the respondent's thinking? Is (name of student) following the guidelines regarding Moodle space?</p>	<p>Postings at times lack courtesy Tone of postings at times incorporates slang, is unprofessional, lacks clarity, and does not consider readers' perceptions and experiences. Further, the posting is poorly written with frequent misspellings and/or improper use of terminology Posting does not affirm or challenge the respondent's thinking Posted guidelines for using Moodle are inconsistently followed</p>	<p>Postings are frequently courteous Tone of postings frequently invites others to respond, i.e. professional, clear, and considerate of readers' perceptions and experiences Postings frequently affirm or challenge the respondent's thinking Posted guidelines for using Moodle are frequently followed</p>	<p>Postings are always courteous Tone of postings invites others to respond, i.e. professional, clear, and considerate of readers' perceptions and experiences Postings consistently affirm or challenge the respondent's thinking Posted guidelines for using Moodle are consistently followed</p>
<p><b>Dedication:</b> Are (name of student)'s postings posted on time? Does (name of student) post throughout the discussion forum timelines or are his/her postings grouped all together? Is it easily apparent that (name of student) is engaged in the discussion? Has s/he responded to two peers on two different topics?</p>	<p>Postings are frequently not on time Selected postings demonstrate low to moderate level of engagement throughout the week Required number of postings per week is frequently not followed Has not responded to two peers on two different topics</p>	<p>Postings are mostly on time Selected postings demonstrate engagement throughout the week Required number of postings per week is frequently followed Frequently responds to two peers on two different topics</p>	<p>Postings are always on time Selected postings demonstrate a high level of engagement throughout the week Required number of postings per week is consistently followed Consistently responds to two peers on two different topics</p>
<p><b>Learning:</b> Did (name of student) identify his/her assumptions when discussing the case(s)? Has (name of student) discussed how these assumptions have changed? Has (name of student) discussed if his/her</p>	<p>Assumptions are inconsistently identified in the postings Inconsistently identifies and discusses if there are changes in</p>	<p>Assumptions are frequently identified in the postings Frequently and discusses if there are changes in assumptions and points of view</p>	<p>Assumptions are consistently identified in the postings Consistently identifies and discusses if there are changes in</p>

Criterion	1	2	3
<p>points of view have changed or if they have remained the same? Has (name of student) developed new insights throughout the course? What has (name of student) learned about him/herself as a student of ethics?</p>	<p>assumptions and points of view Inconsistently identifies new insights in the case(s) Minimal evidence is provided regarding what the student learned about him/herself as an online student and student of ethics</p>	<p>Frequently identifies new insights in the case(s) Satisfactory evidence is provided regarding what the student learned about him/herself as an online student and student of ethics</p>	<p>assumptions and points of view. Consistently identifies new insights in the case(s) Comprehensive evidence is provided regarding what the student learned about him/herself as an online student and student of ethics</p>
<b>TOTAL MARK</b>			<p>___/15 x 10% = ___/10</p>

Professor's Comments:

**NURS 5100: Ethics, Policy & Practice  
Discussion Facilitation**

Student: \_\_\_\_\_

Topic: \_\_\_\_\_

	<b>1</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>3</b>
<b>Organization</b>	Preparatory items are posted late or are absent Facilitation plan is lacking &/or is disorganized Discussion exceeds the time limit or is too short to support a comprehensive discussion	At least one of the preparatory items is posted late or is absent Facilitation plan is evident although is at times disorganized. Discussion is within the time limit although time could have been used more effectively	All preparatory items are posted on time Facilitation plan is organized and logically flows Within the time limit with effective use of the allotted time
<b>Development of ideas</b>	Description of practice situation is unclear & general The readings/resources posted are unrelated to the ethical problem and do not assist the discussion participants to develop a understanding of the ethical problem The discussion questions lack focus & clarity & do not encourage exploration of an ethical dilemma arising from the practice situation	Description of practice situation is somewhat clear & needs more specificity Two readings/resources posted assist discussion participants develop a understanding of the ethical problem but could be more obviously linked to the ethical problem Two discussion questions are somewhat clear & require more focus. The questions do encourage exploration of an ethical dilemma arising from the practice situation	Description of practice situation is specific & clear Two readings/resources posted clearly assists discussion participants develop a understanding of the ethical problem Two discussion questions are clear, focused, & encourages exploration of an ethical dilemma arising from the practice situation
<b>Support for ideas</b>	A limited range of the pertinent scholarly literature is incorporated into the discussion including the posted preparatory readings	A satisfactory range of the pertinent scholarly literature is incorporated into the discussion including the posted preparatory readings	A broad range of the pertinent scholarly literature is clearly incorporated into the discussion including the posted preparatory readings

	Parameters of the ethical issue are not identified Integration and analysis of different points of view is lacking in the discussion A systematic approach to reasoning through the problem lacking Use of an ethical framework is lacking &/or is incorrectly applied in the discussion	Parameters of the ethical issue are identified but lack clarity Integration and analysis of different points of view is sporadic throughout the discussion Use of a systematic approach to reasoning through the problem is sporadic Use of an ethical framework is correctly applied but inconsistently in the discussion	Parameters of the ethical issue are clearly identified Integration and analysis of different points of view apparent throughout the discussion Use of a systematic approach to reasoning through the problem evident Use of an ethical framework is correctly and consistently applied in the discussion
<b>Creativity</b>	Approach lacks creativity and only minimally engages participants in a meaningful way Sporadically initiates and sustains the interest and functioning of the discussion	Approach is somewhat creative and engaging in a meaningful way for participants Satisfactorily initiates and sustains the interest and functioning of the discussion	Approach is creative and engages participants in a meaningful way Consistently initiates and sustains the interest and functioning of the discussion
<b>Ability to engage group</b>	Discussion points do not or minimally support dialogue and reflection. Discussion points are not addressed in the course of the facilitation Responses to class input and questions do not demonstrate significant knowledge of the issue and familiarity with the body of literature on the topic	Discussion points support somewhat superficial dialogue and reflection. Discussion points are sporadically addressed in the course of the facilitation Responses to class input and questions demonstrate satisfactory knowledge of the issue and familiarity with the body of literature on the topic	Discussion points effectively support in-depth dialogue and reflection, and are addressed throughout the course of the facilitation Responses to class input and questions demonstrate significant knowledge of the issue and familiarity with the body of literature on the topic
<b>Total</b>	/15 x 25% = /25		

**Professor's comments:**

**NURS 5100: Ethics, Policy & Practice  
Final Paper**

**Student name:** \_\_\_\_\_

	1	2	3	4
<b>Organization</b>	Overall organization of the paper is poor.	Overall organization of the paper is acceptable.	Overall organization of the paper is good.	Overall organization of the paper is excellent.
<b>Development of Ideas</b>	Introduction does not provide direction for the paper. Thesis statement is absent. Integration of materials with original analysis is poor.	Introduction provides direction for the paper, but critical reasoning framework not applied throughout the paper. Thesis statement is present but only vaguely identifies the topic of the paper. Integration of materials with original analysis is uneven.	Critical reasoning framework identified and developed, although framework may not always be fully developed. Thesis statement is present but wordy. Integration of materials with original analysis is smooth.	Critical reasoning framework identified and developed throughout paper. Thesis statement concisely identifies the topic of the paper. Integration of materials with original analysis is skillful.
<b>Content and Knowledge</b>	Minimal scholarly references (references do not meet specified requirements). Quotations are not supportive of the arguments. Awareness of ethical nuances of topic is weak. Understanding of ethical terms is weak. Topic/problem is vague and unclear; a description rather than an evaluation of the topic is presented.	Incorporates limited range of scholarly references. Quotations used in a superficial manner or excessive use of direct quotes. Personal voice is missing. Awareness of ethical nuances of topic is acceptable. Understanding of ethical terms is acceptable. Topic /problem is superficially presented; evaluation of the topic is acceptable.	Incorporates an adequate range of scholarly references. Quotations adequately illustrate arguments. Awareness of ethical nuances of topic is good. Understanding of ethical terms is good. Topic/problem is clearly presented, but lacking critical analysis; evaluation of the topic is good.	Incorporates a broad range of scholarly references. Quotations insightfully illustrate arguments. Awareness of ethical nuances of topic is excellent. Understanding of ethical terms is excellent. Topic/problem is clearly presented and critically analyzed; evaluation of the topic is excellent.
<b>Synthesis of ideas and depth of argument</b>	Summary of the literature predominates. Stereotypical or ineffective thinking about the topic. Assumptions pertaining to the topic/problem are incorrect. Evidence for making claims is lacking and/or questionable. Reasons for adopting/rejecting options are lacking and/or weak.	Mostly a review of the literature and common observations. Raises good ideas without following through; general understanding of the topic. Assumptions pertaining to the topic/problem are inappropriate. Evidence for making claims is acceptable. Reasons for adopting/rejecting options are acceptable.	Some original insights arising from the use of the literature. Solid understanding of the topic demonstrated by comprehensive coverage. Assumptions pertaining to the topic/problem are questionable. Evidence for making claims is good. Reasons for adopting/rejecting options are good.	Thorough analysis and examination of the topic/problem from multiple perspectives. Mastery of the topic and its content; provides subtle and perceptive insights. Assumptions pertaining to the topic/problem are reasonable. Evidence for making claims is excellent. Reasons for adopting/rejecting options are excellent.
<b>Expression of Ideas</b>	Grammatical and spelling errors interfere with expression of ideas. Multiple and repeated errors in APA format. Expression of ideas frequently unclear and confusing.	Significant grammatical errors including incomplete sentence structure, poor usage of terms, colloquial expressions and spelling errors. Significant APA format errors. Inconsistent clarity, wordiness or duplication of ideas.	Minor grammatical errors, colloquial expressions and occasional spelling errors. Minor APA format errors. Generally clear, succinct and logical expression of ideas. Easy to read.	No grammatical or spelling errors. No APA format errors. Logical, succinct development of ideas. Excellent expression of ideas, engaging, and enjoyable to read.

**COMMENTS**

**FINAL GRADE = /20 x 30% = /30**

### Nursing 5100 Course Schedule

Week	Topics Area	Specific Topics	Assignments
1	Welcome, Introductions and Course orientation	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li><b><i>In-class face to face session</i></b></li> <li>Navigate Moodle course</li> <li>What is ethics? What is health ethics?</li> <li>Critical reasoning</li> </ul>	
2	Online orientation		
3	Approaches to ethics: Code of ethics	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Organizational codes</li> <li>Professional code of ethics (CNA)</li> </ul>	
4	Approaches to ethics: Utilitarianism & Deontology		
5	Research & ethics	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Informed consent</li> </ul>	<b>SELF-EVALUATION #1</b>
6	Practice & ethics		<b>Feedback using Discussion Forum Posting Criteria will be provided by the instructor</b>
7	Approaches to ethics: feminist ethics	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Ethics of care</li> <li>Feminist ethics</li> </ul>	
8	Approaches to ethics: Distributive justice	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Justice</li> <li>Distributive justice</li> </ul>	
9	Approaches to ethics: Social justice	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Human rights</li> <li>Social Justice</li> </ul>	<b>POST CRITICAL INCIDENT; READINGS; GUIDING DISCUSSION QUESTIONS</b>
10		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li><b><i>In-class face to face session</i></b></li> </ul>	<b>DISCUSSION FACILITATION DUE</b>
11	Public health ethics		
12	Policy & ethics		<b>SELF-EVALUATION #2</b>
13	Wrap up, final thoughts & farewell		<b>Feedback using Discussion Forum Posting Criteria will be provided by the instructor</b>
			<b>FINAL PAPER DUE DEC 7, 2015 TCPS 2 TUTORIAL COURSE DUE NO LATER THAN DEC 11</b>

## Readings

Week	Reading	Link
<b>1 Intro</b>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Austin, W. (2007). The ethics of everyday practice: Healthcare environments as moral communities. <i>Advances in Nursing Science</i>, 30(1), 81-88.</li> <li>2. Doane, B., Pauly, B., Brown, H., &amp; McPherson, G. (2004). Exploring the heart of ethical nursing practice: Implications for ethics education. <i>Nursing Ethics</i>, 11(3), 240-253.</li> </ol>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. <a href="http://0-ovidsp.ovid.com.darius.uleth.ca/ovidweb.cgi?T=JS&amp;CS C=Y&amp;NEWS=N&amp;PAGE=fulltext&amp;AN=00012272-200701000-00009&amp;LSLINK=80&amp;D=ovft">http://0-ovidsp.ovid.com.darius.uleth.ca/ovidweb.cgi?T=JS&amp;CS C=Y&amp;NEWS=N&amp;PAGE=fulltext&amp;AN=00012272-200701000-00009&amp;LSLINK=80&amp;D=ovft</a></li> <li>2. <a href="http://0-nej.sagepub.com.darius.uleth.ca/content/11/3/240.full.pdf+html">http://0-nej.sagepub.com.darius.uleth.ca/content/11/3/240.full.pdf+html</a></li> </ol>
<b>2 Online orientation</b>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Twoney, J. G. (1989). Analysis of the claim to distinct nursing ethics: Normative and nonnormative approaches. <i>Advances in Nursing Science</i>, 11(3), 25-32.</li> <li>2. Solomon, M. Z. (2005). Realizing bioethics' goals in practice: Ten ways "is" can help "ought". <i>Hastings Center Report</i>, 35(4), 40-47.</li> </ol>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Scanned Pdf</li> <li>2. <a href="http://0-onlinelibrary.wiley.com.darius.uleth.ca/doi/10.1353/hcr.2005.0048/epdf">http://0-onlinelibrary.wiley.com.darius.uleth.ca/doi/10.1353/hcr.2005.0048/epdf</a></li> </ol>
<b>3 Code of ethics</b>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Canadian Nurses Association (2008). <i>Code of Ethics for Registered Nurses</i>, Ottawa, ON: Canadian Nurses Association</li> <li>2. Storch, J. (2008). Codes of ethics: Aspirational or regulatory? <i>Canadian Journal of Nursing Leadership</i>, 21(2), 31-33.</li> <li>3. Eriksson, S., Hoglund, A. T., &amp; Helgesson, G. (2008). Do ethical guidelines give guidance? A critical examination of eight ethics regulations. <i>Cambridge Quarterly of Healthcare Ethics</i>, 17(1), 15-29.</li> </ol>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. <a href="http://cna-aic.ca/~media/cna/page-content/pdf-fr/code-of-ethics-for-registered-nurses.pdf">http://cna-aic.ca/~media/cna/page-content/pdf-fr/code-of-ethics-for-registered-nurses.pdf</a></li> <li>2. <a href="http://0-www.jstor.org.darius.uleth.ca/stable/pdf/27903323.pdf?acceptTC=true&amp;jpdConfirm=true">http://0-www.jstor.org.darius.uleth.ca/stable/pdf/27903323.pdf?acceptTC=true&amp;jpdConfirm=true</a></li> <li>3. <a href="http://0-journals.cambridge.org.darius.uleth.ca/action/displayFulltext?type=1&amp;fid=1512276&amp;jid=CQH&amp;volumeId=17&amp;issueId=01&amp;aid=1512272">http://0-journals.cambridge.org.darius.uleth.ca/action/displayFulltext?type=1&amp;fid=1512276&amp;jid=CQH&amp;volumeId=17&amp;issueId=01&amp;aid=1512272</a></li> </ol>
<b>4 Utilitarianism Deontology</b>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. McNaughton, D., &amp; Rawling, P. (1993). Deontology and agency. <i>Monist</i>, 76(1), 81-101.</li> <li>2. Deontological ethics</li> <li>3. Kant's moral philosophy</li> <li>4. The history of utilitarianism</li> <li>5. Mills moral and political philosophy</li> <li>6. Ayers, L. (1989). Implications of utility and deontology for the clinical nurse specialist. <i>Clinical Nurse Specialist</i>, 3(3), 109-112.</li> </ol>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. <a href="http://0-www.jstor.org.darius.uleth.ca/stable/pdf/27903323.pdf?acceptTC=true&amp;jpdConfirm=true">http://0-www.jstor.org.darius.uleth.ca/stable/pdf/27903323.pdf?acceptTC=true&amp;jpdConfirm=true</a></li> <li>2. <a href="http://plato.stanford.edu/entries/ethics-deontological/">http://plato.stanford.edu/entries/ethics-deontological/</a></li> <li>3. <a href="http://plato.stanford.edu/entries/kant-moral/">http://plato.stanford.edu/entries/kant-moral/</a></li> <li>4. <a href="http://plato.stanford.edu/entries/utilitarianism-history/">http://plato.stanford.edu/entries/utilitarianism-history/</a></li> <li>5. <a href="http://plato.stanford.edu/entries/mill-moral-political/">http://plato.stanford.edu/entries/mill-moral-political/</a></li> <li>6. Scanned PDF</li> </ol>
<b>5 Research</b>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Hurst, S. A. (2008). Vulnerability in research and health care: Describing the elephant in the room? <i>Bioethics</i>, 22(4), 191-202.</li> <li>2. Miller, T., &amp; Boulton, M. (2007). Changing constructions of informed consent: Qualitative research and complex social worlds. <i>Social Science &amp; Medicine</i>, 65(11), 2199-2211.</li> </ol>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. <a href="http://0-search.ebscohost.com.darius.uleth.ca/login.aspx?direct=true&amp;db=rzh&amp;AN=2009893780&amp;site=ehost-live&amp;scope=site">http://0-search.ebscohost.com.darius.uleth.ca/login.aspx?direct=true&amp;db=rzh&amp;AN=2009893780&amp;site=ehost-live&amp;scope=site</a></li> <li>2. <a href="http://0-www.sciencedirect.com.darius.uleth.ca/science/article/pii/S0277953607004340">http://0-www.sciencedirect.com.darius.uleth.ca/science/article/pii/S0277953607004340</a></li> <li>3. <a href="http://0-search.ebscohost.com.darius.uleth.ca/login.aspx?direct">http://0-search.ebscohost.com.darius.uleth.ca/login.aspx?direct</a></li> </ol>

	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>3. Fouka, G., &amp; Mantzorou, M. (2011). What are the major ethical issues in conducting research? Is there a conflict between the research ethics and the nature of nursing? <i>Health Science Journal</i>, 5(1), 3-14.</li> <li>4. Rubin, S. L. (2014). The clinical trials nurse as subject advocate for minority and culturally diverse research subjects. <i>Journal of Transcultural Nursing</i>, 25(4), 383-387.</li> </ol>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>4. <a href="http://0-tcn.sagepub.com.darius.uleth.ca/content/25/4/383.full.pdf+html">=true&amp;db=rzh&amp;AN=2011270066&amp;site=ehost-live&amp;scope=site http://0-tcn.sagepub.com.darius.uleth.ca/content/25/4/383.full.pdf+html</a></li> </ol>
<b>6 Practice</b>		
<b>7 Feminist</b>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Feminist ethics</li> <li>2. Little, M. O. (1996). Why a feminist approach to bioethics? <i>Kennedy Institute of Ethics Journal</i>, 6(1), 1-18</li> <li>3. Lindemann Nelson, H., &amp; Lindemann Nelson, J. (1996). Justice in the allocation of health care resources: A feminist account. In S. M. Wolf (Ed) <i>Feminism &amp; bioethics: Beyond reproduction</i> (pp. 351-370). New York, NY: Oxford University Press.</li> <li>4. Bjorklund, P. (2004). Invisibility, moral knowledge and nursing work in the writings of Joan Liaschenko and Patricia Rodney. <i>Nursing Ethics</i>, 11(2), 110-121.</li> </ol>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. <a href="http://plato.stanford.edu/entries/feminism-ethics/">http://plato.stanford.edu/entries/feminism-ethics/</a></li> <li>2. <a href="https://muse-jhu-edu.login.ezproxy.library.ualberta.ca/journals/kennedy_institute_of_ethics_journal/v006/6.1little02.html">https://muse-jhu-edu.login.ezproxy.library.ualberta.ca/journals/kennedy_institute_of_ethics_journal/v006/6.1little02.html</a></li> <li>3. Scanned PDF</li> <li>4. <a href="http://0-nej.sagepub.com.darius.uleth.ca/content/11/2/110.full.pdf+html">http://0-nej.sagepub.com.darius.uleth.ca/content/11/2/110.full.pdf+html</a></li> </ol>
<b>8 Distributive justice</b>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. John Rawls</li> <li>2. Braveman, P., &amp; Gruskin, S. (2003). Defining equity in health. <i>Journal of Epidemiological Community Health</i>, 57, 254-258.</li> </ol>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. <a href="http://plato.stanford.edu/entries/rawls/">http://plato.stanford.edu/entries/rawls/</a></li> <li>2. <a href="http://jech.bmj.com/content/57/4/254.full.pdf+html">http://jech.bmj.com/content/57/4/254.full.pdf+html</a></li> </ol>
<b>9 Social justice</b>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Beauchamp, D. E. (2007). "Community": the neglected tradition of public health. <i>Hastings Center Report</i>, 15(6), 28-36.</li> <li>2. Gostin, L. O. (2001). Public health, ethics, and human rights: a tribute to the late Jonathan Mann. <i>The Journal of Law, Medicine &amp; Ethics</i>, 29(2), 121-130.</li> <li>3. Haigh, F. (2002). Human rights approach to health. <i>Croatian Medical Journal</i>, 43(2), 166-169</li> <li>4. Human rights</li> <li>5. Austin, W. (2001). Using the human rights paradigm in health ethics: The problems and the possibilities. <i>Nursing Ethics</i>, 8(3), 183-195.</li> <li>6. Gostin, L. O., &amp; Powers, M. (2006). What does social justice require for the public's health? Public health ethics and policy imperatives. <i>Health Affairs</i>, 25(4), 1053-1060.</li> </ol>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. <a href="http://0-www.jstor.org.darius.uleth.ca/stable/pdfplus/3563066.pdf">http://0-www.jstor.org.darius.uleth.ca/stable/pdfplus/3563066.pdf</a></li> <li>2. <a href="http://0-onlinelibrary.wiley.com.darius.uleth.ca/doi/10.1111/j.1748-720X.2001.tb00330.x/pdf">http://0-onlinelibrary.wiley.com.darius.uleth.ca/doi/10.1111/j.1748-720X.2001.tb00330.x/pdf</a></li> <li>3. <a href="http://www.cmj.hr/2002/43/2/11885041.htm">http://www.cmj.hr/2002/43/2/11885041.htm</a></li> <li>4. <a href="http://plato.stanford.edu/entries/rights-human/">http://plato.stanford.edu/entries/rights-human/</a></li> <li>5. <a href="http://0-nej.sagepub.com.darius.uleth.ca/content/8/3/183.full.pdf+html">http://0-nej.sagepub.com.darius.uleth.ca/content/8/3/183.full.pdf+html</a></li> <li>6. <a href="http://0-search.proquest.com.darius.uleth.ca/docview/204643078/C231D8379A384152PQ/20?accountid=12063">http://0-search.proquest.com.darius.uleth.ca/docview/204643078/C231D8379A384152PQ/20?accountid=12063</a></li> </ol>
<b>10 Discussion facilitation</b>		

<b>11 Public health</b>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Childress, J. F., Faden, R. R., Gaare, R., D, Gostin, L. O., Kahn, J. Bonnie, R., J. et al (2002). Public Health ethics: mapping the terrain. <i>Journal of Law Medical Ethics</i>, 30(2), 170-178.</li> <li>2. Cohen, J., Kass, N., &amp; Beyrer, C. (2007). Human rights and public health ethics: responding to the global HIV/AIDS pandemic. In C. Beyrer &amp; H.F. Pizer (Eds.), <i>Public Health and Human Rights: Evidence-based Approaches</i>, chp 15. Baltimore, Maryland: Johns Hopkins University Press</li> <li>3. Wikler, D. I. (1978). Persuasion and coercion for health: Ethical issues in government efforts to change life-styles. <i>Milbank Memorial Fund Quarterly</i>, 56(3), 303-338.</li> <li>4. Public Health Ethics</li> </ol>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. <a href="http://onlinelibrary.wiley.com/darius.uleth.ca/doi/10.1111/j.1748-720X.2002.tb00384.x/pdf">http://onlinelibrary.wiley.com/darius.uleth.ca/doi/10.1111/j.1748-720X.2002.tb00384.x/pdf</a></li> <li>2. Scanned PDF</li> <li>3. <a href="http://www.jstor.org/darius.uleth.ca/stable/3349651?seq=1#page_scan_tab_contents">http://www.jstor.org/darius.uleth.ca/stable/3349651?seq=1#page_scan_tab_contents</a></li> <li>4. <a href="http://plato.stanford.edu/entries/publichealth-ethics/">http://plato.stanford.edu/entries/publichealth-ethics/</a></li> </ol>
<b>12 Policy</b>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Upshur, R. E. (2002). Principles for the justification of public health intervention. <i>Canadian Journal of Public Health</i>, 93(2), 101-103.</li> <li>2. Jennings, B. (2007). Health policy in a new key: Setting democratic priorities. In R. Bayer, L.O.Gostin, B. Jennings, &amp; B. Steinbock (Eds.), <i>Public health ethics: Theory, policy, and practice</i>, pp. 231-245, New York, NY: Oxford Press.</li> <li>3. Cole, P. (1995). The moral basis for public health interventions. <i>Epidemiology</i>, 16(1), 78-83.</li> </ol>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. <a href="http://tinyurl.com/d8fzach">http://tinyurl.com/d8fzach</a></li> <li>2. Scanned PDF</li> <li>3. Scanned PDF</li> </ol>