

UNIVERSITY OF LETHBRIDGE
FACULTY OF HEALTH SCIENCES
PUBH 3850 – CANADIAN HEALTH CARE SYSTEM
Course Syllabus – Summer I 2014

Instructor: Chad Witcher, PhD
Assistant Professor, Public Health
Office: M3049, Markin Hall
Office phone: (403) 332-4439
Fax: (403) 329-2668
Email: chad.witcher@uleth.ca
Office hours: By appointment (email is preferred method of contact)

Course Description and Objectives

PUBH 3850, Canadian Health Care System, presents a historical overview of the development of Canadian “Medicare,” describes the major organizational and functional components of Pan-Canadian health care, outlines health care expenditures and funding, and examines health care reform. Although in-depth comparisons with other countries are beyond the scope of the course, course content will include some information on health care systems outside of Canada, particularly with respect to the U.S. health care system.

Goals

Upon completing this course, students should:

1. Understand the fundamentals of the health care system in Canada, including its history, structure and major components.
2. Recognize and understand some of the major issues facing Canada’s health care system and be able to critically evaluate them.
3. Be familiar with various initiatives focused on health care reform within Canada.
4. Be able to identify, understand and discuss a range of issues related to health care administration and delivery within Canada

Course Format

Classes will take place in room TH204 (Turcotte Hall) from 9:00AM to 11:50AM (MST) on Tuesdays & Thursdays, beginning May 8th, 2014 and ending June 19th, 2014 (please see course schedule on page 12).

Course objectives will be achieved through a combination of lectures, class discussion, group presentations, online postings and written assignment. As necessary, supplementary materials will be posted to the Moodle webpage and/or distributed by email.

Required Texts

1. Thompson, V. D. (2010). *Health and Health Care Delivery in Canada*. Toronto, ON: Elsevier.
2. Armstrong, P., & Armstrong, H. (2010). *Wasting Away: The Undermining of Canadian Health Care* (2nd ed.). Don Mills, ON: Oxford University Press.

Optional Text

Armstrong, P., & Armstrong, H. (2010). *About Canada: Health Care*. Black Point, NS: Fernwood Publishing.

Evaluation

Your final grade will be based upon your performance on the following (please note values and exam dates/due dates):

1. *Mid-term Exam (20%)* – June 3, 2014
2. *“SICKO” Documentary Assignment (20%)* – Due on June 10, 2014 at 9:00AM MST
3. *Group Presentation (20%)* – Due at the beginning of the appropriate class
Please Note: All presentation materials must be submitted to the instructor for review at least 24 hours prior to the due date. Failure to adhere to this policy will result in a reduction of the final grade for this portion of the evaluation.
4. *Online Posts/Commentary (10%)* – Due on Mondays at Noon MST
5. *Final Exam (30%)* – Tuesday, June 24, 2014; 9:00AM-11:00AM in TH204

Grading Breakdown

The grading system for this course is consistent with that established in the Faculty of Health Sciences, effective May, 2002:

Letter	GPA	Percent	Letter	GPA	Percent
A+	4.0	95 - 100%	C+	2.3	71 - 74.9%
A	4.0	91 - 94.9%	C	2.0	67 - 70.9%
A-	3.7	87 - 90.9%	C-	1.7	63 - 66.9%
B+	3.3	83 - 86.9%	D+	1.3	59 - 62.9%
B	3.0	79 - 82.9%	D	1.0	55 - 58.9%
B-	2.7	75 - 78.9%	F	0	0 - 54.9%

Evaluation Guidelines

1. *Mid-term Exam* (20% of final grade):

The exam will consist of various types of short answer as well as essay questions, based upon all materials covered and assigned from May 8 to May 29.

2. *"SICKO" (2007) Documentary Assignment* (20% of final grade):

This assignment requires viewing the documentary *Sicko* (2007) produced by Michael Moore. Although we will view and discuss the documentary in class on May 29, it is recommended that students review the documentary on his or her own time to aid in the preparation of the assignment. The documentary can be accessed online (<http://topdocumentaryfilms.com/sicko/>) as well as via the U of L Library (DVD).

The objective of this assignment is to select a point made about the health care system of the U.S. or another country by Michael Moore, and write a brief paper that provides arguments to support or refute this point by using empirical evidence (4 pages double-spaced maximum, excluding title page and references). For example, a point in the documentary is made regarding hospitals turning patients away in the U.S. One could agree that this is an issue in the U.S. and find evidence to support this or, alternatively, disagree and find evidence to refute.

Your paper should include a brief introduction and conclusion but the majority of your paper should demonstrate why you agree or disagree with the point made in the documentary:

- Is this, or is this not, the actual case?
- Here is evidence that demonstrates it is, or is not.

Structurally, begin your paper with a brief introduction that introduces the point made in the documentary, present a clear statement of whether you agree or disagree with that point, present convincing arguments for or against that are supported by empirical evidence, and finish with a brief conclusion.

3. *Group Presentation* (20% of final mark):

Each student is required to participate in a group presentation. These will occur on May 15, May 22, June 5, June 12 and June 19. The objective of these presentations is to expand upon the issues and trends presented in Chapter 10 of the Thompson text. More specifically, the intent is to provide students with the opportunity to explore and synthesize material pertaining to the following topics within the current Canadian health care context:

1. Mental Health
2. Human Health Resources (Shortage of Nurses and Doctors, Nurse/Doctor Recruitment)
3. Home and Continuing Care
4. Drug Coverage
5. Wait Times (including ER wait times) and Access to Medical Care
6. Aboriginal Health Care
7. Going Electronic (Electronic Health Records)
8. Primary Health Care
9. Prevention, Health Promotion and Public Health (*not specifically addressed in Chapter 10*)

Responsibilities:

Reform has been recommended at the federal and provincial/territorial levels for all topics listed above. Therefore, each group will deliver a presentation (approximately 30 minutes in length) which addresses the following:

- What is the background to the issue, what is the actual issue, and what is its significance?
- Were specific recommendations made by specific committees, bodies, etc.?
- What progress has been made with respect to this issue and what is the status of current reform initiatives within Canadian jurisdictions/provinces/territories?
- Are there future initiatives planned?

Each group will be evaluated as follows (out of a total of 20% of the course):

- Group's performance (graded out of 15)
- Evaluation of group member(s) (graded out of 5) based upon the following scale:
 - 0 = No contribution
 - 1 = Contributed the bare minimum
 - 2 = Contribution exceed the bare minimum but inadequate in most areas
 - 3 = Contribution adequate but lacking in one or more areas
 - 4 = Contribution almost met expectations
 - 5 = Contribution met or exceeded expectations

Please submit your evaluation via email no later than on the subsequent Monday at noon.

4. *Online Posts/Commentary* (2 x 5% of final grade):

Articles to facilitate class discussion have been assigned to classes on May 13, May 20, May 27, June 10 and June 17 (please see: "Discussion Readings" on page 13). Twice during the term, each student must post a comment based upon his or her reading of an article

assigned to a particular class. Students can choose to submit his or her two comments at any point during the term within the following guidelines:

- Each commentary focuses on a different assigned article
- The maximum number of student posts per topic is five
- Each commentary must be submitted by noon on the preceding Monday. In other words, if you intend to make a comment on an article associated with week 3, you must submit your commentary by noon on Monday, May 19th.

Students are to provide a brief synopsis of the article and outline what he or she believes are the main/key points of the article, relate the information presented to the respective class topic and provide at least one question to stimulate in-class discussion.

Students' commentary will serve as the "jumping off point" for class discussion. Therefore, students should be prepared to elaborate on his or her post.

5. Final Exam (30% of final grade):

The final exam will consist of various types of short answer as well as essay questions, based upon all materials covered in the course.

Grading Rubrics¹

Documentary Assignment

Ideas

A-range: Excels in responding to assignment. Interesting, demonstrates sophistication of thought. Topic and purpose/objective is clearly and concisely introduced. Central idea and/or position is clearly communicated throughout; limited enough to be manageable. Coherent expression and communication of ideas. Appropriate operationalization of terms where appropriate.

B-range: A solid paper responding appropriately to assignment. Some minor improvements required in terms of topic development, communication of central idea and articulation of position. May benefit from additional operationalization of terms.

C-range: Adequate paper but significant restructuring required in terms of introducing the topic, topic development and the communication of the central idea throughout the paper. Lack of operationalization of terms when appropriate.

¹Adapted for PUBH 3850 based upon rubric from the UC Davis English Department Composition Program

D-range: Minimally adequate paper with significant restructuring required in majority of areas.
F: Paper does not meet the objectives of the assignment.

Support

A-range: Uses evidence appropriately and effectively, providing sufficient evidence and explanation to convince the reader. Evidence provided draws upon empirical, scholarly works and peer-reviewed literature.

B-range: Appropriate and effective use of evidence for the most part, but would benefit from additional citations and/or higher quality evidence in some sections.

C-range: Additional evidence required. Arguments/position need(s) strengthening and the quality of evidence used is sometimes below the assignment's expectations.

D-range: Significant improvement required with respect to the articulation of one's argument/position. Additional evidence also required. Quality of evidence often below the assignment's expectations.

F: Major problems in all areas, including little to no use of appropriate evidence.

Organization & Coherence

A-range: Uses a logical structure appropriate to paper's topic and purpose. Contains an introduction/description which clearly and effectively sets up the paper as well as a conclusion which flows logically from the content of the paper. Clear articulation of arguments presented in a logical and coherent manner. Sophisticated transitional sentences often develop one idea from the previous one or identify their logical relations. Writing guides the reader through the chain of reasoning or progression of ideas.

B-range: Shows a logical progression of ideas and uses fairly sophisticated transitional devices (e.g., may move from least to most important idea). Some additional logical links may be required, but each paragraph clearly relates to paper's central idea. Introduction and Conclusion sections as well as one or more arguments may require minor editing.

C-range: Adequate structure but difficult to follow the logic of one or more ideas or arguments. Would benefit from significant editing with respect to usage of transitional devices and a more clear articulation of how the information relates to the paper's topic and purpose. Introduction and Conclusion sections may also require editing.

D-range: Minimally adequate structure with poor idea/argument development. Significant restructuring required to improve transitions. Ineffective introduction and conclusion sections.

F: Major problems throughout; ideas/arguments are very difficult if not impossible to follow. Poorly structured sections throughout.

Style and Mechanics

A-range: Adherence to APA style (6th ed.) with few or no formatting errors. Proper sentence structure. Sentences are varied, yet clearly structured and carefully focused, not long and rambling. Paper is easy to read/follow. Almost, or entirely free of spelling, punctuation, and grammatical errors.

B-range: Some APA style/formatting issues as well as minor issues with sentence structure. May also contain some run-on sentences and/or poorly developed paragraphs and some instances of spelling, punctuation and grammatical errors.

C-range: Numerous APA style/formatting issues as well as run-on sentences and poorly developed paragraphs/sentences. Numerous spelling, punctuation and grammatical errors.

D-range: Significant issues with respect to readability – numerous APA style/formatting errors and awkward sentences as well as poorly developed paragraphs and numerous spelling, punctuation and grammatical errors.

F: Major issues with respect to readability which render the document very difficult if not impossible to read and/or follow.

Group Presentation

A-range: Well organized presentation that is interesting, engaging and relevant. Presentation offers a comprehensive overview of the topic and thorough treatment of pan-Canadian reform.

B-range: Solid presentation but may require additional information to enhance comprehensiveness with respect to the nature of the topic and/or reform progress. May also require minor changes to enhance clarity and/or relevance of ideas presented.

C-range: Adequate presentation but requires significant changes to improve the comprehensiveness of the information presented as well as the clarity of communication.

D-range: Substantial changes required to most/all aspects of the presentation.

F: Failure to address the objectives of the presentation.

Online Posts/Commentary

A-range: Thoughtful posting which effectively, and concisely, captures the article's key points and clearly articulates the relevance within the context of the weekly topic. Question(s) raised exhibits critical thinking and reflection.

B-range: Solid posting but may require minor improvements with respect to its articulation of the key points and/or explanation of relevance. The question(s) posed may also lack critical insight.

C-range: Adequate post but requires significant improvement in one or more required elements.

D-range: Substantial improvement required in most/all aspects.

F: Post does not address the objectives of the assignment.

General Guidelines and Information

Expectations and Etiquette

Students are expected to attend all classes, arrive on time and stay for the duration of each class. If a student must leave before the end of class, he or she must inform the instructor prior to the start of class. Students are also expected to be active participants in the class and are encouraged to take part in all class discussion. The use of laptop/notebook computers and tablets is permitted for course-related activities. However, the use of these and all other portable electronic devices for any other reason during class time is prohibited unless a student has received special consent from the instructor. Students violating this policy may be asked to leave the classroom.

Note Regarding Email Messages

Do not assume a message has been received until you receive a confirmation response from the instructor. Please use your uleth account for all correspondence.

Written Work

Papers should be prepared in APA style (6th edition) with headings, in-text citations and a complete reference list. Your cover sheet must contain the following: Title, name(s) with ID number(s) and affiliation. Please use one-inch margins and a 12-point font throughout. Assignments and other written work are to be submitted electronically via the Moodle "Assignment" tool. Please submit documents as .rtf, .doc or .docx files.

Before submitting a paper to your instructor, be sure to consider the following elements (preferably, have a peer evaluate the paper for these elements):

- Clear statement of objectives
- Clear development of arguments
- Convincing and appropriate summary/conclusion
- Adequate and appropriate referencing
- Correct spelling and grammar (use a computer spell-check to help)
- 12-point font (as seen here) with one-inch margins all around
- Page numbering
- Usage of direct quotes (use very sparingly)
- Proper referencing (no first names or initials in text (e.g., John Smith))
- Please avoid relying on textbooks or other articles for interpretation – always go to the original source

Students are strongly encouraged to access services offered by the Academic Writing Centre (see below), as a high proficiency in academic writing is expected from all students.

The Academic Writing Centre
L1006A, Library
4401 University Drive
Lethbridge, Alberta T1K 3M4
Phone: 403-394-3963
Email: writing.centre@uleth.ca

Problems Submitting Assignments

The inability to submit an assignment by the deadline due to technological difficulties on the student's part (e.g., problems with the student's computer or internet access) is not a valid reason for late submission. In such a situation, the student must: (1) inform the instructor (via phone or email) about the difficulties experienced prior to the deadline, and (2) either fax the assignment to the instructor or drop it off in the instructor's mailbox prior to the deadline. Failure to submit the assignment prior to the deadline will result in penalty for late submission.

Late Assignments and Missed Exams

Papers that do not arrive on time will be subject to a penalty of five **marks** for the first day and two **marks/day** each day thereafter. A late paper that is submitted more than 6 days after the deadline will not be accepted. Students may hand in assignments late or be excused from an exam without penalty due to extraordinary circumstances only (i.e., valid health concern or bereavement) and provided the instructor receives the appropriate documentation as defined by the university calendar prior to the due date of the assignment or date of exam. Students

not submitting term work or who miss exams without a valid reason will receive a zero for that part of the course grade.

Students who cannot write final examinations for reasons beyond their control may request alternative scheduling from the Dean of Health Sciences. However, the instructor will refuse requests related to scheduling conflicts due to previously scheduled flights, trips, etc. All students are required to be available on the day of the final exam, which was set prior to the beginning of the course.

Support

A variety of services are available to support students' well-being via Counselling Services. Please visit www.uleth.ca/counselling for more information. Counselling Services is located in Turcotte Hall (TH218).

Phone: 403-317-2845

Email: counselling.services@uleth.ca

Plagiarism Statement

The University of Lethbridge 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. Students must be able to submit both electronic and hard copy versions of their work upon request.

To aid in the prevention of instances of plagiarism, students have been granted use of the Turnitin website to check their written work prior to submission. Please access the website, create an account and log on with the following credentials:

Class ID: 8018794

Enrollment Password: PUBH3850

Student Discipline

Students in the course are subject to the student discipline policy for academic and non-academic offenses in accordance with the University Calendar.

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 at 403-329-2766 (<http://www.uleth.ca/ross/counselling/index.html>) to set up an appointment. 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.

Copyright Statement

All University of Lethbridge students, faculty and staff must comply with Canadian law and institutional license agreements pertaining to copyright. At the same time, keeping abreast of our copyright obligations and options is a complex task as copyright matters locally and globally are in flux and are likely to remain so for at least the near future.

The University's Copyright website (www.uleth.ca/copyright) is a source of current copyright information that includes:

- answers to common copyright questions (see the [FAQs](#)),
- guidance on whether you need permission or a license to copy a particular work (see the [Copyright Permissions Flow Chart](#)),
- guidance on assessing whether fair dealing may apply to specific instances of copying you wish to undertake (see the [Guidelines for Copying under Fair Dealing](#)), and
- a [permissions look-up tool](#) to help you determine the kinds of copying and other uses permitted by the Library's license agreements covering specific online journals and other online resources.

You are encouraged to contact the University Copyright Advisor (copyright@uleth.ca) for assistance with any copyright questions or issues.

Course Schedule

Topics	Assigned Readings
WEEK 1 <u>May 8</u> Introductions, course overview and “warm-up”	
WEEK 2 <u>May 13</u> History of Health Care in Canada <u>May 15</u> 1. Mental Health 2. Health Human Resources (Shortage of Nurses and Doctors, Nurse/Doctor Recruitment)	Thompson Chapter 3 Week 2 Discussion Reading
WEEK 3 <u>May 20</u> Federal Government’s Role in Health Care <u>May 22</u> 1. Home and Continuing Care 2. Drug Coverage	Thompson Chapter 4 Week 3 Discussion Readings
WEEK 4 <u>May 27</u> Provincial and Territorial Governments <u>May 29</u> In-class documentary: “SICKO”	Thompson Chapter 5 Week 4 Discussion Reading
WEEK 5 <u>June 3</u> Mid-term Exam <u>June 5</u> 1. Wait times (including ER wait times) and Access to Medical Care 2. Aboriginal Health Care	
WEEK 6 <u>June 10</u> Dollars and “Sense” of Health Care Funding “SICKO” Documentary Assignment due <u>June 12</u> 1. Going Electronic (Electronic Health Records) 2. Primary Health Care	Thompson Chapter 6; A & A Chapter 5 Week 6 Discussion Reading
WEEK 7 <u>June 17</u> Practitioners and Practice Settings <u>June 19</u> 1. Prevention, Health Promotion and Public Health	Thompson Chapter 7; A & A Chapters 3 & 4 Week 7 Discussion Reading

Discussion Readings

Week 2 (History of Health Care in Canada):

Laidlaw, J. M. (1963). From one who left Saskatchewan. *Canadian Medical Association Journal*, 88, 100.

Week 3 (Federal Government's Role in Health Care):

1. Bailey, I. & Curry, B. (2011, December 19). In surprise move, Flaherty lays out health-spending plans til 2024. *The Globe and Mail*. Retrieved from <http://www.theglobeandmail.com>
2. Canadian Broadcasting Corporation (2012, January 16). Peter Mansbridge talks with Stephen Harper [Interview Transcript]. Retrieved from <http://www.cbc.ca/news/politics/transcript-peter-mansbridge-talks-with-stephen-harper-1.1192774>
3. Bailey, I. & Curry, B. (2011, December 19). Flaherty's 10-year health-care plan divides provinces. *The Globe and Mail*. Retrieved from <http://www.theglobeandmail.com>

Week 4 (Provincial and Territorial Governments):

Kleiss, K. (2014, February 12). First Nations leaders call for better health services on reserves: 'We're Albertans too.' *Edmonton Journal*. Retrieved from <http://www.edmontonjournal.com>

Week 6 (Dollars and "Sense" of Health Care Funding):

Shaw, R. (2013, January 18). B.C. spends little on health wellness and prevention, says watchdog John Doyle. *Times Colonist*. Retrieved from <http://www.timescolonist.com>

Week 7 (Practitioners and Practice Settings):

Collier, R. (2012). Medically necessary: How to decide? *Canadian Medical Association Journal*, 184(16), 1771-1772. doi: 10.1503/cmaj.109-4316