

Subject Description Form

Subject Code	APSS6403														
Subject Title	Health Care Ethics														
Credit Value	3 (Compulsory)														
Level	6														
Pre-requisite / Co-requisite/ Exclusion	Nil														
Objectives	To develop students' ability in critical appraisal of bioethical concepts and theories for their application to ethical discourse on biomedical and health care issues														
Assessment Methods	<table border="1" style="width: 100%; border-collapse: collapse;"> <thead> <tr> <th style="text-align: left;">100% Continuous Assessment</th> <th style="text-align: center;">Individual Assessment</th> <th style="text-align: center;">Group Assessment</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>1. Reaction Paper</td> <td style="text-align: center;">25%</td> <td style="text-align: center;">--</td> </tr> <tr> <td>2. Seminar Presentation</td> <td style="text-align: center;">--</td> <td style="text-align: center;">25%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>3. Individual Paper</td> <td style="text-align: center;">50%</td> <td style="text-align: center;">--</td> </tr> </tbody> </table> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The final grade is calculated according to the percentages assigned; • The completion and submission of all component assignments are required for passing the subject; and • Student must pass all the components if he/she is to pass the subject. 			100% Continuous Assessment	Individual Assessment	Group Assessment	1. Reaction Paper	25%	--	2. Seminar Presentation	--	25%	3. Individual Paper	50%	--
100% Continuous Assessment	Individual Assessment	Group Assessment													
1. Reaction Paper	25%	--													
2. Seminar Presentation	--	25%													
3. Individual Paper	50%	--													
Intended Learning Outcomes	<p>Upon completion of the subject, students will be able to:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> a. evaluate how ethical theories offer divergent understandings of the central values that frame health care and bioethical discourse b. critically appraise the contemporary issues in biomedical and health care ethics, taking into account the context of technological and social changes, and the challenges of moral pluralism c. articulate the relevant knowledge and skills needed to critically analyze and assess normative positions taken on the biomedical and health care issues at local, regional, and international levels d. justify their ethical viewpoints in ethical argumentation on specific biomedical and health care issues by adopting global and cross-cultural perspectives 														

<p>Subject Synopsis/ Indicative Syllabus</p>	<p>Conceptualization of ethical issues and approaches to ethical decision making in different moral theories: Kantian obligation-based ethics, utilitarian consequence-based ethics, libertarian right-based ethics, feminist care ethics, agent-based virtue ethics, Chinese Confucian ethics.</p> <p>Ethical argumentation: the ability to identify the issues at stake in health care and bioethics, and how the issues are presented at local, regional, and international levels; the ability to critically assess arguments and positions; the ability to carefully and clearly articulate ethical issues; and draw on rival moral theories to examine competing ethical justifications in moral reasoning, to defend one's own moral position and to engage in consensus formation.</p> <p>Global and cross-cultural perspectives on ethical discourse of specific biomedical and health care issues are explored, such as genetic engineering, reproductive technology, human experimentation, complementary and alternative medicine, life-sustaining treatment in end-of-life care, euthanasia, health resource rationing.</p>																																							
<p>Teaching/Learning Methodology</p>	<p><u>Lecture</u></p> <p>They are conducted to examine and critically appraise the concepts and theories of ethics as applied to health care.</p> <p><u>Seminar</u></p> <p>Case studies and problem-based triggers will be used for engaging students in clarifying their ethical viewpoints and articulating ethical argumentation. Students would critically evaluate one's own performance and to constructively criticize peers' performance in the seminar.</p>																																							
<p>Assessment Methods in Alignment with Intended Learning Outcomes</p>	<table border="1" data-bbox="516 1062 1518 1503"> <thead> <tr> <th rowspan="2">Specific assessment methods/tasks</th> <th rowspan="2">% weighting</th> <th colspan="4">Intended subject learning outcomes to be assessed (Please tick as appropriate)</th> </tr> <tr> <th>a</th> <th>b</th> <th>c</th> <th>d</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>1. Reaction paper</td> <td>25</td> <td>✓</td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> </tr> <tr> <td>2. Seminar presentation</td> <td>25</td> <td>✓</td> <td>✓</td> <td>✓</td> <td>✓</td> </tr> <tr> <td>3. Individual paper</td> <td>50</td> <td>✓</td> <td>✓</td> <td>✓</td> <td>✓</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Total</td> <td>100</td> <td colspan="4"></td> </tr> </tbody> </table> <p><u>Reaction paper</u></p> <p>Students will be assessed on their ability to appreciate how ethical theories offer divergent understandings of the central values that frame health care and bioethical discourse</p> <p><u>Seminar presentation</u></p> <p>Students will be assessed on their ability to engage in ethical discourse with peers</p>						Specific assessment methods/tasks	% weighting	Intended subject learning outcomes to be assessed (Please tick as appropriate)				a	b	c	d	1. Reaction paper	25	✓				2. Seminar presentation	25	✓	✓	✓	✓	3. Individual paper	50	✓	✓	✓	✓	Total	100				
Specific assessment methods/tasks	% weighting	Intended subject learning outcomes to be assessed (Please tick as appropriate)																																						
		a	b	c	d																																			
1. Reaction paper	25	✓																																						
2. Seminar presentation	25	✓	✓	✓	✓																																			
3. Individual paper	50	✓	✓	✓	✓																																			
Total	100																																							

	<p><u>Individual paper</u></p> <p>Students will be assessed on their ability to deliberate, analyse, articulate, and critique contemporary issues in biomedical and health care ethics by taking into account of competing theories and multi-cultural perspectives.</p> <p>Notes:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The final grade is calculated according to the percentage assigned; • The completion and submission of all component assignments are required for passing the subject; and • Student must pass all the components if he/she is to pass the subject. 	
<p>Student Study Effort Expected</p>	<p>Class contact:</p>	
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Lecture 	<p>25 Hrs.</p>
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Seminar 	<p>14 Hrs.</p>
	<p>Other student study effort:</p>	
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Extensive reading 	<p>60 Hrs.</p>
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Seminar presentation and written assignment 	<p>60 Hrs.</p>
	<p>Total student study effort</p>	<p>159 Hrs.</p>
<p>Reading List and References</p>	<p>Indicative Reading List:</p> <p>Beauchamp, Tom L. & Childress, James F. (2013). <i>Principles of Biomedical Ethics</i>. (7th edition). New York: Oxford University Press.</p> <p>Cohen, Michael H. (2003). <i>Future Medicine</i>. Ann Arbor: The University of Michigan Press.</p> <p>Davis Anne J., Tschudin V., & de Raeye L. (eds) (2006). <i>Essentials of Teaching and Learning in Nursing Ethics: Perspectives and Methods</i>. Edinburgh: Churchill Livingstone/Elsevier</p> <p>Dickenson, D., Huxtable, R., & Parker, M. (2010). <i>The Cambridge Medical Ethics Workbook: Case Studies, Commentaries, and Activities</i> (2nd edition), Cambridge; New York: Cambridge University Press.</p> <p>Engelhardt, H.T. (1996) <i>The Foundations of Bioethics</i> (2nd edition). New York: Oxford University Press.</p> <p>Fan, RP (ed.) (1999). <i>Confucian Bioethics</i>. Dordrecht: Kluwer Academic Publishers.</p> <p>Gilligan, C., Ward, J., Taylor, V., McLean, J., Bardige, B. (1988). <i>Mapping the Moral Domain: A Contribution of Women's Thinking to Psychological Theory and Education</i>. USA: Harvard University Press.</p>	

	<p>Hope, Tony (2004). <i>Medical Ethics: A Very Short Introduction</i>. Oxford: Oxford University Press.</p> <p>May, W.F. (2001). <i>Beleaguered Rulers: The Public Obligation of the Professional</i>. Louisville, KY: Westminster John Knox Press.</p> <p>Pang, Samantha MC. (2003). <i>Nursing Ethics in Modern China: Conflicting Values and Competing Role Requirements</i>. Amsterdam-New York: Rodopi.</p> <p>Sandel, Michael J. (2007). <i>The Case against Perfection: Ethics in the Age of Genetic Engineering</i>. Cambridge, MA & London: The Belknap Press.</p> <p>Tao, Julia Lai PW (Eds.). (2002). <i>Cross-cultural Perspectives on the (Im)Possibility of Global Bioethics</i>. Boston, Mass.: Kluwer Academic Publishers.</p> <p>Ten Have, Henk A.M.J. & Sass, H-M (eds.) (1998). <i>Consensus Formation in Healthcare Ethics</i>. Dordrecht: Kluwer Academic Publishers.</p> <p>Velleman, J. David. (2015). <i>Beyond Price: Essays on Birth and Death</i>. Cambridge: Open Books Publishers.</p>
--	--