**Ethics Work-up 2**

Due: Friday, 11/18 by 4pm; upload to Canvas

In .doc or .pdf format

**Instructions for Work-up 2**

1. Read Case Study B below and complete the Ethics Work-up. The Complete Ethics Work-up guide can be found at the bottom of “Assignments and Grading” on the digital syllabus.

2. You will find the grading rubric immediately following the case study below.

3. Copy each step of the rubric into your document (.doc or .pdf).

4. Place all your responses in bullet point lists under each rubric step, rather than paragraphs

5. Upload to Canvas by 11/18, 4pm

**Case Study B: Pediatric Ethics**

Ashley was born in 1997 with a severe brain impairment of unknown cause, which is termed a “static encephalopathy” because it has not and will not improve. Although she sleeps, awakens, and breathe on her own, she is unable to raise her head, sit up, hold an object, walk, or talk. She also must be tube-fed. Nonetheless, Ashley is alert and responsive to her environment, particularly enjoying the music of Andrea Bocelli. Her parents have nicknamed Ashley “pillow angel” because she always remains where she is placed, which is usually on a pillow.

When Ashley was 6 ½ years old, she began to show signs of puberty and her parents and doctors began to anticipate a variety of issues common in children with severe neurological impairments. As these children grow larger, it takes more strength to move them and provide basic bodily care, raising the risk of pressure sores from immobility. In addition, precocious puberty is common in children with various forms of severe brain damage. The early appearance of secondary sexual characteristics (such as breasts, menstruation, etc.) is often distressing to parents and caretakers. Many parents of severely disabled children explore possible ways to avoid having to deal with menstruation and fertility in a diapered child.

Ashley’s parents request a hysterectomy (to prevent menstruation), surgical removal of nascent breast buds (to prevent continued development), and estrogen therapy through dermal patches (to speed up the natural closure of her growth plates so that Ashley does not keep growing larger and more difficult to move). Make an ethically justified argument for whether the clinicians should grant the parents’ request.

Background: this is an actual case from Seattle, Washington. Because the case was public, no facts were changed. Source: Baylor College of Medicine

*Grading rubric on next page*

**Ethics Work-up 2 Grading Rubric (60 points total)**

*For this Work-up, please copy each step into your document and put all your responses in bullet point lists under that step, rather than paragraphs. Upload completed file (.doc, .pdf).*

*Please see details on each appeal can be found in the Complete Ethics Work-up Guide (*at the bottom of “Assignments and Grading” on the digital syllabus*).*

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Task** | **Points possible** | **Points earned** | **Notes/Feedback** |
| **Step 1.** Identify relevant facts of the case and any additional information you want to know. | **8** |  |  |
| **Step 2.** Identify the available alternate courses of action.  *\*You are welcome to number/letter your options; however, please describe the options substantively when evaluating with appeals. If you only use “option A” when evaluating, I quickly lose the meaning.* | **4** |  |  |
| **Step 3.** Assess each available alternative from the perspective of the relevant ethical appeals.  *Under your paragraph response of each appeal (except appeal A), put a bullet point list of normative ethical theories (and particular concepts/commitments of those theories) that inform your analysis.*  *Also, try to use as many bioethical terms (beneficence, paternalism, external constraint, among several others) in your analysis.*  A. Appeal to established legal and professional standards  *\*no normative theories needed for this appeal* | **4** |  |  |
| B. Appeal to autonomy (a) decision-making autonomy, and (b) fundamental rights to confidentiality, honesty, control over one’s health/body, be free of interference, etc. | **8** |  |  |
| C. Appeal to consequences (serious and far-reaching, irreversible, probable) | **8** |  |  |
| D. Appeal to virtues;  name/explain at least 2 (compassion, respect, integrity, self-sacrifice, courage, honesty, or others) | **4** |  |  |
| E. Appeal to justice (marginal patients, issues of rights and access related to fairness, libertarian, egalitarian, or basic decent minimum and other considerations) | **8** |  |  |
| F. Appeal to special obligations name/explain at least 2  (to vulnerable patients, to those lacking decision-making capacity, for patient’s family’s decisions, moral/religious constraints, for legitimate self- interest and professional integrity.) | **6** |  |  |
| **Step 4.** Make a considered decision with the first three steps (minimum) s you would attempt   * state clear reasons based on your assessment of appeals for assigning priority to one course of action over another. * state a critique of your decision and respond to that critique * *ensure you note which two normative theories inform your judgment most with a brief explanation of why* | **8** |  |  |
| **Step 5.** Identify steps that might have been taken to prevent the ethical challenge(s) that arose in this case. | **2** |  |  |