



**TO ENHANCE MORAL REASONING
AND
IMPROVE CRITICAL DECISION-MAKING
IN ENVIRONMENTAL HEALTH©**

**Prepared for
Concordia University of Edmonton
ENVH 523
(Spring 2016)**

Prepared & Delivered by
E-sinc®
Glenn Wm. Sinclair, Inc.
Suite #1500, 10180 - 101 Street
Edmonton, Alta., T5J 4K1
(780) 974-9220
gws@e-sinclair.com

Copyright 2016

MODULE I

I. INTRODUCTION to the SEMINAR

The Course OBJECTIVES:

- 1) *That potential Environmental Health Officer's (EHO's) recognize moral dilemmas and their impact in the worlds of Environmental Health.*
- 2) *To create an experience for those involved in Environmental Health whereby they gain new skills at handling the challenges of ethical decision-making.*
- 3) *Improve an EHO's ability to use the differences in stages of moral reasoning to improve productive working relations with facility operators, politicians, teammates, and others who impact their daily tasks.*

note #1: For purposes of this course **the terms ethical and moral will be interchangeable**. It should also be noted that the purpose of this seminar is not to make you more moral or ethical but to enhance your ability to reason through moral/ethical problems!.

note #2: There are three primary formats for holding discussions in the class: **round-table** — when each person will provide comments, input &/or feedback in an orderly fashion, and the invitation of the prof; **crossfire** — moderated within the group itself, comments and questions will go back and forth among the participants (the prof will only intervene if he determines too few are dominating the process; **conversation** — this is directed toward the prof, but often initiated by questions, queries or concerns raised by group members.

Professorial Overview

• Why I'm even interested in this stuff!?

I tend to think along the same lines as my professional colleague Peggy Connolly:

We are confronted on a daily basis with ethical dilemmas...Should a parent leave a sick child alone or stay at home with the child and risk losing the job that provides health insurance? Is it morally permissible to pay protection money to stay in business and provide for one's family? Is it ethically acceptable to create a child to be a donor for another? Whether deliberative or unconscious, satisfying or distressing, decisions about moral issues are ubiquitous in daily life, affecting choices & behaviour in public & private spheres...¹

¹ *Ethics in Action: a Case-based Approach*, Connolly, Peggy et al, Wiley-Blackwell (2009) p.1

Intelligent, reasonable and deeply caring individuals hold diametrically opposing & mutually exclusive perspectives. We continue to be challenged to find ways to acknowledge others' perspectives respectfully, and to honour those who hold them, even when it is not possible to accommodate their positions...²

Despite the prevalence of ethical challenges in daily life, few people have had training in moral reasoning...Still, today, although students who enroll in ethics classes may be exposed to ethical theory, they may have limited opportunities for examining its practical application to the complexities of everyday moral situations...³

Understanding moral issues is difficult. People often fail to recognize moral dilemmas and, when they do, are uncertain how to respond. No single set of ethical principles encompasses all the dimensions & complexities of moral challenges for all people in all places at all times...perceptions of & responses to ethical dilemmas may be skewed by the conflict between moral interests & self interest.⁴

• **Why I teach it!?**

• **Where else I use it!?**

² *Ibid* p. 1 & 2

³ *Ibid* p. 2

⁴ *Ibid*

For those who say there is no time or place in the real world of business, industry and government for the study of ethics (i.e. leave it to all the *do-gooders*), let me ask you then:

- **why not start a business in baby stomping? (particularly for welfare babies)**
- **why not put every unemployed &/or developmentally challenged person to work in the army front lines (send them to the Ukraine or Syria/Iraq as part of NATO's forces)?**
- **why not make all drugs and prostitution legal, like alcohol & gambling, and simply tax it?**

So you think these are all too much OFF THE WALL?!?

Well, here's one from the *Centre for Disease Control (CDC)* in Atlanta (Georgia, USA)...

An American, after undergoing a preliminary test, appears to have TB. If so, it probably is not a serious case; nevertheless, he is asked to stick close by (i.e. in his city) until more intense testing is analysed and a complete diagnosis is possible. While awaiting the results, the man leaves for a social event in Italy. The CDC's *environmental health division (EHA)* then determines that while a full quarantine might not be necessary they nevertheless, should not have released him so quickly as there is the possibility of infecting others and he may have a serious lapse in his own health and therefore they request that he return to hospital. They cannot locate him.

CDC then discovers he has left the country although they are not sure exactly how (they suspect by airline) and to where they are unsure as well (Italy does not come immediately to mind). They decide to contact all the airlines that fly from Atlanta to Europe and the feedback eventually convinces them that he flew on one (1) of two (2) possible days and likely on one (1) of three (3) possible flights. None of the flight crews, nor central office reservation teams, can confirm exactly where he would have sat if he did go on their flight (these discount airlines did not have reserve seating).

CDC then decides to make a public announcement requesting that anyone sitting near a white man (of particular dimensions and features) on a recent flight (on these specific days) to either Paris, Dublin or Rome please contact their office. When this doesn't bring forth many clues (and certainly no response from their patient) the question is then raised whether they should request the passenger lists and contact the people directly...

In the interim, information is relayed to media in the prospective locales where the individual might be visiting requesting their assistance in finding him and having him get in touch with CDC. Then the results come back and there is confirmed evidence of a minor health issue although it is not contagious. At the same time they finally make contact with the individual. Arrangements are made for his return...

Working at your *pre-set table*, analyse this case according to the questions below and prepare to present to the full group...

- What (and by who) are the ethical dilemmas that are raised in this scenario?

- Which is the most serious ethical dilemmas facing the EHA officials?

- Where, if at all, are the airlines facing ethical dilemmas in this scenario?

- Why do you think these dilemmas emerged in the first (1st) place?

FULL CLASS *Roundtable Conversation...*

The Participants

(Individually)

Prepare a mini-bio (*see next page*) which includes:

- name (underline or indicate how you prefer to be addressed)
- e-mail address (both now and in early August should it be different)
- snail mail (postal) address + phone number (for any mailings I may have to make)
- where are you on your *learning journey*? & why?
- what you intend to do with your degree (when you get it)?
- what uniqueness(es) will you contribute to this course?

NOTE: Don't forget to complete the DIT-1⁵

(Roundtable)

- what do we (individually + collectively) hope to gain from the experience of this course?

- why do we think a course on ethical reasoning has been included in this professional program?

- ***And, provide one [1] idea/characteristic/aspiration you would like to be remembered for? (i.e. your legacy!!)***

⁵ An assessment tool to determine one's stage(s) of moral reasoning developed by the late James Rest, University of Minnesota based on the original paradigm by the late Lawrence Kohlberg of Harvard University. The results have no bearing on your grade in this course.

PLEASE PRINT LEGIBLY!!

Name: _____

_____ E-Mail

who am I/where have I come from?

where am I in my *learning journey*? & why?

what do I intend to do with the degree I hope to gain?

for now, what uniqueness(es) will I contribute to this course?

[**note:** turn this page in to the prof]

- b) Let's discuss how the marks for this course should be determined given the three (3) factors/influences in our current *learning journey*.

- _____ % — **prof** (minimum is **80%**)
- _____ % — **peer assessment:** (i.e. for small group/team work)
- _____ % — **self-evaluation:** (i.e. how well did I meet my own learning goals)

- c) Questions, points of departure, statements of enhancement...?

- d) Before we look at one of our own cases, let's reflect on the idea of *Bounded Ethicality*... (from the Ethics Unwrapped series)

What might one [1] example be in our own lives to date that we may have seen, witnessed or actually committed ourselves?

Now let's examine one of our own cases...

II. Case Study #1: Family vs. Profession

You are a bio-chemist working for the National Research Council in Ottawa, having obtained both an Honours B.Sc. from U of Calgary and an M.Sc. from U of Saskatchewan and worked for a time with the provincial Ministry of Environment in Manitoba. You are on summer vacation visiting your brother, who left a very successful career in banking and moved his family into the Selkirk Mountains of B.C. where they have poured their time, energy and entire life savings (\$\$\$) into the recent purchase, renovation and subsequent re-opening of a large, historic resort hotel in a small town renowned for its allegedly curative hot springs.

Being a TYPE A personality, you become bored and decide to show their grade six (6) daughter (your niece) environmental techniques she could use for a science fair project. The first task is to test the water in the springs. You learn, much to your surprise, that it is very high in a derivative of strontium, a mineral in this particular chemical form that has recently been suspected to raise the possibility of birth defects when in contact with the skin of pregnant women.

Team Challenge (Small group listings are in **Addendum A**)

- ***What do you do with your suspicions?***

- ***To what extent should family be a factor in your decision?***
- ***To what degree is the fact your niece is involved an issue?***

- ***What is your final decision?***

Prepare a presentation for the full group...

Video Vignette: *Ethics Unwrapped...*

Self-serving Bias...

- what does this vignette say to us?
- how might it be a useful reminder in our work?

NOTE: Make sure you've turned in you bio page + the completed D.I.T.

III. The RATIONAL USE of LOGICAL REASONS — THE LECTURE: *Stages in our Critical Thinking*

[for a comprehensive understanding go to the prof's web-site www.e-sinclair.com
in the Research Section — read the paper: *Kohlberg through the Sinclair Prism*]

Have We Got the Cart Before the Horse

Cognitive-Developmental Approach

cognitive because it recognizes that moral education, like intellectual education, has its basis in stimulating the *active thinking* of the individual about moral issues and decisions.

developmental because it seems the aims of ethical reasoning is movement through moral stages.

A person can not get to moral action if s/he is incapable of moral thought.

What are the Preliminary Questions?

- *What is it that makes me think a particular decision is better?*
- *How does a critical decision most consistently get justified when I reflect back on it?*
- *Why do I think I am (or am not) facing an ethical dilemma?*

The Dewey Concept {with influences off/from Piaget}

No Vacuum Here Awareness {with influences of Ralph Moser}

Don't Touch ME with that Moral Stuff!!

It's a tool to get us to more Justice & Caring...

The Basic Paradigm

PRE-CONVENTIONAL

Stage One (1) — the punishment & obedience orientation. The physical consequences of action determine its goodness or badness, regardless of the human meaning or value of these consequences. Avoidance of punishment and unquestioning deference to power are valued in their own right, not in terms of respect for an underlying moral order supported by punishment and authority (the latter being Stage Four).

Stage Two (2) — the instrumental-relativist orientation. Right action consists of that which instrumentally satisfies one's own needs and occasionally the needs of others. Human relations are viewed in terms like those of the marketplace.. Elements of fairness, of reciprocity, and of equal sharing are present, but they are always interpreted in a physical, pragmatic way. Reciprocity is a matter of *you scratch my back and I'll scratch yours*, not loyalty, gratitude or justice,

CONVENTIONAL

Stage Three (3) — the interpersonal concordance or good boy/nice girl orientation. Good behaviour is that which pleases or helps others and is approved by them. There is much conformity to stereotypical images of what is majority or *natural* behaviour. Behaviour is frequently judged by intention — *he means well* becomes important for the first time. One earns approval by being *nice*.

Stage Four (4) — the law & order orientation. There is orientation towards authority, fixed rules and the maintenance of the social order. Right behaviour consists of doing one's duty, showing respect for authority, and maintaining the given social order for its own sake.

POST-CONVENTIONAL

Stage Five (5) — the social-contract, legalistic orientation, generally with utilitarian overtones. Right action tends to be defined in terms of general individual rights and standards which have been critically examined and agreed upon by the whole society. There is a clear awareness of the relativism of personal values and opinions and a corresponding emphasis upon procedure rules for reaching consensus. This is the *official* morality of the government & constitution.

Stage Six (6) — the universal-ethical-principle orientation. Right is defined by the decision of conscience in accord with self-chosen *ethical principles* appealing to logical comprehensiveness, universality and consistency. These principles are abstract and ethical (the *Golden Rule*, the categorical imperative); they are not concrete moral rules like the *Ten Commandments*. At heart, these are universal principles of *justice*, of the dignity of human beings as *individual persons*.

Evolution of the Research...

- stages are *structured wholes* or organized systems of thought; individuals are *consistent* in level of moral judgment;
- stages form an *invariant sequence*, under all conditions except extreme trauma, movement is always forward, never backward; individuals never skip stages — movement is always up to the next stage;
- stages are *hierarchical integrations*, thinking at a higher stage includes or comprehends within it lower-stage thinking; there is a tendency to function at or prefer the highest stage possible.

Not IQ — Yet Structured...

The stage or structure of a person's moral judgment defines:

- **what he finds valuable in each of these moral issues**
- **why he finds it valuable**

However, mature moral judgment is not a sufficient condition for mature moral action. One cannot follow moral principles if one does not understand (or believe in) moral principles. However, one can reason in terms of principles and not live up to these principles.

- **moral judgment, while only one factor in moral behaviour, is the single most important or influential factor yet discovered in moral behaviour**
- **while other factors influence moral behaviour, moral judgment is the only distinctively *moral* factor in moral behaviour**
- **more judgment change is long-range and irreversible: a higher stage is never lost; moral behaviour as such is largely situational and reversible or *loseable* in new situations.**

Other Approaches:

character education — the *bag of virtues*

values clarification — *no right answer*

In terms of moral discussion, the important conditions appear to be:

- exposure to the next higher stage of reasoning;
- exposure to situations posing problems and contradictions for the individual's current moral structure, leading to dissatisfaction with the current level;
- an atmosphere of interchange and dialogue combining the first two conditions, in which conflicting moral views are compared in an open manner.

How do we become better at Moral Decision-Making? The opportunity is here...

A central question remains: *does the learner (i.e. you) want to make better decisions when facing ethical dilemmas*

- | | | |
|-------|-------------------------------------|---|
| (i) | <i>punishment and obedience -</i> | fear |
| (ii) | <i>the attempt to make a deal -</i> | you scratch my back, I'll scratch yours! |
| (iii) | <i>let's try to get along -</i> | nice person image |
| (iv) | <i>law and order -</i> | show me the rules! |
| (v) | <i>social contract -</i> | I have an obligation to you |
| (vi) | <i>universal principles -</i> | I believe!! |

[Review the *stages schematics* **handout**]

Another way to explore this is to look at the stages in terms of the question of **the value of human life**. Here are examples of each stage of reasoning:

- Level 1 *The value of human life is confused with the value of physical objects and is based on social status or physical attributes of the possessor.*
- Level 2 *The value of human life is seen as instrumental to the satisfaction of the needs of its possessor, or of other persons.*
- Level 3 *The value of human life is based on the empathy and affection of family members and others towards its possessor.*
- Level 4 *Life is conceived as sacred in terms of its place in a categorical, moral, or religious order of rights and duties.*
- Level 5 *Life is valuable in terms of its relation to community welfare and in terms of life being a universal right.*
- Level 6 *Belief in the sacredness of human life as representing a universal human value of respect for the individual.*

Once you become comfortable with the various stages and more adept at determining the levels at which others predominately operate from, then you can adjust the level(s) you choose to use when attempting to mediate or resolve a dilemma resulting primarily from the behaviour of others. However should you believe that your own behaviour and/or the thinking that supports it is inadequate or insufficient for the challenges/tasks at hand, then it is incumbent to refine your own level(s) of moral reasoning. If your present disposition is to use level four (4) reasoning, start to reformulate your arguments at a level five (5).

For personal reflection...

- **Does this make your decision-making better (in your view)?**

- **Is there more comfort with the rationale?**

- **Does the resultant action(s) more consistently match your thinking?**

- **Do you see an improved articulation of your approach to ethical dilemmas?**

- **Is the moral dilemma more easily recognized?**

- **Ought it to be more readily addressed?**

- **Do you think you would be more effective in moments of crisis?**

IV. The MORAL DILEMMA:

How do we reason through the critical moments in our managerial decision-making:

- **when both choices are equally distasteful or desirable?**
- **do we see such moments as the beginnings of ethical dilemmas?**
- **do we believe there are more (and/or less) rational approaches to be used?**
- **if there are tools that could assist, would we use them?**
- **and if so, would we want our subordinates also to have access to them?**

These questions help form the backdrop to this exercise. The entire course is oriented to analysis and application of a tool to enhance your capabilities to resolve the critical ethical dilemmas occurring in the managerial domain.

Some examples

- *A situation where an individual's personal integrity & judgment is challenged AND a choice must be made even though it is painful + the situation is uncertain (least adverse effect). [earlier ENVH 523 class]*
- *A moral dilemma is when there is an internal conflict between what you believe is right & the difficult consequences you are faced with. [earlier ENVH 523 class]*
- *Professional ethics is the application of moral standards and ideas of the good life to the intentions, actions, technologies and goals/targets used in the professional world [Wexler]*
- *Having to make a decision based on choice that challenge your core belief & integrity, none-the-less the morally right decision may lead to unpleasant consequences creating grey areas. [earlier ENVH 523 class]*
- *A situation where a decision needs to be made between two (or possibly more) equal & conflicting options, the outcome of which will result in a painful solution! [earlier ENVH 523 class]*
- *Professional ethics is that particular branch of applied ethics which seeks to describe the moral standards in use in professional practices and to prescribe effective ways to change, raise or alter these moral standards. [Wexler]*
- *A conflict where an individual is forced to make a choice in which their reasoning is challenged and there is often a trade-off between the consequences to oneself & the consequences imposed on others. [earlier ENVH 523 class]*
- *A moral dilemma is an internal conflict between two (2) equal choices/options that must be made but the consequence is painful. [earlier ENVH 523 class]*

A. *Introductory Individual Brainstorm:*

- What is a dilemma?
- How does one come to a decision when neither choice is acceptable?
- Or, when both are equally desirable?

List all relevant components of what you think would be included in a definition of a *moral/ethical dilemma*.

B. *Small Group Discussion* (Part I):

{initial pairings will start at the pre-set tables}

Focus on establishing, through consensus, a mutually acceptable definition (it is permissible to start with one of the examples and improve/enhance it).

C. *Small Group Discussion* (Parts II & III):

- (i) A second (2nd) round whereby Groups are now paired off: two (2) small groups will merge and attempt to combine their two (2) definitions into one (1) single definition.

- (ii) The third round (3rd) repeats the process...merging into a single definition

D. *Full Class Presentations:*

Each super-group will present and explain their definition.

- (iii) Produce a collective consensus statement for use as a *working definition* for and throughout this Seminar (it can be a modified version of the above given definition or a considerably different statement).

V. **SPECIAL ASSIGNMENT: *Additional Queries Part 1***

{see Addendum A for your designated group}

- In your small group prepare a **presentation** on your designated **query**.

Query A

You are in middle management in the Dept of Health and have an irksome employee. He is tardy, often absent, produces rather substandard work, and continually creates histrionic scenes calling attention to himself as an indispensable contributor. You have the opportunity to pass this employee over to another office within your Department (but out of the city) by writing a glowing recommendation. The employee in question is eager for the transfer as it will involve a raise in pay and increased responsibilities.

Do you temper your remarks, write a glowing letter, and rid yourself and your work group of this problem?

Query B

As a newly promoted Health Inspector in Edmonton, you have rented an apartment in a major complex in Sherwood Park, which is not located in your inspection area. However, you do know the landlord as you have had professional dealings with him regarding other properties, which you have inspected in St. Albert. After having lived in the apartment for a couple of months, you start to have a problem with mice. You complain to the landlord who immediately brings over traps and tries to determine how the mice are entering your apartment. Happy that the landlord is dealing with the situation, you are shocked when your neighbouring tenant(s) accuse(s) you of using your position to get your complaint dealt with. Unknown to you, they have been complaining for weeks & months to the landlord about the same issue.

In talking to the Department Head, she suggests organizing a meeting of all tenants (away from the apartment) whereat you will document all complaints and then turn it over to the Inspector for the area. In talking with two of your classmates, they both suggest that you go directly to the landlord and tell him that provided he undertakes a major pest eradication program for each tenant within a week, you will not have him written up with a citation (and court date).

What do you do? Where or how can this be most quickly brought to resolution?

Query C

As a recently appointed EHO, you go to inspect a restaurant and discover there is a temperature violation in one of the refrigerators (7 degrees, Celsius). The operator indicates that he can't do much about this because the fridge is frequently used (door opened & closed often) and so the issue is unavoidable.

The restaurant operator has a reputation for always trying to make a deal whenever he can (especially when he thinks he can cut corners). You know of one previous occasion when he offered to cater, for free, a former EHO's kid's birthday party if a certificate of health was issued. You have been asked to help a charity golf tournament by arranging the food...

Would you ignore this violation if he will do the catering for the tournament or insist that the problem be fixed? Explain your decision:

Presentations & Critiques...

A)

B)

C)

Video Vignette: Concepts Unwrapped...

Intro to Behavioural Ethics...

- why do you think you were shown this now?
- from your experiences to date, who should be shown this video?

VI. Conversations around dealing with the world out there...

(A) THOUGHTS ABOUT Moral Smugness...

{A Guest Lecturer who has done considerable research in *ethics & decision-making*, particularly in the public and not-for-profit sectors, including studies involving the examination of the potential for *moral smugness* particularly in post-conventional moral reasoning, will present additional insights for dealing with ethical dilemmas and getting successfully through the moment of critical choice. In addition to the presentation, there will be an opportunity for questions and conversation with the guest.}

(B) THOUGHTS ABOUT COWBOY ETHICS...

{refer to the *backgrounder* provided in advance of the course}

Preliminary Reflection... (individual brain-storming)

What is James Owen's stage of *moral reasoning* in **Cowboy Ethics**? (Examples?)

In the Author's NOTE James Owen makes the following comments:

*Not so many years ago, the denizens of Wall Street inspired awe and envy. We were **masters of the universe** and had the numbers to prove it. But after a wave of scandals exposed a dark side of the industry, I found myself mourning what had been lost. I could only wonder: **How did we get to this sorry state? When did we stop caring about our principles and the well-being of our clients? And most importantly, how could we begin to redeem ourselves and earn back the trust of investors and regulators?** Our malady was so deep-rooted that I could see no cure.*

- What is Owen getting at?



- How does it resonate with your journey to get a degree in Environmental Health?

In your designated groups {see Addendum A}, refer to the assigned questions on pages one [1] through seven [7] contained in the document **Thoughts about Cowboy Ethics**. Prepare brief responses that can help lead the class to an effective connection between the text, the *Sinclair/Kohlberg Paradigm* and the course as it attempts to apply ethics to the role(s) of the *Environmental Health Officer (EHO)*.

All groups address the first two [2] questions on *page 1 of 7*.

CE-1: bullet at bottom of *page 1 of 7*, question/point ii) at the top of *page 5 of 7*, question/point b) on *page 6 of 7*

CE-2: first three [3] bullets on *page 2 of 7*

CE-3: last two [2] bullets on *page 2 of 7*, question/point iii) on *page 5 of 7*

CE-4: first two [2] bullets on *page 3 of 7*, question/point iv) on *page 5 of 7*

CE-5: last two [2] bullets on *page 3 of 7*, question/point v) at bottom of *page 5 of 7*

CE-6: first three [3] bullets on *page 4 of 7*

CE-7: question/point i) at the bottom of *page 4 of 7*, question/point a) at top of *page 6 of 7*, the *final analysis* question at the bottom of *page 6 of 7*

Each team should then review the four [4] bullets on *page 7 of 7* and prepare a comprehensive response from the perspective of an EHO...that is:

- think of bullet two [2] as *instilling public health team values*
- in bullet three [3] think, *transforming our profession...*
- the others are fairly straight forward

(C) Case Study #2 The Idealistic Professional!!

It is important to recognize that in the process of reasoning through an ethical dilemma, the stages upon which a person predominately builds rational arguments to resolve that dilemma are most likely to be reflected in those situations that affect the individual immediately, in the questions of *home and work*. **This case study allows you to see the development and growth of ethical reasoning in one individual, as well as quite well defined stages of moral reasoning of other characters that, in their interaction, help &/or hinder the development the central character's stage(s) of ethical reasoning.**

While viewing the full length version of the rather intriguing movie *The Firm*⁶ be prepared to identify two [2] major moral dilemmas during the film: indicate the levels of moral reasoning used by the characters involved and whether or not the dilemma was resolved, and why!

As well, **there are a number of scenes to pay particular attention to:**

- a) During the recruiting of Mitch McDeere (Tom Cruise) the Managing Partner reveals how he knew what to offer: *what is your first reaction to this information?*

- b) Discussing the offer with his wife Abby, Mitch says *Did you ever think I'd make a six-figure salary?* — what was her reply, and what does that tell you about her?

⁶ *The Firm*, a film by Sydney Pollack, released in 1993 by Paramount Pictures as a John Davis/ Scott Rudin/Mirage Production starring Tom Cruise, Jeanne Tripplehorn, Ed Harris, Holly Hunter, Hal Holbrook & David Strathairn.

- c) Why do you think the firm selected Avery (Gene Hackman) to be McDeere's mentor? In what ways did he help McDeere grow in *ethical reasoning*?

- d) What did Abby mean when she said there is a difference between being upset and being scared? And, a little later, why did she reply to Mitch's *I want to give you everything you gave up*, with the comment: *Stop it! Just bring flowers*?

- e) The trip to the Cayman Islands comes early in the story, and the Islands play a recurring role throughout the story: does this have anything to do with Abby's earlier comment *It's not for me — it's not even for you!?* And, why do you think that Mitch would immediately go and visit his brother after returning for the first time?

- e) After the visit to Washington, Mitch then met with the *inner circle* at the firm: was this a form of confession? or Step One in coming to grips with the fact that *your life as you know it is OVER*?

- d) During the dinner scene on the day of the Bar Exam reception, Abby said: *You can't promise me anything anymore!* What did she mean and was she right? How valid was Mitch's comment: *I couldn't stand you not knowing*?

- c) When the *inner circle* met with Avery after the discovery that Mitch had a brother who was a felon, what was the reasoning behind the need to have such information? Why wasn't Avery more concerned?

- b) When Mitch starts down his journey on the *over-billing problem*, what are his reasons? And what stage level is he operating at?

- a) What level of reasoning says: *You did the cheating, I'm the one that feels guilty*?

- a) Avery's comments at the school yard (*I take rejection well*) and his little speech at the Hyatt in the Caymans tell you what about his reasoning stage level?

- b) How do you rationalize Mitch's breaking into the computer codes, printing the information, and then taking it out of the firm? And, then his brutal beating of the Security Boss (Wilfred Brimley)?

- c) Forgetting the rather interesting screenplay between the Chicago boys and Mitch, consider the reasoning apparent in Mitch's comments: is there any evidence of change in stage level? And if so, is it an example of growth or simply a shift?

- d) What is your general assessment of the Senior Partner, Oliver Lambert (Hal Holbrook)? What stage level did he seem to reason at? Where did his emphasis on *family* fit in with all this? Where is his disconnect with *Cowboy Ethics*?

- e) What about Avery? Illustrate his level(s) of reasoning! Where did his recurring thoughts about marriage and his own love life fit in with all this?

- b+d) What stage(s) do you think Abby generally reasoned at? Illustrate:

- c+a+e) What stage(s) do you think Mitch generally reasoned at? Where are there transitions? In each case, who helps or hinders? At the conclusion of the story, where is he predominately reasoning, and will this become relatively constant? Explain &/or illustrate each of your responses:

- all groups) What was the *ultimate ethical dilemma* for Mitch & Abby? And, what stages did they use to get through it?

B..

Small Group Discussions...

Prepare a collective response to your designated questions and be prepared to present to the full class.

Full Class Conversation...

We will hear from various groups on the different questions and will then reflect/converse on the responses...

Concluding Roundtable

- In what ways/contexts is this entire approach to understanding and dealing with *ethical dilemmas* beginning to make sense?

- How might the reading of *Cowboy Ethics* have helped the characters in the Law Firm? In what way might we use both the book & our insights from the film to real-life situations when we face organizations and corporations in the communities we work within so that we end up with results that are more productive and easier to deal with?

VII. *Wrap-up to Module One [I] and other conversations...*

ASSIGNMENT for NEXT MODULE — *Individual Tasks...* (due: Day 1, Module Two [II])

***Case Study #3* You Don't Know Jack...**

An Examination of a Leader who slipped and fell...

{view *In It To Win* – available at www.EthicsUnwrapped.utexas.edu}

Referencing **Addendum B**, and the *chosen/assigned letter*, each student will choose two [2] (from four [4] listed vignettes) for the assigned tasks:

- Examine the behaviour of Jack in light of the two [2] vignettes you choose and determine how these illustrate critical ethical failures on his part.
- Reflecting on Jack's behaviour, identify at least three [3] lessons you learned and explain how you would incorporate these lessons into your professional practice to help ensure you choose an ethical practice and do not make the same ethical missteps or errors.
- Determine at least one aspect from your selected vignettes that has broader applicability to life beyond your profession and explain that connection in terms of your personal world.
- Your submission ought to include references to *Cowboy Ethics*, especially in your discussions of ways you intend to avoid Jack's missteps. You may also draw on examples provided in other cases discussed to date.
- Present the findings in a written {typed on paper or e-mailed in .pdf file} or audio/visual {DVD or USB} report to the professor at the outset to Module II.

NOTE #1: It is permissible to collaborate with one [1] or two [2] colleagues, but the report must clearly indicate who all worked together on the submission and identify the choices each individual made (i.e. if two [2] people work on the project, there must be four [4] vignettes chosen from the eight [8] listed; if three [3] work on the assignment, there must be six [6] chosen from the twelve [12] listed).

NOTE #2:

- The paper should be between three [3] and five [5] pages long *per participant* (with any citations contained within the text itself).
- If the assignment is in the form of an audio/visual presentation, it should be no more than six [6] minutes in length and no less than four [4] minutes, again on a *per participant* basis..

In addition, each individual will provide a written analysis of the following dilemma by answering the questions (the collective response should be no more than two [2] pages, bullets are permissible – but no team work on this aspect of the between-module tasks):

Plagiarism as an Issue in the Search for Creativity.

This incident involves a micro-biology course at the local university that has a reputation for being very difficult. It is an optional course, except for those going into *environmental health professions*. The professor is a veteran and his marking has not varied much in the past fifteen years: FIVE[5] major papers MUST be written DURING the term [emphasis mine].

A student in her graduating year took this course and wrote the first four [4] papers. When the time came to hand in the fifth [5th] paper, she had many other things to do in order to graduate. One of her friends had taken the course two years previously and still had her papers. The student asked her for one [1] of the papers, rewrote a few parts of it and handed it in, believing that the professor would never remember a paper that had been written that long ago, especially since many students take the course. Needless to say, the professor recognized the paper and he even recalled the name of the student who had originally written it.

- a) What should the professor do? Why?
- b) Suppose the set punishment for plagiarism is expulsion from school. Should the professor consider the fact that the student is about to graduate?
Explain:
- c) In what way(s) might the student who loaned the paper be guilty?
- d) Would you see either of these students as employment risks?
Explain:
- e) Would you want either of these students working on a research project for you?
Explain:

MODULE II

VII. Turn in Tasks from Module One [I]...

Case Study #3 **You Don't Know Jack...**

An Examination of a Leader who slipped and fell...

{view *In It To Win* – available at www.EthicsUnwrapped.utexas.edu}

Referencing **Addendum B**, and the *chosen/assigned letter*, each student will choose two [2] (from four [4] listed vignettes) for the assigned tasks:

- Examine the behaviour of Jack in light of the two [2] vignettes you choose and determine how these illustrate critical ethical failures on his part.
- Reflecting on Jack's behaviour, identify at least three [3] lessons you learned and explain how you would incorporate these lessons into your professional practice to help ensure you choose an ethical practice and do not make the same ethical missteps or errors.
- Determine at least one aspect from your selected vignettes that has broader applicability to life beyond your profession and explain that connection in terms of your personal world.
- Your submission ought to include references to *Cowboy Ethics*, especially in your discussions of ways you intend to avoid Jack's missteps. You may also draw on examples provided in other cases discussed to date.
- Present the findings in a written {typed on paper or e-mailed in .pdf file} or audio/visual {DVD or USB} report to the professor at the outset to Module II.

NOTE #1: It is permissible to collaborate with one [1] or two [2] colleagues, but the report must clearly indicate who all worked together on the submission and identify the choices each individual made (i.e. if two [2] people work on the project, there must be four [4] vignettes chosen from the eight [8] listed; if three [3] work on the assignment, there must be six [6] chosen from the twelve [12] listed).

NOTE #2:

- The paper should be between three [3] and five [5] pages long *per participant* (with any citations contained within the text itself).
- If the assignment is in the form of an audio/visual presentation, it should be no more than six [6] minutes in length and no less than four [4] minutes, again on a *per participant* basis..

In addition, each individual will provide a written analysis of the following dilemma by answering the questions (the collective response should be no more than two [2] pages, bullets are permissible – but no team work on this aspect of the between-module tasks):

Plagiarism as an Issue in the Search for Creativity.

This incident involves a micro-biology course at the local university that has a reputation for being very difficult. It is an optional course, except for those going into *environmental health professions*. The professor is a veteran and his marking has not varied much in the past fifteen years: FIVE[5] major papers MUST be written DURING the term [emphasis mine].

A student in her graduating year took this course and wrote the first four [4] papers. When the time came to hand in the fifth [5th] paper, she had many other things to do in order to graduate. One of her friends had taken the course two years previously and still had her papers. The student asked her for one [1] of the papers, rewrote a few parts of it and handed it in, believing that the professor would never remember a paper that had been written that long ago, especially since many students take the course. Needless to say, the professor recognized the paper and he even recalled the name of the student who had originally written it.

- a) What should the professor do? Why?
- b) Suppose the set punishment for plagiarism is expulsion from school. Should the professor consider the fact that the student is about to graduate?
Explain:
- c) In what way(s) might the student who loaned the paper be guilty?
- d) Would you see either of these students as employment risks?
Explain:
- e) Would you want either of these students working on a research project for you?
Explain:

Upon Reflection: An overview of *In It To Win...*

- What Stages of moral reasoning does Jack seem to use? And why?

- What was his most serious moral failing?

- What would you have done (if he was working for you) to ensure he acted ethically?

VIII. Conversations around dealing with your world of environmental health...**(A) Case Study #3: *Gilbane Gold***

{see Addendum C for your designated group}

Synopsis⁷

Gilbane Gold is the name given to dried sludge from the Gilbane wastewater treatment plant. It is sold to farmers as a commercial fertilizer. The annual municipal revenue generated saves the average family about \$300 a year in taxes. Several years ago the city of Gilbane established limits on the discharge of heavy metals to the sewers in order to protect *Gilbane Gold* from the build-up of toxic materials that could end up in the farmer's soil. These limits are ten (10) times more restrictive than Federal limits. However, the limits are based on the concentration of the discharge with no restrictions on total weight of material discharged.

Z CORP is a computer components manufacturer, which discharges wastewater containing small amounts of lead and arsenic into the city sewer system. By the current city test standards, the discharge usually meets the allowable levels for heavy metals. However, a newer test, known only to *Z CORP* environmental people, shows the discharge exceeds the city test standards. An ethical dilemma arise within *Z CORP* concerning whether to advise the city of the newer test. Acceptance of the newer test would require additional investment in clean-up equipment. **Tom Richards** is a *Z CORP* environmental engineering consultant who was fired for advocating the new test. Thereafter, **David Jackson**, an engineer working for *Z CORP*, goes public with his views. A television media investigation results.

Complicating the situation is the fact that *Z CORP* has just received a contract for five (5) times as many computer modules as they presently produce, albeit at a very thin profit margin. The increased production means five (5) times as much waste will be produced. The discharge concentration can be kept the same by adding five (5) times the amount of water, thus still meeting the existing city standards. The result, however, is that *Gilbane Gold* has five (5) times the amount of heavy metals in it as before. The *Z CORP* vice-president is opposed to changing the test standards as that would require additional investment in wastewater treatment equipment. This could cause *Z CORP* to lose money on the new contract. The VP contends that *Z CORP*'s responsibility is to provide jobs and a payroll and that the city should worry about the environment.

⁷ Excerpted from the **Study Guide for *Gilbane Gold***, National Institute for Engineering Ethics, Texas Tech University (1989)

Primary Questions (for all small groups to consider)

- Have any laws been broken? And, is this even relevant?
- What are the major ethical problems? Where are they linked to technical uncertainties?
- Where are the decision points (moments of critical choice) whereby the situation could have been resolved?
- When, in such moments, should you turn to your professional organization or at least to some of your professional colleagues?

Background Thoughts (for each group to reflect & utilize as necessary)⁸

The right course of action is usually clear when it is between *good & evil*. However, it is not unusual for Environmental Health officials to find themselves forced to choose between competing *goods*, rather than between *good & evil*. This scenario brings together the competing *goods* of:

- protection of human health and the environment (regulation and the spirit vs. the letter of the law)
- the quality of life and the welfare of people (jobs & taxes)
- personal integrity (view of self & living up to personal standards)
- free enterprise (profitability and competition in an international marketplace)

Key Players

David Jackson (young environmental engineer at Z CORP)

Maria Renato (Channel 13 Reporter)

Lloyd Bremen (farmer, also former commissioner for environmental protection)

Dr. Winslow Massin (professor emeritus at *Hanover University, School of Engineering*)

Phil Port (head of Z CORP's environmental affairs department)

Tom Richards (environmental engineering consultant)

Diane Collins (Z CORP Vice-President: in charge of plant)

Frank Seeders (Z CORP head of production)

Specific Challenges

Each group will analyse the case from the point-of-view of a particular individual or organization. The final *cross-fire* will attempt to determine what the proper/best/preferred resolution ought to be (and the goal of all teams will be to get to a solution, without the need of an independent mediator). The team that does the most to work towards a resolution and (if different) the team that actually brings the *crossfire* to conclusion will receive a bonus of up to three [3] marks towards the final marks of each participant.

⁸ *Ibid.*

GG-1: Maria Renato, Channel 13 Investigator

in addition to the primary questions noted above...

- explain your perception of the degree of fairness in the Channel 13 investigation?
- to what extent did all *sides* get adequate coverage?
- what level(s) of moral reasoning appear to be behind Maria's approach to the ethical challenges?
- in what ways did (or did not) Maria's work contribute to resolution of the major dilemma?

GG-2: Professor Emeritus Winslow Massin

in addition to the primary questions noted above...

- assess the *helpfulness* as well as the *goodness* of the retired professor's comments & advice?
- discuss the validity of his view(s) extolling a compromise between development and production of new products and the resultant impact on the environment (and by implication, environmental health)
- should the fact he is retired be considered in weighing his value (& even whether he should have been invited for comment at all)?
- what should his advice have been to David?
- what is his seeming level of moral reasoning?

GG-3: Lloyd Bremen (farmer & former commissioner for environmental protection)

in addition to the primary questions noted above...

- how proper is it for former officials to get involved in such events after they have retired?
- to what degree might he be a mediative force in this dispute as he both helped write the regulations and now, as a farmer, is a purchaser of Gilbane Gold?
- where might he be helpful to city officials in explaining the long term impacts of their decision-making in regards to encouraging industry while promoting Gilbane Gold?

GG-4: Phil Port, David Jackson's boss

in addition to the primary questions noted above...

- where was Phil Port's primary allegiance?
- to what extent, and in what instances, could he have facilitated a resolution to the dilemma?
- to what degree is he responsible for resolving the problems *Z CORP* seem to be creating (in other words, is this an environmental challenge or a production challenge or somewhere else??)
- what seems to be his level(s) of moral reasoning?

GG-5: Tom Richards, Consultant

in addition to the primary questions noted above...

- assess Tom's ethical conduct with respect to David Jackson?
- ...with respect to *Z CORP*, especially the environmental affairs department?
- ...with respect to Channel 13?
- what seems to be his level(s) of moral reasoning?

GG-6: Senior Z CORP Management (basically Diane & Frank)

in addition to the primary questions noted above...

- assess their conduct from the perspective of a *Z CORP* shareholder / a city taxpayer / a Gilbane Gold user
- what are their primary responsibilities — what are they being paid to do?
- what would be the advantages & disadvantages if they had pursued a policy of *maximum protection of the environment, whatever the cost*?
- because the company is meeting (or comes close to) the letter of the existing discharge law, to what extent does it have a greater responsibility to meet the philosophy or objective behind this law, which is currently flawed because it does not limit the mass of pollutants discharged or require the most advanced analytical technology in measuring toxic substances?

GG-7: David Jackson, the young environmental engineer

in addition to the primary questions noted above...

- what all might David have done during the development / evolution of this dilemma that could have averted it?
- what is your assessment of whether he should have *gone public* or *blown the whistle*?
- assess his decision to tell Channel 13 his side of the story *off the record* & how is *Z CORP* likely to react?
- what is the advice the *Z CORP* lawyer is likely to give?
- what advice would you give?

GG-8: The Moderators, (these individuals DO NOT appear in the video)

The challenge of the Moderators will be to help facilitate, as necessary (or as opportunity arise), the group coming to a consensus answer... The Moderators are not to run the cross-fire or even attempt to direct it; rather when either an impasse or a seemingly solution seems near, they can make suggestions to either individuals or the group as to possible ways to resolve the issue.

GG-7: The Peer Reviewers, (these individuals DO NOT appear in the video nor will they sit in the circle and participate in the resolution process)

This group will assist the professor in rating each team as to its efforts to get to solution while maintaining, for a time at least, their initial position.

Initial Presentations [Team Seating will form a large oval – all but GG-9 facing each other]

GG-3: Lloyd Bremen (farmer & former commissioner for environmental protection)

GG-7: David Jackson, the young environmental engineer

GG-6: Senior Z CORP Management (primarily **Diane & Frank**)

GG-5: Tom Richards, Consultant

GG-2: Professor Emeritus Winslow Massin

GG-4: Phil Port, David Jackson's boss

GG-1: Maria Renato, Channel 13 Investigator

*Cross-fire... **Who is right? Who makes the most sense? What ought to be the final outcome? How can we all get there?***

Remember: The *cross-fire* attempts to determine what the proper/best/preferred resolution ought to be (and **the goal of all teams will be to get to a solution**, without the need of an independent mediator). The team that does the most to work towards a resolution and (if different) the team that actually brings the *crossfire* to conclusion will receive a bonus of up to three [3] marks towards the final marks of each participant.

(B) Three Case Studies: Trying to be a better EHO!!

TASKS:

Step 1 — Individual Brainstorm....

(Before joining your designated group {see Addendum C}, re-read your assigned case and then make quick notes on the following questions.)

- what is the moral dilemma?

- what stage(s) are each of the key individuals at?

- what stage(s) are you most likely to develop a resolution?

Step 2 — Small Group Preparations

Note your specific Case, designated by your Group's identification!!

Develop a *role play* which starts out with all the characters at very obvious yet different *stage(s) of ethical reasoning* and in a methodical process work through to the resolution of the moral dilemma by bringing the key players to a *common level of reasoning*. The final scenario needs to be credible both in terms of solution and stage reasoning — thus it may be the case that one [1] of the four [4] characters does not become part of the solution because they cannot seem to move off their *primary stage of ethical reasoning* or, if there are five [5], one [1] could be used as a mediator you bring in to achieve a consensus.

- In order to adequately prepare for this task, re-read the Case Study to make sure all generally agreed on the basic facts themselves.
- Having individually completed the *brainstorm* & the *re-read*, determine who should play each character, what the general script might sound like, determine the *stage(s)* each character is going to use during the course of the discussions (from opening comments through to the resolution of the dilemma) and how the final scene (showing the resolution) should unfold. [timing of presentation will be between four [4] & six [6] minutes]
- As the challenge is to role-play potential resolutions to this dilemma. **Go through the process at least three times, each time switching roles** to permit each participant to play at least two [2] of the roles — this may help determine who is most comfortable in arguing the agreed upon stage of that role.
- After completing the practice rounds of the role-play, the small group then develops a joint presentation for the large group and appoints a spokesperson. The presentation should concentrate on the major question (noted above at the end of each dilemma)

(B) Case Study #4-1: Getting More Mileage Out of Your Position?

As an Environmental Health Officer (**EHO**) working in the Health & Safety Office at a large oil & gas company, you have just completed your six [6] months *probationary period*. As part of this process you had to write an exam on company policies both within the environmental domain and the administration of human resources. You are now assigned to a **Senior Inspector** (for an additional six [6] months of *mentorship*) to conduct regular on-site assessments of various facilities throughout the province. At the end of your first week, as you are getting ready to return to the city, the **Senior Inspector** shows you how to record your expenses. You notice that he has recorded his meals according to the corporate expense guide, even though some meals were provided at the sites and he adds, on average, about forty-six [46] extra kilometres to his daily travel (he says it's to cover the extra driving he does for the company and never gets paid for, plus it's a number that when added into the total doesn't stand out).

You are not comfortable with this, as you are sure that the company's internal auditors eventually will catch up to this (especially for you, as they do spot audits on all new employees just before their first [1st] year anniversary). The policies are very clear: *you are to record your mileage from the point of leaving HQ until you return & only those meals actually eaten away from company facilities are to be included in your travel claim and then only at the rates proscribed in the travel guide*. But your mentor indicates he is following common & accepted practice — *besides, the company is making billions — who really cares about a few kilometres & the occasional meal? And remember, we aren't paid like those rig workers, or the engineers at head office!*

You decide to talk this over with **your partner** when you get home. The conversation is heated with lots of reminders about what happens to people first in their first [1st] year, especially for scamming expense monies. Moreover it is suggest that the reason you studied the policies was because the company wanted you to abide by them. Finally, though you remind your partner that you don't get to drive than often anyway, so it is not going to be a big deal, and it will keep things in balance with the mentor's sheets (thereby not as likely to raise suspicions).

To make sure that you are on track, you decide to go to the **Manager of Environmental Safety** where you talk *hypothetically*, discussing policies & problems with trying to determine accurately what should be included & not included, especially since sometimes even though you eat at a camp in the late afternoon (early supper), by the time you get to the motel you are ready to have a pizza, etc. You also express some of the concerns that were raised by your partner, should things go astray.

The **manager** suggests that perhaps it would be good for you & your mentor to come in so that the **Mentor** will know exactly what he should be looking for when he is over-seeing your expense claims. This seems to you to be a good idea as it might both relieve your current unease & get the Mentor on-side with company policies re these issues, especially in light of the fact there is an extended field inspection coming in four [4] days and you have to know how you are going to address these issues before then.

The Dilemma: How does the Manager deal with the Mentor & you? AND, what is the final resolution?

(B) Case Study #4-2: Do Cheap Cows Lead to Costly Meat?

It has been a very, very dry year. The headlines in newspapers suggested that this is the *worst drought of the century*. The dairy farmers are depressed because their cattle feed supplies are running dangerously low, and quality grazing pastures are growing scarce. Fearing that most of their herds will become an economic burden (in part because of deep concern that the cattle will become sick and their value will depreciate), many farmers decide to cut their losses and sell part of their prized herds to local slaughterhouses. The prices of beef drop significantly over the course of two (2) months, and consumers have responded to this sudden price drop by increasing their consumption of beef & beef products.

Tony, a friend you have known since playschool days, operates a small restaurant in a remote part of town (and outside your designated inspection area). Recently business has been slow and he became two (2) months behind in rent. In order to drum up more business, he decided to offer a *beef bonanza* week for his customers. Tony took out a loan at his bank and bought over twenty thousand (\$20,000) dollars worth of beef — everything from ground meat to ribs and prime cuts, as well as spending five thousand (\$5,000) dollars on advertising. He laboured for days preparing the meats: trimming, marinating and cooking. Within a few days he had made more than he did in the previous three (3) months. It was a resounding success: many first (1st) time clients came to his place. He quickly decided to go out and buy even more for another two (2) week *bonanza*. But, as there was to be no local auction that week, he made a private purchase directly from one (1) of the large ranches some distance from town.

You are delighted to see Tony so happy and congratulated him on his success. Shortly thereafter, while in the office and standing at the water cooler, a fellow EHO tells you there are increasing cases of food poisoning in her jurisdiction. Subsequently, through additional inquiries you find out these cases are associated with the consumption of contaminated beef (apparently from improper butchering practices). It would seem that a different, though equally remote from the centre of town, eating establishment. The director of your Regional Health Authority (RHA) hastily calls a team meeting of all EHO's in your RHA and invites those from the two (2) neighbouring ones as well to sit in on the discussions. The result is that a recall order is to be issued and the local auction marts closed for three (3) weeks [i.e. the next two (2) selling days at each site].

The auction marts notify all purchasers to return any unused portions of their orders (for further inspection & analysis). Meat purchased from auctions outside the three (3) RHA's is not impacted, so several of the more affluent restaurants simply went further afield, as did the local hospital and various school & company cafeterias. Since Tony had none of his last auction purchase left, and since none of his customers had said anything about feeling ill, he decided to keep using his private stock (from the ranch within one (1) of the two (2) nearby RHA's) and thus continue his newly competitive presence in the *dining-out market*.

The dilemma: To what extent ought you to get involved in this situation (as you know where Tony got his meat)? Do you go to Tony / tell your EHO colleague / send an anonymous message to the head of the RHA?

(C) Case Study #4-3: Divorced & Down!

You, a certified environmental health inspector (EHO), go into a restaurant to conduct a regular inspection. The owner (Peter) has built up an excellent reputation in the community over the past thirty (30) years. In responding to EHO visits/inspections, he always does exactly what is instructed, and within hours of the request. He has always been very reasonable to deal with, and is considered one (1) of the best operators in the region. In fact, it is one (1) of the reasons that you only visit his establishment once in three (3) years rather than the regular eighteen (18) month rotation.

On this occasion (which is neither three (3) years or eighteen (18) months since the last inspection) it is more a visit as you have a very green intern (Clara) with you (as you think this will be a good experience for her). When you enter the restaurant, Peter informs you that he will be closing at the end of the next month. He has had financial troubles since his wife left him some six (6) months ago, and he will soon be bankrupt. He recognizes that there is an intern with you and encourages you to have her do a *mock inspection* since you have come quite a ways. You agree — Clara is to inspect & you will observe.

The inspection reveals that the kitchen has not been cleaned as part of regular maintenance for quite some time. There is dust on the pizza oven, some dishes show signs of baked on food remnants, and there is general disarray in the food preparation area (which his wifer used to keep spotless). At this point you believe this situation indicates there is a major problem in the facility; for one (1) thing, you notice that not all the food is covered and there may even be mould. You are not sure Clara has noted that perhaps all of the food is questionable re safety issues. There is fresh pizza meat that must have been cut with the very dirty meat-slicer you saw under the prep counter; the dishwasher has bleach in the dish-soap container & there is no sanitiser in the special container. At the same time, the walk-in freezer is not bad — most of the food is covered and the temperature is more than appropriate. And there are the necessary three (3) sinks, although you suspect that one may not be fully operational and so you wonder if regular hand-washing is being practised as the other two sinks are being constantly used in cleaning regular dishes & utensils. Finally, you notice ashtrays placed in nooks & corners that have been recently used.

As you are about to confer with Clara, she asks whether this place is in a condition usual for such eateries as she finds it horrible and in need of remedial action. With that Peter interrupts by reminding you that he is on his last legs. He has been running the operation alone for six (6) months (even though two (2) other workers are observed to be there). He insists that he has never poisoned anyone and the main eating area remains clean as do the public washrooms. He reminds you that he has always followed all EHO recommendations immediately in the past and has never caused any trouble (in fact he has even wrote letters of commendation on your behalf on three (3) different occasions). He pleads for leniency as he needs to cut corners so he has money to pay the lawyers; besides, this was just supposed to be a practice session for Clara.

The dilemma: **What do you do? How can you justify showing some leniency? Is Clara an avenue out or potentially part of the problem?**

Step 3 — Small Group Presentations: *The Role Plays*

IX. A Second Look at Defining *Moral Dilemmas*...

Here are the four [4] draft definitions, prepared during Module I. In the previously designed *small groups* (but melded together as follows:

- *Moderators & Reviewers*
- *David Jackson & Maria Renato & Lloyd Bremen*
- *Diane Collings/Frank Seeders & Phil Port*
- *Prof Massin and Tom Richards*)

combine these into one [1] coherent and compact definition that is no more than twenty-four [24] words (i.e. two dozen!!). To assist in this process, it is acceptable to refer to the various definitions presented in the Module I notes. Be prepared to present your definition to the entire class.

Draft A: {A moral dilemma is a situation where one's ethical values are in conflict with the options available to solve the conflict because the options faced could be equally desirable or undesirable.}

Draft B: {A moral dilemma is a conflict in which you struggle to make a decision which you think is right and giving a moral & good justification for doing it}

Draft C: {A moral dilemma is an internal conflict that challenges your own beliefs and values that may lead to unpredictable consequences to yourself & others}

Draft C: {A moral dilemma is an internal conflict a person experiences in the decision-making process where one's own personal and societal beliefs & values are being challenged}

Final Definition...

X. Case Study #5: Incident at Morales...⁹

{check Addendum C for designated group}

This film involves a variety of ethical issues faced by a company that wants to quickly build a plant in order to develop a new chemical product to gain a competitive edge over the competition. Potential technical and ethical issues arise from choices of designs, including valves, piping, chemicals, etc. The process to develop the product is designed to be automated and controlled by computer software. The process also involves high pressures and temperatures as well as using chemicals that require special handling.

Because of environmental considerations related to the chemicals used in the process, the company decides to construct their plant in Mexico. Out of this decision arise technical, environmental, financial & safety problems that involve ethical issues.

The central figure, Fred, confronts a number of key moments of critical choice including the use of expensive controls from a company that has an inside connection at the firm, the introduction of environmental health controls that would actually be higher than local requirements, the purchase of pipes & connectors made from stainless steel or a high pressure alloy when marketing pressures require a slightly different product.¹⁰ And perhaps there are cultural expectations as well?

CAST of CHARACTERS:

Fred	Chemical Engineer hired by <i>Phaust</i> to design a plant to manufacture a new paint remover
Wally	Fred's supervisor at <i>Phaust</i>
Chuck	Vice-President of Engineering at <i>Phaust</i>
Dominique	Corporate Liaison from <i>Chemistré</i> (parent company in France) to <i>Phaust</i>
Maria	Fred's wife, a compliance litigator for U.S. Environmental Protection Agency
Hal	Market Analyst at <i>Phaust</i>
Jen	Research Chemist at <i>Phaust</i>
Peter	Project Manager of the construction firm that builds the new plant in Morales
Jake	Plant Manager for the <i>SuisseChem</i> plant in Big Spring, Texas
Manuel	Plant Manager for the new <i>Phaust</i> plant in Morales, Nuevo Leon, Mexico

⁹ A film produced by the **National Institute for Engineering Ethics**, Texas Tech University, Lubbock Texas, 2005.

¹⁰ This is summarized from the Study Guide provided with the above noted film.

As you view the story, identify

- *four (4) key moments when ethical choices are made...*

- *to what extent would you define Fred to be a morally good person...*

- *where better decisions could have been made that would have averted some of the ethical dilemmas within the Incident at Morales...*

- *to what extent is this as much an public health issue as it is an engineering one? where would you have intervened or at least made sure everyone realized that public health was a pre-eminent issue in the scenario?*

In addition to developing a group answer to the items raised on the previous page, prepare responses to the following questions designated to your group.

G. Would reference to a CODE of CONDUCT have solved this problem? Explain:

B. What questions of ethical conduct do you see around the initial hiring of Fred? Were they appropriately handled, in your mind?

D. What is it about Wally's *One Rule* that could lead to ethical problems?

A. How do you react to Chuck's comment about inflating the budget as a hedge against potential budget cuts? What is the difference between inflating a budget & providing contingency funds as a line item in the budget?

E. Chuck's brother-in-law is the U.S. rep for a supplier of controls: what ethical issues does this raise? What is your response to Wally's justification of this approach to purchasing?

C. Why did Fred share his concerns with his wife? Was this appropriate? Discuss his comment that since the plant is beyond her jurisdiction it is of no concern to her?

- F. Is Wally justified in confronting Fred about the environmental meeting? Who should moderate such a meeting – a public/environmental health professional? Why or why not?

- A./D. Did Fred act responsibly in both (a) lining the evaporation ponds and (b) specifying cheaper controls? Were there any ethical dilemmas here that a public/environmental health officer would have faced?

- E./F. While talking with Peter, Fred is inspired to make the couplings a maintenance issue, specifying that the couplings should be replaced regularly: to what degree is it appropriate to convert design decisions into maintenance procedures without including operations people in the decision process? To what extent does this happen in other public &/or environmental health situations?

- B./G./C. Although the chemical process was supposed to be automated, Fred allowed Manuel to volunteer to control the process manually: how was this an ethical decision?

In conclusion:

- D. How should a company, such as *Phaust*, encourage ethical decision-making in the future? Where have you witnessed similar problems in your world of work (*without necessarily naming names*)?

- B. How does *corporate culture* affect how we practice public health? To what extent does *political culture* impact our ethical decision-making?

- E. Even if a lawyer indicates you have no legal obligations to your former employer when you go to a new job, what *moral obligations* do you have to ensure the confidentiality of information you acquired at the earlier job?

- A. How much responsibility does the employer have to ensure that you are free to pursue your tasks employing the highest standard of ethical decision-making? Is there an obligation, whether government or private sector, to protect you from having to make an unethical though technically legal decision?

- C. Where and when is it a good idea to share your ethical challenges with your partner at home? What ought you to do when your partner reveals to you a problem at their workplace that you recognize as a public health issue? [What if it is not in your jurisdiction?]

F./G. Do you believe that standards should be universal, or is it okay to have particular health standards in one (1) country and another set for another country? And what about from province to province? Municipality to municipality?

A./C./D. What obligation(s) do we have to consider downstream (i.e. future) implications or possibilities when making critical choices about an immediate problem? And, when does future trump the present (or vice versa) in resolving ethical dilemmas?

B./E. Where and when does the issue of trust impact our ethical decision-making? And should this include allowances for a *margin of error*? Is candour a component of moral choice? Is *reputation for integrity* a necessary aspect for any good public health official?

All Groups — what stage(s) of moral reasoning did the following appear to be at:

Fred	_____	Chuck	_____	Maria	_____
Wally	_____	Peter	_____	Manuel	_____

XI. Preparing for the Final Debates: A Practice Session...

In your designated team, you will be given a practice case to study — you will either **argue in the affirmative** — or **provide the counter/alternative argument(s)**. The key is always to make sure you read the case carefully and then study the central question so as to be certain of the position you are to be taking. You will not be presenting from the same perspective as the other team. The purpose of the debate is to give you the opportunity to try to persuade the other team to come to your perspective. Think of yourselves before a city council or a public hearing and work at trying to bring the other team more towards a consensus if possible...

NOTE: In the Final Debates, each team will participate in two [2] debates. One as the proponent, one as the alternative!!

The *rules* for the debates are straight-forward:

- **In the Final Debates, there will be a coin toss to determine which team goes first (the team that wins the coin toss gets the choice of whether to go first or second); then the Case is announced and the key question for debate is given.**
- **The *affirmative team* will get three [3] minutes to prepare and then have seven [7] minutes to make their case**
- **The *counter-group* will get two [2] minutes to prepare and then have four [4] minutes to respond to the *affirmative team*.**

There will then be a one [1] minute caucus for the Affirmative Team to prepare a rebuttal.

- **The *affirmative team* will then have three [3] minutes to present their rebuttal.**
- **In the Final Debates, the judges will also be given an opportunity to question the *affirmative team* (after a one [1] minute caucus) – each judge may ask one [1] question plus one [1] follow-up. Following this they will score each team (although the results are not revealed at this time).**

In the Final Debates, the process would be repeated, except the teams would switch roles.

- The scoring for the Final Debates is as follows: these scores contribute to part of the *peer score*
- **The *non-participating teams* will rate each team according to the scoring rubric. Their score sheets will be turned in before the judges begin to ask their questions.**

(NOTE: these scores will contribute to part of the *prof's score*)

- **The professor will score each debate and will compare the various peer results to his own — the higher the degree of convergence, the higher the mark for the *non-participating group* scoring — the prof's score, however is the one that will count most for the *participating teams* scores...**

Preliminary Practice Round(s)...

The Debating Teams...

Debaters A

Debaters B

Debaters C

Debaters D

Debaters E

Debaters F

Each Team will be given an opportunity to present a practice case, either in the affirmative or the negative, to the prof as a way to gain confidence that their skills sets are pointed in the right direction for the finals...

Debaters A

vs.

Debaters B

Debaters C

vs.

Debaters D

Debaters E

vs.

Debaters F

Observations...

Another final review moment...

Values & Ethics in the Public Service of Canada

Here is a summary of a presentation given to graduate students at *Saint Paul University* at different times over a two [2] year period. It is useful if you ever contemplate working for the federal government, and valuable in any other public service role. If you have any questions/queries don't hesitate to contact **Ms. Trudel-Maggiore** in Ottawa at the Department of Fisheries & Oceans (or whatever it is now titled).

Module III

IX (b). A Final Look at Defining *Moral Dilemmas*...

An internal conflict that forces one's decision-making to choose between two equal options based on one's ethical beliefs and values.

An internal conflict that forces one to make a choice based on one's ethical beliefs, values & experiences that will cause unpredictable negative consequences.

Review *Ethical Leadership, Parts 1 & 2*...

Final Definition...

XII. ADDITIONAL REFLECTIVE ANALYSIS —

*Case Study #6: **Henry's Daughters**¹¹*

This case provides additional perspectives the challenges surrounding ethical decision-making. It touches on some of the issues raised in Ethics Unwrapped as well as Cowboy Ethics. It can also serve as a useful reference in both aspects of the Final Exam (the Final Individual Case & the Final Debates).

Henry, sixty-five [65] is a retired but still well-connected automobile executive and sometime lobbyist. He is involved in an academia-industry-government smart highway design called **Sanshands**. The intent is to design & develop an automated highway/auto control system to take over driving from individuals within their cars.

Laura, twenty-nine [29] is Henry's older daughter, a professional engineer working as project manager on **Sanshands**. Her recommendations will be considered prior to final adoption of the preferred research project.

Julie, twenty-one [21] is Henry's younger daughter, is working as an intern with **Outocar** which is one of two organizations chosen to develop the test pilots (the other firm, **GuideMe**, has retained Henry as a consultant).

¹¹ Film produced by the National Institute for Engineering Ethics, Edward Whitacre College of Engineering, Texas Tech University (2010).

The two [2] sisters live together and often talk about their work. As the story unfolds they both see disconcerting actions/activities including excessive influence by **GuideMe** on the key decision-makers and plagiarism by co-workers. Pressures build within government towards choosing **GuideMe** which prompts allegations from **Outocar** that lead to a state senate ethics commission hearing. Two [2] key witnesses are *Laura* and *Henry*.

This story highlights ethical issues encountered by the characters, such as professional relationships, conflicts of interest, favouritism, confidentiality of proprietary info, sexual harassment, and individual privacy. The individuals disagree over the tradeoffs between technical performance, safety, reliability, sustainability, flexibility and cost. They also find that political and social factors can influence technical decisions.

Several ethical observations to note...

- ethics is an integral and explicit component of ordinary technical and business decision-making...
- technically competent, ethically sensitive, reasonable people may have different perspectives on an ethical issue, and can disagree when faced with complex ethical issues...
- negotiations resolve some of the conflicts but others remain unresolved – ethical problems should be resolved by rational methods...
- codes of ethics and guidance from licensing boards can be helpful in resolving ethical challenges...
- it is sometimes necessary to make decisions under pressure with incomplete data, insufficient time and inadequate information

As the story unfolds...

ALL GROUPS:

What are the first dilemma(s) you see emerging?

Identify the two (2) biggest ethical decisions that need(ed) to be made regarding the first [1st] dilemma you recognize...

HD-4, HD-5, HD-6

Regarding the two [2] sisters, there are numerous questions that could be raised but consider these in particular: *was it ethical for Henry to pull strings to get Julie her internship?* and, *was Laura given the project because of her professional talents + work ethic or because of Henry's connections?* (And if so, would this raise a conflict of interest issue?) plus *the cake eating scene* raises what ethical issues?

HD-1, HD-2, HD-3

Relate the comments, *keep it in the family*, *don't rock the boat*, and *it's just normal business* to the overall ethical challenge(S) of Henry & his daughters

ALL GROUPS

Upon reflection, at the conclusion of the story, what was the real moral problem, and where did it start?

What were the good decisions that were made? And why?

Give an example of three [3] moral failings *Ethics Unbounded...*

From your assigned character, and from that person's perspective how would you have done things differently?

HD-1 – Laura



HD-2 – Julie

HD-3 – Jeff

HD-4 – Henry

HD-5 – Senator Bob

HD-2 – Barry

When we think about the ethical challenges of leadership, where & why do the most seem to emerge? And can *ethics unbounded* from the *Concepts Unwrapped* series add any clarity or deepen our understanding of this case?

HD-1, HD-4

professional issues: *to what extent should you consider political factors and social impacts in your decision-making? And, should Laura have said something about Marty's treatment of Warren like she did about the ogling of Julie?*

HD-2, HD-5

- **conflict of interest:** *to what degree was it appropriate for Henry and his daughters to work on the same project, but for different parties? Should Senator Bob have recused himself from the investigative committee?*

HD-3, HD-6

- **gender issues:** *does the appropriate response to sexual harassment depend on the setting – e.g. whether one is in a situation with one's peers vs. with one's supervisor vs. dealing with a client? And, are sexist comments disguised as jokes acceptable? Is it ever permissible for an employee of one gender to put their hand on the shoulder of another employee or compliment an employee of the other gender?*

HD-1, HD-3, HD-5

- **intellectual property issues:** *what is proprietary information? How should you decide whether to share some of your information from work when you get home?*

HD-2, HD-4, HD-6

- **privacy issues:** *as a matter of interest, does tracking vehicle location cause a violation of privacy? If you knew an individual was illegally dumping environmentally unhealthy waste and a neighbour was willing to attach a GPS device to his truck, to what extent would you use the resultant information to track him down and catch him in the act?*

ALL GROUPS

Provide an assessment of the following characters as to the stage(s) of moral reasoning that they seemed to primarily use:

Henry (father) _____	Laura (older sibling) _____	Julie (younger sib) _____
Senator Bob _____	Jeff (DOT Chief) _____	Barry (Outocar) _____
Warren (DOT engineer – black) _____	Marty (DOT engineer – latino) _____	

Give at least one [1] example of a similarity between one [1] of these characters and *Jack Abramoff*.

XIII. FINAL EXAM – PART ONE [1] — *The Individual Case*

*Erin Brockovich: The Movie*¹²

{this is an *open book* exam – text(s) & notes are permitted}

Sometimes it is not the lawyer that really makes the case — often, in fact, you are going to have to decide yourself:

- are the stakes simply too high? or,
- does the challenge appear too unrewarding? or,
- is this the time that you know you are right, no matter what?

In order to appreciate this, you'll observe a journey by a real person who cared... who believed one's environment should not hurt one's family's health... who wanted to see an environmentally healthier world... no matter what!!

{if you need extra space, write on the reverse page}

Answer each of the following questions:

- What do the initial scenes (job interview(s), court appearance, first scene(s) with her kids) tell (suggest to) you about Erin?

- When the lawyer brought up the *wardrobe* issue, what is the moral dilemma and who is facing it?

- *Do you have so many friends now, you don't need anymore?* What does this tell you about George the biker neighbour? And, about Erin?

¹² Universal Pictures & Columbia Pictures (2000) directed by Steven Soderbergh starring Julia Roberts & Albert Finney.

Answer any two [2] of the following questions:

- What are your feelings towards Erin during/after the first investigation, after she gets fired, upon being re-hired?

- What dilemma(s) is (are) Erin facing at the Water Board office? In the Jensen household?

- Do you think that Erin is being thorough? Would you take her side (or even stick up for her)? What about the *phone call* after the data gathering?

- The need for drawing a *connection* from the local plant to the corporate head office — is this an *ethical dilemma* or simply a political/legal problem? Explain...

Answer only one [1] of the following two [2] questions:

What is the dilemma contained within these two (2) interesting statements by Erin?

- *For the first time in my life, people respect me...*
- *Bend my life around what men want & need...*

When Mrs. Jensen asks for a promise, why is she asking? How is Erin responding?

Answer only one [1] of the following questions recalling the Arbitration process...

- How did they get into this is the first place?

- What seems to be happening between the two (2) firms?

- What really seems to be happening at the community meeting? And, who is really leading things?

- Why is there such persistence at signing the names?

Answer one [1] of the following questions:

- Regarding the Charles Embury issue, what do you think is his reason for talking and why does it arise when it does? What stage(s) of ethical reasoning are in play?

- Why does Erin's decide to take George with her when she tells Mrs. Jensen the results of the decision? What stage(s) of ethical reasoning are in play?

- Explain your reaction(s) in the scene between Masry & Erin at the end when he gives her the bonus cheque! What stage(s) of ethical reasoning are in play?

Answer two [2] of the following questions:

Where & when in this story do we seem to find most of the moral dilemmas?

Why do ethical dilemmas arise in the case? Who, most often, seems to be at the centre? & Why? What stage(s) of ethical reasoning seem most in play?

Where do you see some potential straightforward solutions? How would you implement them? And what stage(s) of ethical reasoning would you employ?

What lesson(s) can we take from this case study? How might they apply to our career path(s)?

Answer two [2] of the following questions:

What *stage(s)* do you see Erin operating at? (Cite & validate)

When Mrs. Jensen asks for a promise, explain what *stage(s)* are evident for her? For Erin?

Explain what stage(s) are displayed at the community meeting, and by whom?

Explain what stage(s) are evident in the persistence at signing the names?

Regarding the Charles Embury issue, explain what is his reason for talking and whether this can be assigned particular stage(s)?

Explain how helpful might understanding different stage(s) have been for Masry in dealing with this entire case? Explain by citing particular moments, and/or individuals...

Answer the following questions:

Who are your two [2] favourite characters in this case? Explain why...

Name: _____

Reason(s) _____

Name: _____

Reason(s) _____

XIV. FINAL EXAM – PART TWO [2] — The *FINAL DEBATES*

The purpose of the debate is to give you the opportunity to try to persuade the other team to come to your perspective. Think of yourselves before a city council or a public hearing and work at trying to bring the other team more towards a consensus if possible...

Each team will participate in two [2] debates: One as the *presenters*, the other providing the *critique/commentary*.

Scoring will be accounted for using the rubric of the International Ethics Bowl (sponsored by the Association of Practical and Professional Ethics – APPE). Round One [1] will use Steps #1 through #4; Round Two [2] uses Steps #5 through #8.

The *rules* for the debates are:

- **There will be a coin toss to determine which team goes first (the team that wins the coin toss has the choice of whether to go first or second); then the Case is announced and the key question for debate is given.**
- **The *presenting team* will have three [3] minutes to prepare and then have up to seven [7] minutes to make their case**
- **The *commentary team* will have two [2] minutes to prepare and then have up to four [4] minutes to respond to the *presenting team*.**

There will then be a one [1] minute caucus for the Presenting Team to prepare a rebuttal.

- **The *presenting team* will then have three [3] minutes to present their rebuttal.**
- **The judges will also be given an opportunity to question the *presenting team* (after a one [1] minute caucus) – each judge may ask one [1] question plus one [1] follow-up. Following this they will score each team (although the results are not revealed at this time).**

The process shall be repeated later in the schedule, except the teams will switch roles.

Schedule for the Debates

Round One:

1st: **Team D** vs. *Team F*; 2nd: **Team A** vs. *Team C*; 3rd: **Team B** vs. *Team E*

Round Two:

1st: *Team C* vs. **Team A**; 2nd: *Team E* vs. **Team B**; 3rd: *Team F* vs. **Team D**

The Debates to be used in 2016 and *the questions to be asked...*

TOPIC #1 A-5: *Nuts Over Water*

Due to the healthy food value of almonds, is not the ethical choice to ensure that almond farmers receive a higher priority for water than urban users?

TOPIC #2 A-6: *To Be or Not to Be*

Given that Canada is now facing the same issues in the *right to die* discussion, is not the ethical decision to give each individual (with sound mind) the choice to request doctor-assisted death?

TOPIC #3 A-9: *Patent Rights*

Given that Canada faces the same issues in accessing new drugs for treating dangerous and/or difficult diseases, is not the ethical decision to bring all drugs under the control/jurisdiction of the Canadian Health Act, thus enabling governments to order drug companies to provide drugs at no more than 100% mark-up over production costs?

TOPIC #4 A-14: *Well Spotted*

As Canada is the destination for many similar school *exploration education* trips, is not the ethical decision to require all such cruises (or flights) to gain clearance from local public health officials prior to leaving the terminals to visit on-shore Canadian sites?

TOPIC #5 B-5: *Drug Pushers*

Pharmaceutical practices in Canada are pretty much the same as in the USA, and as Canada is fundamentally a country that supports a free market and gives a fair degree of professional license, therefore is not the ethical decision to let doctors, pharmacists and other public health official make their own decisions as to whether they have direct contact with drug companies or any other supplier of products they need?

TOPIC #6 B-10: *Equinophagy*

Given that Canada has much the same relationship between horses and their owners, and a similar problem regarding availability of equine slaughter-houses, is not the ethical decision to promote the value of horsemeat while simultaneously expanding the knowledge of EHO's to adequately monitor equine slaughter-house operations?

TOPIC #7 Dilemma Q: *(by Diane Teoh)*

As a young EHO may be too idealistic in the early days of one's career is not the ethical decision to leave any investigations into the behaviours of seasoned EHO's to senior management and simply make sure one's own actions are above reproach?

TOPIC #8 Dilemma N: *Ethics Scenario*

Because of the continuing popularity of tattoos, many people will travel to find a good deal or a quick access, thus going well beyond their own health region's boundaries, is not the ethical decision for each EHO to make sure that every potential problem in such studios is *red-flagged* whether within her/his jurisdiction or not?

TOPIC #9 DilemmasR+O: *(submitted by Andrew Brooks)*

Given that restaurants are prime sources of many of the infractions that EHO's must deal with on a daily basis, is it not the ethical decision for each EHO to report any perceived problem to the appropriate Health authority, whether within her/his jurisdiction or not?

XVII. A FINAL ROUNDTABLE WITH THE PROF...

*How do we feel about this approach to addressing the matter of **critical choice** in our work?*

*Does it appear to be an effective to recognize and deal with **ethical dilemmas**?*

Are we going to try it out?

What should students know before (or at the beginning of) the course to make the experience more useful? More enjoyable? More long-lasting?

XV. CONCLUSIONS

Each participant must have completed the following, and submitted to the prof ...

the self assessment (out of 12): *what is the mark I should receive? & why I believe it is deserved?*

the peer assessment: *on a scale of 1-8 one (1) being very poor, eight (8) being excellent and each number in between representing a graduated rating) rate each of your peers as to their overall level of participation in all the small group work [do no rate anyone that you did not participate with on a team or in a small group task]*

critique the entire course (all three (3) modules) by completing the university's course evaluation

God bless, good luck, and don't be a stranger!!