



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

Prepared for
Concordia University of Edmonton
ENVH 523
(Spring/Summer 2025)

General Course Guide: Cohorts P & Q
{Opening Edition}

Designed, Developed & Delivered by



Glenn Wm. Sinclair, Inc.
Unit #116, 1675 Penticton Avenue
Penticton, BC, V2A 0E2
(250) 809-9220 / 1-866-4-ethink [1-866-438-4465]
gws@e-sinclair.com

Copyright 2025

It may be helpful to review these Individual Reflections

What kind of Student am?

- Aren't I already ethical enough I really don't need a course in *applied ethics*?
- Do I find *role plays* a waste of time and somewhat childish?
- Wouldn't I be happiest if I could get out of doing *group work*?
- Can't we stop the conversations, just lecture and get this over with? [I have more important courses to attend to...]
- Since this course is mandatory, keep it simple: only talk about *environmental health* – no need to look at a bigger picture...{hint, it's more}
- Do I have to get the text? {hint, it becomes essential by Session II & will be needed for the *open book* portion of the Finals and it counts towards your Participation Mark}

What kind of Prof is gw?

- **Does he understand how tough it is to be a post-secondary student?** {hint #1: he spent longer as a post-secondary student than he did as an elementary/secondary student; hint #2: he helped mentor his two kids through their programs to graduation and now is deeply involved in helping his five grand-children (two Canadian, three American); hint #3: at different times he has been an Adjunct at a dozen different universities, and has received very positive feedback from his students!}
- **Will he be a fair evaluator & marker?** {there will be an opportunity to de-brief each session; there are several opportunities to excel in team (small group) settings; the Final Exam is in two [2] parts – an individual *Briefing Note* and a team undertaking – the *Final Debates*; results will be shared by the following Session if at all possible!}
- **What is his fundamental approach to the classroom?** {he believes in equality of opportunity, respectful differences of opinion, accepting individual responsibility, active & engaged participation in small group & team activities, a genuine desire to *get to better*. P.S. he tends not to lecture very often, though because of his ADHD he can drift into story-telling!!}

Briefing Note (Guidelines):

- These will be provided on the specific Module Briefing...
- NOTE: The *Briefing Note* adds to your Participation Mark

ATTENTION: Movies & other audio/visual aids are simply illustrated lectures and will form parts of your Finals. {The course itself is designed from an original graduate studies model – to be truly effective it requires solid individual thinking, participating and involvement in cooperative learning!}

NOTE, this course occurs on alternate weeks: but the finals are August 1st (Friday)

SESSION I: *Aren't We Ethical Enough..? Shouldn't we just be In it to Win...*

Part 1: Case Study #1: **You Don't Know Jack...** from the **Ethics Unwrapped** series¹

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

[Working at your table as a working group, analyse this case according to the questions below and prepare to present to the full group...]

Round Table Conversations

- Examine the behaviour of Jack and determine where he made critical ethical failures: why you think he did what he did? How did such a successful person (in the words of Professor Prentice) *go off the rails*?

- 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.

- Looking beyond the career aspect of this analysis what does this story tell us that has broader applicability to life outside your profession by connecting to your personal world?

- Is it possible to suggest any contemporary Canadian leaders who might fit this challenge/description?

¹ Available at www.ethicsunwrapped.utexas.edu

Part 2: Unwrapping Some Major Ethical Flaws...²

{initial preview of special vignettes – all teams will view in order to be able to offer critiques}

Team A: Consider the concepts of *Framing*...(evident in the film)

What might be a couple of examples of *Framing* in our own lives to date that we may have seen, witnessed or actually committed ourselves? What was the focus that led to that moment (the *metrics*)? Where did the *blindness* come into play? Was the environment all that *toxic*? Give a couple of examples how an EHO could find her/himself sliding into that same problem.

Team B: Consider the concepts of *Moral Equilibrium*...(evident in the film)

Present two or three examples of *Moral Equilibrium* that we might think could happen in our life as an EHO or even student? Where might one begin to *run up a scoreboard re our own self-image*? Does *looking at the good things we do* actually lead to *moral licensing*?

Team C: Consider the concepts of *Rationalization Bias*...(evident in the film)

What might be a couple of examples of *Rationalizations* in our own lives to date that we may have seen, witnessed or actually committed ourselves? Or perhaps how can one lead to counteract this, to help mitigate *cheating just a little bit* or *is that really all that dishonest* or *is everyone else doing it*? How do we overcome the importance of the *end result* – is the *cause the real focus*? Give a couple of examples how an EHO could find her/himself sliding into that same problem.

Team D: Consider the concepts of *Self-Serving Bias*...(evident in the film)

Identify at least two examples of *Self-Serving Bias* that we might think could happen in our life as an EHO or scientist? How much does *selective memory* cause us to be *less than fair*, are our *minds tricking us into believing*? Does one really use *filters* to promote *self-interest* leading to the idea we are *100% right*?

² Available as part of *In It To Win...*

Team E: Consider the concepts of *Overconfidence Bias*...(evident in the film)
Present two or three examples of *Overconfidence Bias* that we might think could happen in our life as a student or partner or mentor? How do we determine that we are *more ethical than our neighbour* or perhaps just that we are *satisfied with our moral character*?
Is arrogance really the trigger?

Team F: Consider the concepts of *Role Morality*...(evident in the film)
Identify at least two examples of *Role Morality* that we might think could happen in our life as an EHO or Health Researcher? If we aren't yet working in our career, how might this really be something to worry about, this idea of *win for my client* or *give them what they paid for*? Who is your client when you are still a student, and is this important?

Presentations...

*Case Study #2: **Family vs. Profession*** {same teams}

You are a bio-chemist working in the area of environmental health for the National Research Council (NRC) in Ottawa, having obtained both an Honours B.Sc. from U of Calgary, an M.Sc. from U of Saskatchewan, worked for a time with the provincial Ministry of Environment in Manitoba and now are being considered for an educational sabbatical to get your degree in Environmental Health from CUE. 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 health techniques to use in 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.

E-sinc

Team Challenge

- *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...

In Conversation,

So, what have we learned so far?

Why do you think we started the course this way?

DAY 2: (Belated) INTRODUCTION to the SEMINAR

(A) The Course OBJECTIVES: It's about **getting to better!!**

- 1) That the potential Environmental Health Officer (EHO) recognizes 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 & their employees, politicians, teammates, and others who impact their daily tasks, as well as the general public.

(B) Key notes

note #1: For purposes of this course **the terms *ethical & 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 provides comments, input &/or feedback in an orderly fashion, and at 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, initiated by questions, queries or concerns raised by group members.

note #3: *Brevity* is important in this course: think briefing notes not essays, think sentences not paragraphs...

note #4: The professor has a condition known as *ADHD* — it may impact the way the course may unfold on any given day (*off-ramping*) — you may meet clients or work-mates with equally unsettling conditions: learn to work with, not condemn! (See handout for more background)

E-sinc

(C) *The Marking System*

- 85 % — prof **The things that combine to establish the professor's mark?**
 - **Individual** participation in the class – **15 marks** (Sessions 2 through 6 marks will be assigned as follows: up to 1 mark for a thoughtful *Briefing Note*; 1 mark for actual attendance (deductions could occur for significant lateness or partial absence), 1 mark for evidence of mandatory text book – *Cowboy Ethics*);
 - **Team** presentation of the assigned *Role Play* activity – **15 marks (5 by external judge(s) re believability & coherence, does the overall presentation make sense to a practicing EHO - 10 by prof re does it show understanding of Sinclair prism & stages theory, do the stages show progression & resolution)**);
 - Effective **mini-group** participation in the *Crossfire* exercise – **5 marks** (graduated scale based on degree/extend to which resolution is/isn't achieved);
 - Successful completion of the two components of the **final exam** held during *Session 7* [total possible = **50 marks**]:
 - the **Team-based Final Debates (40 marks – 15 from external judges & 25 by prof: formal/scoring based on guidance given by the APPE Ethics Bowl – this will be open book³), and**
 - the **Individual Final Case Analysis (10 marks – a briefing note dealing with a single ethical dilemma – *the only learning aid permitted in this part of the exam will be the mandatory text: no phone or laptop or other such device will be permitted, though written/printed notes from various class sessions will be accepted***).
- 10% — **peer assessment:** (i.e. *how helpful &/or supportive was each of my classmates that I worked with in small groups &/or teams*)
- 5% — **self-evaluation:** (i.e. *how well did I meet my own learning goals*)

NOTE: (Optional Task)

- (Homework/Out-of-class Assignment!!) **For a bonus of two [2] marks** prepare a **critique** of the professor's penultimate draft of *Getting to Better* (free to download from www.e-sinclair.com)
[This review needs to be submitted (either by paper or e-mail) prior to the beginning of Session 3 – on or before June 11th – **this assignment will not be graded, the bonus marks are achieved simply for completing the critique!**]

³ Class notes & text books will be permitted. Use of AI will NOT be tolerated!

(D) *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...⁴

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...⁵

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...⁶

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.⁷

At all times remember: **this is an applied ethics course...** {applied to all aspects of life!}

⁴ *Ethics in Action: a Case-based Approach*, Connolly, Peggy et al, Wiley-Blackwell (2009) p.1

⁵ *Ibid* p. 1 & 2

⁶ *Ibid* p. 2

⁷ *Ibid*

E-sinc

- **Why I teach it!?**

{if one can't do – then teach?!}

{perhaps more importantly, to share some insights, inspire your curiosity}

- **Where else I use it!?**

{corporately for a long time, also public & private institutional training}

{even counselling on occasion & in familial contexts too}

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 let the restaurant owners simply police themselves and report once a year that they think *all is well*? (As an EHO you would only drop in if they offered you a free meal!!)**
- **why not allow landlords to determine how often they should repair or even clean their apartments along with determining how many people could occupy any given suite? (As an EHO you would only drop by if you were a shareholder or partner in the complex!!)**
- **why not permit farmers to determine when their cattle are causing a problem by watering in a creek with the idea being that they know animals and the land best, so they could send pictures if they thought there was a problem?**

(E) *Case Study #3: TB & the CDC in Atlanta [Centre for Disease Control]*

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 & their manifests were incomplete).

E-sinc

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...

Fifteen [15] minute *quick task #1*...

[Working at *your table as a working group*, analyse this case according to the questions below and prepare to present to the full group...]

- **What (and by whom) 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*...

(F) *Each Participant*

Prepare a mini-bio (*on designated page*) which includes:

- full name (print in BIG BLOCK letters the *name you prefer to be called*)
- e-mail address (how you wish the prof to communicate directly to you)
- snail mail (postal) address + phone number (for any mailings the prof makes)
- where are you on your *learning journey*? & why?
- what you intend to do with your degree (when you obtain it)?
- what uniqueness(es) will you contribute to this course?

Complete and submit the DIT-1⁸

- ***Reminder of the key resources utilized during the course, including the required text (Cowboy Ethics), access to Ethics Unwrapped, the videos made available by the prof via Google Drive, the draft of the prof's book (Getting to Better) available for download at www.e-sinclair.com!!***

⁸ Assessment tool to determine one's stage(s) of moral reasoning developed by the late James Rest, U. 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, but will help you understand the paradigm and how you intersect with it.

Read & Review...

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 framework to the entire course. These definitions help enhance your capabilities to resolve the critical ethical dilemmas occurring in the leadership 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]*
- *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]*
- *A moral dilemma is an internal conflict between two conflicting moral decisions, based on one's personal perspective and values, resulting in undesirable outcomes or moral implications [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]*
- *A moral dilemma is a form of cognitive dissonance where I am facing an ethical conflict that I must resolve, but could negatively impact myself or the people around me. [earlier ENVH 523 class]*
- *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 when I face an internal conflict because I must decide between two (or more) personal ethical values to make a painful yet critical choice [earlier ENVH 523 class]*

NOTE: Complete the Session *Briefing Note* (& turn in to prof)

PLEASE PRINT LEGIBLY!!

Name: _____

_____ E-Mail

who am I/what are key points about my background?

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

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

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

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

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

SESSION II: *Beginning the Search for Better Ethical Reasoning...*

(A) Video Vignette: *Ethics Unwrapped...*

{refer to the Group Listings and collectively analyze these Vignettes & prepare responses to these questions}

[approximately 15 minutes on each Part before returning to the full group/class]

Ethical Leadership Part 1...

- what are the four most vital pieces of advice this vignette has for an EHO?

- give at least two examples of where you think this vignette should be shown (from experiences at least two of your group members have had)

- what aspects of life outside one's EHO vocation might this vignette have something useful to say? (Give three examples)

Ethical Leadership Part 2...

- what are the key points that you agree most with in this vignette?

- how realistic is this vignette and why do you say that?

- name at least one take-away per group member from this vignette that you will attempt to utilize in this course...

Presentations to the full class...

(B) Rational Use of Logical Reasons —*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* derived in part from the original paper of Dr. Kohlberg in *The Kappan*, 1971]

Have We Got the Cart Before the Horse?

The 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 of/from Piaget}

No Vacuum Here Awareness {with influences of Ralph Moser}
just who might be our influencers & our impacts...

Don't Touch ME with that Moral Stuff!!

In the end, perhaps what we need to remember most...

It's a tool to get us to better 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). {This was the fundamental political leadership throughout the main parts of the pandemic.}

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: *you get vaccinated, I'll let you out of lockdown!*

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*. {Had we been led at this stage throughout – much different approach: treat the sinc, keep the well going about life.}

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*. {p.s. Remember my Expo '86 example!}

E-sinc

Evolution of the Research...

- stages are *structured wholes* or organized systems of thought; individuals are *consistent* in level of moral judgment the majority of the time; there can be bi-level reasoning too.
- 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; [this is something my research disagrees with!!].
- 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; this presupposes well-grounded framework of recognizing & approaching moral dilemmas.

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. 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*

E-sinc

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.

- | | | |
|-------|-------------------------------------|---|
| (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*]

In addition to the story about the development of my son, let's 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?**

*Thoughts/Concerns about **Moral Smugness**...*

{A former Graduate Student at the Saint Paul University (affiliated with the U of Ottawa) undertook considerable research (as part of her *M.A. in Public Ethics*) in *ethics & decision-making*, primarily in the public and not-for-profit sectors. She included in her studies the examination of the potential for *moral smugness* particularly in post-conventional moral reasoning. It turns out that in certain situations, people who usually reason at Stage Five [5], on cases related primarily to race or criminality their reasoning shifts to Stage Two [2].}

(C)

APPLYING the PARADIGM

{see Addendum A for your designated group}

Part 1:

- In your small group analyse your **designated case** according to the questions provided.

Case 4-a:

Influenza Challenges!!

Smithville is a city of 50,000 people and an influenza epidemic has broken out. The hospitals are overrun with patients needing the anti-viral medication. The city is aware that with this level of outbreak, there will not be enough medication for all the patients. The city has decided to form a committee of four (4) members to make the impossible decision of choosing who gets the medication and who does not.

The team is made up of:

- **Dr. Luca Stone**, representing all the three (3) major city hospitals.
- **Dr. Melanie Kim**, the head of emergency preparedness for the city.
- **Mayor John Hughes**, representing the citizenry of Smithville
- **Michelle Wood** is the Executive Director of the local branch of the Red Cross, an organization heavily involved in helping the city administer the vaccines.

Dr. Luca Stone has been a physician for twenty (20) years and has no family in the area. She has been climbing the ladder of both the medical community & the hospital institutions through her explicit and growing knowledge of hospital & city protocols (and practices). She is a stickler for the laws and regulations that govern the hospitals so efficiently and rarely allows emotion(s) to sway her decisions. **Dr. Stone** believes that the people with the highest probability for survival should be given the anti-viral vaccine first (1st). This is to ensure that the medication is used to its utmost efficiency.

Dr, Melanie Kim is head of emergency preparedness and a second (2nd) generation Korean-Canadian. She was raised in several countries (as her father was a special attaché with federal department of *Foreign Affairs*). Her multi-cultural background(s) contribute to adopting cultural diversity within the medical community. She is the ambassador to the diversity office in the hospital system and has built a social network of ethnic minorities. Even though **Dr. Kim** is a seasoned experienced doctor and with her social characteristics she keeps to strict doctor protocols (including the *code of ethics*).

Mayor John Hughes is thirty-two (32) years old and has lived in Smithville his entire life, is married with two (2) children. Hughes won his first (1st) election by a very slim margin and wants very much to get re-elected in the next municipal election. He has been interested in politics his entire life (his mother was an alderman for several years when he was in elementary school and his father was chairman of the local *Separate School Board* for two (2) terms when he was in high school), and this is a pivotal decision for him with the election coming within six (6) months. The Mayor believes the best way to win is to tell people what they want to hear rather than try to sway them towards his opinions. For this reason he has decided to side with the majority on this decision, even if it goes against his gut instincts.

Michelle Wood, a former EHO, has been working for the Red Cross for fifteen [15] years. She has a family in Smithville and has spent her life trying to help the people around her. Michelle believes that God has given her the power to help others. Moreover, Wood has the opinion that the city should find a solution that supplies the vaccine to all of the residents. Her point-of-view is that God created all beings equally, so we cannot be the ones deciding who will live or die.

With the outbreak spreading & time running out, the committee has to come to some level of consensus...

- What is the central ethical dilemma? Is this a result of differences between the committee members or does it arise out of the situation itself?
- What are the possible solutions to this dilemma?

Characters:

- Dr Stone [starts at stage four (4)]
- Dr. Kim [starts at stage five (5)]
- Mayor [starts at stage three (3)]
- Michelle Wood [starts at stage four (sub-six) 4(6)]

How, drawing on her experience as a former EHO, might Michelle lead the search for a resolution?

Case 4-b:

Free but Good Lunches

You are a junior inspector with a regional health authority, conducting inspections (with a senior inspector) of work camps in remote wilderness areas. Remote means two (2) hours from any village, town or city, travelling radio call roads and predominant activities in the area are oil, gas and forestry operations. While you have not been to this particular work camp before, you are aware (from conversations with colleagues, etc.) there were previous issues surrounding the water source including reported illness from occupants of the camp.

After completing an inspection of the kitchen, you are invited to lunch by the catering staff. There were no major food safety issues identified during the inspection and the invitation to lunch is always made to any visitors to the camp. Although you do not suspect any motive behind the invitation, you hesitate to take up the offer. The senior inspector however accepts the invitation and serves himself from the steam table.

You decide to go for a walk instead of having lunch. In talking to the Inspectors on the way home, she states that it has always been the custom to do this and besides, in the past, she has actually written up another camp catered to by the same company.

Your spouse is indignant and recommends that in all future trips you take your own lunch with enough food for the Senior Inspector if necessary, and you inform her that this will be your practice.

- **Where can this be most quickly brought to resolution?**
- **Will this be most effective? and lasting?**

Characters:

- Senior Inspector [starts at stage two (sub-three) 2(3)]
- Spouse/Partner [starts at stage five (5)]

What stage should you, the EHO, be at the outset? And how does that evolve into a solution at what stage?

Case 4-c:

the Food-handler

You become aware of an *asymptomatic Covid carrier* food-handler at a fairly up-scale hotel in the downtown core. The job is to specifically plate the food. The banquet is for 1900 people. The food may be contaminated. Should it be thrown out? Or simply served as is?

While reflecting on this challenge, the food manager comes by and offers to buy you a coffee so she can talk to you about another problem she has discovered (she does not know about the above noted issue). She has just discovered that some of the chickens for the banquet had left been on out on a back counter at 10 degrees Celsius for over two hours due to the late arrival of two Assistant Chefs. There is no time to replace these chickens and she is quite confident there was no harm.

You have a strong relationship with a colleague from CUE who now works in another province but you communicate often. She reminds you of your ethics class and that your DIT score suggests you are a Stage Five and suggests you have an image to maintain.

Which is the more serious dilemma? Why?

Can you work out any kind of arrangement that would be acceptable to you and the hotel? How?

- **What stages of reasoning are present here?**
- **Where or how can this be most quickly brought to resolution?**
- **Will this be most effective? and lasting?**

Characters:

- Food Manager [starts at stage three (sub-two) 3(2)]
- Out-of-province EHO [starts at stage five (5)]

What stage should the EHO be at the outset? And how does that evolve into a solution at what stage?

E-sinc

Case 4-d: *the New Canuck Diner Owner*

Brandon (the EHO) inspects a restaurant and determine that the conditions are such that he feels the restaurant should be closed until it is repaired and sufficiently cleaned up. However, if Brandon closes the restaurant the owner (who is a new-Canadian, without a strong grasp of the English language) will likely lose business, both in the short and long term; in fact, it might even fail. [The restaurant is in a small town, so word will travel fast and linger!] Furthermore, his extended family depends on the basic incomes/tips from this restaurant for their very survival while establishing themselves in their newly adopted country.

Brandon, being relatively early in his career, determines that he needs to gain additional input and/or direction on this matter. He discusses it with a colleague, his spouse and of course, his supervisor.

Jennifer, a fellow EHO, suggests that Brandon try to work out an arrangement whereby he gives the owner a chance to improve things by hiring some local high school students to carry out a work-study project under Brandon's direction.

Melinda, Brandon's spouse (and a receptionist/secretary by training) advocates that new Canadians should play by the same rules that any other business does. The best Brandon can do is to recommend the owner hire a retired café owner (Melinda's uncle's sister) as a mentor for a six month period to get everything up to standard.

Micah, Brandon's supervisor strongly suggests that he sticks to the rule book, especially if he wants to get good performance reviews.

How does Brandon work through these rather varied and somewhat complicated suggested solutions? And what is the final result?

Characters:

- Jennifer [starts at stage five (5)]
- Melinda [starts at stage two (2)]
- Marissa [starts as a stage four/three (4/3)]

What stage should the EHO be at the outset? And how does that evolve into a solution at what stage?

Case 4-e:

Personally Impacted

The Barber and the Barbed...

When *Chuck's Barber Palace* opened down the block advertising \$15 professional hair colouring, Priscilla, a struggling young Environmental Health Officer, was unable to pass up the terrific deal. Priscilla's hair turned green and a few chunks fell out after her Barber Palace experience.

A month later Priscilla was sent to do an inspection at *Chuck's Barber Palace*. Still smarting for her *Anne of Green Gables* experience, she is uncertain what to do. Will Chuck think that she is being unfair, even if there is a legitimate health concern, because of her negative experience?

Anna, a friend and co-worker, is willing to go with Priscilla, but the Area Manager, Peter thinks that would be a waste of human resources and would only consider it if Priscilla agrees, in advance, to do two (2) additional inspections for Anna.

The office secretary, Frank, offers to go and try out the place first to see if it also happens to him. Frank is always offering to do things for others 'cause he likes compliments and thinks people will think more of him if he is seen as a nice guy.

What is Priscilla's best option? Will this also be the easiest?

Characters:

- Anna [starting at a Stage Five(5)]
- Peter [starting at a Stage Two(2)]
- Frank [basically at a Stage Three(3)]
- Priscilla [a very strong Stage Four(4)]

While the stage of the EHO is known at the outset? How does that evolve into a solution at what stage?

Case 4-f: *When Knowledge may be Too Much Info*

You work as an inspector in a RHA just outside the city. Your colleague **Luqman** works as a specialist for Alberta Environment covering an area not in your jurisdiction. Over a *cold one* he mentions that he knows a particular gas station (not in your area) has been leaking at least one type of petroleum product into a confined groundwater pocket (i.e. aquifer) over many years. This aquifer happens to be partially underneath an apartment building.

It poses a health hazard because people could be killed if the place explodes (gas seepage and build-up). At the same time, this problem has been around for a long time and there has been no explosion to date.

What do you do?

*Your spouse, **Petr**, believes that you must follow your professional code and tell the local RHA about the problem, even if it means **over-riding** your friend's confidence (your spouse won't call it **betraying**).*

*A colleague, **Shipra**, whom you trust argues that you must honour your friend's confidence; however, she also recommends that you encourage your friend to go to the local RHA and tip them off to the potential problem.*

- **What stages of reasoning are present here?**
- **Where or how can this be most quickly brought to resolution?**
- **Will this be most effective? and lasting?**

Characters:

- Petr [starts at stage four (4)]
- Shipra [starts at stage five (5)]
- Luqman [starts as a stage three (3)]

What stage should the EHO be at the outset? And how does that evolve into a solution at what stage?

Part 2:

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

Query A (Small Groups 4-a & 4-d – separately)

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 (& discuss the stages at work)? Explain:

Query B (Small Groups 4-b & 4-e – separately)

As a newly promoted Environmental 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 (& discuss the stages at work)? Explain:

Query C (Small Groups 4-c & 4-f – separately)

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 (& discuss the stages at work)? Explain:

Presentations & Critiques...

{Do the stages seem correctly utilized?}

- A) _____

- B) _____

- C) _____

NOTE: Complete the Session Briefing Note (& turn in to prof)

(Homework Task!!)

Read the paper by **Bob Hrasko** (Black Mountain Irrigation District)

SESSION III: *Dark Waters: Forever Chemicals & the Battle We Fight*

Part 1: Case Study #5: *Dark Waters*⁹

{refer to *Addendum A Rubric 2* for your designated group person}

*View: the docu-drama film **Dark Waters**
This case provides additional perspectives on challenges
surrounding ethical decision-making in the world of environmental
health. It also touches on some of the issues raised in **Ethics
Unwrapped** as well as **Cowboy Ethics**.*

The Challenge:

- Within your designated team, prepare a collective *briefing note* to the professor of no more than one & one-half [1½] pages that includes discussing –
 - the degree of relevance to this *ENVH 523* course including where it might be most effectively scheduled within (& why); and, in your mind, should every EHO view this film? Explain your position
 - Where do you think an EHO could have been most helpful to Rob Bilott (the lawyer)? How would you try to make yourself known to such a lawyer (or at least, such a case)?
 - What is the central ethical dilemma in this story that would impact an EHO?
- Describe with references, what predominate stage(s) of ethical reasoning were utilized by:
 - the lawyer *Robert Bilott* (lead lawyer on DuPont case, played by *Mark Ruffalo*)
 - the lawyer *Tom Terp* (Managing Partner played by *Tim Robbins*)
 - Bilott's wife (played by *Anne Hathaway*)
 - *Wilbur Tennant* (the farmer, played by *Bill Camp*)
 - the lead lawyer for DuPont, *Phil Donnelly* (played by *Victor Garber*)

⁹ Universal Pictures (2019) Focus Features & Participant, directed by **Todd Haynes**, starring **Mark Ruffalo**, **Anne Hathaway**, **Tim Robbins**, **Bill Camp** and others. Can be seen on *YouTube* and other platforms.

- identify three moments where an EHO's participation/intervention would have been very beneficial (& why)
- beyond ENVH 523, who should view this story; moreover, from your perspective are PFAS really *forever chemicals*¹⁰ that suggest we are at risk?
 - Comment on the value of the background paper itself?
- Any additional reflections about *Dark Waters* that should be brought forward?
- your personal reactions to the film

Be prepared to make an oral presentation of the *briefing note*...

&

Submit one printed/written copy to the professor at the conclusion of the class on behalf of all members of the team.

¹⁰ Refer to the paper by **Bob Hrasko** (Black Mountain Irrigation District) presented to the *Water Stewardship Council* of the Okanagan Water Board, January 12th, 2023

Part 2: Conversation on *Cowboy Ethics...* (the mandatory text)

Preliminary Reflection... [for your designated team – see *Appendix A*]

ALL SMALL GROUPS

- What is the stage of *moral reasoning* James Owen primarily comes from in **Cowboy Ethics**? [In your explanation, provide examples...]

- Thinking ahead to your career as a EHO, to whom &/or where might you make this book available? Why?

In the INTRODUCTION, we find these words:

We may be living a so-called ordinary life. Yet even as we move through the rhythms of our daily tasks, we still hope we can find that reservoir of courage, determination, and nobility we really need when life puts us to the test. We want to know, when all is said and done, that we are not ordinary at all.

- Interpret these comments in terms both of your reading of the Text and the symbiotic relationship to this course.

Within the text itself, let's examine some of the thoughts, concepts and questions that Owen puts before us...

Group CE-1

At a time when it can feel like the whole world is going downhill, the Code of the West points us back to basics, like keeping your word and heeding the Golden Rule. Back to core values, like courage, honour, and self-reliance. Back to timeless, universal principle that are relevant to each one of us, no matter who we are, where we were born, or how we worship. Does anyone disagree that a promise made should be a promise kept? Who among us doesn't believe that some things in this world should never be for sale?

- Why does he ask these questions?

- Do they need to be asked of us? Why/Why not?

- How would you answer them?

E-sinc

Group CE-2 & CE-3

You, and only you, are the author of your life's story. Only you can know what values and beliefs define you. And only you can decide what winning at life means to you. But we all get so caught up in our busy lives we forget to stop and think about what we truly believe in at the core.

- Explain your reaction/response to this statement...
-

Group CE-3 & CE-4

Live Each Day with Courage.

- In less than 47 words, provide some insights as to what Owen is getting at.
-

Group CE-4 & CE-5

Take Pride in Your Work.

- In no more than 31 words, explain what this means for an EHO.
-

Group CE-5 & CE-6

Always Finish What You Start.

- In less than 43 words, translate this into an EHO's day.
-

Group CE-6 & CE-1

Do What Has to Be Done.

- How does this apply to the role of an EHO?
-

Group CE-5 & CE-2

Be Tough, But Fair.

- Give at least three examples of a way the EHO can do this.
-

E-sinc

Group CE-4 & CE-3

When You Make a Promise, Keep It

- Where could this become difficult in the life of an EHO?
-

Group CE-1 & CE-4

Ride for the Brand

- EHOs are not cowboys, but there is still a considerable element of truth in this for the Environmental Health profession. In no more than 43 words outline what that truth is.
-

Group CE-2 & CE-5

Talk Less and Say More

- This expression also came to the fore in a great courtroom scene in the Paul Newman movie *Nobody's Fool*. In less than 31 words, define this as a motto for EHO's.
-

Group CE-3 & CE-6

Remember That Some Things Aren't For Sale

- List at least three things within the life of an EHO that ought not to be for sale...
-

Group CE-6 & CE-4

Know Where to Draw the Line

- Where does this part of the Code mesh with conversations with clients (whether they be businesses, governments or individuals)?
-

Group CE-3 & CE-1

I've also come to believe that we – meaning each one of us, and our families and communities – have more power to change things than we think. Personally, I don't believe throwing money at big issues is the answer. Nor can we afford to wait for large-scale, top-down government programs to turn the tide – especially with the political divisions and resource limitations we have now. But what if we shifted our attention away from a few big, unwieldy levers that may or may not deliver results, and focussed instead on the multitude of small levers that we can each apply in our own lives?

- What is Owen saying to you? To your profession? (No more than 29 words)
-

Group CE-5 & CE-2

Being engaged in positive, problem-solving action can also bring meaning to our own lives, and perhaps even create new ties, as we join with others in common purpose.

- To what extent is Owen too idealistic versus how would this be a good motto for all EHO's?
-

ALL GROUPS

- How might the reading of *Cowboy Ethics* have helped the characters in the Law Firm (movie *Dark Waters*)? 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?
-
-

Part 3: Video Vignette: *Concepts Unwrapped...* {continue in the same teams}

(A) *Intro to Behavioural Ethics...*

- why do you think you were shown this now?

- from your group's varied experiences to date, what are the top four *take-aways* from this vignette?

- from your experiences to date, who should be shown this video?

(B) *Legal Rights & Ethical Responsibilities...*

- where might the conundrum raised in the Vignette show itself in the life of an EHO?

- provide three [3] examples of where these two *pinnacles of decision-making* in life clash and suggest which might be more important?

- why is sharing this video important (and to whom)?

ASSIGNMENT for NEXT MODULE – Team Tasks...

Background materials will be provided for each team's *Role Play*. It should be noted that while Day 1 of Session IV will be given over for group preparations, teams should have carried out preliminary planning prior to that!

NOTE: Complete the Session *Briefing Note* (& turn in to prof)

SESSION IV – *Applying the Paradigm Through Role Plays*

Each Team will be assigned a particular case study to turn into a *Role Play*. Each member of the team must play at least one of the characters (additional characters can be added, but such must be relevant to the story and their stage(s) of ethical reasoning must be easily determined at the outset). Each character will have an assigned stage of ethical reasoning at the start of the role play. However, in the resolution of the ethical dilemma(s) at the centre of the story, characters may/should move in their stages of reasoning in order to achieve the desired conclusions.

The role play has to be at least four [4] minutes in length, but cannot be more than seven [7] minutes in order that the development of a solution is readily apparent to the class without being tedious or confusing. Penalty marks will be assessed for each 20 seconds over or under the above-noted time frame.

{Professors will give a partial demonstration.}

EHO DILEMMAS (demo case) [the food-handler]

You become aware of an *asymptomatic Covid carrier* food-handler at a fairly up-scale hotel in the downtown core. The job is to specifically plate the food. The banquet is for 1900 people. The food may be contaminated. Should it be thrown out? Or simply served as is?

While reflecting on this challenge, the food manager comes by and offers to buy you a coffee so she can talk to you about another problem she has discovered (she does not know about the above noted issue). She has just discovered that some of the chickens for the banquet had left been on out on a back counter at 10 degrees Celsius for over two hours due to the late arrival of two Assistant Chefs. There is no time to replace these chickens and she is quite confident there was no harm.

You have a strong relationship with a colleague from CUE who now works in another province but you communicate often. She reminds you of your ethics class and that your DIT score suggests you are a Stage Five but also that you have an image to maintain.

What do you do?

Which is the more serious dilemma? Why?

Can you work out an arrangement that would be acceptable to you and the hotel? How?

- **What stages of reasoning are present here?**
- **Where or how can this be most quickly brought to resolution?**
- **Will this be most effective? and lasting?**

For purposes of the *Role Play* start with the following positions:

- Boss is a strong Stage 4
- Colleague is somewhat more a 3(4)
- The Food Manager is a definite 2

What stage should the EHO be at the outset? At what stage will it evolve into a solution?

E-sinc

TEAM 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 — Team Preparations

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

Develop a *role play* starting with all the characters at obvious yet different *stage(s) of ethical reasoning*. 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. {For best planning, each team should find a special place in the university to work!}
- 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] & seven [7] minutes]

E-sinc

- As the challenge is to role-play potential resolutions to this dilemma. **Go through the process at least three times, each time (if there is some uneasiness) switch at least some of the roles** to permit each participant to play more than one [1] role — this may help determine who is most comfortable in arguing the agreed upon stage of that role.
- Each team member should then rough out what their initial portion of the script might sound like, and consider what other stages may be necessary to get to a solution.
- Once the initial scripts are created, conversations need to be had to meld the various scripts into a single performance. This will include how the dilemma is best resolved, which in turn requires determining 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). {Teams can access the Prof for guidance, advice & related help throughout the planning & preparation processes!}
- Once the progression is determined and the various stages are utilized in the unfolding story, the final scene (showing the resolution) then needs to be written to demonstrate how it will unfold. The final stage(s) used needs to be believable in how it was arrived at – each participant must show their individual stage progression. [N.B. timing of presentation will be between four [4] & seven [7] minutes]
- After completing the practice rounds of the role-play, the team then finalizes the script for presentation to the large group and appoints a spokesperson to set the stage for the audience. The presentation should concentrate on the major question (noted above at the end of each dilemma). *Make sure that each speaker is loud enough to hear, that the various steps in the story are clear, and when the final resolution is achieved that all have come together in a way that is realistic and sensible* [either on video or in-person]!!

Step 3 — Team Presentations: *The Role Plays*

- Present two [2] copies of the script to the Judges
- Present the *role play* (either via video or *in person*)
- Receive the responses from the judges (after all presentations have been made)

Scoring Rubric for the Role Plays

What the Judges/Evaluators are Looking For!!

External Judge(s):

- Presentation → Did it put the EHO in a positive, constructive light?
- House realistic is the unfolding story?
- To what degree does knowledge from other ENVH courses get brought adequately & accurately into the story?
- Was it easy to follow the conversations? (Were there helpful/informative visuals)?
- Did the resolution seem believable?

The Prof as Evaluator:

- Timing: minimum 4 minutes, maximum 7 minutes (need for warning?)
- How accurately does it bring out the Six [6] Stages of Ethical Reasoning?
 - Is there a believable progression?
- Are these usual references to *Ethics Unwrapped*?
 - In what ways?
- How does *Cowboy Ethics* play a significant role?
 - Is such usage accurate/useful?
- Does the resolution seem plausible?

NOTE: Complete the Session *Briefing Note* (& turn in to prof)

Session V – *The Crossfire: Can We Solve the Riddle?*

Part 1: Additional Practice with Stages Theory...

{see Addendum A – Rubric 2 for your designated group}

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

Query G (Small Groups SG-1, SG-2 – separately)

Cathy attended a year-end party for your program. It was a pretty wild event, and at one point she walks in on a scene involving her best friend, Donna, and one of the professors, Dr. Noanbetter.

Later Donna decides to press charges of sexual assault (you are the only witness).

*The Department Head, Dr. Pickle, asks Cathy to keep quiet as Dr. Noanbetter is very good; in fact, he is the only really world-class expert in his field: **He has helped raise the credibility of the program and thus the value of Cathy's degree in the job-marketplace.** Cathy is uneasy because she also knows that Donna had earlier in the year commented that Dr. Noanbetter was very good looking. She had gone farther and even mentioned the idea of trying to get a date with him, to try him out!*

Cathy decides to talk it over with her two best friends before making a decision...

Shannon sides with the Department Head, saying that this should not be going to court anyway. Donna was mature enough to know what would happen if she got too chummy with the prof; besides Cathy's (indeed all their classmates) ability to get good positions as EHO's depends on the reputation of the school and that is what needs to be kept to the forefront.

Crystal reminds Cathy that she is the victim's best friend and how would she feel if she could be a witness for Cathy and she jammed out on Cathy? No should always mean no; and what was said weeks earlier is not relevant! The professionalism of being a graduate requires you to be a witness.

Characters:

- Cathy [starting at a stage three (3)]
- Shannon [starting at a stage two (2)]
- Crystal [starting at a stage five (5)]
- Dr. Pickle [starting at a stage two (2)]

What stage should the EHO be at the start? And how does that evolve into a solution at what stage?

E-sinc

Query F (Small Groups SG-3 & SG4 – separately)

*A Public Health Inspector in a small rural town is completing an inspection of a local restaurant. At the conclusion of the process, the Inspector goes over the inspection report with the owner of the facility. The owner (**Gillian**) of the facility gets called out of the meeting (which is taking place in his office).*

There sits on his desk the float for the following day. The owner returns and accuses you of taking some of the money. He suggests that he will overlook the missing money if the Inspector will give him a clean inspection report.

*A colleague **Anna**, but in another Health Unit (and one who has no knowledge of this owner), is contacted. Her response is simply to challenge the owner and report the entire incident to the local police.*

*Another colleague **Martha**, who has dealt with this operator in the past, suggests making the deal but getting a written note that exonerates the Inspector from any wrong-doing*

Characters:

- Anna [starts at stage four (4)]
- Gillian [starts at stage two (2)]
- Marissa [starts as a stage three (3)].

Would should the Inspector do? What stage should the EHO (Inspector) be at the outset? And how does that evolve into a solution at what stage?

Query E (Small Groups SG-5 & SG-6 – separately)

The EHO is carrying out a search of some property (city owned) and is taking soil samples to test the land for structural strength. The EHO is working by herself, one-half hour out of the city, and comes across a small strong-box type object. Upon opening the box, which has a package wrapped in newspapers dated in 1997. The box is full of twenty (\$20.00) dollar bills, totalling \$12,000 (twelve thousand dollars). What do you do with the box?

- *The EHO returns to the office, to turn it in; but, mentions it to a friend (a fellow co-worker) who looks in the box, sees the money and takes note of where you store it.*
- *Someone phones for the cash and its it returned to the owner. The owner received the cash but eight thousand (\$8,000) is missing.*
- *The EHO has an idea that the friend (co-worker) may have taken the money. What is something she can do?*

Now what do you do? Do you rat your friend out or do you say that it is the only amount of money that was in the box and someone may have taken it before it was found by the EHO?

Query D (Small Groups SG-7 & SG-8 – separately)

*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 student is about to graduate?*
- 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?*

Presentations & Critiques...

[one group will go first/other will provide a critique – order by draw!]

- A) _____

- B) _____

- C) _____

- D) _____

Part 2: Additional Practice with Concepts Unwrapped...

{in the same teams as in Part 1, but combined into four [4] groups}

(A) Intro to Behavioural Ethics...

- why do you think you were shown this now?

- from your group's varied experiences to date, what are the top four *take-aways* from this vignette?

- from your varied perspectives, name three types of people who should be shown this video? Why?

(B) Legal Rights & Ethical Responsibilities...

- where might the conundrum raised in the Vignette show itself in the life of an EHO?

- provide three [3] examples of where these two *pinnacles of decision-making* in life clash and suggest which might be more important?

- why is sharing this video important (and to whom)?

Part 3: Additional Practice with Waste Management

1st Situation {Teams SG-1 & SG-8; Teams SG-4 & SG-5}

DVD — Island Waste Management

background:

This is a real scenario, the result of a student project in a Business School class the professor taught in 2008 @ UPEI. It examines the way that the province of Prince Edward Island has brought its waste management program under control in a way that now results in over 65% of residential & business waste being diverted from going into landfill sites. This story has been told to numerous people outside of PEI, including some politicians in Alberta as a way to improve the *greening of the province*.

specific questions:

How involved should Environmental Health Officers (EHO's) be in trying to help convince political leaders to seriously consider a much more comprehensive waste management program within the drive for greener world?

Given that James Owen comes from a perspective of reacting to failure of a system designed to protect society, how might he address this challenge which is arising out of a successful public process?

What ought to be the ethical stance of an EHO in this particular case and what then becomes the foremost goal of any recommendations the EHO might see as essential?

Challenge

Your team of EHO's has been asked by the Regional Committee of Mayors in the greater Edmonton area to develop the strategies that this Committee should recommend to their respective municipal governments to ensure a leading edge environmental health oriented waste management program can be implemented which could become a model for the entire province — prepare the initial *macro-briefing*? Determine the various stages in ethical reasoning that might have to be deployed to gain maximum acceptance from various stakeholders...

2nd Situation {Teams SG-7 & SG-6; Teams SG-3 & SG-2}

PowerPoint — India's Challenge...

background:

This is a real scenario, presented by a Graduate Student to an International Ethics Conference several years ago. She was interested in the ethics of allowing a river with deep religious and cultural values to become so polluted. She asked what professionals ought to recommend to the regional government since there is new emphases on India's need to demonstrate more commitment to a *greener world*..

specific questions:

When religious &/or cultural beliefs clash with public/private socio-economic practices that can impact our environmental health, what are the responsibilities of the Environmental Health Officer (EHO)?

How would James Owen suggest dealing with something with a significant religious overtone to it, and in another cultural milieu?

What ought to be the ethical stance of an EHO in this particular case and what then becomes the foremost goal of any recommendations the EHO might see as essential?

Challenge

Your team of EHO's has been asked by the Regional Government to recommend a long term management plan that would ensure positive, effective environmental health benefits for/from this river system — prepare the initial *macro-briefing*? Determine the various stages in ethical reasoning that might have to be deployed to gain maximum acceptance from various stakeholders...

Part 4: Case Study #6: *Gilbane Gold*

{refer to *Addendum A – Rubric 2* for your designated group person}

*Synopsis*¹¹

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.

¹¹ Excerpted from the **Study Guide for *Gilbane Gold***, National Institute for Engineering Ethics, Texas Tech University (1989)

E-sinc

Primary Questions (for all group-persons 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)¹²

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 – 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 *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)

¹² *Ibid.*

SG-8: 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-5: 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-2: 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* Vice-Pres Diane

in addition to the primary questions noted above...

- assess her conduct from the perspective of a *Z CORP* shareholder / a city taxpayer / a Gilbane Gold user
- what are her primary responsibilities — what is she being paid to do?
- what would be the advantages & disadvantages if she 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 *Z CORP* Head of Production Frank

in addition to the primary questions noted above...

- assess his conduct from the perspective of a shareholder &/or his team of employees
- what is his primary responsibility — what is he being paid to do?
- since the line is already operating on a thin profit margin, is there not a responsibility to maintain jobs for the employees?
- because the company is meeting (or comes close to) the letter of the existing discharge law, to what extent does he have to further jeopardize the viability of the production anyway?

GG-1: 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?

E-sinc

Initial Presentations [Teams will form a large oval – all facing each other]

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

GG-2: Tom Richards, Consultant

GG-1: David Jackson, the young environmental engineer

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

GG-5: Professor Emeritus Winslow Massin

GG-6: Senior Z CORP Vice-Pres Diane

GG-7: Senior Z CORP Frank, Head of Production

GG-8: 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?***

Please 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**). 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 full marks in this task; others will score according to their degree of contribution, collaboration &/or articulation of perspective. **There will be a maximum time allocation of seventeen [17] minutes for the entire Crossfire.**

NOTE: Complete the Session *Briefing Note* (& turn in to prof)

SESSION VI. Erin Brockovich: Will We Be as Brave?

Part 1: *Case Study #7: Erin Brockovich – The Movie*¹³

{refer to revised *Role Play Teams* re *Final Debates* for your designated group}

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!!

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

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

Team C *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?

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

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

¹³ Universal Pictures & Columbia Pictures (2000) directed by Steven Soderbergh starring Julia Roberts & Albert Finney.

E-sinc

Team E 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?

Team D 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...

Team C 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...

Team B The following questions recall the Arbitration process...

- a) How did they get into this is the first place?
- b) What seems to be happening between the two (2) firms?

Team A Re 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?

Team A 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?

Team B 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?

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

Team D 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?

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

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

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

Team C When Mrs. Jensen asks for a promise, explain what *stage(s)* are evident for her? For Erin? Why do you think this is?

Team D What really seems to be happening at the community meeting? And, who is really leading things? Explain what stage(s) are displayed at the community meeting in the persistence at signing the names, and by whom?

Team E 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...

Part 2: Preparing for the Final Debates: A Practice Session...

In your designated team, you will be given a practice case to study — depending on the time availability you may have to opportunity to either be **the presenting team** — or **provide the commentary (critique)** or simply observe (and ask questions of the prof). Make sure you read the case carefully and then study the central question so as to be certain of the position you could be taking. Think of yourselves as before a city council, a regional health board, a tribal authority 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 participates in two [2] debates: as presenting, and as the *commentary*!!

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

- **In the Final Debates**, the schedule for *presenting* will be laid out, complete with notification as to the team providing *commentary*. Following each section the teams will return to the audience until they are next scheduled to participate. **There will be no back-to-back sittings for any team.**
 - **The *presenting team* will be given two [2] minutes to prepare and then have six [6] minutes to make their case**
 - **The *commentary* will have two [2] minutes to prepare and then three [3] 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 two [2] minutes to present their rebuttal.**
- **In the Final Debates**, 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).

Preliminary Practice Round(s)...

If time permits, each Team will be given an opportunity to present or provide commentary to the prof to help refine skills in advance of the finals...

Debaters A/a
Debaters C/c

vs.
vs.

Debaters B/b
Debaters D/d

Observations... {by the prof & **Debaters E/e**}

Part 3: 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?

God (or whomever/if-ever you have faith in) bless, good luck, and don't be a stranger!!

NOTE: Complete the Session *Briefing Note* (& turn in to prof)

Session VII – The Finals {Cohorts will undertake in opposite order on same day}

MORNING!

NOTE: The only aid, in addition to your printed *Course Supplement*, that can be brought into this segment is your text (*Cowboy Ethics*). No phones, laptops, or other electronic devices are permitted.

Cohort P: *Start time – 9:00 a.m.*

{complete all four segments before leaving the room}

- **Final Case Study** (maximum three [3] page **Briefing Note**) –
Watch the Case, then prepare your responses!
{you have up to 2&1/4 hours to complete}
- ENVH 523 *Cohort Evaluation* – approximately 15 minutes to complete
On the graduated scoring sheet *rate each of your peers as to their overall level of participation in all the small group/team work*
[NOTE: do not rate anyone that you did not participate with on a team or in a small group task; also *to avoid having your submission disqualified* → do NOT rate yourself, do NOT give everyone the same score]
- ENVH 523 *Self Assessment* – approximately 15 minutes to complete (if desired, obtain original *goals* paper, from guest prof supervisor)
- *CUE Course Evaluation* (only guest prof supervisor will be present) – approximately 15 minutes to complete

E-sinc

Cohort Q: Start time –9:30 a.m.: The FINAL DEBATES

{this section is subject to modification or alteration prior to **Session VI**}

The purpose of the debate is to give you the opportunity to try to persuade the other team to understand your perspective. Think of yourselves before a city council, a regional health board, a tribal authority 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 *presenting*, the other providing the *critique/commentary*.
- Scoring will be determined by using the rubric of the International Ethics Bowl (sponsored by the Assoc. of Practical & Professional Ethics – APPE). Round One [1] will use Steps #1 through #4; Rd Two [2] uses Steps #5 through #8.

The *rules* for the debates are:

- **The order of the debates will be determined in advance – after each presentation teams will return to the audience as there will be no back-to-back settings. While each team will know the Case it will be *presenting*, the key question as to whether it will be for or against the statement will be announced at the outset of the debate itself.**
- **The *presenting team* will have two [2] minutes to prepare and then have up to six [6] minutes to make their case.**
- **The *commentary team* will have two [2] minutes to prepare and then have up to three [3] 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 two [2] 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) **which will be calibrated with that of the prof's to form one's final mark** (*each team mate will receive the same mark, no matter what role is played*).**

The process shall be repeated later in the schedule, except each team will undertake the other role.

- One score that will be announced at the conclusion of all the Rounds will be **the Spirit Award**. *Spirit points reflect an assessment by the judges of the extent to which each team's presentation embodied the spirit of the debates (in particular with respect to civility) – total possible score: 5 points*
- This score does not impact the grade – rather it is used to determine prizes, if any to be awarded!!

Schedule for the Debates {tentative}

PROPONENT *Commentary*

Either

Team E	vs. <i>Team A</i>
Team B	vs. <i>Team C</i>
Team D	vs. <i>Team E</i>
Team A	vs. <i>Team B</i>
Team C	vs. <i>Team D</i>

Or

Team A	vs. <i>Team C</i>
Team B	vs. <i>Team D</i>
Team C	vs. <i>Team A</i>
Team D	vs. <i>Team B</i>

AFTERNOON!!

NOTE: The only aid, in addition to your printed *Course Supplement*, that can be brought into this segment is your text (*Cowboy Ethics*). No phones, laptops, or other electronic devices are permitted.

Cohort Q: *Start time – 1:00 p.m.*

{complete all four segments before leaving the room}

- ***Final Case Study*** (maximum three [3] page **Briefing Note**) –
Watch the Case, then prepare your responses!
{you have up to 2&1/4 hours to complete}
- ENVH 523 *Cohort Evaluation* – approximately 15 minutes to complete
On the graduated scoring sheet *rate each of your peers as to their overall level of participation in all the small group/team work*
[NOTE: do not rate anyone that you did not participate with on a team or in a small group task; also *to avoid having your submission disqualified* → do NOT rate yourself, do NOT give everyone the same score]
- ENVH 523 *Self Assessment* – approximately 15 minutes to complete (if desired, obtain original *goals* paper, from guest prof supervisor)
- *CUE Course Evaluation* (only guest prof supervisor will be present) – approximately 15 minutes to complete

Cohort P: *Start time –1:30 p.m.: The FINAL DEBATES*

{this section is subject to modification or alteration prior to **Session VI**}

The purpose of the debate is to give you the opportunity to try to persuade the other team to understand your perspective. Think of yourselves before a city council, a regional health board, a tribal authority 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 *presenting*, the other providing the *critique/commentary*.
- Scoring will be determined by using the rubric of the International Ethics Bowl (sponsored by the Assoc. of Practical & Professional Ethics – APPE). Round One [1] will use Steps #1 through #4; Rd Two [2] uses Steps #5 through #8.

The *rules* for the debates are:

- **The order of the debates will be determined in advance – after each presentation teams will return to the audience as there will be no back-to-back settings. While each team will know the Case it will be *presenting*, the key question as to whether it will be for or against the statement will be announced at the outset of the debate itself.**
- **The *presenting team* will have two [2] minutes to prepare and then have up to six [6] minutes to make their case.**
- **The *commentary team* will have two [2] minutes to prepare and then have up to three [3] 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 two [2] 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) **which will be calibrated with that of the prof's to form one's final mark** (*each team mate will receive the same mark, no matter what role is played*).**

The process shall be repeated later in the schedule, except each team will undertake the other role.

- One score that will be announced at the conclusion of all the Rounds will be **the Spirit Award**. *Spirit points reflect an assessment by the judges of the extent to which each team's presentation embodied the spirit of the debates (in particular with respect to civility) – total possible score: 5 points*
- This score does not impact the grade – rather it is used to determine prizes, if any to be awarded!!

Schedule for the Debates {tentative}

PROPONENT *Commentary*

Either

Team A	vs. <i>Team C</i>
Team B	vs. <i>Team D</i>
Team C	vs. <i>Team A</i>
Team D	vs. <i>Team B</i>

Or

Team E	vs. <i>Team A</i>
Team B	vs. <i>Team C</i>
Team D	vs. <i>Team E</i>
Team A	vs. <i>Team B</i>
Team C	vs. <i>Team D</i>