

GOAL: The goal of this exam is to give you an opportunity to consolidate your thoughts and ideas about the theoretical elements of bioethics and of the doctor patient relationship.

FORMAT: Your exam should be typed, double spaced, 1” margins, standard font. Your response should include references to the texts we have read thus far, notes from class sessions, and/ or other reputable sources that you have properly documented. Your response should be addressed to an academic audience (text-based conventions). Length will be covered within TOPICS (see below).

To give you a rough idea of the expectations for papers, here is a qualitative rubric. The source of this rubric is the Writing Program at NMT:

A: An A paper makes a unique contribution to our knowledge about a particular subject, significantly applying and extending principles discussed in class. It does not merely quote sources but rather evaluates the claims they make with respect to the overall argument of the paper. Its documentation ethics are unimpeachable. It has style. It presents a polished surface to the audience in terms of visual presentation, grammar, punctuation, and citation.

B: A B paper displays mastery of principles taught in class. It contains a strong, arguable thesis addressed to a specific audience. While there may be a few glitches in style and presentation, overall it would be presentable to an advisor for feedback.

C: A C paper satisfies the requirements of the assignment as stated, including a recognizable thesis, material from multiple sources, and passable style and mechanics. It is therefore an average performance, suitable for presentation as a rough draft to peers, the instructor, or writing center staff for feedback.

D: A D paper fails to satisfy the basic requirements of the assignment in argumentation and presentation. It contains errors in thesis, support, style, documentation, and visual presentation that render it unsuitable to submit to outside readers in an academic environment.

F: An F paper seriously fails to meet the requirements of the assignment either through gross inadequacy of effort or through a grave breach of ethics such as plagiarism.

Here’s a figure to accompany the above information:

	excellent	very good	good	fair	poor
Content/ ideas/understanding of the concepts (weighted most heavily)					
Development/support— Clear, convincing					
Presentation is clear and highly readable					

Part 1

Write a coherent 2-3 page essay* that explores one (you choose) of the following topics. Be sure to reference the readings from your text book and from available handouts as support for your assertions. Make sure that you document your ideas carefully using an accepted documentation style (MLA, APA, CBE...). *Page count does not include Works Cited page.

1. Reflect on the first essay we read for class—“Learning the Language” by Perri Klass. Examine Klass’s observations on the language of doctors through several ethical theories (deontology, utilitarianism, relativism, feminism...). The purpose is to generate insight into the kinds of structures and values that are embedded in the language (and actions

and attitudes) of doctors. Follow up your analysis by determining the dominant model that the physicians employ in Klass's article. The dominant models are carefully laid out in Chapter 2 of our textbook.

2. Describe how the Dr. / patient relationship has changed through the years, and how ethical theories play into those changes. You might also consider the role of the media and popular culture in marking or facilitating the changes.
3. Discuss the role technology has played in the evolution of medicine and medical ethics. Tie in the ethical theories discussed in class.

Part 2

Case Studies can help us tie theory to practice (or praxis). For this part of the exam, you will write two case analyses. You can choose from the 3 options below:

- 1). Write a clear explanation of the ethical issues that the case involves
- 2). Discuss how the case should be resolved and why you suggest a particular resolution(s). Your responses should be informed by the ethical theories we have studied in class.

Your choices:

- Case 2 on page 698
- Case 6 on page 699
- The following case from the popular series *House*. If you choose the case from *House*, you need not address every case in the episode. Choose one that you can discuss in detail or several that form some platform from which to discuss ethics.

THE RIGHT STUFF

EPISODE PREMIERE: October 2, 2007

A female Air Force pilot named Greta flies a Stealth fighter jet with precision over a desert landscape. She begins to perceive sounds for the flight rather than visuals. She heads for a crash into the mountainside. Greta is actually in a virtual reality flight simulator inside a warehouse. Angry and confused, she blames the controller for her crash.

In the hospital lecture hall, House asks the Fellowship candidates to identify the man on the screen behind him. It is the actor Buddy Ebsen, who was diagnosed with an allergy to aluminum dust in the make-up used on him as the original Tin Man character in "The Wizard of Oz." House dismisses the group to investigate the allergy. Cuddy comes to the door to tell House he'd better start eliminating candidates. House proceeds to fire the entire Row C. Yet when a pretty applicant goes to leave, House changes it to Row D instead.

House gets a page from his own pager number. He enters his office to find Greta waiting. She offers him fifty thousand dollars in cash to diagnose what is wrong with her. It appears that she is seeing with her ears, and she hopes to keep this fact from NASA and the Air Force where she is a candidate for astronaut training.

House brings the case of synesthesia to the remaining group of applicants and tells them to keep it a secret. He assigns some candidates to perform different tests on the patient. Another group is sent to break into Greta's home to find out what she is hiding. He tells the rest of the candidates to wash his car.

While candidate Jeffery Cole washes House's car, the others assigned to it complain. Amber Volakis has them all stop, and she takes the car to a

carwash with Cole.

The trio designated to break into the patient's home also complain. Henry Dobson, a candidate far older than the others, manages to break into the apartment and outsmarts his younger colleagues.

Candidates Taub, Jody and "Thirteen" report back to House that the patient has an elevated red blood count. A group of doctors walk past House's office and he notices that one looks very much like Chase. House decides that the cause of Greta's problem must be carbon monoxide poisoning from her fireplace.

When Amber returns from the carwash, House has her put the patient into a hyperbaric chamber. In the chamber, Greta suffers a heart attack from the oxygen therapy. The doctors try different methods to save her. When they hit her with defibrillator paddles, Greta is set on fire.

House asks the doctors what could have caused the heart attack. Henry suggests a cardiomyopathy, and House tells him to do a transesophageal echo. He orders the rest to go document ten things that cause infection in the hospital cafeteria. House tells Wilson that he saw Chase. Wilson thinks it's only an illusion, and he attributes it to House's guilt because Chase and Cameron are in Arizona.

Henry hesitates inserting the endoscope into Greta and gives it to Thirteen to do instead. The Fellows follow House down the hallway to update him. He recommends a test for hyperthyroidism. While candidate Chris Taub administers the test, the patient has a panicked reaction when she finds out that they had been to her home. Greta runs out of the room and locks herself in the hospital chapel. As the Fellows try to reason with her, House arrives. He notices someone who looks like Cameron but with blonde hair. Cuddy comes upon House to ask the identity of the mystery patient in her hospital. She admonishes him about running everything past her.

House checks in with the team, and they decide that the patient suffers from liver cancer. House asks Wilson for advice on how to test Greta. Lawrence Kutner, who was eliminated as number 6 has returned with his number upside down as a 9. Kutner provides the answer: they should get Greta drunk and measure her response. House chooses Cole, a Mormon who does not drink alcohol, to be the control group.

While feeding Greta shots of tequila, House thinks that he sees Forman walk by. He chases him down the hall. By the time House returns to Greta's room, she has disappeared. Cuddy chastises House for the unorthodox tests he is doing. She takes a whiff of him and asks if he has been drinking.

With Cole and Thirteen, House examines Greta's belabored breathing and concludes that she has lung cancer. Greta refuses surgery, fearing that NASA will see the scars it will cause. House consults the Fellows. Since Taub is a plastic surgeon, he suggests breast implant surgery to mask the scars. Prior to surgery, Cuddy asks House to explain why the patient is undergoing cosmetic surgery. He says it is in the best interest of the patient.

During the surgery, the team finds cysts on Greta's lungs. House calls out to the doctors for a diagnosis. He hears someone in the viewing gallery give the correct answer -- Von Hippel-Lindau Syndrome. That person is Chase. House is unsure if this is another vision but then realizes it is not. Chase has joined the surgical staff of the hospital and he was really in the hall.

House confronts Wilson who knew all along that Chase returned from Arizona. Cameron now works downstairs in the emergency room of Princeton-Plainsboro. Forman is at New York Mercy Hospital.

Greta awakes from surgery and still insists on not telling NASA. House lets her know that he told NASA himself.

House is in front of the candidates in the lecture hall and announces his selections. In the hallway, he addresses the eldest candidate, Henry. House says that he knows Henry did not attend medical school. He offers him the position of assistant.

House approaches Cameron in the ER. He says that he had lied about telling NASA of Greta's condition. He couldn't kill her dream.

A rubric for evaluating your response to a case study might look like this:

	excellent	very good	good	fair	poor
Considers the scope of the situation; response takes into consideration theoretical elements and ties them to specifics of the case.					
Perspective is clear and consideration of the angles of the case are evident					
Presentation is clear/organized; style is mature and grammar is correct					