Pharm 543 Pharmacy Laws & Ethics

Ethics Case Writeup

This is a two-part exercise. Each group will (1) write up an ethics case and (2) evaluate the ethical dilemma using the normative ethical principles described in class. Division of labor is up to the group, though the group is jointly responsible for the finished document. The combined document will be turned in using Catalyst eSubmit via the class web site.

The case is a description of an episode involving an ethical dilemma you have personally observed or for which you have obtained details from a colleague – but not a recent episode of ER, House or Grey’s Anatomy, etc. The case should relate to some aspect of pharmacy practice. The write up should be brief, but sufficiently thorough to describe the elements below. The description must be anonymous, so details that could identify patients, practitioners or innocent others must be removed from the write up.

Please limit the case to two pages and evaluation to one page. Format should be standard margins (1 inch), double-spaced, legible 10-12 point font.

First line: Pharm 543 Ethics Case: <ethics case submission title>
Second line: Group <number>
Third and subsequent lines: Group Members: <name of each group member>

Case

• **case statement** – history and background, identification of the ethical dilemma(s), why a dilemma vs. an issue of law
• **who is involved** – who are the participants in the dilemma, what are their vested interests, identifies other parties that should have a say in the outcome
• **relevant facts** – clearly identifies all of the facts (clinical and otherwise) that impinge on the dilemma
• **context** – clearly identifies the context of the dilemma, including any cultural issues relevant to the dilemma

Evaluation

• **principles** – state the perspective of the evaluation and evaluate the dilemma using each of the five normative principles,
• **argument** – what is your recommendation for resolving the dilemma
• **root cause** – what could be changed in the pathway to the dilemma that would have prevented its occurrence

Grading: 5 points