

Overview

In this course, you will complete a project on ethical decision making. The result will be in the form of a presentation. This project is due in Module 8, so that students can share their presentation in the last class.

Rosenberg and Schwartz spearheaded the movement to a decision-making process that the 2022 Ethical Code for Behavior Analysts adopted. As you move through the course, be thinking about how the topics and codes may present a “gray” area to decipher when discerning between what is ethically right and what is ethically wrong.

For this project, you will either:

- Report a real-life ethical dilemma you or a colleague have experienced
- Create an original ethical dilemma

Use the Rosenberg and Schwartz article and address Steps 1 – 3 (see Figure 1). You will present this process via a PPT presentation (or similar software, such as Keynote) in class. Those unable to present in live class will be required to use the record function on PPT (or other desktop recording software) and share with your instructor **at least 24 hours before** the Module 9 virtual class.

Directions:

Be sure to be familiar with the decision-making process. Although this assignment is presented at this time, it is best to continue to draft ideas and scenarios until you are exposed to most of the content. Once you feel prepared, write a clear and well-defined scenario. From there, you will follow the decision-making process and create a PPT presentation with *at least* the following slides (you may add slides, if needed):

1. Title Slide

- Should include your name and general title of the discussion (e.g., Decision Making Guide to conflicts of interest)

2. Scenario Slide

- While PPT slides should not typically contain excess verbiage, it will be necessary to paste your entire scenario onto this slide. The scenario should present an obvious ethical dilemma with specific contextual information, such as important characteristics of the individual, setting, relevant relationships between individuals, etc. that will allow adequate examination of the scenario.

- Example (used throughout the instructions):
 - *Parents ask their ABA provider, Arya, to coach their 6-year-old with down syndrome to learn how to swim. The BCBA is a certified swimming instructor on the weekends and has experience training individuals with varying intellectual abilities. The family lives in Hawaii (mom is a professional surfer and the father works for the local aquarium) and is concerned for their child's lack of water safety skills and a lack of providers in this context. The beach, animals, and spending time with family are all highly preferred for the learner. Should Arya enter the dual relationship?*
3. Step 1: Why does this trigger your ethical radar?
- Be sure to follow the prompts in step 1, identifying the dilemma, the possible guiding BACB code, and any personal values or biases you bring to the scenario.
 - It is fine to use more than one slide, if necessary.
 - Example:
 - *Despite being one of the most qualified swim instructors for this population, the swim coach would be entering a dual relationship with the family (BACB Code 1.11)*
 - *Arya's behavior analytic training and background has instilled adherence to the Code and the BA verbal community has cautioned against multiple relationships with the rationale that it could impair objectivity and blur lines.*
 - *Arya also wants to advance values, ethics, and principles of the profession.*
4. Step 2: Brainstorm Solutions
- Derive at least (2) different conclusions, one based solely on the code and another based on the context of the situation
 - Example:
 - *BACB Code 1.11*
"... behavior analysts avoid entering into or creating multiple relationships"
"... seek to resolve the multiple relationship"

- *Other solution*

Honor the request under specific conditions designed for the protection of the learner, the BCBA, and the profession (i.e., clear delineation and definition of both roles, transparent and well-documented billing procedures).

Can still adhere to code 1.11 "behavior analysts develop appropriate safeguards to identify and avoid conflicts of interest in compliance with the Code and develop a plan to eventually resolve the multiple relationship. Behavior analysts document all actions taken in this circumstance and the eventual outcomes."

5. Step 3: Evaluate the Solutions

- Compare and contrast your two solutions and highlight at least 3 – 5 pros and cons for each solution. Consider any relevant variables listed in Figure 1, such as safety, dignity, outcomes, relationships, culture, etc.
- Example:
 - *Dual relationship is avoided.*
 - *Relationship with the parents may be harmed*
 - *Missed opportunity to disseminate and expand profession's reach*
 - *Child still without skills to swim*
 - *Dual relationship is entered*
 - *Risk of impaired objectivity*
 - *Role confusion*
 - *Unethical billing possibilities*
 - *Socially valid*
 - *Opportunities for intersection of interventions addressing safety, independence, and communication*

6. Conclusion

- Select the outcome you chose, highlighting the key elements for your decision.

Presentation Requirements

Whether the presentation is recorded or live, it is expected that the presenter will speak clearly, so that all words are audible. It is also expected that the presenter will be prepared and articulate the information on the slides in a smooth and controlled manner (i.e., deliver pertinent information without long pauses or repetition of filler words).

DECISION MAKING PROJECT

Criteria	20 Points	10 Points	0 Points
Presentation	Speaker was audible and articulate.	Speaker was either audible or articulate, but not both.	Speaker was neither audible or articulate. <i>If assignment was not submitted in time for live lecture, students will receive a "0" in this area.</i>
Title Slide	The section was present and the author included a relevant title and their name.	The section was present, but the author omitted either the title or name.	The section was not present or the author omitted all aspects of the section.
Scenario Slide	The scenario was well defined, including all contextual variables required.	The scenario was defined, but some contextual variables were missing.	The scenario was not well defined, missing contextual variables required to evaluate the situation.
Step 1 Slide	The slide presented a one-sentence explanation of the dilemma, identified the relevant BACB code, and conveyed personal values or biases related to the scenario.	The slide was present but the author only addressed 2/3 required elements.	The slide was either not present or only addressed 1/3 required elements.
Step 2 Slide	The slide was present and identified a BACB Code related solution and an alternative solution.	The slide was present, but was missing 1/2 required elements.	The slide was either not present or did not address any required elements.
Step 3 Slide	The slide was present and listed at least 3 – 5 pros or cons to each solution.	The slide was present, but only listed 2 pros or cons on one of the solutions.	The slide was either not present or did not provide pros or cons to each solution.