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**Aids in the Workplace…. Q: 1**

Question: What are the moral issues in this case? What ideals, obligations, and consequences must Carla Lombard consider? What rights, if any, are stake? Will it make a difference whether Carla adopts a Kantian approach or utilitarian approach to this situation?

The two biggest moral issues in this case are the rights of privacy to Tom, and the “publics” right to know about any situation that may affect their own personal well being.

Tom has every right to his personal privacy, and should be allowed to inform his boss about potential illness in his own time, so long as there is no immediate risk to the public. However, the employees also have a right to be informed of issues that could possibly affect them, and what they need to do to be safe.

This particular case does not indicate what Carla’s response to the situation was, and how she obtained the information was definitely a factor in this issue.

As far as a Kantian approach (permitting Tom his privacy on this issue) vs. Utilitarian approach (taking steps to make sure that the rest of the work force is informed about a possible risk to their own safety). I would say that it definitely makes a difference, because I don’t believe that either approach is completely correct.

The Kantian approach, while allowing Tom his privacy, has the potential to put other employees at risk, yet at the same time a total utilitarian approach robs Tom of that privacy and could possibly make him a social outcast.

If I were in Carla’s position, and knowing how I obtained the information, I would have to pull Tom aside in a private meeting, and ask for verification. Not to put Tom in a bad situation, but to verify the legitimacy of the issue.

If it turned out to be accurate, I would ask him how he wanted to deal with the situation, and allow that decision on the specifics to be his. This protects his right to privacy, and allows him the opportunity to receive support in the manner that he chooses.

And then regardless of whether the information was accurate, I would play it safe by instituting a new training policy and have public safety meetings (if they weren’t already in place) on proper methods of sanitizing equipment, proper food prep protocols, and proper first aid steps for any type of minor on the job accident (minor cuts and scrapes etc.).

These training sessions would be held every year during the mid fall and early spring months, as these are the times when temperature swings are in play, and people are more likely to get sick or spread germs. This allows the company to train its employees properly, without specifically mentioning “AIDS”, and yet addresses a very important issue, that should probably be addressed by all companies on a more regular basis.

**The Mommy Track….Q:3**

Question: Do you think there already is such a thing as a mommy track? Is the idea of a mommy track a good one? Is it somehow discriminatory against women? Against men?

I definitely think that in the corporate world there is a “Mommy Track” mentality, although it will never officially be acknowledged. This is because corporate America is so focused on “the bottom line” that the concept of “family” is foreign to those that are in charge of that bottom line.

However, because of laws there are restrictions on businesses as to how they can react to situations that are outside of the employees control (such as a sick child), and therefore unofficial concepts such as the “Mommy Track” are creeping into society.

I definitely don’t think that the “Mommy track” concept is a good one, this is because it encourages people to change the priority of their family, to the priority of a career. While money is good, and required to “make a living” money cannot buy true happiness, and solely focusing on a career can easily cause one to lose sight of this fact. This of course is from the personal standpoint, but from the corporate standpoint, I don’t believe that it is any better.

If you actively encourage people to focus strictly on their career, then you are not only encouraging people to put their career as their main priority, but you are also helping to foster a work environment that is potentially extremely stressful. This is because as much as corporations want that focus of career only, a grand majority of the time that is just not realistically possible.

As such, I definitely think that this concept is discriminatory against everyone. In today’s constantly evolving society, more and more often, both women and men alike share all family responsibilities, and this affect isn’t restricted to those that are trying to raise families.

If you want a good career, you are pressured into focusing on that and only that, and are penalized for implementing common sense when dealing with the different issues of life that come up that are not directly career related.

Breaking from the initial concept of the “Mommy Track”, employees today can find themselves lumped into this category for things such as not going to work while being sick. When healthcare cost is such a major part of today’s economy, you would think that employers would provide incentives for employees to avoid the workplace while sick, so that contagions are not spread. People may comment on how easily this is abused be because of people with poor work ethics, but options such as remote access would allow employers to be more lenient in this area. If remote access isn’t an option due to the type of job, it would still be preferable to let the abuse happen and replace the abusing employees, than to reduce company productivity even further by essentially encouraging waves of disease to cycle through the workplace.

Of course, this is but one example of how this concept extends past raising a family, but the penalizing affects are the same as the “Mommy Track”.