Part 1: Fact Identification: In the following incident, I identify the nurse’s off-duty status as the most morally relevant fact listed in Part 3 below.

Part 2: Foundational Concepts Assumed:

- Beneficence
- Supererogation
- The Hippocratic Oath

Part 3: Incident Fact Listing:

- Small child falls off swing, scrapes knee
- Observed by off-duty nurse
- Nurse washes wound, puts on band-aid
- Child sent home to parent
- Wound uninfected
Part 4: Ethical Analysis:

The off-duty nurse had no professional obligation or duty to help this child. Thus, helping the child in the above situation moves beyond the duty of the nurse, and is therefore supererogatory behavior. Since the child benefited from a non-infected wound, and was sent directly to a parent who could then take further charge of the child’s well-being, the moral principle of beneficence supported the actions of the nurse. Instead of playing for a further period with dirt in the wound, or going to a stranger’s home where the child might find danger, the wound was cleaned promptly, and the child was sent to the proper location, his own home, for further supervision. Since the Hippocratic Oath, which binds medical caregivers, focuses on the prevention of harm to patients, the nurse also fulfilled this Oath by preventing infection in the child’s wound.

Some may argue that the nurse was wrong to interfere in an incident over which she had no professional jurisdiction. Since she was off-duty, she intervened without need.

But I argue that, even though this nurse was not at work, her moral role as a good neighbor justified the beneficent concern in her actions. I defend her supererogatory behavior, because it shows a higher dedication to her profession.

Part 5: Closing Fact Identification:

And so, for the above reasons, I identify the nurse’s off-duty status as the most important moral fact in the incident.