

Discussion Questions for Week 1

A "threaded discussion" is a discussion forum that allows students to respond to questions posted by the professor (original responses), which can then be read by other users who add their own comments in response (secondary postings). Unlike chat rooms and other "real-time" interaction forums, threaded discussions do not require different users to be logged on at the same time.

Discussion questions are assigned each week. **Original responses to these questions must be posted by Thursday at 11:59PM.** Original responses must be at least **250 words** and must incorporate concepts from the lectures and assigned readings.

Secondary Responses/Postings: Each student must post **two or more** secondary responses to other students' postings **for each discussion question.** Secondary responses are due by **11:59PM on the Monday following the week in which the questions were assigned.** They must be a minimum of **150 words** and, like original responses, should incorporate concepts from the lectures and assigned readings. Students are encouraged to embark on interactive discussions that go beyond the minimum number of secondary postings.

Although the discussion board is expected to be student-driven, professors will be participating in the discussions as well.

DQ 1.1: Imagine that you were a member of the jury that heard the *Ancheff* case. Would you have concluded that John Ancheff was in a research study? What pieces of information would have been most important in reaching your decision? What is the relevance of the fact that the hospital was continuing to collect information on each patient who got the higher dose of the drug and putting that information in a file separate from the patient's medical records? What about the fact that the physicians responsible for the program were publishing and lecturing about the results?

DQ 1.2: In the last paragraph of the excerpt from Rid and Schmidt, the authors argue that, "by mandating strict adherence to a single set of rules, the Declaration [of Helsinki] fails to respect and promote the moral agency of researchers." Do you agree with this critique? If so, in what ways would you suggest making the Declaration of Helsinki more flexible? If not, how would you respond to Rid and Schmidt's concerns about how the document is currently written?