**Ethics Online Discussion**

For this activity, please review the following **in this order**,

1. Module 4 PPT and ethics in research timeline

2. The Elixir Sulfanilamide video (4:56 minutes)  
https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=jfFQPGVZPuk&feature=youtu.be

3. The Thalidomide video (12:07 minutes)  
https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=41n3mDoVbvk&feature=youtu.be

4. The Belmont Report video (26:49 minutes)  
https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=M6AKIIhoFn4&feature=youtu.be

5. Deadly Deception: Tuskegee Syphilis Experiment (free on Youtube; 56:27 minutes) ***OR*** Three Identical Strangers (small fee depending on provider; 96 minutes)   
<https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=qNa8CnC4sSU&feature=youtu.be>  
http://www.threeidenticalstrangers.com

6. What does a clinical research nurse do?  
https://www.mdanderson.org/publications/cancerwise/what-does-a-research-nurse-do.h00-158906967.html

After watching and reading these resources, you will participate in two discussions: Patient Scenario Discussion and Unethical Study Discussion. See the rubric for grading criteria.

**Patient Scenario Discussion**

A patient confides to you, as the bedside nurse taking care of her on the oncology unit, that she signed a paper agreeing to be in a research study conducted by the university the hospital is affiliated with, but she doesn’t really understand it and doesn’t want to be a “guinea pig.”

Consider the scenario and answer the following questions in a new thread.

1. What would you do in this situation?

2. Using the information provided in the Belmont Report video and the "What does a clinical research nurse do?" article, what is your rationale for your decision?

Your initial and response posts must be submitted by the due dates/times noted in the course calendar.  **Late penalties will be incurred for *any* late response (initial and/or response)**

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Criteria** | **Mastery = 4** | **Proficient = 3** | **Developing = 2** | **Beginning = 1** |
| Action taken | Action taken **is** thoughtful, clear, succinct, and logical | Action taken is **mostly** thoughtful, clear, succinct, and logical | Action taken is **somewhat** thoughtful, clear, succinct, and logical | Action taken **is superficially stated.** |
| Rationale for decision supported by evidence from video ***and*** article | Rationale **is** thoughtful, clear, succinct, and logical; supported with evidence from video and article | Rationale is **mostly** thoughtful, clear, succinct, and logical; supported with evidence from video and article | Rationale is **somewhat** thoughtful, clear, succinct, and logical; supported with evidence from video or article | Rationale **is superficially stated.;** not supported with evidence from either video or article |
| Response to a first peer includes evidence from video ***and*** article to support post | Response **is** thoughtful, clear, succinct, and logical; supported with evidence from video and article | Response is **mostly** thoughtful, clear, succinct, and logical; supported with evidence from video and article | Response is **somewhat** thoughtful, clear, succinct, and logical; supported with evidence from video or article | Response **is superficially stated.;** not supported with evidence from either video or article |
| Response to a second peer includes evidence from video ***and*** article to support post | Response **is** thoughtful, clear, succinct, and logical; supported with evidence from video and article | Response is **mostly** thoughtful, clear, succinct, and logical; supported with evidence from video and article | Response is **somewhat** thoughtful, clear, succinct, and logical; supported with evidence from video or article | Response **is superficially stated.;** not supported with evidence from either video or article |

**Ethics Online Discussion**

**Unethical Study Discussion**

Choose ONE video to view for this discussion: *Deadly Deception: Tuskegee Syphilis Experiment* OR *Three Identical Strangers*.

1. What fact about the video you chose is most impactful to you? Why?

2. Connect the ethical principles of human subjects research in the Belmont Report to the ethics (or, more accurately, lack thereof) of the experiment detailed in the video you chose.  For example, if you choose beneficence, explain what is meant by that per The Belmont Report, and explain how the ethical principle was violated by the experiment.  Use information from your chosen video and the Belmont Report video to support your answer.

Your initial and response posts must be submitted by the due dates/times noted in the course calendar.  **Late penalties will be incurred for *any* late response (initial and/or response).**

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Criteria** | **Mastery = 4** | **Proficient = 3** | **Developing = 2** | **Beginning = 1** |
| Video chosen is stated and impact explained | Impact **is** thoughtful, clear, succinct, and logical | Impact is **mostly** thoughtful, clear, succinct, and logical | Impact is **somewhat** thoughtful, clear, succinct, and logical | Impact **is superficially stated.** |
| Connection between an ethical principle in the Belmont Report to details in chosen video explained | Connection **is** thoughtful, clear, succinct, and logical; supported with evidence from both videos | Connection is **mostly** thoughtful, clear, succinct, and logical; supported with evidence from both videos | Connection is **somewhat** thoughtful, clear, succinct, and logical; supported with evidence from only one video | Connection **is superficially stated.;**  not supported with evidence from either video |
| Response to a first peer includes evidence from chosen video ***and*** Belmont Report to support post | Response **is** thoughtful, clear, succinct, and logical; supported with evidence from both videos | Response is **mostly** thoughtful, clear, succinct, and logical; supported with evidence from both videos | Response is **somewhat** thoughtful, clear, succinct, and logical; supported with evidence from only one video | Response **is superficially stated.;**  not supported with evidence from either video |
| Response to a second peer includes evidence from chosen video ***and*** Belmont Report to support post | Response **is** thoughtful, clear, succinct, and logical; supported with evidence from both videos | Response is **mostly** thoughtful, clear, succinct, and logical; supported with evidence from both videos | Response is **somewhat** thoughtful, clear, succinct, and logical; supported with evidence from only one video | Response **is superficially stated.;**  not supported with evidence from either video |

**Grade Calculation**

Score of 0 to 4 will be determined based on performance level for each criterion in the grading rubric for each of the discussions. Scores for all four criteria will be added and then divided by 4 for a final score between 0.00 and 4.00. Each discussion is worth 100 points, and grades out of 100 points will be converted and recorded in the gradebook as follows.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Score out of 4** | **Point Grade** |
| 4.00 | 50/50 |
| 3.75-3.99 | 48/50 |
| 3.50-3.74 | 46/50 |
| 3.25-3.49 | 45/50 |
| 3.00-3.24 | 44/50 |
| 2.75-2.99 | 43/50 |
| 2.50-2.74 | 42/50 |
| 2.25-2.49 | 40/50 |
| 2.00-2.24 | 39/50 |
| 1.01-1.99 | 37/40 |
| </= 1.00 | 35/50 |
| No posts | 0/50 |