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Brief Course Description
This course is a prescribed course for students enrolled in the Bachelor of Social Science and is also open to all students as an elective. In this course students are introduced to: (i) the nature of ethics and moral discourse in the social sciences; (ii) a range of practical ethical issues and moral debates that they may encounter in their professional lives; and (iii) and methods for addressing these ethical issues.

Contact Hours
Lecture for 1 Hour per Week for 13 Weeks
Tutorial for 1 Hour per Week for 12 Weeks

Learning Materials/Texts
Mintoff, J (ed). Ethical Debates in the Social Sciences, 3rd edn (School of Humanities and Social Sciences, 2008).

Course Objectives
On successful completion of this course students will be able to:
1. Demonstrate an understanding of the nature of ethics and moral discourse.
2. Demonstrate an understanding of a range of ethical issues, perspectives and debates relevant to the social sciences.
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3. Critically appraise and discuss the relevant literature in written and oral forms.
4. Communicate understanding of ethical issues in written and oral forms, by employing analytical skills enabling them to deal with moral issues and get beyond mere disagreement and ambiguity.

Course Content
The course has two parts.
(i) The first part introduces students to the nature of ethics and moral discourse; the nature of ethical methodology; and the possibilities and limits of ethical discourse and practice.
(ii) The second part concerns a range of practical ethical issues and moral debates students may encounter in their professional lives (such issues may include the ethical review of research, issues arising in the formulation of policy, etc).

Assessment Items
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Essays / Written Assignments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Assignment; 1500 words; due week 13, 30%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Essays / Written Assignments</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tutorial Paper; 1500 words; due throughout semester, 30%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Essays / Written Assignments</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Essay; 2000 words; due mid semester, 40%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Assumed Knowledge
40 units of study at 1000 level.

Callaghan Campus Timetable

SOCS2300
ETHICAL DEBATES IN SOCIAL SCIENCES
Enquiries: School of Humanities and Social Science
Semester 2 - 2008
Lecture Tuesday 9:00 - 10:00 [LSTH]
and Tutorial Tuesday 10:00 - 11:00 [W308] Wks 2-13
or Tuesday 11:00 - 12:00 [V102] Wks 2-13
or Tuesday 12:00 - 13:00 [V104] Wks 2-13

Plagiarism
University policy prohibits students plagiarising any material under any circumstances. A student plagiarises if he or she presents the thoughts or works of another as one's own. Without limiting the generality of this definition, it may include:

· copying or paraphrasing material from any source without due acknowledgment;
· using another's ideas without due acknowledgment;
· working with others without permission and presenting the resulting work as though it was completed independently.

Plagiarism is not only related to written works, but also to material such as data, images, music, formulae, websites and computer programs.

Aiding another student to plagiarise is also a violation of the Plagiarism Policy and may invoke a penalty.

For further information on the University policy on plagiarism, please refer to the Policy on Student Academic Integrity at the following link -

The University has established a software plagiarism detection system called Turnitin. When you submit assessment items please be aware that for the purpose of assessing any assessment item the University may -
· Reproduce this assessment item and provide a copy to another member of the University; and/or
Communicate a copy of this assessment item to a plagiarism checking service (which may then retain a copy of the item on its database for the purpose of future plagiarism checking).

Submit the assessment item to other forms of plagiarism checking

**Written Assessment Items**

Students may be required to provide written assessment items in electronic form as well as hard copy.

**Marks and Grades Released During Term**

All marks and grades released during the term, are indicative only until formally approved by the Head of School on the recommendation of the School Assessment body.

**Extension of Time for Assessment Items, Deferred Assessment and Special Consideration for Assessment Items or Formal Written Examinations**

Students are required to submit assessment items by the due date, as advised in the Course Outline, unless the Course Coordinator approves an extension of time for submission of the item. University policy is that an assessment item submitted after the due date, without an approved extension, will be penalised.

Any student:

1. who is applying for an extension of time for submission of an assessment item on the basis of medical, compassionate, hardship/trauma or unavoidable commitment; or

2. whose attendance at or performance in an assessment item or formal written examination has been or will be affected by medical, compassionate, hardship/trauma or unavoidable commitment;

must report the circumstances, with supporting documentation, to the appropriate officer following the instructions provided in the Special Circumstances Affecting Assessment Procedure - Policy 000641.

Note: different procedures apply for minor and major assessment tasks.

Please go to the Policy at [http://www.newcastle.edu.au/policylibrary/000641.html](http://www.newcastle.edu.au/policylibrary/000641.html) for further information, particularly for information on the options available to you.

Students should be aware of the following important deadlines:

- **Requests for Special Consideration** must be lodged no later than 3 working days after the due date of submission or examination.

- **Requests for Extensions of Time on Assessment Items** must be lodged no later than the due date of the item.

- **Requests for Rescheduling Exams** must be received no later than ten working days prior the first date of the examination period

Your application may not be accepted if it is received after the deadline. In the first instance, students who are unable to meet the above deadlines due to extenuating circumstances should speak to their Program Officer or their Program Executive if studying in Singapore.

**Changing your Enrolment**

The census dates below are the last dates to withdraw without academic penalty. For onshore students, withdrawal on or before the census date means no financial penalty.

- For semester 1 courses: 31 March 2008
- For semester 2 courses: 31 August 2008
- For Trimester 1 courses: 18 February 2008
- For Trimester 2 courses: 9 June 2008
For Trimester 3 courses: 22 September 2008
For Trimester 1 Singapore courses: 3 February 2008
For Trimester 2 Singapore courses: 25 May 2008

Students may withdraw from a course without academic penalty on or before the last day of semester. Any withdrawal from a course after the last day of semester will result in a fail grade.

Students cannot enrol in a new course after the second week of semester/trimester, except under exceptional circumstances. Any application to add a course after the second week of semester/trimester must be on the appropriate form, and should be discussed with staff in the Student Hubs or with your Program Executive at PSB if you are a Singapore student.

To check or change your enrolment online, please refer to myHub - Self Service for Students
https://myhub.newcastle.edu.au

Faculty Information

The Student Hubs are a one-stop shop for the delivery of student related services and are the first point of contact for students studying in Australia.

The four Student Hubs are located at:

Callaghan campus
- Shortland Hub: Level 3, Shortland Union Building
- Hunter Hub: Student Services Centre, Hunter side of campus

City Precinct
- City Hub & Information Common: University House, ground floor in combination with an Information Common for the City Precinct

Ourimbah campus
- Ourimbah Hub: Administration Building

For Port Macquarie students, contact your program officer or EnquiryCentre@newcastle.edu.au, phone 4921 5000

For Singapore students, your first point of contact is your PSB Program Executive

Faculty websites

Faculty of Business and Law

Faculty of Education and Arts
http://www.newcastle.edu.au/faculty/education-arts/

Faculty of Engineering and Built Environment
http://www.newcastle.edu.au/faculty/engineering/

Faculty of Health
http://www.newcastle.edu.au/faculty/health/

Faculty of Science and Information Technology
Contact details

Callaghan, City and Port Macquarie
Phone: 02 4921 5000
Email: EnquiryCentre@newcastle.edu.au

Ourimbah
Phone: 02 4348 4030
Email: EnquiryCentre@newcastle.edu.au

The Dean of Students
Resolution Precinct
Phone: 02 4921 5806
Fax: 02 4921 7151
Email: resolutionprecinct@newcastle.edu.au

Deputy Dean of Students (Ourimbah)
Phone: 02 4348 4123
Fax: 02 4348 4145
Email: resolutionprecinct@newcastle.edu.au

Various services are offered by the University Student Support Unit:

Alteration of this Course Outline

No change to this course outline will be permitted after the end of the second week of the term except in exceptional circumstances and with Head of School approval. Students will be notified in advance of any approved changes to this outline.

Web Address for Rules Governing Undergraduate Academic Awards

Web Address for Rules Governing Postgraduate Academic Awards

Web Address for Rules Governing Professional Doctorate Awards

STUDENTS WITH A DISABILITY OR CHRONIC ILLNESS

The University is committed to providing a range of support services for students with a disability or chronic illness.

If you have a disability or chronic illness which you feel may impact on your studies, please feel free to discuss your support needs with your lecturer or course coordinator.

Disability Support may also be provided by the Student Support Service (Disability). Students must be registered to receive this type of support. To register please contact the Disability Liaison Officer on 02 4921 5766, or via email at: student-disability@newcastle.edu.au

As some forms of support can take a few weeks to implement it is extremely important that you discuss your needs with your lecturer, course coordinator or Student Support Service staff at the beginning of each semester.
Online Tutorial Registration:

Students are required to enrol in the Lecture and a specific Tutorial time for this course via the Online Registration system. Refer - [http://studinfo1.newcastle.edu.au/rego/stud_choose_login.cfm](http://studinfo1.newcastle.edu.au/rego/stud_choose_login.cfm)

NB: Registrations close at the end of week 2 of semester.

Studentmail and Blackboard: Refer - [www.blackboard.newcastle.edu.au/](http://www.blackboard.newcastle.edu.au/)

This course uses Blackboard and studentmail to contact students, so you are advised to keep your email accounts within the quota to ensure you receive essential messages. To receive an expedited response to queries, post questions on the Blackboard discussion forum if there is one, or if emailing staff directly use the course code in the subject line of your email. Students are advised to check their studentmail and the course Blackboard site on a weekly basis.

**Important Additional Information**

Details about the following topics are available on your course Blackboard site (where relevant). Refer - [www.blackboard.newcastle.edu.au/](http://www.blackboard.newcastle.edu.au/)

- Written Assignment Presentation and Submission Details
- Online copy submission to Turnitin
- Penalties for Late Assignments
- Special Circumstances
- No Assignment Re-submission
- Re-marks & Moderations
- Return of Assignments
- Preferred Referencing Style
- Student Representatives
- Student Communication
- Essential Online Information for Students

---

For more information related to confidentiality and documentation please visit the Student Support Service (Disability) website at: [www.newcastle.edu.au/services/disability](http://www.newcastle.edu.au/services/disability)
Detailed Course Outline and Assessment Information

Detailed Course Content:
In 2008, SOCS2300 falls into four sections. (I) The first section of the course, from weeks two to four, introduces students to the nature of ethics and moral discourse, and the possibilities and limits of ethics discourse and practice. The remaining three sections introduce a range of practical ethical issues and moral debates social science students may encounter in their professional lives. (II) In the second section, from weeks five to seven, students are introduced to the principles underlying the National Statement on Ethical Conduct in Human Research, and the moral debate surrounding these principles. (III) In the third section, from weeks eight to ten, students will be introduced to the National Statement in detail, and to the specific ethical issues relating to the conduct of social science research. (IV) And in the final section of the course, students will be introduced to the practicalities of applying to conduct research on humans, and in particular of completing the University of Newcastle’s Initial Application – Expedited Review form.

Text:
References for each week’s lecture and tutorial, and primary references for the essays, are contained in the following text (unless otherwise stated). Students are required to have a copy of the text, which is available from Uprint.

Mintoff, J (ed). Ethical Debates in the Social Sciences, 3rd edn (School of Humanities and Social Sciences, 2008).

References:
Students may find the following additional references useful, all of which have been placed in Short Loans or 3-Day Loan.

General Ethics:

Ethics and the Social Sciences:

Application for Human Research:
National Health & Medical Research Council (NHMRC), Australian Research Council (ARC), and Australian Vice Chancellors Committee (AVCC). National Statement on Ethical Conduct in Human Research, (Canberra: AusInfo, 2007), available at http://www.nhmrc.gov.au/publications/synopses/e72syn.htm (10/6/2008), and on Blackboard.
Detailed Assessment Items:
The assessment will consist of the following:
(i) Tutorial Presentation, of 1500 words and presented during a tutorial, worth 30%, to be allocated in the
week 2 tutorial, due on the agreed date of the presentation to your tutor (Hardcopy).
(ii) Essay of 2000 words, worth 40%, available in Course Readings and via Blackboard, and due at 4pm
Friday in week 7 to BOTH Shortland or Ourimbah Hub (Hardcopy) AND TURNITIN (Electronic Copy
via Blackboard).
(iii) Assignment of 1500 words, worth 30%, available in Course Readings and via Blackboard, and due at
4pm Friday in week 13 to BOTH Shortland or Ourimbah Hub (Hardcopy) AND TURNITIN (Electronic
Copy via Blackboard).

Non-Repetition of Work. Students are required to attempt different topics for their tutorial presentation and
their essay question. For example, if your tutorial paper is on Respect for Persons, then you must not do
your essay on this topic. The penalty liable for students found repeating work is to the loss of all the marks
for one or other of the two pieces of work on the same topic.

— oOo —

WEEK 1 (Lecture Date: 22 Jul)

Lecture: Introduction to Ethics
Although we use moral language all the time, little of our discussion directly concerns the truth of the moral
principles underlying our discussion. The first lecture introduces the idea of discussion of moral principles,
and provides an overview of the course.

Lecture Reading: Ethical Debates, ch 1

Tutorial: No Tutorial This Week

SECTION I: MORAL METHODOLOGY
This section of the course, from weeks two to four, introduces students to the nature of ethics
and moral discourse, and the possibilities and limits of ethics discourse and practice.

WEEK 2 (29 Jul)

Lecture: Relativism
One of the indisputable facts of moral life is the way in which moral beliefs and attitudes differ from one
society to the next. This fact has tempted many to think that there are no society-independent morality, and
that right and wrong depends entirely on the society in which one finds oneself. In this lecture we examine
the arguments for and against this claim.

Lecture Reading (Ethical Debates, ch 2)

Tutorial: Tutorials Start This Week

WEEK 3 (5 Aug)

Lecture: Understanding Moral Discussion
The only rational means of addressing disagreements over moral principles and specific cases is argument
and counter-argument. This involves talking with, and reading the work of, other people. This lecture
discusses some basic techniques for understanding moral argumentation, and illustrates them with Peter
Singer's discussion of our obligations to those suffering from absolute poverty.

Lecture Reading: Ethical Debates, ch 3

Guided Tutorial: Understanding Moral Discussion: Abortion
Presenter #1:
(a) Describe in your own terms the so-called conservative argument for the wrongness of killing a human fetus. Singer considers a number of suggested dividing lines between a fertilized egg and a child. Explain in your own terms each such suggestion, and his response to it.

Presenter #2:

(b) Describe in your own terms the so-called Feminist Argument for the liberal position on abortion. What objections does Singer have to this argument? Note: a "utilitarian" claims that if the consequences of performing an action are, on balance, better than the consequences of any alternative, then one is morally obliged to perform that action.

Tutorial Reading (Ethical Debates, ch 3)

WEEK 4 (12 Aug)

Lecture: Evaluating Moral Discussion
After understanding the argument a person gives for their moral views, one needs to determine how good that argument is. This lecture introduces and illustrates some basic techniques for evaluating moral argumentation, again illustrating them with Singer’s discussion of Rich and Poor.

Lecture Reading: Ethical Debates, ch 4

Guided Tutorial: Evaluating Moral Discussion: Abortion
Presenter #1:
(c) Describe in your own terms how Singer himself chooses to deal with the conservative argument against abortion.
Presenter #2:
(d) Singer realizes that his own position is susceptible to an important objection. Describe that objection in your own terms, and Singer’s response.

EACH Presenter:
(e) The answer you need to provide to this question depends on your forming an attitude towards abortion. Say whether you are more inclined to think that abortion is morally wrong, or more inclined to think that it is not morally wrong. And then:
(i) If you are more inclined to think abortion IS morally wrong, explain in detail how you would respond to Singer’s own objections to the conservative argument on pp. 149-156.
(ii) If you are more inclined to think abortion is NOT morally wrong, explain what you disagree with in the conservative argument on pp. 138-142. Note that: (a) if you are inclined to agree with one of the liberal arguments, then you will need to reply to Singer’s objections to that argument; (b) if you are inclined to agree with Singer, then you may need to investigate the possibility of drawing a morally significant distinction between killing a fetus and killing an infant; (c) if you have some other reason for rejecting the conservative argument, then explain that reason in detail.

Tutorial Reading (Ethical Debates, ch 3)
As for Week 3.

— oOo —

SECTION II: VALUES AND PRINCIPLES

In this section of the course, from weeks five to seven, students are introduced to the principles underlying the National Statement on Ethical Conduct in Human Research, and the moral debate surrounding these principles. Opening Reading: NHMRC, ARC, and AVCC. National Statement on Ethical Conduct in Human Research, (2007), sect 1.

WEEK 5 (19 Aug)

Lecture: Justice: Distributing Things Fairly
According to the National Statement (1.4-5), justice in research relates to fair treatment in the conduct of research (so-called ‘procedural’ justice), and fair distribution of benefits and burdens of research (so-called
'distributive' justice). But what is a fair distribution, whether of the benefit of research, or any other benefit? This lecture examines two different answers to this question.

Lecture and Tutorial Reading (Ethical Debates, ch 5)
Beauchamp, T. 'Justice', in his *Philosophical Ethics*, 3rd edn, (McGraw-Hill, 2001), ch 9 esp pp 320-335. [For copyright reasons, this chapter is available only in Short Loans.]

Tutorial: Justice: Distributing Things Fairly
ONE Presenter (you decide):
(a) Detail clauses 1.4 ("Justice") and 2.2.10 ("Reimbursing Participants") of the *National Statement* (Ethical Debates, ch 10).
Presenter #1:
(b) Explain in your own terms Nozick's so-called Entitlement Theory of Justice, and what you take to be its implications about the interpretation and plausibility of these clauses.
Presenter #2:
(c) Do the same for Rawls's Egalitarian Theory of Justice, and in particular for the so-called Difference Principle.
EACH Presenter:
(d) Decide which view of justice is more plausible by examining the arguments for, and the objections to, each. Consider in relation to the readings.

WEEK 6 (26 Aug)

Lecture: Beneficence: Avoiding Harm and Doing Good
According to the *National Statement* (1.6-9), beneficence involves amongst other things assessing and taking account of the risks of harm and the potential benefits of research to participants and to the wider community. But what is the right balance between avoiding harm and doing good, and under what conditions might the value of doing good outweigh other values such as justice and respect? By way of examining these questions, in this lecture we discuss a view which places priority on doing the greatest good for the greatest number.

Lecture and Tutorial Reading (Ethical Debates, ch 6)
Beauchamp, T. "Mill and Utilitarian Theories," in his *Philosophical Ethics*, 3rd edn, (McGraw-Hill, 2001), ch 4, esp pp 101-121, 127-133. [For copyright reasons, only pp 101-121, 127-133 are included in the Course Readings; the complete chapter is available in Short Loans.]

Tutorial: Beneficence: Avoiding Harm and Doing Good
EACH Presenter (pick on each):
(a) Detail clauses 1.6 to 1.8 ("Beneficence") of the *National Statement*. Describe the Case Study ("Health Policy for Hypertension") at the beginning of chapter 4 of Beauchamp’s *Philosophical Ethics*.
EACH Presenter:
(b) Explain Utilitarianism in your own terms, and what you take to be its implications about the morality of Weinstein and Stason’s “targeted” treatment strategy.
(c) Do the wider benefits of Weinstein and Stason’s “targeted” treatment strategy justify neglecting the health needs of the country’s poorest sector? Explain your answer.
(d) More generally, might the wider benefits of some research justify exposing participants to the risk of harm (eg, feelings of fear, being humiliated, damage to personal relationships) for which they receive no compensating benefits? Answer these questions by examining the arguments – particularly those of Smart and Williams – contained in the readings.

WEEK 7 (2 Sep)

Lecture: Respect: Treating People as Ends, not Means
According to the *National Statement* (1.10-13), respect for human beings involves having due regard to their beliefs and welfare, and for their capacity to make their own decisions. This idea is at the heart of an important ethical theory, which claims that the fundamental ethical value is treating people as ends-in-
themselves, rather than merely as means to the promotion of some good. This lecture introduces and examines this view.

Lecture and Tutorial Reading (Ethical Debates, ch 7)
Beauchamp, T. "Kant and Deontological Theories," in his Philosophical Ethics, 3rd edn, (McGraw-Hill, 2001), ch 5, esp pp 161-165. [For copyright reasons, only pp 161-165 are included in the Course Readings; the complete chapter is available in Short Loans.]
Feldman, F. 'Kant, II', in his Introductory Ethics, Prentice-Hall, pp 119-134.

Tutorial: Respect: Treating People as Ends, not Means
EACH Presenter (pick one each):
(a) Detail the first paragraph of Chapter 2.2 ("General Requirements for Consent") from the National Statement. Describe the Case Study ("A Case of Deception in Psychology") at the beginning of chapter 5 of Beauchamp’s Philosophical Ethics (2nd edn).
EACH Presenter:
(b) Did the experiment involve disrespect for the experimental subjects? Would that by itself have implied that it was not morally justified?
(c) More generally, what is it to respect someone? Should we always respect people? Why should we respect people? Answer these questions by considering and evaluating the arguments contained in the readings.

— oOo —

SECTION III: THE NATIONAL STATEMENT
In this section of the course, from weeks eight to ten, students will be introduced to the National Statement in detail, and to the specific ethical issues relating to the conduct of social science research.

WEEK 8 (9 Sep)

Lecture: Risk and Benefit
There are two important themes in the ethics of human research. According to the National Statement (2.1), one of these relates the risks and the benefits of that research. The purpose of this lecture is to introduce these notions in more detail, to examine various ways in which risks might be morally balanced against benefits, and to determine the implications of this issue for the conduct of social science research.

Lecture and Tutorial Reading (Ethical Debates, ch 8)
Also, from ch 10:
NHMRC, ARC, and AVCC. National Statement on Ethical Conduct in Human Research: ch 2.1

Tutorial: Risk and Benefit
Presenter #1:
(a) Explain in your own terms, and with examples taken if possible from the readings, the National Statement’s distinction between harm, discomfort, and inconvenience.
(b) Deiner & Crandall (at pp 22-26) consider three different moral principles for determining whether the benefits of research justify the risk of harm involved. State them, and the problems with each.
Presenter #2:
(c) Explain in your own terms, and with examples taken if possible from the readings, the National Statement’s classification of potential harms in research.
(d) Deiner & Crandall (at pp 27 ff) consider a number of different methods for minimizing the risks of harm. Explain them in your own terms.
EACH Presenter:
(e) Chose an example from the readings which involves risk of substantial harms, and explain how they might be negated, minimized, or managed.
Lecture: Informed Consent
The second important theme in the ethics of human research, according to the National Statement (2.2-3), relates to the notion of informed consent. The purpose of this lecture is to introduce this notion and its moral justification in more detail, and highlight the problems social scientists may face in trying to respect the so-called Principle of Informed Consent.

Lecture and Tutorial Reading (Ethical Debates, ch 9)
Also, from ch 10:
NHMRC, ARC, and AVCC. National Statement on Ethical Conduct in Human Research: chs 2.2, 2.3.

Tutorial: Informed Consent
Presenter #1:
(a) Explain in your own terms Elms’s key ideas and arguments.
Presenter #2:
(b) Explain in your own terms Macklin’s key ideas and arguments.
EACH Presenter:
(c) Is there a difference between the degree of informed consent morally required for social research, and that for medical research? Consider this question in relation to the readings.

WEEK 10 (23 Sep)

Lecture: The National Statement on Social Science Research
The purpose of the National Statement on Ethical Conduct in Human Research is “to promote ethically good human research” (p 6), which requires according participants respect and fostering research which is beneficial to the community. The aim of this lecture is to introduce the National Statement (2007), and to discuss how the general moral principles of justice, beneficence, and respect have been interpreted as applying to social science research.

Lecture Reading (Ethical Debates, ch 10)

Tutorial: The National Statement on Social Science Research
Presenter #1:
(a) Read the two cases you have been assigned, viz Case 2d ("Pseudo-patient studies: Homan 1986") and Case 5 ("Baking Bread").
Presenter #2:
(b) Read the two cases you have been assigned, viz Case 6 ("Paddington Station") and Case 9 ("Infiltrating the National Front").
EACH Presenter:
(c) For each case you have been assigned, briefly describe the research methodology, and apply the National Statement to it, highlighting the precise clauses where the research may be inconsistent with the Statement. What conclusions do you come to on the acceptability of the research, or of the relevant clauses of the National Statement?

Tutorial Reading (Ethical Debates, ch 10)
Case 9, "Infiltrating the National Front", from Homan 1991: 103-4.

MID-SEMESTER BREAK (29 Sep - 10 Oct)
— oOo —

SECTION IV: THE INITIAL APPLICATION

In this final section of the course, students will be introduced to the practicalities of applying to conduct research on humans, and in particular of completing the University of Newcastle's Initial Application – Expedited Review form.

WEEK 11 (14 Oct)

Lecture: Understanding an Initial Application
The ultimate point of thinking about ethics is not merely moral understanding, but also moral practice. We need not only to understand the principles underlying the National Statement, but to be able to put those principles into action in designing social research which adequately address the principles of justice, beneficence and respect for persons. The aim of this lecture is to provide a general introduction to the process of applying to do research on humans and the requirements of the University of Newcastle's Initial Application – Expedited Review form.

Lecture Reading (Ethical Debates, ch 11)


Also, from ch 10:

NHMRC, ARC, and AVCC. National Statement on Ethical Conduct in Human Research, (Canberra: AusInfo, 2007), esp clauses 5.1.5 to 5.1.25.

Tutorial: Understanding an Initial Application
Presenter #1:
(a) Read the case you have been assigned, viz Case 8 (“When Prophecy Fails”).

Presenter #2:
(b) Read the case you have been assigned, viz Case 10 (“Telephone tapping”).

EACH Presenter:
(c) For the case you have been assigned, complete sections B-D of the University of Newcastle’s Initial Application – Expedited Review form. Notwithstanding the instructions on the form, you MUST answer all questions in Part C, and all questions in Part D to which you are directed by a question in Part C. Pay specific attention to question D19 (“Can the risks be easily negated, minimized or managed?”)
(d) Also complete question E1 (“Brief ‘plain English’ description of the project”).
(e) Verbally present the results to the class, describing the research methodology, and the ethical issues identified by the form.

Tutorial Reading (Ethical Debates, ch 11)

WEEK 12 (21 Oct)

Lecture: Evaluating an Application (Questions)
The aim of this lecture and the next is to introduce students in detail to the means of evaluating a completed Initial Application – Expedited Review form. This week’s lecture focuses on evaluating the answers to the questions in an application.

Lecture Reading (Ethical Debates, ch 12)

Also, from chs 10, 11:
**NHMRC, ARC, and AVCC. National Statement on Ethical Conduct in Human Research,** (Canberra: AusInfo, 2007).


**Tutorial: Evaluating an Application** (Questions)

You are a member of a Human Research Ethics Committee [ie, the class], and have been assigned the project below, to be reviewed for the Week 12 and 13 tutorial meetings. In preparation for the Week 12 meeting, conduct an ethical analysis of the Application Form [NOT the Attachments, ie NOT the Information Sheets, etc], paying attention to the accuracy of Parts C and D, and the adequacy of the responses to D19, E1, E2, E3, E4, and any other questions which may be of relevance. At the meeting, explain to the Committee the research to be conducted, explain your ethical comments, your recommendations for approval or rejection of the project, and (if appropriate) how the answers to the Application Form might be ethically improved. Also come prepared to discuss any disagreements you might have with the other reviewers.

**Tutorial Reading** (*Ethical Debates*, ch 12)


**WEEK 13 (28 Oct)**

**Lecture:** Evaluating an Application (Attachments)

This lecture continues the detailed introduction of students to the means of evaluating a completed National Ethics Application Form. This week’s lecture focuses on evaluating the Information Statement and Consent Forms of an application.

**Lecture Reading** (*Ethical Debates*, ch 13)


University of Newcastle. *Information Statement – Sample Content,* and *Consent Form – Sample Content,* both available at: [http://www.newcastle.edu.au/research/human/forms.html#initial](http://www.newcastle.edu.au/research/human/forms.html#initial) (10/6/2008), and also on Blackboard.

Also, from chs 10, 11:

**NHMRC, ARC, and AVCC. National Statement on Ethical Conduct in Human Research,** (Canberra: AusInfo, 2007).


**Tutorial: Evaluating an Application** (Attachments)

You are a member of a Human Research Ethics Committee [ie, the class], and have been assigned the project below, to be reviewed for the Week 12 and 13 tutorial meetings. In preparation for the Week 13 meeting, conduct an ethical analysis of the Attachments [ie, the Information Sheets, Consent Forms, Survey, Interview Schedule, Data Sheet] and anything in the Application Form which may be of relevance. At the meeting, remind the Committee of the research to be conducted, explain your ethical comments, your recommendations for approval or rejection of the project, and (if appropriate) how information in the Attachments might be ethically improved. Also come prepared to discuss any disagreements you might have with the other reviewers.

**Tutorial Reading** (*Ethical Debates*, ch 12)


**WEEK 14 (4 Nov)**

**Lecture:** No Lecture This Week

**Tutorial:** No Tutorial This Week