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Course Learning Outcomes and Objectives
Instructor Goals

Law Students
- Interdisciplinary approach
- Collaborative teaching
- Medical and legal instructors
- Focus on legal perspectives

Dental Assisting Students
- Limited interdisciplinary collaboration
- Limited perspectives on legal and ethical issues
- Focus on professional clinical practice
Proposed Course Learning Outcomes

Expose students to perspectives from students from a different country and/or culture.

Research a topic and collaborate with students from another institution and from another professional program.

Learn about issues, challenges and differences from other professional perspectives.
Project Learning Objectives

1. Apply specific knowledge about ethics and the law to support your ideas and opinions in the discussions about ethical dilemmas *Case Studies*.

2. Understand how differences in culture and variations in professional disciplines impact perspectives on values and ethical decisions.

3. Identify various issues that may arise in health care and professional practice by participating in each of the *Case Study Discussions*.

4. Demonstrate problem solving and ethical decision-making skills in your contribution to the *Case Study Discussions* and your collaboration with your student partners.
Project Description
Student Cohorts

**GCU**
Third-year Undergraduate Law Students

**GCU**
Fourth-year Undergraduate Ophthalmic Dispensing Students

**MCC**
Freshman One-Year Dental Assisting Students
### Group Assignments

You can facilitate collaboration among students by setting up groups. Groups allow students to establish a closer virtual relationship with members of the class and promote a sense of online community. More Help.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Group Set</th>
<th>Enrolled Members</th>
<th>Self-Enrol</th>
<th>Available</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>GCU law</td>
<td></td>
<td>27</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group A</td>
<td></td>
<td>6</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group B</td>
<td></td>
<td>6</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group C</td>
<td></td>
<td>6</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group D</td>
<td></td>
<td>6</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group E</td>
<td></td>
<td>6</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group F</td>
<td></td>
<td>6</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group G</td>
<td></td>
<td>7</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group H</td>
<td></td>
<td>6</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group I</td>
<td></td>
<td>7</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Ice Breaker: Introduction of Groups

- Students had an opportunity to introduce themselves
- Decide on the most important “rules” to follow in posting discussions and exchanging ideas
- Develop modes of communication to collaborate within the group
Ice Breaker: Student Responses

Chloe Thompson Brown
A short note about Glasgow

for everyone in the group not from Glasgow, you should know we have regularly been voted the UKs friendliest city so don't be shy in telling us you don’t agree with our opinions.

Our weather is pretty miserable all the time which means once it reaches about 12 degrees Celsius (around 50 degrees farheineit), we start acting like its a heatwave because it's the only chance we have to get any vitamin D.

Glasgow is the largest city in Scotland and we firmly believe it should be the capital city, but we're not sadly, its Edinburgh. Scotland is one of only two countries in the world where coca-cola is not the most popular drink. We drink Irn-Bru, it's sublime. Its a fantastic hangover cure. If you ever go to Spain in May-August you will just find countless numbers of sunburnt Scottish people hitting the streets to desperately track some down.

The population of Glasgow is under 600,000 and there's only about 5 million people in the full of Scotland which is tiny when you compare us to the capital city of England, London, which has nearly 9 million people. So little of us in such a grassy and hill filled place means our air and water is lovely.
Ice Breaker: Student Responses

Hannah Albone

Introduction

Hi everyone! My name is Hannah Albone and I am in the dental program at MCC! I am 19 years old and I have an apartment in Rochester, NY. I enjoy participating in theatre and I love to travel! Can’t wait to hear some of your interests and I am so excited to work with all of you!

I believe the most important rule for online discussions is to encourage positive comments. We all have different opinions and beliefs and I believe that we should be respectful of that. If any of you disagree with what I post I would still love to hear your comments and maybe you could change my outlook on that topic!

Can’t wait to hear from you!

-Hannah

Haris Bashir

RE: discussion board rules

I feel that rule 4 is the most important, as it is common for someone to put forth a theory or viewpoint that may have some form of controversy surrounding it and we can often be quick to 'criticise' people rather than the idea itself which is often somewhat of an issue.

This can also be seen as compatible with Rule 3. As Natalie and Lauren have mentioned that rule 3 possess that fundamental element of being respectful towards others and their viewpoints; which can also be linked to rule 4 as it can be interpreted as having that same principle – respectfulness, more specifically at other people rather than their viewpoints however.

Although I do feel that rule 5 as Lauren has mentioned is important to some extent, I would personally say that in certain situations it will be inevitable to avoid arguing especially when there is a lot of conflicting viewpoints put forth, however as long as the fundamentals of Rule 3 and 4 are applied in doing so then I don’t think there is too much wrong with an argumentative debate.
## Ice Breaker Summaries

Organise Forum Threads on this page and apply settings to several or all threads. Threads are listed in a tabular format. The Threads can be sorted by clicking the column title or the caret at the top of each column. More Help.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Thread</th>
<th>Author</th>
<th>Status</th>
<th>Unread Posts</th>
<th>Total Posts</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>17/02/16 23:03</td>
<td>Summary for Group C</td>
<td>Douglas Britton</td>
<td>Published</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17/02/16 22:45</td>
<td>Hello</td>
<td>Alison Britton</td>
<td>Published</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17/02/16 18:59</td>
<td>Welcome from Michael</td>
<td>Michael Bromby</td>
<td>Published</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17/02/16 17:50</td>
<td>Comments on Your Summaries</td>
<td>Krista Rodriguez</td>
<td>Published</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17/02/16 15:34</td>
<td>Group G Summary</td>
<td>Usman Mohammed</td>
<td>Published</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17/02/16 14:52</td>
<td>Group B Summary</td>
<td>Haris Bashir</td>
<td>Published</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17/02/16 13:14</td>
<td>Group H</td>
<td>Bobbie Pearson</td>
<td>Published</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17/02/16 13:08</td>
<td>Summary For Group F</td>
<td>Kris Jenkins</td>
<td>Published</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17/02/16 13:05</td>
<td>Summary for Group D</td>
<td>Kerrie Campbell</td>
<td>Published</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17/02/16 12:55</td>
<td>Group A Summary</td>
<td>Rachel Irene Bond</td>
<td>Published</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17/02/16 11:24</td>
<td>Summary for Group E</td>
<td>Samantha Hunt</td>
<td>Published</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Ice Breaker Summary: Group F

Six introductions were submitted to our seminar group board for this week. Members gave a brief description of themselves, introducing the key components of their course and what they may wish to gain from it. Those who have a clear path outlined future aspirations. A good mix of law, dental and eye related students are present with all looking forward to discussing future seminar scenarios.

Glasgow members all agreed that it is a friendly city, commenting on the people and social aspects it has to offer. Another common theme generated from the Glasgow members was that while Glasgow is a nice city in which to learn, the weather could be a bit depressing at times, especially through the winter months. This thought was mirrored by the Monroe College students who pointed out the winters can also be bleak. However, Rochester is situated in reach of many natural wonders including the Niagara Falls. These brief introductions have assisted on creating a comfortable and more human feeling towards the seminar discussions.

Continuing with the comfortable theme, the outlining of rules gave rise to clear group beliefs, with the top 3 being:

1. Rule 3 - be respectful of everyone’s opinions has been adopted as our number one rule for the group discussions based on it being the most cited.
2. Rule 4. Encourage positive comments. A good general rule: "criticise ideas, not people".
3. Rule 10. Don’t post when intoxicated! You’ll find it harder to keep to the guidelines!

This introductory stage has allowed group members to build rapport, putting a human behind the computer screen.
Timeline for Submission of Discussions

**Weekly Timetable for Online Discussion**

Problems will be made available on a Wednesday at 3pm UK time (this will be 10am in New York State). Discussion should take place up until the following Tues / Wed when summaries will be posted and the seminar tutors will post some responses too.

Below is an indicative timetable of how discussion will most probably proceed… it’s up to the group to make it happen!

**Wednesday 3pm GMT / 10am EST**
- Problem becomes available to the group
- Time for thought and possibly first postings

**Thursday**
- Time for further thought, research and first postings

**Friday – Tuesday**
- Group discussions, reply to others, add second thoughts

**Tuesday / Wednesday**
- Conclude discussions, leaders will start to draft and post their summaries

**Wednesday 3pm GMT / 10am EST**
- Summary posts must be completed
- All students can reply to other summary posts
- Tutors will comment, students may reply

The seminar tutors can and will look at your discussions during the week, but most likely they will not comment or intervene unless questions are made directly to the tutor.
Case Studies

Wk 4 PBL: Negligence
Availability: Item is no longer available. It was last available on 24-Feb-2016 15:00.
Attached Files: PBL Scenario Negligence.pdf (284.394 KB)

Wk 5 PBL: Consent I
Availability: Item is no longer available. It was last available on 02-Mar-2016 15:00.
Enabled: Statistics Tracking
Attached Files: PBL Scenario Consent I.pdf (73.908 KB)

Wk 6 PBL: Consent II
Availability: Item is no longer available. It was last available on 09-Mar-2016 15:00.
Enabled: Statistics Tracking
Attached Files: 06 PBL research issues.pdf (110.447 KB)

Wk 7 PBL: Confidentiality
Availability: Item is no longer available. It was last available on 16-Mar-2016 15:00.
Enabled: Statistics Tracking
Attached Files: 07 PBL confidentiality.pdf (73.402 KB)
## Group Summaries

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Topic</th>
<th>Notes</th>
<th>Numbers</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Starter for 10! Summaries</td>
<td>Discussion leaders should enter group summaries from the problem-based learning activity in this area of Blackboard <em>themselves</em> towards the end of each session.</td>
<td>30 2 11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Negligence</td>
<td></td>
<td>16 2 9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Consent I</td>
<td></td>
<td>8 0 7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Consent II</td>
<td></td>
<td>9 1 9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Confidentiality</td>
<td></td>
<td>7 2 7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Student Summary: Consent II Case

Fiona Margaret Buckmaster
Group E Summary

Group E struggled to come to an agreement regarding Prof Helsinki's study. It was agreed that all research of this type should comply with ethical guidelines such as the Declaration of Helsinki. However, whilst some members of the group felt that Prof Helsinki was completely justified in not telling the participant that they were involved in a research study; other members of the group felt that this was not justified, and may be akin to “trickery.”

The argument from the side of not telling the patient was mainly based on the fact that informing the patient that they were part of a research study would adversely affect the results of the study and make those results carry much less weight within the scientific community. It was argued that there is a large precedent for conducting this kind of study (known as a randomised control trial or RCT) within the scientific community, and most Western medicine is based upon findings from such RCTs.

The other side of the argument argued that the family has a right to veracity and autonomy, particularly from a medical profession who is expected to at all times be informative. It was suggested that perhaps the parents of the children could be informed of the research, but not the children themselves. This also poses difficulties, however, as with behavioural disorders such as this much of the progress results are communicated by the parents based on parental observations, and so the parents knowledge of the trial may also adversely affect the results.

By contrast, the group was in agreement in regards to Frieda's study. Unlike Prof Helsinki's study, in this case the patient's knowledge of being included in the research would have no effect on the results, and so it was agreed that the ethical way to proceed would be to gain informed consent from the participants, and give the participants the chance to opt out if they wish. This will obviously be logistically more difficult than not informing the participants, and some people may refuse to take part, but this is the right thing to do ethically. The one issue that did arise was whether or not Frieda would have to inform a participant if they tested positive for HIV (and they did not previously know). The consensus was that it would be considered legal to inform the participant should their test be positive.
Fraser Ness

Group G Summary

Firstly, our group agreed that more caution should have been exercised before undertaking any non-essential cosmetic procedure as the patient had a genuine concern of pain in her lower left jaw. The patient mentions this to Brigitte, however she ignores the complaint and continues which was not appropriate. This was thought to be the first act of negligence.

There was a disparity of opinions in our group as to whether Brigitte should have been allowed to perform the procedure in the first place, or whether she could perform the procedure if she had enough experience and was competent. The scenario states that Brigitte is a dental assistant. In the UK dental nurses may not provide treatment such as teeth whitening (even if they know how to do it), whereas dental hygienists with further training can perform these procedures. As the scenario only says dental assistant, we could not be sure whether this was something that Brigitte was registered to do. For the sake of the scenario we assumed that she could.

The group was unanimous in opinion that the peroxide should have been checked more frequently, and that this responsibility lies with Dr Forest as he is the registered practitioner. A practitioner will check the expiry and batch number of a product before use, and this should be recorded. This is carried out in case of any adverse drug reactions, so a particular batch can be traced and pulled from the market if necessary. As far as we are aware, Brigitte did not do this. As a group this was also thought as an act of negligence.

It was mentioned in the scenario that Dr Forrest is only just qualified. This brought up the point that practitioners should be held to the same standard, no matter whether they are senior or newly qualified, which has been demonstrated in Whish v Essex Area Health Authority.

The case of R vs Bateman was also mentioned, where a health professional cannot be expected to provide a 100% standard of care all of the time, but must not drop below at least a 50% standard of care. Thus, meaning practitioners are held to an average standard. In this case, it was thought that the standard of care was lower than it should have been.

To satisfy the requirement for a negligent claim the question ‘Did the conduct of the practitioner amount to a breach of duty of care?’ must be asked. Our conclusion was yes this was a case of negligence, but it is unclear whether the fault truly lies with Brigitte or instead with Dr Forrest as he is the registered practitioner. It is more likely the latter, but more information is required.
Faculty Feedback: All Groups or Individual Groups

Krista Rodriguez

Negligence Summaries

Nice job on the Negligence Discussions, Groups:

I wanted to post an overall review of the case based on your summaries, rather than individual responses. It was interesting reading about the legal impacts of negligence with mention of whether it can be proven and who might be responsible. Since I am not familiar with the legal aspects, I learned about the necessity to have a "causal" link between the patient's pain and the treatment procedure(s).

Clinical practice of dental assisting here in the U.S. is a bit complicated. Each state (and we have 50 of them) establishes their own laws governing practice for any licensed professional, including dentists, dental hygienists and DA. Some states do not even require a DA to be licensed. Some call it registration. Some states allow the credentialed DA to do expanded functions while other states limit the scope of practice. Restrictions are included in each State's Dental Practice Act.

In NYS, a DA must have a license to practice expanded functions which would include whitening procedures. However, our law also includes the following caveat:

Michael Bromby

RE: Negligence Summaries

Thanks for supplying the US / NY perspective on this Krista.

In the UK, we would refer to 'respondeat superior' (let the master answer) as vicarious liability, but the law is not particularly different here in Scotland. Our biggest different is that the public health authority (an arm of the state) who may be vicariously liable for both master and servant in the health practice. Therefore, costs are gained by claimants against the NHS if they are successful. This means that the public purse will get hit for every claim.

Allison Britton

RE: Group A Summary

Hi. Thank you for your summary. A lot of focus upon possible risk and explaining likelihood of risk and increased pain. this is very relevant to any current legal discussion on possible negligence. court places much emphasis on this aspect. The problem notes that Amanda has a history of tooth sensitivity but doesn’t state whether she has been asked about this or volunteered this information- whose responsibility is this- Dr Forest to ask or hers to disclose? Brigitte has been working there for 5 years so not a 'novice' BUT she would be expected to discharge her role in line with a similar body or people doing a similar professional role. The case of Wilsher would indeed be appropriate here. also an issues about Dr Forests state of knowledge - should he have reasonably known about the journal publication. to bring the case law up to date, it may have been helpful to consider a couple beyond Bolitho and the idea of policy and increased weight given to the patients self determination and autonomy. Good discussion.
MCC Student Preparation
Student Preparation: MCC

Collaborative Project with Glasgow University

Instructions: Discussion Assignments and Grading

Ethics and Jurisprudence Discussion Project: Instructions and Grading

Open this folder to find the Grading Assignments: copy your discussion postings and paste them in each of the corresponding assignment boards. I will grade them here.

This is a mandatory assignment and each part (each discussion) will be graded. In order to keep everyone on track, you must adhere to the following guidelines:

Overall Project Description:

You will be required to participate in FIVE discussions with students from Glasgow University. There will be students enrolled in the Law School and some from the Ophthalmology School from Glasgow and dental assisting students from MCC.

- Discussion 1: Introduction and Deciding on Rules
- Discussion 2: Case: Negligence
- Discussion 3: Case: Consent I
- Discussion 4: Case: Consent II
- Discussion 5: Case: Confidentiality

Goal: to evaluate ethical/legal cases from different perspectives: from the legal side and from the clinical practice side of the scenario. The project is also intended to think about differences in culture and to provide students with an opportunity for cultural exchange.

Objectives:

1. To learn about ethical and legal implications of health care practice (background knowledge).
2. To begin to evaluate an ethical dilemma, implement decision-making skills and prepare for possible ethical situations in future clinical practice.
3. To meet people from a different country for an opportunity to talk about cultural similarities and differences and to broaden perspectives on life in another country, in a different educational institution and in a different career/profession.
Grading and Guidance

Grading:

Discussions will be graded each week as to:

- **Submission due dates:** points will be deducted if the original discussion is not posted by Friday
- **Submission quality:** each discussion will be graded based on substance, quality of ideas, formatting and inclusion of significant points and facts and thoroughness of the ideas.
- **Leader summary:** a grade will be given for the Summary when you are the leader, based on quality of the summary, formatting and thoroughness of including all ideas. Points will be deducted if the summary is not posted by the due date: Wednesday of the next week
- **Each discussion** will be worth: 20 points each (100 points)
- **Leader Summary** will be worth: 20 points

Format:

- Discussions should be easy to read: organize your writing: use bullets, paragraphs (not just a continuous paragraph)
- Use correct/proper grammar, punctuation, vocabulary. This is a professional assignment and your writing should reflect on a well-presented and well-written document. You are entering a profession and you should learn to speak and write in a professional and intelligent manner.
- Thorough: you should think through the dilemma, research the background knowledge, expand your ideas and broaden your perspectives.
- Quality: I can tell if you just write something quick or have really thought about the problem, the implications and the solutions.
- Contributions: you should be commenting on your group members’ discussion postings......be respectful and courteous. Think about their ideas and expand on them or ask questions. This is a collaboration so it is important that you interact with each other.

SUGGESTIONS:

- Use your lecture notes and textbook (chapters on Ethics and Jurisprudence) for background knowledge of the legal aspects. Include this information into your discussions.
- I will be providing supplemental information at times
- Use on line resources to research a topic further
- **Meet as a group on Wednesday and/or Thursday** when everyone is back on campus to read and discuss the next Case. You can formulate ideas, look up facts and share perspectives. Because you are in different groups, it is not a problem to have similar discussion postings. However, you should all be contributing your own ideas and work. If a student is not contributing to the overall discussion and just using other people’s work, I want to know about it (and for your sake I would not include that person in the group collaboration). An instructor will be available to ask questions of........use any instructor for help.
- Message me in BB if you have questions and check BB for information I may post.
Grading

**GCU Discussion 1: Introduction and Choosing Rules**

Post a copy of your discussion in this discussion board so that it can be graded for this course.

- Your original discussion and all of your comments to other group members.
- All students can read these discussions so please do not post any personal comments. Message me for those types of communication.
- However, you can add your thoughts about your group if you would like and any interesting things your group discussed.

**GCU Discussion 2: Negligence**

Post a copy of your discussion in this discussion board so that it can be graded for this course.

- Your original discussion and all of your comments to other group members.
- All students can read these discussions so please do not post any personal comments. Message me for those types of communication.
- However, you can add your thoughts about your group if you would like and any interesting things your group discussed.

**GCU Leader Summary Discussion**

Post a copy of your Discussion Summary in this discussion board so that it can be graded for this course.

- When you are the Leader of the case, you will need to summarize the group’s discussion. Post your summary here.
- All students can read these discussions so please do not post any personal comments. Message me for those types of communication.
- However, you can add your thoughts about your group if you would like and any interesting things your group discussed.
Encouragement to Participate

SUGGESTIONS:

- Use your lecture notes and textbook (chapters on Ethics and Jurisprudence) for background knowledge of the legal aspects. Include this information into your discussions.
- I will be providing supplemental information at times
- Use on line resources to research a topic further
- Meet as a group on Wednesday and/or Thursday when everyone is back on campus to read and discuss the next Case. You can formulate ideas, look up facts and share perspectives. Because you are in different groups, it is not a problem to have similar discussion postings. However, you should all be contributing your own ideas and work. If a student is not contributing to the overall discussion and just using other people’s work, I want to know about it (and for your sake I would not include that person in the group collaboration). An instructor will be available to ask questions of…… use any instructor for help.
- Message me in BB if you have questions and check BB for information I may post.

BENEFITS: this project is intended to provide you with an opportunity to expand your knowledge and perspectives and to experience a cultural exchange in a limited setting. You have chosen to enter a profession as a clinical practitioner. It is CRITICAL that you understand the ethical and legal issues that govern our practice. You now have an ethical responsibility to be the best practitioner you can be and this requires that you:

- Learn as much as possible
- Put forth effort
- Follow directions and meet deadlines
- Develop a work ethic that is of high standards and demonstrates dedication to learning and skill development
- Collaborate with others
- Broaden your perspectives on clinical knowledge and skills as well as background knowledge
- Develop personally by expanding your horizons, learning new things, and practicing what you have learned (vocabulary, behavior, etc……)
- Learn what it means to be “professional” in all aspects of your life: what you say, how you say it, what you know, how you behave, how you treat others, etc…….

This is extremely important.

For future employment and success in life, these are valuable learning experiences. Employers look for these qualities even more than clinical skills at first…… you can learn skills over time and with practice. BUT, if you are not professional, ethical or collaborative, you will have difficulty being successful…… these are things that are “hard” to teach but can be developed with practice, example and by providing you with these types of opportunities. I hope you will take advantage of the time and effort your instructors put into your educational program in order to help you grow and develop both personally and professionally.
Resource Links

**Skype**
Skype can be used to contact individuals all over the world for free! You can download...

**Google Hangouts**
This is a way to call/communicate with people for free. Download from this link...

**Google Drive**
Google Drive allows you to post a document which can then be read, edited and saved...

**Drop Box**
Drop Box is another way for Collaborative Document Editing. Multiple people can view...

**Deekit**
Deekit is a site that uses visual presentation to communicate. It’s an on lin...

**Doodle Poll**
Doodle Poll is a site that allows you to schedule meetings.

**Congregar**
Congregar is another site that can be used to set up meetings between gro...

**MCC Library Help**
This LINK will take you to the Library help site. You can find out what’s av...
- Study rooms that can be used to work in groups
- Have computers with video cameras if you want to create a visual
Analysis of Engagement
Student Engagement

Activity over the five week period
Student Engagement

Activity based on days of the week

![Bar Chart showing activity based on days of the week]

Day of Week

- 2
- 3
- 4
- 5
- 6
- 7
- 8

Activity:

- Monday: 6000
- Tuesday: 4500
- Wednesday: 7000
- Thursday: 3000
- Friday: 2500
- Saturday: 1500
- Sunday: 1000
Student Engagement

Activity based on hours of the day (GMT)
Student Perspectives
Feedback Survey: Closed Questions

International Seminar Evaluation Questionnaire 15/16

This is your opportunity to give feedback to your module team about the experience you have had on the HCLE module specifically in relation to the collaborative international seminars. This feedback is invaluable for the team when monitoring, updating and enhancing module content. Please complete your responses as soon as possible.

Please select what program you are studying.

Overall, I am satisfied with experience I gained from the online seminars.

The scenarios were intellectually stimulating.

The scenarios were valuable to increase my knowledge and understanding of the topics (law and ethics).

I was able to balance my workload in order to contribute regularly to the discussion boards.

I fulfilled my responsibilities for group participation and summary reporting.

The feedback comments received for the summaries were helpful.

Reading the summaries written by other students in other groups was useful.
Feedback Survey: Open Questions

International Seminar Evaluation Questionnaire 15/16

This is your opportunity to give feedback to your module team about the experience you have had on the HCLE module specifically in relation to the collaborative international seminars. This feedback is invaluable for the team when monitoring, updating and enhancing module content. Please complete your responses as soon as possible.

- Did you understand the requirements and directions for the collaborative online seminars?
- What was most beneficial or what could be helpful? (what would help you prepare for this project)?

- Did the scenarios and your group discussions encourage critical thinking?
- Can you give an example?

- Did you gain a global awareness of different cultural perspectives?
- Did you change or consider a different worldview on healthcare ethics or legal issues as a result of your group discussions?

- What did you find most useful or enjoyable about the online seminar experience?
- Did you gain any benefits for personal growth and cultural interactions?

- What do you think could be improved on the online seminar experience?
- Do you feel there were opportunities for personal/cultural exchange?
- Do you have ideas to improve these opportunities?
Reflection Comments: GCU

Barriers to Learning
• Heated debate, or lack of debate
• Lack of research time or prep
• Issues beyond law (ie ethics) not always identified

Academic Perspectives
• Broader understanding of legal concepts
• Different perspectives on ethical situations

Personal Growth
• Opportunity to discuss issues with people from other professions and cultures
• Gain confidence in making ethical decisions
Reflection Comments: MCC

- Variety of Cases and opinions was useful
- Beneficial to hear from the “law” perspective
- Reading other opinions and able to share my own
- Encouraged critical thinking; made me think about different ideas
- Being the leader for a summary
- Did see a difference in perspective based on profession
- Did change my mind after reading other input
- Learning about the differences between countries’ laws
- Enjoyed reading about other students’ lives in a different country
- Needed to set aside more time to focus on my thoughts
Suggestions for Improvement: MCC

- More background in the topic areas
- More personal interactions: chances to “chat”
- More group participation
- Due dates a bit confusing at first due to time differences
- More cultural exchange by introducing culture into the cases
- Higher weight for the grade
- Shorter time to respond
- An APP to receive an alert on my phone
- More background info on the cases