

## Citizens' Jury on Reasonable Expectations

### Overview of 3-day jury activities

When	Overview of activities	Main participants (other than facilitators)
Day 1, AM	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Complete start of jury questionnaire</li> <li>• induction/getting to know one another</li> <li>• group “practice exercise” based on the JK Rowling legal case (Murray v Express Newspapers plc), asking the jurors whether there was a reasonable expectation of privacy</li> </ul>	None
Day 1, PM	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• brief introduction to the Anita scenario, health records and relevant law (15 minutes total?) with questions and answers from the jury</li> <li>• Q1 of Anita story               <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ story role play (e.g. by jurors)</li> <li>○ “balancing witness” asks witness why the information sharing described in the Anita scenario is needed</li> <li>○ small group work to identify what else the jurors would like to understand about this part of the scenario</li> <li>○ Q&amp;A between jurors and witnesses</li> <li>○ small group work with groups identifying reasons why information should be shared and reasons why it should be kept private for this part of the scenario</li> <li>○ individual jurors make notes with their initial views on whether it is reasonable for Anita to expect information to be shared</li> </ul> </li> </ul>	Witness: Dr Katherine Checkland Balancing witness: Jon Fistein?
Day 2, AM	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Reflection on day one and any questions about what was done</li> <li>• Q2 of Anita story – repeat as for Q1 above</li> <li>• Q3 of Anita story – repeat as for Q1 above</li> </ul>	Malcolm Oswald Witnesses: Dave Clemmett, Robert Doran Balancing witness: Jon Fistein
Day 2, PM	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Q4 of story - repeat as for Q1 above</li> <li>• Q5 of story - repeat as for Q1 above</li> </ul>	Witnesses: Helen McManus, Niels Peek Balancing witness: Jon Fistein
Day 3, AM	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Reflection on day one and any questions about what was done</li> <li>• Vote on Anita scenario Q1 to Q5 (yes/no)</li> <li>• Agree potential jury answers for “why” questions</li> <li>• Individuals select answers to why questions Q1 to Q5</li> <li>• Group work to answer Q6 on what might have made sharing acceptable where a majority said it was not reasonable for Anita to expect it to be shared</li> </ul>	Malcolm Oswald

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Answer questions 7 and 8 – the “criteria” of when it is reasonable to expect privacy and when it is reasonable to expect information to be shared</li> <li>• Develop jury report with jury</li> </ul>	
Day 3, PM	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Analyse two case studies in groups, and apply the jury’s own “criteria” from Q7 and Q8 to the case study (case studies to be determined e.g. Deepmind/ Royal Free case study)</li> <li>• Review whether testing the criteria on the case studies means the criteria should change (and if so, change the jury report)</li> <li>• End-of-jury questionnaire</li> <li>• Wrap-up and goodbye</li> </ul>	

