

Ethics of International Research and Scholarship

A Case Design/Analysis Competition

An initiative of the Program for Scholarly Integrity (PSI) of the Laney Graduate School, this case design and analysis competition aims at putting doctoral students in the driver's seat to communicate ethical reasoning/decision-making in international research and scholarship. Students are asked to think critically about possible scenarios that could arise in international research and design a case that exemplifies key challenges to scholarly integrity and research ethics in international collaborations. Students will be asked to accompany their case with a detailed analysis that highlights and assesses the case's ethical dimensions using the G.R.A.C.E. Method for Ethical Reflection (see Appendix II). Through their participation in this competition, students will be able to demonstrate their talents, analytical skills, and creativity in ethical reasoning. The cases and analyses they generate may be integrated in future workshops or classes on scholarly integrity and research ethics.

Who is eligible?

This competition is open to all doctoral students. Students can work alone, in pairs, or in groups of three to design their workshop submission. All group members, however, must be enrolled in a doctoral program at the Laney Graduate School at the time of submission.

What are the objectives of this competition?

1. **Knowledge:** Explain how national/cultural context may affect researchers' views on issues reflected in the core areas for the Program for Scholarly Integrity (see Appendix I).
2. **Attitude:** Convey concern for different cultural approaches to address a situation that may arise in international research and scholarly integrity.
3. **Skills:** Analyze practical challenges for communicating ethics to stakeholders who may hold different sets of values and norms.

What tasks are required of participants?

1. **500-800 word case scenario:** Devise a case scenario that integrates key challenges faced by students and investigators in international research and scholarship.
2. **1500-2000 word analysis:** Provide an analysis of the devised case using the G.R.A.C.E. Method for Ethical Reflection (see Appendix II).
3. **250-500 word instructional recommendations:** Provide a brief description of how the case and analysis can be used in a training workshop or class on ethics and scholarly integrity in international research.

Timeline

1. **January 25, 2014:** Competition is announced.
2. **March 1, 2014:** 'Info-Session.' Location TBA.
3. **April 1, 2014:** All submissions (cover sheet, case-scenario, analysis, and instructional recommendations) are due by 5pm. Submissions should be emailed to psi@emory.edu
4. **April 30, 2014:** Winning teams are announced via the PSI website.

Guidelines for Devising a Case Scenario

1. **Adaptable:** The case should be tailored so that it can be adapted to various disciplines and research settings (e.g. avoid intra-disciplinary jargon or context-specific scenarios). Case scenarios should be lifelike in their design and should stem from challenges that could actually arise in a research setting.
2. **Not Specific to Person(s) or Event(s):** For this competition, a case could be inspired by real-life scenarios, but participants in this competition should refrain from disclosing identifiable details about a particular event or individual. Participants are encouraged to alter names/locations/periods to ensure the anonymity of their cases. Any cases that might potentially identify individuals or specific events may be disqualified from the competition.
3. **Relevant to PSI:** The case should address *at least* one of the core areas of the Program for Scholarly Integrity (see list of core areas in Appendix I)

Guidelines for G.R.A.C.E. Analysis

Participants will need to analyze their respective cases using the G.R.A.C.E. Method for Ethical Reflection. While the questions cited in the G.R.A.C.E. rubric should be considered and addressed in full, they do not exhaust all of the terms of each analysis. Instead, the G.R.A.C.E. rubric should serve as a point of departure for students---a catalyst for developing a deeper understanding of the critical thinking and ethical reasoning dimensions of their case. Analyses should also address anticipated objections and consider alternative actions/perspectives.

Guidelines for Instructional Recommendations

In this brief statement, participants are asked to describe how their case/analysis could be integrated in a broader class/workshop on international research ethics. Participants should detail creative approaches that will optimize the use of their case and analysis. Such approaches may consist of in-class didactic exercises, online tutorials, scripted role-plays, games, etc. Regardless of the approach, the 'effective' workshop is one that incorporates various perspectives and interdisciplinary approaches in addition to being informative and participatory.

Awards

There are three awards for this competition that have been made possible through support from the Council of Graduate Schools. Awards to the top three teams will be determined by a panel of faculty and student judges. The first place team/individual will be awarded \$1000 followed by \$700 and \$300 for second and third placed teams, respectively. This amount is to be divided among team members. Winning workshop designs will be posted on the PSI website and may be shared with the Council of Graduate Schools for further dissemination.

Appendix I

Core Areas of the Program for Scholarly Integrity

- i. **Data Management:** Accepted practices for acquiring and maintaining research data. Proper methods for record keeping and electronic data collection and storage in scientific research. Includes defining what constitutes data; keeping data notebooks or electronic files; data privacy and confidentiality; data selection, retention, sharing, ownership, and analysis; data as legal documents and intellectual property, including copyright laws.
- ii. **Mentoring:** The responsibilities of mentors, advisors and students in graduate study and research. Includes the role of a mentor/advisor, responsibilities of a mentor/advisor, conflicts between mentor/advisor and trainee, collaboration and competition, selection of a mentor/advisor, and abusing the student - mentor/advisor relationship.
- iii. **Authorship:** The purpose and importance of scholarly publication, and the responsibilities of the authors. Includes topics such as collaborative work and assigning appropriate credit, acknowledgments, appropriate citations, repetitive publications, fragmentary publication, sufficient description of methods, corrections and retractions, conventions for deciding upon authors, author responsibilities, and the pressure to publish.
- iv. **Peer Review:** The purpose of peer review in determining merit for research funding and publications. Includes topics such as, the definition of peer review, impartiality, how peer review works, editorial boards and ad hoc reviewers, responsibilities of the reviewers, privileged information and confidentiality.
- v. **Collaboration:** Research collaborations and issues that may arise from such collaborations. Includes topics such as setting ground rules early in the collaboration, avoiding authorship disputes, and the sharing of materials and information with internal and external collaborating scholars.
- vi. **Human Subjects:** Issues important in conducting research involving human subjects. Includes topics such as the definition of human subjects research, ethical principles for conducting human subjects research, informed consent, confidentiality and privacy of data and patient records, risks and benefits, preparation of a research protocol, institutional review boards, adherence to study protocol, proper conduct of the study, and special protections for targeted populations, e.g., children, minorities, and the elderly.
- vii. **Animals:** Issues important to conducting research involving animals. Includes topics such as definition of research involving animals, ethical principles for conducting research on animals, Federal regulations governing animal research, institutional animal care and use committees, and treatment of animals.
- viii. **Scholarly Misconduct:** The meaning of research misconduct and the regulations, policies, and guidelines that govern research misconduct in federally funded institutions. Includes topics such as fabrication, falsification, and plagiarism; error vs. intentional misconduct; institutional misconduct policies; identifying misconduct; procedures for reporting misconduct; protection of whistleblowers; and outcomes of investigations, including institutional and Federal actions.
- ix. **Conflict of Interest:** The definition of conflicts of interest and how to handle conflicts of interest. Types of conflicts encountered by researchers and institutions. Includes topics such

as conflicts associated with collaborators, publication, financial conflicts, obligations to other constituencies, and other types of conflicts.

- x. **Ethics of Teaching:** Ethical obligations of a teacher, appropriate student - teacher relationships, privacy, confidentiality, setting boundaries, ethical implications of material selection, safe spaces and critical discussion, ethics of grading, letters of recommendation.
- xi. **Public Scholarship:** Understanding the social or environmental impact of a research project, communicating with stakeholders, communicating results to the public, the ethics of community action research, the social value of scholarship, science, and research.

Appendix II

G.R.A.C.E.¹ : A Method for Ethical Reflection

Get the Whole Story

- What are the technical, personal, and social facts and values pertinent to the situation?
 - How have the facts influenced the people involved and affect the situation?
 - What are the beliefs (personal, professional, and cultural) at play?

Recognize Obligations

- What is expected of you as a professional (or other role you inhabit) and as a moral agent?
 - Would proposed actions fulfill and/or violate any obligations?
 - Are there legal, regulatory, or policy issues to consider?
 - How do issues of organizational loyalty factor into your options?

Accept Responsibilities/Avoid Over-reaching

- What is the scope of your role in the situation? What falls outside your role?
 - How should you participate in the process?
 - How do issues of hierarchy or structure enhance or impede your options?

Consider Consequences

- What are the possible outcomes of proposed actions?
 - Are the possible consequences predicted to produce good and/or bad results?
 - What are the potential harms and benefits?

Evaluate Character

- How might the proposed actions be viewed by others within the profession or outside the institution?
 - Might the proposed actions lead to worthwhile or problematic ethical habits?
 - Do they manifest principles of action you are willing to apply in other similar situations?
 - Do they set a precedent?
 - Do they implicate policy for the institution or profession?

¹ Developed by D. Micah Hester, University of Arkansas for Medical Sciences

Appendix III

Cover Page for Case Design/Analysis Competition

Title	
Participant(s) Teams can consist of one, two, or three members. All members must be doctoral students in the Laney Graduate School.	Name: Doctoral Program: Year: Phone: Email:
	Name: Doctoral Program: Year: Phone: Email:
	Name: Doctoral Program: Year: Phone: Email:
PSI Core Areas <i>Please check the following areas of scholarly integrity that will be addressed in the case scenario.</i>	<i>Data Management</i>
	<i>Mentoring</i>
	<i>Authorship</i>
	<i>Peer Review</i>
	<i>Collaboration</i>
	<i>Human Subjects</i>
	<i>Animals</i>
	<i>Scholarly Misconduct</i>
	<i>Conflict of Interest</i>
	<i>Ethics of Teaching</i>
<i>Public Scholarship</i>	

Checklist

- | | |
|---|-------|
| 1. Cover page | _____ |
| 2. Case scenario (500-800 words) | _____ |
| 3. GRACE analysis of case (1500-2000 words) | _____ |
| 4. Description of instructional recommendations (250-500 words) | _____ |

All documents are due through electronic submission (psi@emory.edu) by 5pm on April 1, 2014

Case Design and Analysis Assessment Rubric

NOTE: All submissions are expected to follow standard scholarly rules and conventions with respect to grammar and punctuation, spelling, and citations. Failure to adhere to these rules/conventions may negatively impact assessment of a particular submission.

1. Case: Creativity and Originality

Fair		Good		Excellent	
1	2	3	4	5	6
Case is clearly inherited or adopted with little original consideration (e.g., case involves a <i>simplified</i> problem that routinely arises in research and entails a <i>standard remedy</i>)		Case is largely original, although some aspects may have been adopted (e.g., case involves a <i>complex</i> problem that can arise from time to time <i>and</i> requires <i>some</i> ethical reasoning and assessment)		Very creative and original (e.g., case involves a <i>complex</i> problem that can arise <i>and</i> requires a <i>strong degree of</i> ethical reasoning and assessment)	
Comments					

2. Case: Adaptability (by discipline¹)--the workshop can be adapted to various disciplines and forms of research.

Fair		Good		Excellent	
1	2	3	4	5	6
Case is applicable to one discipline of research/scholarship (e.g., case involves data storage procedures that largely pertain to computer sciences)		Case may be adapted to more disciplines, but is likely to arise in only one division ² such as humanities, natural sciences, or social sciences (e.g., case involves data storage procedures applicable to only lab sciences)		Case may be adapted to any division such as humanities, natural sciences, social sciences (e.g., case involves property rights of data/evidence collected outside the U.S.)	
Comments					

¹ 'Discipline' refers to a particular field of study or doctoral program (e.g., philosophy, psychology, epidemiology, comparative literature, etc.)

² 'Division' refers to one of the three academic divisions at Laney Graduate School (i.e., humanities, social sciences, and natural sciences)

3. Case: Adaptability (intercultural/international)--the case can be applied to various research settings and entails cultural awareness and sensitivity.

Fair		Good		Excellent	
1	2	3	4	5	6
Case is limited to one instance of international/intercultural collaboration (e.g., case involves challenges arising from PI/mentor who is from outside the U.S. and unfamiliar with U.S. norms/customs)		Case involves research in international settings (e.g., case involves challenges arising from collecting data outside the U.S.)		Case involves research conducted outside the U.S. <i>in partnership with</i> international stakeholders (e.g., case involves negotiating authorship for research conducted outside the U.S. and with international partners)	
Comments					

4. Analysis: Identification and Assessment of Roles and Responsibilities

Fair		Good		Excellent	
1	2	3	4	5	6
Does not attempt to or fails to identify key actors, ethical issues, or responsibilities.		Summarizes ethical issues and cites key actors and responsibilities, though some aspects are incorrect or confused. Nuances and key details are missing or glossed over.		Effectively identifies and assesses the ethical aspects of the case in light of key stakeholders and their respective responsibilities. Attentive to nuances and key details, particularly those that pertain to legal, regulatory, and policy constraints.	
Comments					

5. Analysis: Identifies and Assesses Outcomes, Consequences, and Anticipated Objections.

Fair		Good		Excellent	
1	2	3	4	5	6
Merely provides a simplistic assessment; fails to synthesize facts and seems illogical.		Rough integration of facts and assessment of possible outcomes. Outcomes and consequences are explored, but in a limited way.		Identifies and discusses possible outcomes and extends assessment to address implications and consequences. Considers context, assumptions, and facts.	
Comments					

6. Analysis: Overall Use of GRACE Method for Ethical Reflection

Fair		Good		Excellent	
1	2	3	4	5	6
Merely answers questions highlighted in GRACE Method; fails to synthesize facts and seems illogical.		Areas of GRACE are investigated and integrated, but in a limited way; analysis acknowledges, refutes, and synthesizes ideas, although some aspects seem lacking.		Analysis demonstrates ownership of GRACE method and demonstrates sophisticated, integrative thought.	
Comments					

7. Clear and Descriptive Instructional Recommendations

Fair		Good		Excellent	
1	2	3	4	5	6
Does not attempt to or fails to provide a brief description of how the case and analysis can be used in a training workshop or class on ethics and scholarly integrity in international research.		Merely outlines ways that case and analysis could be used in a class or training workshop, but fails to provide details on where the case/analysis would be most appropriate.		Provides a clear, concise description of <i>how case can best be used in a training workshop or class</i> on ethics and scholarly integrity in international research. Provides multiple instructional options for maximum flexibility.	
Comments					

8. Overall Organization and Quality of All Submissions (i.e., case-scenario, analysis, and instructional recommendations)

Fair		Good		Excellent	
1	2	3	4	5	6
Case-scenario, analysis, and instructional recommendations reflect limited efforts. Disorganized and repeats information or dismisses evidence without adequate justification; lacks logical connection of ideas. Little evidence of proofreading.		Basic organization is apparent and errors are not distracting or frequent. Still, there appears to be some problems with more difficult aspects of style and voice.		Organization is clear and errors are minimal; Examines evidence thoroughly and concisely; questions its relevance and effectively integrates facts and arguments.	
Comments					

Overall Assessment

The Case Design and Analysis Assessment Rubric details the traits and dimensions that serve as the basis for evaluating submissions. Within each category, explanations and examples are provided to help clarify the meaning of each trait or dimension. Each category provides a scale of values on which to rate each dimension. These values provide a systematic approach to evaluating submissions for each category; *however, the values should not be aggregated into a composite score.* Judges are expected to assign weight to each category according to its relevance to the overall outcomes of the competition (namely, the development of a strong case-scenario, analysis, and instructional recommendations). In this light, some submissions may fare better in some categories over others. Judges are to deem whether these categories make a particular submission better than others. Awards are determined by a deliberation process among judges, which is formulated around discussions of team performance in each category. -

This section below allows judges to note their scores from the Case Design and Analysis Assessment Rubric, but does not suggest that scores in specific areas will be aggregated into a composite score. Judges will determine strongest submissions based on their scores for specific areas in light with broad judging criteria.

	Criteria	Assigned Score
1.	Case: Creativity and Originality	
2.	Case: Adaptability (by discipline)---	
3.	Case: Adaptability (intercultural/international)	
4.	Analysis of Roles and Responsibilities	
5.	Analysis: Identifies and assesses outcomes, consequences, and anticipated objections.	
6.	Analysis: Overall Use of GRACE Method for Ethical Reflection	
7.	Clear and Descriptive Instructional Recommendations	
8.	Overall Organization and Quality of All Submissions (i.e., case-scenario, analysis, and instructional recommendations)	
Summative Comments:		