COURSE OBJECTIVES

This course will cover ethical issues in research. There are a number of thorny issues that researchers face – some of which are more obvious but others of which are more difficult to spot. These include IRB/ethics board oversight, informed consent, conflicts of interest, research misconduct, reproducibility, and equipoise/therapeutic misconception. We will cover these and other ethical issues – as well as special cases such as ethics in research with vulnerable populations, ethics in online research, and ethics in international research.

Holy day policy for absences (University policy)

A recent Faculty Senate decision has been made for how instructors must handle the situation of religious holidays and attendant missed classes by students. The solution adopted by the Faculty Senate and University Administration is to allow students to take off any religious holiday of his or her choice as a matter of right, but only if the student discloses her or his specific intentions to the faculty member in writing within the first three days of class meeting. Students, at the discretion of the instructor, may be required to make up any assignments or examinations missed due to absences for religious holidays.

Department policy on scientific misconduct and plagiarism

The Department of Public Health Sciences is committed to fostering an environment that supports the promotion of public health values and is conducive to professionalism and ethical standards for the responsible conduct of science and education.

The University of Miami expects all graduate students to adhere to the highest standards of ethics and academic integrity. All forms of academic fraud are strictly prohibited. These include, but are not limited to, plagiarism and/or cheating (whether it be in an examination, dissertation, thesis, research paper, research project, form of creative expression, experimental data, or any other academic undertaking).

Students found to be in violation of these standards are subject to disciplinary actions through the process described in the University of Miami Graduate Student Honor Code (http://www6.miami.edu/dean-students/pdf/graduate_honorcode.pdf).

Plagiarism

Plagiarism is representing the words or ideas of someone else as one’s own. Examples include failing to cite direct quotes properly and failing to give credit for someone else’s ideas or materials. If students are unsure whether a particular practice is acceptable, they are urged to discuss the issue with the faculty instructor, the UM Writing Center, or refer to the links provided below:

- What It Is and How to Recognize and Avoid It
PREREQUISITES

There are no prerequisites for this course. It is intended for PhD students, although advanced master’s students are also welcome. Master’s students should speak with the instructor before signing up for the course.

LEARNING OBJECTIVES

This course is targeted toward the following learning objectives:

- Mastering the breadth of ethical challenges such as plagiarism, falsification, fabrication, IRB oversight, and conflicts of interest;
- Applying these ethical challenges and potential solutions to one’s own field of study;
- Becoming expert in ethical issues related to one’s field of study so that one can design a study to investigate these issues; and
- Identifying questionable or problematic research practices in other scholars’ work.

CLASS FORMAT AND ASSIGNMENTS

The class format will be participatory, where students are expected to have completed the readings prior to each session so that we can have an informed discussion. Readings will be posted on Blackboard
by Friday of each week so that students will have the weekend to complete the readings. There is no
textbook for the course.

Readings will still be assigned on days when we have guest lecturers. The guest lecturer might not
mention all of the topics covered in the readings, but the readings will be important in writing your
reaction papers, casebook, and final presentation.

Graded assignments will fall into three general categories:

(1) **Reaction Papers** – each student should submit 3 reaction papers during the semester. These reaction
papers provide students with an opportunity to “respond” to the content and readings from a given
week of class. More or less, the reaction paper should be 2-3 pages and should explain your thoughts
and responses to what was covered in class, how it applies to your specific area of research, and how
the ethical issues on this specific topic and in this specific research area can be addressed.

(2) **Casebook** – the casebook will be completed during the course of the semester. Each student should
look over the list of topics that will be covered and identify three such topics. For each topic, students
should find at least three cases in which the ethical principle in question was violated. For each case,
describe what was done (using citations as appropriate), what principles were violated (and how they
were violated), and what corrective actions were or should have been taken. Do you agree with the
corrective actions that were taken? Did they go far enough? Is the problem continuing to occur? If so,
what further corrective actions should be taken? Provide citations as possible and necessary. There is no
required length for these entries, but a suggestion might be 3-5 pages per entry (for a total of 12-20
pages total for the casebook).

After each entry (topic) in the casebook has been written up, students should submit that entry to me
for review. I will provide feedback. The final casebook should be submitted by April 24th and should
describe at least 9 cases of ethical violations and associated corrective actions (at least 3 cases for each
of 3 topics).

(3) **Final Presentation** – the final paper should be an outline of a potentially publishable manuscript
summarizing the ethical issues and potential solutions within your field of study. What are the primary
ethical challenges that need to be addressed? What strategies have been used to address these issues,
and how can these strategies be improved? How do the ethical issues affect the state of your field? *Feel
free to work with your faculty mentor in preparing this presentation, as the goal is to produce an eventual publication for you.*

The final paper will be presented orally in class on April 24th.

The grading rubric will be as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reaction Papers (3 total):</th>
<th>30% (10% each)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Casebook</td>
<td>35%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Final Paper Oral</td>
<td>35%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Grade</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>92.6-100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A-</td>
<td>89.6-92.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B+</td>
<td>86.6-89.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>72.6-76.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C-</td>
<td>69.6-72.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D+</td>
<td>66.6-69.5%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### TENTATIVE CLASS SCHEDULE:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DATE</th>
<th>TOPIC</th>
<th>READINGS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>January 16th</td>
<td>Introduction to Course</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>January 23rd</td>
<td>IRB/Ethics Board Oversight</td>
<td>Ford et al. (2015)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Tartaro &amp; Levy (2015)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Tsan and Nguyen (2015)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Wilson et al. (2014)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>January 30th</td>
<td>Informed Consent and Participants’ Rights (Joey Casanova, HSRO, guest lecturer)</td>
<td>Edlund et al. (2014)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Hallinan et al. (2016)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Lad &amp; Dahl (2014)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Simon et al. (2016)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>February 6th</td>
<td>Conflicts of Interest (Lory Hayes, Conflict of Interest office, guest lecturer)</td>
<td>Ancker &amp; Flanagan (2007)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Jones et al. (2012)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Resnik &amp; Elliott (2013)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Shrader-Frechette (2012)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>February 13th</td>
<td>Mentor-Student Relationships (Allison Harbin, guest lecturer)</td>
<td>TBA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>February 20th</td>
<td>Research Misconduct and Protective Measures</td>
<td>Dubljević et al. (2014)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>DuBois et al. (2013)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Allen and Dowell (2013)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Fisher and Partin (2014)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Foo and Tan (2014)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Giner-Sorolla (2012)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>February 27th</td>
<td>Ethics in statistical analysis (HARKing and p-hacking)</td>
<td>Fanelli (2012)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>O’Boyle et al. (2014)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>de Gloucester (2013)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Lew (2012)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Simmons et al. (2011)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>March 6th</td>
<td>Equipoise and Therapeutic Misconceptions in Randomized Trials</td>
<td>Henderson et al. (2007)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Miller &amp; Brody (2007)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Miller &amp; Joffe (2011)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Hansson (2006)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>March 13th</td>
<td>NO CLASS – SPRING BREAK</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Date</td>
<td>Topic</td>
<td>Lecturer/Reference</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| March 20th | Replicability (Paul Braunschweiger, CITI, guest lecturer) | Redman and Caplan (2016)  
Asendorpf et al. (2013)  
De Winter & Happee (2013)  
Goodman et al. (2016) |
| March 27th | Authorship and Related Issues               | Moffatt (2013)  
Marušić et al. (2011)  
Sandler & Russell (2005)  
Smith & Williams-Jones (2012) |
| April 3rd  | Ethics in International Research (Adriane Gelpi, DPHS, guest lecturer) | TBA |
| April 10th | Ethics in Online and Social Media Research  | Bull et al. (2011)  
Varnhagen et al. (2012)  
Zimmer (2010)  
McKee (2013)  
Wilson et al. (2012) |
| April 17th | Ethics in Research with Vulnerable Populations | Brabeck et al. (2015)  
Ellis et al. (2007)  
Hodge (2012)  
Hurst (2008) |
| April 24th | PAPER PRESENTATIONS                        | TBA |
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