Background on the Program for Scholarly Integrity:
In Spring 2008, the Council of Graduate Schools (CGS) put out a national call for proposals to “develop educational models for promoting responsible conduct of research and integrity in professional scholarship, education, and research.” One of five projects selected for funding, Emory’s response was guided by three principles:

• To integrate education in research ethics and integrity into the graduate curriculum.
• To develop students’ skills of critical reflection about problems of scholarly integrity.
• To increase knowledge of standards, regulations and best practices with respect to ethics and scholarly integrity.

Following a 3-year development program involving significant faculty and student engagement, the Executive Council of the Laney Graduate School approved the following requirements of the Program for Scholarly Integrity (PSI):

1. **PSI 600:** Students must complete a 6-hour core seminar in scholarly integrity, supported by the Laney Graduate School in collaboration with the Center for Ethics. Participation in this seminar will be recorded on the student’s transcript and must be completed in the student’s first year of doctoral studies.

2. **Program-Based Instruction:** Students must also complete a minimum of 6 hours of program-based ethics material. The disposition of this discussion time is at the program’s discretion. These discussions may take place within existing courses, such as methodology or professionalization courses. They may also take the form of faculty-led workshops or journal clubs. The intention of this part of the program is to promote student discussions with their own program faculty, and to integrate explicit attention to ethics into the regular course of graduate education. Students must complete this requirement prior to candidacy.

3. **PSI 610:** Prior to graduation, students must attend a minimum of 4 workshops. These will be sponsored by the LGS, the Center for Ethics, and may include other relevant sessions around campus. Students will register for these sessions individually, and participation will be recorded on the student’s transcript.
PSI Learning Objectives

The following learning objectives describe the overall goals of the Program for Scholarly Integrity. At the conclusion of the program, students will be able to:

- Explain the disparities in values that create ethical dilemmas.
- Justify the importance of responsible engagement in scholarly inquiry.
- Identify ethical challenges as they arise during research, training, and professional life.
- Implement a process for addressing ethical issues.
- Respect disciplinary codes of conduct, institutional policies, and global standards in scholarly inquiry.

Seminar Goals for PSI 600

Within the context described above, the goal for this 6-hour seminar is to introduce students to the foundations of ethical reflection in which they will engage throughout the course of their graduate careers. Working within an interdisciplinary context, after participation in this seminar, students will be able to:

- Identify disparities in values that create ethical dilemmas.
- Differentiate ethical issues from issues of law, policy, religion, or communication.
- Use a rubric to identify and analyze ethical issues as they arise in research, teaching, and scholarship.
- Locate general institutional resources to address emerging ethical problems.

Seminar Format

In order to ensure an interdisciplinary and interactive seminar, students will participate in different activities throughout the day. Faculty members from a variety of disciplines will demonstrate to students the ways in which considerations of scholarly integrity remain vital throughout graduate school and professional practice.

The specific schedule for the day, along with learning objectives for each substantive component, follows.

Website

For more information about the PSI mandate, a complete schedule of PSI 610 workshops during the school year, and links to our Facebook, Twitter and blog, please follow the path below:

Emory Laney Graduate School → Professional Development → Program for Scholarly Integrity
### PSI 600 Seminar Syllabus – AUGUST 2014

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Time</th>
<th>Topic</th>
<th>Purpose of the Session</th>
<th>Faculty</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>8:30-8:50*</td>
<td>Welcome &amp; Introduction</td>
<td></td>
<td>Dean Lisa Tedesco &amp; the PSI Team</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8:50-9:45</td>
<td>PSI Intake Assessments</td>
<td>• Students will complete the Ethical Decision Making Measure.</td>
<td>Karen Rommelfanger (Director, PSI)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9:45-11:15</td>
<td>Session 1: <em>Ethics Today</em></td>
<td>• Provide a broad historical and philosophical overview of the emergence of ethics.</td>
<td>Facilitator: Edward Queen (Center for Ethics)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LECTURE</td>
<td></td>
<td>• Identify differences between scholarly and other ethical concerns.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11:15-12:15</td>
<td>Session 2: <em>Identifying &amp; Assessing an Ethical Issue</em></td>
<td>• Explain how to identify an ethical issue.</td>
<td>Facilitator: Gillian Hue (IMSD/Neuroethics)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CASE STUDY</td>
<td></td>
<td>• Develop a process for thinking through a challenging case study.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12:15-1:15</td>
<td>Lunch (provided)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1:15-2:15</td>
<td>Session 3: <em>Ethical challenges of interdisciplinarity</em></td>
<td>• Demonstrate the pervasiveness of ethical issues in interdisciplinary collaborations.</td>
<td>Moderator: Carlos Moreno (GDBBS) Panelists: Ben Reiss (English); Sita Ranchod-Nilssen (Institute for Developing Nations)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FACULTY PANEL</td>
<td></td>
<td>• Highlight the unique ethical challenges of interdisciplinary collaborations.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2:15-3:45</td>
<td>Session 4: <em>The Practice of Ethical Analysis</em></td>
<td>• Encourage students to work through ethical issues on their own.</td>
<td>Facilitator: Mark Risjord (Philosophy)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CASE DISCUSSION</td>
<td></td>
<td>• Provide students a space to apply the GRACE rubric to identify and assess ethical issues.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3:45-4:30</td>
<td>Session 5: <em>Ethical wisdom from graduate students</em></td>
<td>• Offer and evaluate different ways of analyzing ethical issues.</td>
<td>Moderator: Yolanda Smith (Neuroscience) Panelists: Lindsay Allen (Healthy Policy &amp; Management); Omar Villanueva (Chemistry); E. Michelle Ledder (Religion)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>STUDENT PANEL</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Registration with light refreshments will begin promptly for all students at 8:00am.*
G.R.A.C.E. – 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.
Writing Rubric: Questions for Case Analysis

What is the problem?
• How would you define the ethical issue(s) to be addressed?

What are all the reasonable solutions?
• What positions might reasonable persons take?
  o “reasonable” = “having reasons”
  o “most reasonable” = “best”
    ▪ “worse” need not be equivalent to “unreasonable” or “stupid”

What is your position on the problem?
• What position/stand do you want to take with regard to a solution?

What support can you give for your position? (Look at the GRACE considerations)
• What relevant reasons/justifications can you give?
  o What evidence (technical, legal, social, personal, empirical) do you have?
  o What principles, values, rules, obligations, and/or concerns are relevant to support your claim?
• Are there any limitations to your proposed solution?
  o What, if any, competing considerations/obligations are lost if your solution is implemented?
  o How far or into what situations does your proposed solution extend?
  o Are there practical factors that might limit or affect the application of your solution?

Why might someone differ with you? (Look at the GRACE considerations)
• What ethical/logical/practical weaknesses can you identify in your own position?
• What is the best argument you can make for competing solution(s)?
  o Why, given this “best” argument, is that solution still not better than your own?
• What are the areas of agreement and disagreement among the competing claimants?
• Is there an alternate solution that can satisfy important aspects of your position and those of others who seemingly differ with you?
CASE ANALYSIS: Aspects of Ethical Reflection

1. **Confrontation with a problem (What issues are raised by the case?):** When you read/hear a case, what bothers you or strikes you as problematic? What values are being expressed; what principles are in tension? Where, how, and why does conflict occur?

2. **Define the problem (What is the central question of the case?):** What is (are) the central ethical question(s) (CEQ) put by the case? While it may be necessary to address a fair number of questions in an ethical analysis of a case, a central ethical question is a primary ethical concern that must be addressed and answered if the physician is to know how to proceed. It should arise directly from the ethical tensions/problems that the individuals and context of this case pose. There can be more than one central question.

3. **Pose alternative responses to the problem (What answers are reasonable? What claims can be presented as answers?):** What are the available (i.e., all possible, reasonable) answers to the central question(s)? That is, what might someone reasonably state as a legitimate solution to the ethical dilemmas posed by #2.

4. **Reason through the alternatives (What is the best answer and why?):**
   a. **First step:** What are the best arguments supporting each of the answers you give in #3? What support/warrant/backing are there for each of the claims made in #3?
   b. **Second step:** Where are the arguments you describe weak or vulnerable to serious objection? What qualifiers/exceptions exist that weaken the support for each claim? Can they be strengthened to avoid objection, and if so, how?
   c. **Third step:** Given your work addressing #4a & #4b, which answer to the central question(s) is best? Why?

5. **Test/Implement the proposed solution (How should you execute your solution? What qualifiers/exceptions must be considered?):** How should your chosen answer (#4c) to the central question be implemented given the specifics of the case at hand? Are there practical/procedural concerns that must be addressed in order to employ what you have determined is the most ethical solution to the dilemma?

It is important to note that these five “aspects” of reflection are listed consecutively primarily for educational purpose—that is, in order to help in developing good habits of inquiry. However, in everyday practice, good reflection requires continual reevaluation of the process in light of findings along the way, even requiring the need to revisit prior considerations. For example, in reflecting on possible answers to a previously determined CEQ, it might be decided that the problem is, in fact, defined incorrectly, and thus we must go back and rethink the CEQ(s). (Examples can easily be multiplied in order to show any or all parts of the reflective process may need revisiting.)
Boston College ordered to turn IRA interviews over to UK authorities
Matt Williams, The Guardian, 7 July 2012

Boston College has again been ordered to hand over interviews it conducted with a convicted IRA terrorist to UK authorities after an appeal against the release was thrown out. The ruling on Friday by the 1st US circuit court of appeal confirmed an earlier decision by district court judge William Young in relation to car bomber Dolours Price, who spoke to researchers on condition that the information would not be released in her lifetime. But following the latest development in a lengthy legal battle, the material will now be handed over to Northern Ireland police by next month.

Recorded between 2001 and 2006, interviews with several former and serving Irish Republican Army (IRA) members formed the backbone of an oral history project at the college. The conversations were taped under the proviso that they would not be released until the participant had died, with some interviewees citing fears that the stories could lead to reprisals. But the transcripts are wanted by Northern Ireland police in relation to an investigation into the 1972 abduction and killing of Jean McConville. The Belfast mother of 10 had been accused of being an informant by the IRA and was murdered, some have claimed, on the order of Sinn Fein leader Gerry Adams. Adams has denied any link.

Boston College didn’t appeal Young’s ruling on Price. But The Belfast Project director Ed Moloney and ex-IRA gunman Anthony McIntyre, who conducted the interviews, filed a lawsuit challenging the decision. Their attorney argued that McIntyre and others who were part of The Belfast Project would be branded informants and faced “the real risk of physical harm” if the interviews were turned over. He also said it could have a chilling effect on other academic research projects.

But on Friday, the appeals court ruled that the two men had no right to interfere with the police request, made under a treaty between the United States and United Kingdom that requires both sides to aid each other’s criminal investigations. It added that criminal investigations take precedence over academic study. “The choice to investigate criminal activity belongs to the government and is not subject to veto by academic researchers,” the court wrote.

Boston College is still appealing Young’s order regarding another subpoena, in which he said the school must turn over interviews with seven other former IRA members. Attorney Jon Albano, who filed a brief on behalf of the American Civil Liberties Union in support of Moloney and McIntyre, said the ruling was “not a good sign” for the college’s pending appeal in regards to the other participants in the project. Albano described the striking down of the Price appeal as disappointing. “We were not saying that there was some kind of automatic absolute protection for academics, any more than for reporters,” he said. “We were saying that if you look at the facts of this case, this is a case were Moloney and McIntyre actually deserve to be protected.” A spokesman for Boston College couldn’t be reached Saturday for comment.

Its project was aimed at capturing for prosperity the testimonies of those involved in decades of violent unrest in Northern Ireland, known as the Troubles. Several US politicians – including senator John Kerry of Massachusetts and Charles Schumer of New York – have lobbied the state department on behalf of the institution’s desire to have the interviews remained sealed. Moloney has said he believes the recordings are explosive enough to damage Northern Ireland’s unity government.
Does the Punishment Fit the Crime?
Adapted from a scenario submitted by a student and used with their approval

A doctoral student in a lab where I had previously worked was apparently doing well. Bill had already published a first author manuscript in a high impact journal and had a second under review. Unfortunately, however, Bill’s laboratory colleagues were less than professional, and he was frequently the butt of jokes and catty whispering. These unprofessional behaviors were, in my view, typical of the lab as a whole but seemingly condoned by Dr. Green, who did nothing to stop them.

One day, another graduate student in the lab, Larry, asked Bill for some bacterial strains that Bill had developed and that Larry wanted to use for some follow-up work. In Bill's haste, he accidentally handed the wrong strain to Larry, which Bill realized only later on when it was too late to cancel the experiment.

The PI of this lab, Dr. Green, was known for maintaining a culture of fear, recrimination and egoism among his lab personnel. I cannot help but think this played a factor in what Bill did next: Upon realizing his error, he switched the labels on two vials of bacterial strains, covering up his mistake in his lab notebooks and the lab stock records.

When the lab results came back with data that didn’t correlate with what Bill and Larry knew from previous studies, Bill came clean and told Larry and Dr. Green about his mistake and his subsequent cover-up. He told them that he had been agonizing about his actions for weeks; he apologized profusely; and he offered to repeat the experiment on Larry's behalf so as to make amends.

Dr. Green refused this course of action, however, and had Bill come before an institutional ethics committee for a hearing and sanctioning. A number of persons testified as character witnesses at the hearing – some for and some against Bill. As word of what happened got around, the unpleasant interpersonal atmosphere in Dr. Green’s lab was discussed both informally and then formally at the hearing. What carried a great deal of weight, however, was Dr. Green's own statement that, as things now stood, he could not trust any of Bill's data and he claimed he could no longer support Bill’s doctoral work. Ultimately, the committee decided to grant Bill a masters degree and he was asked to leave the program.
But I Don’t Want to Be An Author

Adapted from the Atlanta Clinical and Translational Institute and Emory University

This situation occurred the summer after I finished my master’s degree, when I decided to begin my doctoral work in political science. I chose to work with Dr. Amir because of her well-known expertise in electoral politics and state formation, an area in which I wanted to concentrate my career.

A few weeks after beginning the program, I thought I had made a mistake because I began feeling somewhat uncomfortable around her. She seemed overly nice to me, always trying to be helpful, charming and funny. These behaviors struck me as clumsy and off-putting, but in the five years I worked with her, she never made any romantic advances or overtures. Fortunately, as the months went on, I began feeling slightly more comfortable around her, and I think she did around me.

The ethical incident that still bothers me involved a time-sensitive opportunity to analyze the parliamentary turmoil in Egypt, a topic of particular interest to Dr. Amir and me. We decided to work together to write a manuscript that would be published in The New York Review of Books rather than a peer-reviewed journal. While I was in charge of tabulating the election results, describing the emergence of new political parties and mapping out potential alliances, Dr. Amir was to provide historical background as well as insights into the evolution of the parliamentary process. Or at least she seemed to. The problem was that by the time we were to begin writing together, she had already prepared several paragraphs to be inserted in-full into the introduction and conclusion of the article. At the end of a few weeks, we finished a draft that combined both sets of materials. And that’s when the surprise came.

As we were adding some finishing touches, Dr. Amir said to me, “Rafael, I’ve been very impressed with how you’ve done the lion’s share of this project, so I want you to be the sole author of this article. It will be good for your career. I don’t need this publication, but it will look good on your CV, especially with you as sole author. So, it’s yours. And don’t say I never gave you anything, ha, ha, ha.”

At first I was really thrilled about this. The only other publications I had were one where I was included with several other authors on a review of the elections in Venezuela, and another on an interview with a senior scholar in the field. I thought this opportunity would be really cool.

But then I began having second thoughts. Mostly, they involved the fact that I would be taking credit, as the sole author, for a text that I didn’t generate alone. Would that be a misrepresentation? Also, from time to time Dr. Amir made a firm suggestion for a change in this or that interpretation – but those were her ideas that we incorporated into the manuscript, not mine. Yet, as sole author, I would be taking credit for the whole thing.

As it happened, we did submit the article with me as sole author. The NYRB was fine with it – not that they knew any different – and I only acknowledged Dr. Amir in a footnote, as she really didn’t need the publication (and perhaps didn’t want her name on a non-peer reviewed publication). I later found out, however, that Dr. Amir’s uncle was a leading member of one of the political parties that we described in the article in rather favourable terms. Moreover, the article itself generated significant interest, and I was asked to speak on different public panels and radio stations about the situation in Egypt for the next few months. Although this helped my career quite a bit, and I never disclosed Dr. Amir’s role, I’ve always been bothered by this odd turn of authorship events. Instead of the usual problem of people demanding authorship credit when they don’t deserve it, here’s an individual who should have been listed as an author but refused.