

The Right Choice

*Video Sketches and Training Materials for Advancing
Responsible Conduct of Research in Africa*

Facilitator Guide

Acknowledgements

This training program was developed by the University of Ibadan and Northwestern University's Center for Global Health, Clinical and Translational Sciences (NUCATS) Institute and the Weinberg College of Arts and Sciences Multimedia Learning Center. The project described was supported by Grant Number 5D43TW007995-04S1 and 5R24TW008878 from the Fogarty International Center. The content is solely the responsibility of the authors and does not necessarily represent the official views of the Fogarty International Center or the National Institutes of Health. Robert L. Murphy MD and David Olaleye DVM PhD are Principal Investigators.

CAST

Femi	Nnabuenyi Anigbogu
Chioma	Onyinyechi Enyia Daniel
Nneka	Olamide Agunloye
Dr. Bayo	Babatunde Ogunbosi
Dr. Anakwe	Babatunde Alaraje
Elder	Idowu Cadmus

CREW

Director	Nate Herman
Cinematography	Cecile-Anne Sison
Sound	Matthew Taylor
Gaffer	Nate Bartlett
Grip/AC	Jai Broome
Art	Ann Marshall
Subtitles	Jim Kozyra
French Subtitles	Laurence Slama Precision Language & Graphics Inc
Producer	Paula Carney
Content Advisor	Yemi Omatade
Story	Paula Carney
Screenplay	Nate Herman

Music

Bosco

Written by Marion Brown

© 2007 Occidental Brothers Music LTD

Performed by Occidental Brothers Dance Band International

Used by Permission. All Rights Reserved.

Mafiwo

Written by Nathaniel Braddock and Kofi Cromwell

© 2009 Occidental Brothers Music LTD

Performed by Occidental Brothers Dance Band International

Used by Permission. All Rights Reserved.

Thank you to the following colleagues from the University of Ibadan and Northwestern University who contributed to the development of this project:

University of Ibadan

Georgina Odaibo

David Olaleye

Adebola Orimadegun

Kemi Amodu

Adesola Sangowawa

Malik Jibril

Samuel B. Olaleye

Bakarey Adeleue Solomon

Adesina Olubukola

Abigail Olaniyan

Cynthia Okiche

Patricia Adams

Clement Meseko

Northwestern University

Robert L. Murphy

Baiba Berzins

Babafemi Taiwo

Kearsley Stewart

Carolyn Baer

L. Diana Carandang

Lauren Peterson

Janine Spencer

Laurence Slama

©2013. Northwestern University.

Contents

Acknowledgements	2
Introduction	5
Overview	6
Facilitator Instructions	8
Video Sketch Discussion Guides	10
Video Sketch 1 – <i>Plagiarism? Only Technically...</i>	11
Video Sketch 1- <i>Plagiarism? Only Technically...</i> Discussion Questions	12
Video Sketch 2 – <i>Make Me An Author!</i>	13
Video Sketch 2 – <i>Make Me An Author!...</i> Discussion Questions	14
Video Sketch 3 - <i>Data Sharing: It's Not What It Used To Be...</i>	15
Video Sketch 3 - <i>Data Sharing: It's Not What It Used To Be...</i> Discussion Questions.....	16
Video Sketch 4 – <i>What's Ours Is Yours!</i>	17
Video Sketch 4 – <i>What's Ours Is Yours!</i> Discussion Questions	18
Responsible Conduct of Research Glossary	19
References	20
Video Sketch Discussion Guide for Distribution	21
Video Sketch 1- <i>Plagiarism? Only Technically...</i> Discussion Questions	22
Video Sketch 2 – <i>Make Me An Author!...</i> Discussion Questions	23
Video Sketch 3 - <i>Data Sharing: It's Not What It Used To Be...</i> Discussion Questions.....	24
Video Sketch 4 – <i>What's Ours Is Yours!</i> Discussion Questions	25

Introduction

This series of 4 short video sketches (each approximately 5 minutes long) were produced to "trigger" discussion about responsible conduct of research in Africa. The videos were produced to be used during responsible conduct of research training for students, postdoctoral researchers and faculty engaged in basic, clinical and translational research. A companion Facilitator Guide, provides detailed instructions for effective use of each sketch, including suggested discussion questions and. The videos can be used individually or together.

The videos are available on the MEPIN website (www.mepi-nigeria.org) and the Northwestern University Center for Global Health website (<http://globalhealth.northwestern.edu/about/publications/index.html>). Versions with English subtitles and French subtitles are available. This Facilitator Guide is also available in English and French.

Overview

Training in the responsible conduct of research (RCR) is required by many federal agencies that award research grants in the United States. As low- and middle-income countries develop their research infrastructure and apply for research grants from US agencies, responsible conduct of research is increasingly being conducted in international settings.

Training in RCR was first included in a US National Institutes of Health policy in 1989. Since then, several policy updates have occurred. Policy development, training programs and research integrity offices followed in US research institutions. Training program requirements included both content and instructional pedagogy. Currently RCR training is completed every 4 years for those on training awards.

There are six basic principles that govern responsible conduct of research. Excerpts of these principles include:

1. Responsible conduct of research is an essential component of research training. Therefore, instruction in RCR is an integral part of all research training programs.
2. Active involvement in the issues of RCR should occur throughout a scientist's career.
3. Researchers are encouraged to assume individual and personal responsibility for their instruction in RCR.
4. Research faculty of the institution should participate in the responsible conduct of research in ways that allow them to serve as effective role models.
5. Instruction should include face-to-face discussions by course participants and faculty. Online instruction may be a component of RCR training but is not sufficient as the sole form of training.
6. Instruction in RCR must be carefully evaluated in all NIH grant applications for which it is a required component.

The following topics have been incorporated into most RCR curricula:

1. Conflict of interest – personal, professional and financial
2. Policies regarding human subjects, live vertebrate animal subjects in research and safe laboratory practices
3. Mentor/mentee responsibilities and relationships
4. Collaborative research including collaborations with industry
5. Peer review
6. Data acquisition and laboratory tools; management, sharing and ownership
7. Research misconduct and policies for handling misconduct
8. Responsible authorship and publication
9. The scientist as a responsible member of society, contemporary ethical issues in biomedical research, and the environmental and societal impacts of scientific research.

These video sketches were created to provide culturally relevant and sustainable training materials for use in RCR training courses in Africa. As part of the Medical Education in Nigeria Program (MEPIN), institutional consortium members are developing and implementing RCR training. Video sketch scripts were developed after a series of interviews and focus groups were conducted and culturally relevant themes were identified. Both examples of research dilemmas and media preferences were included in the development of the video sketches. The resulting video sketches and discussion questions are intended to augment face-to-face instruction and foster responsible conduct of research in research settings.

Facilitator Instructions

Please read these instructions before incorporating the video sketches into a responsible conduct of research course. Each video sketch addresses several RCR themes. The discussion guide is designed to be flexible so you can highlight issues that are issues in your institution or reflect the interests and needs of participants in your course.

1. Determine in which responsible content of research (RCR) topic the video will be introduced. RCR topics the US National Institutes of Health requires in training programs include:
 - Conflict of interest – personal, professional and financial
 - Policies regarding human subjects, live vertebrate animal subjects in research, and safe laboratory practices
 - Mentor/mentee responsibilities and relationships
 - Collaborative research including collaborations in industry
 - Peer review
 - Data acquisition and laboratory tools: management, sharing and ownership
 - Responsible authorship and publication
 - The scientist as a responsible member of society, contemporary ethical issues in biomedical research, and the environmental and societal impacts of scientific research.

2. Before the first video sketch presentation, discuss the importance of ground rules for the group. The ground rules will depend in part on the size and composition of the group. Some ground rules to consider include:
 - Respect the views of others, not necessarily agreeing with them
 - Criticize the idea, not the person
 - Do not interrupt or speak over another person
 - Participate at your comfort level
 - Cell phones off or on vibrate

3. Tips for using the video sketch presentations in RCR training:
 - View the video sketches before presenting them in a training session. Review the discussion questions.
 - Introduce the video sketch to participants. A short introduction is included in the discussion guide for each video sketch.
 - Play the video.
 - Initiate discussion with participants using the questions included in the discussion guide for each video sketch. Use probing questions to stimulate discussion and draw out possible solutions. Point out that there may be various solutions and there are not necessarily right or wrong answers to many of these questions. Distinguish between

facts and opinions during the discussion. Correct misinformation presented by participants.

- Ask participants for examples they have experienced that may be similar to the video sketch. Discuss possible solutions to these examples based on ideas generated from the video sketch discussion.
- Ask participants how they would discuss issues with their colleagues if something similar happened in a research setting. How can a culture of RCR be promoted in participants' research settings and how could they contribute to it?
- After discussing one or more of the video sketches, ask participants to identify policies that govern RCR in their institutions. For which themes are there existing policies and where are policies needed? How are policies implemented? How is their impact evaluated? What are consequences when policies are not adhered to?

The following section includes discussion guides that can be adapted for use in RCR training courses.

Video Sketch Discussion Guides

Video Sketch 1 – *Plagiarism? Only Technically...*

Resources needed

- DVD player or computer with DVD capacity
- TV or projector with speakers
- Video sketch 1 media file
- Copies of discussion questions to distribute

Synopsis of video sketch

Chioma and Femi are two graduate students who are involved in HIV research. They have a meeting with Prof tomorrow and are writing methods for a series of experiments to discuss at the meeting.

Discussion themes

- Research misconduct and policies for handling misconduct
- Collaborative research
- Mentor/mentee responsibilities and relationships

Session time

Allow at least 30-45 minutes for a complete discussion of this video sketch. The video is approximately 5 minutes long. Adapt the discussion based on the needs of the audience.

Video Sketch 1- *Plagiarism? Only Technically...* Discussion Questions

1. What happened in this video sketch? What did you think about their discussion?
2. Is Chioma's suggestion plagiarism or is it an honest mistake?
3. What if the methods section was in a published article and Chioma was a co-author? Is this plagiarism?
4. Who owns the text of a journal article in a published manuscript? If Chioma contacted the lead author on the paper, can she use the text?
5. What should Femi do if Chioma brings the methods section to their meeting with Prof?
6. What should Prof do? How could Prof prevent this situation from happening?
7. What is research misconduct? Is plagiarism a form of research misconduct? Is self-plagiarism a form of research misconduct?
8. When and how should researchers learn about plagiarism and other forms of research misconduct?
9. Have you seen anything like this happen in your research experiences? What happened and how was it addressed?
10. What could you do in your research setting to prevent similar situations from happening?
11. Are there any policies in place in your setting that address this type of situation?
 - a. If yes, what are they? If no, what policies are needed?
 - b. How would these policies be developed? Implemented? Enforced?
12. What can we learn about plagiarism from the proverb used in the video sketch?

Video Sketch 2 – Make Me An Author!

Resources needed

- DVD player or computer with DVD capacity
- TV or projector with speakers
- Video sketch 2 media file
- Copies of discussion questions to distribute

Synopsis of video sketch

Chioma and Femi learn that a project they were involved in is being written for publication and they are not included as authors.

Discussion themes

- Responsible authorship and publication
- Mentor/mentee responsibilities and relationships
- Conflict of interest

Session time

Allow at least 30-45 minutes for a complete discussion of this video sketch. The video is approximately 5 minutes long. Adapt the discussion based on the needs of the audience.

Video Sketch 2 – *Make Me An Author!...* Discussion Questions

1. What happened in this video sketch? What did you think about their discussion?
2. How significant is Chioma and Femi’s involvement in the research project?
3. What are the criteria for authorship? Do Chioma and Femi meet the criteria for authorship?
4. What are the criteria for contributorship? Do Chioma and Femi meet the criteria for being listed as contributors?
5. Does prof meet the criteria for sole authorship?
6. How do you think Chioma and Femi should approach Prof?
7. What should Prof do? How could Prof prevent this situation from happening?
8. What should a research team discuss about papers planned for a project and when should they discuss authorship?
9. When and how should researchers learn about authorship and contributorship?
10. Does this video sketch involve conflict of interest? How?
11. Have you seen anything like this happen in your research experiences? What happened and how was it addressed?
12. Are there any policies in place in your setting that address this type of situation?
13. Are there any policies in place in your setting that address this type of situation?
 - a. If yes, what are they? If no, what policies are needed?
 - b. How would these policies be developed? Implemented? Enforced?
14. What could you do in your research setting to prevent similar situations from happening?
15. What can we learn about authorship and contributorship from the proverb used in the video sketch?

Video Sketch 3 - Data Sharing: It's Not What It Used To Be...

Resources needed

- DVD player or computer with DVD capacity
- TV or projector with speakers
- Video sketch 3 media file
- Copies of discussion questions to distribute

Synopsis of video sketch

Dr. Anekwe meets with Dr. Bayo to discuss the current draft of his research proposal. He has questions about the data sharing plan required by the funding agency.

Discussion themes

- Data acquisition and laboratory tools: management, sharing and ownership
- Collaborative research
- Human subjects research
- Conflict of interest
- Mentor/mentee responsibilities and relationships

Session time

Allow at least 30-45 minutes for a complete discussion of this video sketch. The video is approximately 5 minutes long. Adapt the discussion based on the needs of the audience.

Video Sketch 3 - Data Sharing: It's Not What It Used To Be... Discussion Questions

1. What happened in this video sketch? What did you think about their discussion?
2. What is a data sharing plan? Why would the funding agency require a data sharing plan as part of a research proposal?
3. What do you think of Dr. Bayo's former colleague's practice of data hoarding?
4. If you were involved in a project and one of the researchers limited your access to data, what could you do?
5. Are there times when shared data is misused? How can you prevent such misuse?
6. When and how should researchers learn about data acquisition, data management, sharing and ownership?
7. Does this video sketch involve conflict of interest? If so, how?
8. Have you seen anything like this happen in your research experiences? What happened and how was it addressed?
9. What could you do in your research setting to prevent similar situations from happening?
10. Are there any policies in place in your setting that address this type of situation?
 - a. If yes, what are they? If no, what policies are needed?
 - b. How would these policies be developed? Implemented? Enforced?
11. What can we learn about data sharing from the proverb used in the video sketch?

Video Sketch 4 – What’s Ours Is Yours!

Resources needed

- DVD player or computer with DVD capacity
- TV or projector with speakers
- Video sketch 4 media file
- Copies of discussion questions to distribute

Synopsis of video sketch

Chioma stops by Dr. Bayo’s office to ask a question. Dr. Bayo talks about a dilemma he has with a collaborative research project he is involved in.

Discussion themes

- Data acquisition and laboratory tools: management, sharing and ownership
- Collaborative research
- Responsible authorship and publication

Session time

Allow at least 30-45 minutes for a complete discussion of this video sketch. The video is x minutes long. Adapt the discussion based on the needs of the audience.

Video Sketch 4 – What’s Ours Is Yours! Discussion Questions

1. What happened in this video sketch? What did you think about their discussion?
2. How should Dr. Bayo have handled his colleague’s request for samples?
3. Does Dr. Bayo meet criteria for authorship?
4. How should Dr. Bayo handle this situation? How does the fact that his colleague is from another institution impact Dr. Bayo’s options?
5. If the colleague was from the same institution as Dr. Bayo, what solutions would be available?
6. If you were involved in a similar dilemma, what could you do?
7. When and how should researchers learn about data acquisition, data management, sharing and ownership?
8. Have you seen anything like this happen in your research experiences? What happened and how was it addressed?
9. What could you do in your research setting to prevent similar situations from happening?
10. Are there any policies in place in your setting that address this type of situation?
 - a. If yes, what are they? If no, what policies are needed?
 - b. How would these policies be developed? Implemented? Enforced?
11. What can we learn about data sharing and authorship from the proverb used in the video sketch?

Responsible Conduct of Research Glossary

Authorship means the responsibilities a researcher has to be an author and order of authors in scholarly writing.

Contributorship - Many journals ask authors to identify the contributions made to manuscript preparation to confirm that all criteria are met. For those who do not meet authorship criteria, listing in the Acknowledgement section is appropriate.

Conflict of interest refers to a situation in which financial or other personal considerations have the potential to compromise or bias professional judgment and objectivity

Data means information that is collected, observed, or created for purposes of analysis to produce original research results.

Publication practices refer to accurate and ethical practices in describing research procedures and citations in scholarly writing.

Research with **animals** involves live, vertebrate animals used (or intended to be used) in research, research training, experimentation, or biological testing.

Research with **human subjects and materials** involves a living individual about whom an investigator conducting research obtains data through intervention or interaction with the individual or identifiable information from the individual.

Research misconduct means fabrication, falsification, or plagiarism in proposing, performing, or reviewing research, or in reporting research results.

References

Bulger RE, Heitman E. Expanding responsible conduct of research instruction across the university. *Academic Medicine*. 2007;82:876–878

Committee on Science E, and Public Policy *On being a scientist*. National Academies Press; Washington DC: 2009.

DuBois JM, Schilling DA, Heitman E, Steneck NH. Instruction in the responsible conduct of research: an inventory of programs and materials withing CTSA's. *Clin Transl Sci* 2010 June; 3(3): 109-111.

Mugenyi P and Swankambo NK (eds). *Mentors' Manual for Health Sciences Training in Africa*. Kampala: FountainPublishers, 2010.

Steneck NH, Bulger RE. The History, Purpose, and Future of Instruction in the Responsible Conduct of Research. *Academic Medicine*. 2007;82(9):829–834

Video Sketch Discussion Guide for Distribution

Video Sketch 1- *Plagiarism? Only Technically...* Discussion Questions

1. What happened in this video sketch? What did you think about their discussion?
2. Is Chioma's suggestion plagiarism or is it an honest mistake?
3. What if the methods section was in a published article and Chioma was a co-author? Is this plagiarism?
4. Who owns the text of a journal article in a published manuscript? If Chioma contacted the lead author on the paper, can she use the text?
5. What should Femi do if Chioma brings the methods section to their meeting with Prof?
6. What should Prof do? How could Prof prevent this situation from happening?
7. What is research misconduct? Is plagiarism a form of research misconduct? Is self-plagiarism a form of research misconduct?
8. When and how should researchers learn about plagiarism and other forms of research misconduct?
9. Have you seen anything like this happen in your research experiences? What happened and how was it addressed?
10. What could you do in your research setting to prevent similar situations from happening?
11. Are there any policies in place in your setting that address this type of situation?
 - a. If yes, what are they? If no, what policies are needed?
 - b. How would these policies be developed? Implemented? Enforced?
12. What can we learn about plagiarism from the proverb used in the video sketch?

Video Sketch 2 – *Make Me An Author!...* Discussion Questions

1. What happened in this video sketch? What did you think about their discussion?
2. How significant is Chioma and Femi’s involvement in the research project?
3. What are the criteria for authorship? Do Chioma and Femi meet the criteria for authorship?
4. What are the criteria for contributorship? Do Chioma and Femi meet the criteria for being listed as contributors?
5. Does prof meet the criteria for sole authorship?
6. How do you think Chioma and Femi should approach Prof?
7. What should Prof do? How could Prof prevent this situation from happening?
8. What should a research team discuss about papers planned for a project and when should they discuss authorship?
9. When and how should researchers learn about authorship and contributorship?
10. Does this video sketch involve conflict of interest? How?
11. Have you seen anything like this happen in your research experiences? What happened and how was it addressed?
12. Are there any policies in place in your setting that address this type of situation?
13. Are there any policies in place in your setting that address this type of situation?
 - a. If yes, what are they? If no, what policies are needed?
 - b. How would these policies be developed? Implemented? Enforced?
14. What could you do in your research setting to prevent similar situations from happening?
15. What can we learn about authorship and contributorship from the proverb used in the video sketch?

Video Sketch 3 - Data Sharing: It's Not What It Used To Be... Discussion Questions

1. What happened in this video sketch? What did you think about their discussion?
2. What is a data sharing plan? Why would the funding agency require a data sharing plan as part of a research proposal?
3. What do you think of Dr. Bayo's former colleague's practice of data hoarding?
4. If you were involved in a project and one of the researchers limited your access to data, what could you do?
5. Are there times when shared data is misused? How can you prevent such misuse?
6. When and how should researchers learn about data acquisition, data management, sharing and ownership?
7. Does this video sketch involve conflict of interest? If so, how?
8. Have you seen anything like this happen in your research experiences? What happened and how was it addressed?
9. What could you do in your research setting to prevent similar situations from happening?
10. Are there any policies in place in your setting that address this type of situation?
 - a. If yes, what are they? If no, what policies are needed?
 - b. How would these policies be developed? Implemented? Enforced?
11. What can we learn about data sharing from the proverb used in the video sketch?

Video Sketch 4 – What’s Ours Is Yours! Discussion Questions

1. What happened in this video sketch? What did you think about their discussion?
2. How should Dr. Bayo have handled his colleague’s request for samples?
3. Does Dr. Bayo meet criteria for authorship?
4. How should Dr. Bayo handle this situation? How does the fact that his colleague is from another institution impact Dr. Bayo’s options?
5. If the colleague was from the same institution as Dr. Bayo, what solutions would be available?
6. If you were involved in a similar dilemma, what could you do?
7. When and how should researchers learn about data acquisition, data management, sharing and ownership?
8. Have you seen anything like this happen in your research experiences? What happened and how was it addressed?
9. What could you do in your research setting to prevent similar situations from happening?
10. Are there any policies in place in your setting that address this type of situation?
 - a. If yes, what are they? If no, what policies are needed?
 - b. How would these policies be developed? Implemented? Enforced?
11. What can we learn about data sharing and authorship from the proverb used in the video sketch?