

 <p>THE UNIVERSITY OF MEMPHIS School of Public Health</p>	<p>PUBH 8901 Doctoral Professional Development Seminar School of Public Health The University of Memphis Fall 2017 Mondays, 5:30-8:30pm 235 Robison Hall</p>
---	---

Instructor

Ken Ward, PhD

Office: 201 Robison Hall

Phone: 678.1702

E-mail: kdward@memphis.edu

Office hours: by appointment

Course Description

This is a required seminar course for all second-year doctoral students in the School of Public Health. It will address a variety of professional issues that are vital to success as a doctoral student and public health professional. A major portion of the course is dedicated to responsible conduct in research. Other topics include public health history, philosophy, and ethics; developing positive mentor/mentee relationships; time management; manuscript and grant writing; reviewing others' scientific work; delivering poster and oral presentations; and preparing for a professional position.

Course Prerequisite

Enrollment as a second-year doctoral student in the School of Public Health

Learning Objectives

1. Describe major developments in the history and philosophy of public health
2. Apply ethics frameworks to public health decision making
3. Understand, evaluate, and apply accepted standards of responsible conduct in scientific research
4. Recognize and discuss diverse issues important to educational and professional success
5. Understand the roles and responsibilities of mentors and mentees
6. Identify effective time management strategies
7. Prepare and deliver effective poster and oral presentations
8. Understand effective strategies for identifying grant funding opportunities and writing successful research grants
9. Critically evaluate the quality of scientific manuscripts submitted for publication, and write and submit a professional-quality review to a journal
10. Understand and utilize sound document design principles in creating a professional curriculum vitae
11. Improve scientific writing skills

Communication

All written assignments should be submitted via email to the instructor at kdward@memphis.edu. The instructor will communicate with you, including notifying you when assignments have been received, by email. In accordance with School of Public Health policy, and due to legal, ethical, and privacy concerns, only your official U of M email address will be used for communication. Emails will be sent only to your official U of M email address, and will be accepted from you only through that account. It is the student's responsibility to regularly check this account.

Required Texts

Macrina, F.L. (2014). Scientific Integrity: Text and Cases in Responsible Conduct of Research, 4th edition. Washington DC: ASM Press.

Additional readings will be assigned in addition to the textbook, as detailed in this syllabus. Links are included in this syllabus to access web-based materials. If a link does not work, enter the resource's information in a web search engine such as Google, and you are likely to find it. If this does not work, please contact the instructor. Readings are available at: <https://umdrive.memphis.edu/kdward/public/PUBH8901>.

Course Requirements and Grading Criteria

Grading will be based on attendance, participation, various homework assignments, and in-class projects, as described below:

Class attendance & participation	20%
Reaction papers (total of 10)	20%
Weekly discussion questions on readings (total of 10)	20%
Manuscript review	15%
Oral presentation	10%
Informed consent document: first draft, revision, and peer critique	10%
Plagiarism quiz	5%

Class attendance & participation (20%): As a community of scholars, it is expected that the instructor and students will work together at all times to create an atmosphere that fosters shared discovery and mutual respect. The instructor will be prepared for each class meeting, and, likewise, students are expected to arrive prepared to ask questions, discuss, and learn. Attendance and active participation are essential to the success of a graduate seminar such as this. As such, students are expected to be present for all classes, arrive on time, stay for the entire class session, and participate actively. In the event of an unavoidable absence, please notify the instructor beforehand, if at all possible. Because serious illness or competing demands may occasionally interfere with class attendance, a student may miss one class without penalty. The penalty for a second missed class is 10% of the total course grade. The penalty for a third missed class is an additional 10% of the course grade. A third missed class will make it impossible to achieve a passing course grade, and is therefore grounds for dismissal from the course.

Several behaviors in the classroom are disruptive and disrespectful to the instructor and other students and are not acceptable. These include tardiness, leaving early, use of electronic devices, and engaging in side conversations while others are talking. If arriving late or leaving early is unavoidable, notify the instructor in advance, if possible. Set your cell phone to silent if you must be available for an emergency. Students who engage in any of these disruptive behaviors may be asked to leave and not allowed to return until a meeting with the instructor has occurred during which a plan to avoid future problems has been worked out.

The following rubric will be used to grade classroom performance:

Criteria considered in grading:	Not Passing	"C" Level	"B" Level	"A" Level
Class attendance	Substantially late to or absent from class; no advance explanation provided. (Note: absence from class means no participation credit is earned for that session).	Arrives late to class at least occasionally.	Arrives on time, is seated and ready to begin at class start time.	Arrives on time, is seated and ready to begin at class start time, immediately ceases other activities at the time the class actually starts.
Attention	Noticeably off-task during a portion of the class and/or distractive to others. Examples include, but are not limited to, attending to non-class matters (checking e-mails, PDAs and/or using a laptop for any task not directly relevant to what's going on in the class at the moment), cellphone/pager noise, off-topic conversations/passing notes/texts	Occasionally inattentive, such as engaging in side conversations or other off-task activities. Cellphone/pager noise is occasionally heard during class.	Generally attentive with most conversations focused on the in-class discussion. Rarely introduces peripheral noises or distractions (cellphones, pagers, and other devices).	Conversations are focused on the in-class discussion. No peripheral noises or distractions (cellphones, pagers, and other devices).
Participation	Does not ask/answer any questions; does not make comments (or relevant comments) during the session; or significantly derails the agenda of the class.	Does not contribute to class discussion, or participates but comments are off-topic and/or reflective of a lack of preparation (e.g. asking questions that the readings already clearly addressed).	Contributes at a good level (but without dominating); contributions add to (do not derail) the class discussion.	Contributions augment / add to comments from peers; synthesizes / incorporates readings and assignments into the class discussion.
Professional demeanor	Professionalism is lacking in one or more major ways (e.g. uses derogatory and/or other highly unprofessional language).	Professionalism is lacking in one or more minor ways (e.g. use of slang and/or marginally disrespectful or arrogant language).	Class participation reflects a good level of professionalism.	Class participation reflects a noticeably high level of professionalism.

Reaction papers (20%): Students will submit 10 reaction papers based on assigned readings. Papers submitted late (after 5:00pm on the Sunday preceding class) do not receive credit. These papers will be responses to case studies presented in the textbook or from other readings. Their purpose is to help the student think critically about the readings related to responsible conduct in research, public health ethics, and professional development. The papers also serve as a mechanism to help students improve their writing skills; as such, the instructor will provide feedback on both content and writing style.

Papers should be 1-2 pages, single-spaced, one-inch margins all around, 11-point font. Student's name and submission date should appear at the top, in the header. Be sure to pay attention to the overall organization

and paragraph structure of your essay. Usually, a well-organized essay will begin with an introductory paragraph that presents the thesis, continue with at least three body paragraphs that flesh out the thesis, and end with a concluding paragraph. There should be clear structure within each paragraph (i.e. a topic sentence, followed by supporting information, then a concluding statement and/or a segue into the next paragraph). Grading is based on both content and quality of writing, so be sure to check over your sentence structure, grammar, punctuation, and spelling.

A checkmark system will be used to grade the reaction papers (✓+, ✓, or ✓-). In calculating the grade, a ✓- corresponds to a number grade of 70%, a ✓ corresponds to a grade of 85%, and a ✓+ to a grade of 100%. Students will submit a total of 10 reaction papers; the lowest grade will be dropped in calculating the grade.

The following rubric explains how grades will be assigned:

Not Passing	✓-	✓	✓+
Reaction paper is not submitted or is submitted late.	Reaction paper is submitted on time, but is substantially shorter than 1-2 single-spaced pages or has major deficits in either conceptualization (e.g., readings do not appear to have been used or adequately understood) or organization (e.g., poor paragraph structure or segues between paragraphs, grammatical or spelling errors).	Reaction paper is of adequate length, is responsive to the questions, makes adequate use of the assigned readings, and has no major organizational problems.	Reaction paper is of adequate length, is well organized (at a level expected of doctoral level professionals), is responsive to the discussion questions, and goes beyond normal expectations for a beginning doctoral student in terms of quality of critical analysis of relevant issues and use of readings.

Weekly discussion questions on readings (20%): At the start of class, students will submit 2-3 discussion questions based on that week's readings. These questions will be used to guide discussion for that class.

A checkmark system will be used to grade the discussion questions (✓+, ✓, or ✓-). In calculating the grade, a ✓- corresponds to a number grade of 70%, a ✓ corresponds to a grade of 85%, and a ✓+ to a grade of 100%. Students will submit a total of 10 sets of discussion questions; the lowest grade will be dropped in calculating the grade.

The following rubric explains how grades will be assigned:

Not Passing	✓ -	✓	✓ +
Discussion questions not submitted, or submitted late.	Fewer than two questions are submitted, questions are not relevant to the readings, or questions do not lend themselves easily to discussion (e.g., are of the “yes” or “no” variety, or query about factual information from the readings).	2 or 3 questions are submitted, they capture important points from a majority of the readings, they are relevant to the readings, and lend themselves to discussion (e.g., are not “esoteric” and focus on issues especially relevant to graduate public health training).	2 or 3 questions are submitted, they capture important points from all or most of the readings and/or highlights common themes across the readings, and lend themselves to discussion (e.g., are not “esoteric” and focus on issues especially relevant to graduate public health training).

Manuscript review (15%): Each student will serve as the co-reviewer (along with the instructor or advisor) of a manuscript that has been submitted to a scientific journal for publication. He/she will be responsible for leading the class in a discussion of the merits and limitations of the article, drafting the review, revising the review based on feedback received from the instructor and classmates, and submitting the final review to the journal. Note that the instructor and the student’s advisor will be responsible for ensuring the scientific quality of all reviews and must give final approval before reviews are submitted to journals.

Students will be responsible for reading and critiquing, during class exercises, all manuscripts being reviewed. The instructor will try, as much as possible, to schedule manuscript reviews evenly throughout the semester. However, because we will be dependent on when manuscripts become available for review from various journals, students need to be prepared for a variable workload: it is likely that there will be no manuscripts to review some weeks, and multiple manuscripts on other weeks.

Oral presentation (10%): Each student will deliver an oral scientific presentation. The presentation will be based on the student’s own research. The student will have 15 minutes to present content followed by 5 minutes for questions. Expectations will be discussed in class. Students also will submit checklist evaluations of other students’ presentations, and provide oral feedback during class.

Informed consent document (10%): Students will create, and submit initial and revised drafts of an informed consent document. The document should be related to a planned or potential research project of the student’s and should be created on the University of Memphis’s consent document template, available at http://www.memphis.edu/rsp/compliance/irb_forms.php. Students also will provide written feedback on a fellow student’s initial draft.

Plagiarism quiz (5%): After completing the assigned readings for Session 3, students will complete an on-line quiz of issues in plagiarism, which is available at <http://www.academicintegrity.uoguelph.ca/plagiarism/quiz-plagiarism>. For each of the 10 items, students should select a response until the correct answer is revealed. Quiz results should be printed and a hard copy submitted at the start of Session 3.

Grading Scale

The letter grades for each requirement are assigned using the following grading scale:

<i>Percentage Grade</i>	<i>Letter Grade</i>	<i>GPA</i>	<i>Percentage Grade</i>	<i>Letter Grade</i>	<i>GPA</i>
≥96%	A+	4.00	76%	C+	2.33
93%	A	4.00	73%	C	2.00
90%	A–	3.84	70%	C–	1.67
86%	B+	3.33	66%	D+	1.33
83%	B	3.00	60%	D	1.00
80%	B–	2.67	<60%	F	0.00

Promoting a Positive Learning Environment

The School of Public Health recognizes its responsibility to promote a safe and diversity-sensitive learning environment that respects the rights, dignity, and well-being of all students, faculty, and staff. Diversity means the fair representation of all groups of individuals, the inclusion of contrasting perspectives and voices, together with the appreciation and valuing of different cultural and socioeconomic group practices. Moreover, we aspire to foster a climate of mutual respect and empathy, among and between students, faculty, and staff, by nurturing an atmosphere that is free from discrimination, harassment, exploitation, or intimidation. Courses will strive to provide an opportunity for all students to openly discuss issues of diversity including, but not limited to, age, disability, ethnicity, gender, race, religious beliefs, and sexual orientation.

Writing Standards

Effective managers, leaders, and teachers are also effective communicators. Written communication is an important element of the communication process. The School of Public Health graduate program recognizes and expects exemplary writing to be the norm for course work.

Academic Conduct

All written work submitted must be the student's original work and conform to the guidelines of the *American Medical Association (AMA)* or *American Psychological Association (APA)* which are available online and via their publications. This means that any substantive ideas, phrases, sentences, and/or graphic images, from other people's published or unpublished work, must be properly referenced to avoid even the appearance of plagiarism. Plagiarism includes, but is not limited to, the use, by paraphrase or direct quotation, of the published or unpublished work of another person without full or clear acknowledgment. It also includes the unacknowledged use of materials prepared by another person or agency in the selling of term papers or other academic materials. It is the student's responsibility to know all relevant university policies concerning plagiarism. Plagiarism is a serious violation of the professional standards of public health. Any documented case of plagiarism in this course will result in dismissal from the course with a failing grade, and may result in other more serious sanctions by the School of Public Health and The University of Memphis.

Cheating is not acceptable at The University of Memphis. Cheating includes but is not limited to the following: using any unauthorized assistance in taking quizzes or tests; acquiring tests or other academic material before such material is revealed or distributed by the instructor; failing to abide by the instructions of the proctor concerning test taking procedures; influencing, or attempting to influence, any university employee in order to affect a student's grade or evaluations; any forgery, alteration, unauthorized possession, or misuse of University documents.

Awarding an Incomplete Grade

A grade of "I" (Incomplete) may be assigned by the Instructor of any course in which the student is unable to complete the work due to EXTRAORDINARY events beyond the individual's control. The "I" may not be used to extend the term for students who complete the course with an unsatisfactory grade. Unless the student completes the requirements for removal of the "I" within 90 days from the end of the semester or summer term in which it was received, the "I" will be changed to an "F," regardless of whether or not the student is enrolled.

Withdrawal Policy

The School of Public Health adheres to Graduate School policies and procedures regarding withdrawal from courses. Consult the Graduate School Dates & Deadlines Calendar for specific information. A late withdrawal is withdrawal from a course after the final date to drop classes, which falls around the middle of each semester. The drop is called a retroactive withdrawal if it takes place after grades have been issued. Before the drop deadline, students can process a drop on the web or over the phone without seeking anyone else's approval. The instructor, however, will appreciate the courtesy of being notified if you decide to drop the course. After the final drop date, the student must obtain approval for late drops or retroactive withdrawal from the Director of Graduate Studies of the School of Public Health. Instructors are not authorized to approve late drops or retroactive withdrawals.

Americans with Disabilities Act

The University of Memphis does not discriminate on the basis of disability in the recruitment and admission of students, the recruitment and employment of faculty and staff, and the operation of any of its programs and activities, as specified by federal laws and regulations. *The student has the responsibility of informing the course instructor (at the beginning of the course) of any disabling condition, which will require modification to avoid discrimination.* Faculty are required to provide "reasonable accommodation" to students with disabilities, so as not to discriminate on the basis of that disability. Student responsibility primarily rests with informing faculty at the beginning of the semester and in providing authorized documentation through designated administrative channels.

Special Needs

Any student who has special needs for assistance and/or accommodation, and who is registered with the Office of Student Disability Services should meet with the instructor during the first week of classes.

Inclement Weather Policy

In the event that inclement weather requires the cancellation of classes at the University of Memphis, local radio and television media will be notified. Additionally, the University of Memphis has established an inclement weather hotline 901-678-0888. Emergency closing information is available at <http://www.memphis.edu/cris/pdfs/closing.pdf>.

Schedule of Topics and Assignments

Session 1 – August 28	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Course overview - “Foundations of public health” (guest presentation by Dr. Marian Levy)
------------------------------	---

Readings for discussion:

Casadevall, A. (2012). Reforming science: methodological and cultural reforms (editorial). Infection and Immunity, 80, 891-896.

Koppaka, R. (2011). Ten Great Public Health Achievements- United States, 2001-2010. *Morbidity and Mortality Weekly Report*, 60, 619-623. <http://www.cdc.gov/mmwr/preview/mmwrhtml/mm6019a5.htm> (accessed August 21, 2017).

Lee, A., Sim, F., & Mackie, P. (2016). Changing times, changing challenges: lessons for public health from history (editorial). Public Health, 138, 1-3.

→ Class will convene at 5:30pm in Robison 235, and then at 6:15pm will join Dr. Levy’s “Foundations of Public Health” class in Manning 204 for a joint presentation

September 4	- No class: Labor Day
--------------------	-----------------------

Session 2 – September 11	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - “Critically evaluating the scientific literature” (guest presentation by Dr. Vikki Nolan) - Advancing public health science: participating in the peer review process
---------------------------------	--

Case study for Dr. Nolan’s presentation:

To be announced

Readings On Peer Review:

Bohannon, J. (2013, October 3). Who’s afraid of peer review? Science, 342, 60-65.

Lovejoy, T.I., Revenson, T.A., & France, C.R. (2011). Reviewing manuscripts for peer-review journals: a primer for novice and seasoned reviewers. Annals of Behavioral Medicine, 42, 1-13.

Macrina, F.L. (2014). Authorship and peer review (chapter 4). In F.L. Macrina (Ed.), Scientific Integrity: Text and Cases in Responsible Conduct of Research, 4th edition, (read pp. 105-123 on peer review). Washington DC: ASM Press.

To be assigned (as needed): Manuscript(s) for peer review

Assignment due – submit discussion questions on this week’s readings at the start of class.

Assignment due – Reaction paper #1 (1-2 single spaced pages):

Choose one of the public health accomplishments discussed in the Session 1 readings (Koppaka, 2011 or Lee et al., 2011) or Dr. Levy’s lecture, and briefly describe how each of the three core functions of public health were applied to eradicate the problem. Also, discuss which of the 10 essential public health services were likely most critical in alleviating the problem. Please e-mail your paper to kdward@memphis.edu by 5:00pm on the Sunday preceding class.

- In-class activity: Discussion of case study assigned for Dr. Nolan's presentation
- In-class activity: Discussion of case studies
- In-class activity: Manuscript critique (discussion of *Respirology* manuscript, led by Vivian)

Session 3 – September 18	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Guest presentation by Professor Perveen Rustomfram, University Libraries: <i>"Information literacy: conducting literature reviews, using the library, using citation software (RefWorks) and scientific databases"</i> - "Writing well and writing honestly" – Review of writing skills and plagiarism <p>(Class tonight will be conducted jointly with the Foundations of Public Health class and will meet in <u>Manning 204</u>)</p>
---------------------------------	--

Readings On Plagiarism:

Flaherty, C., (2014, April 24), In her own words, InsideHigher Ed.com. Retrieved August 7, 2017 from <https://www.insidehighered.com/news/2014/04/25/investigation-brown-professors-plagiarism-case-goes-public>.

Reis, R. (2012, May 14). Literal and intelligent plagiarism: students beware! Tomorrows-professor-digest, 64, Issue 5.

Price, A. (2006). Cases of plagiarism handled by the United States Office of Research Integrity 1992-2005. Plagiarism: Cross- Disciplinary Studies in Plagiarism, Fabrication, and Falsification, 46-56. Retrieved August 7, 2017 from <http://quod.lib.umich.edu/p/plag/5240451.0001.001/--cases-of-plagiarism-handled?rgn=main;view=fulltext>

The Writing Center, University of Wisconsin, Madison (2003, March 4). Acknowledging, Paraphrasing, and Quoting Sources.

To be assigned (as needed): Manuscript(s) for peer review

Assignment due -- After doing the readings on plagiarism, go to the website <http://www.academicintegrity.uoguelph.ca/plagiarism/quiz-plagiarism> and complete the quiz. For each of the 10 items, select a response until you identify the correct answer. When you have completed the quiz, print the results and submit a hard copy at the start of class.

Assignment due -- Reaction paper #2 (1-2 single spaced pages): Write a reaction paper based on the Flaherty reading, and respond to the following questions: Does the case described constitute plagiarism? Why or why not? Does the punishment fit the crime? What recommendations would you make to Professor Ryan to prevent a similar mishap in the future? Please e-mail your paper to kdward@memphis.edu by 5:00pm on the Sunday preceding class.

Note: no discussion questions are due tonight.

- In-class activity: Discussion of Flaherty case study
- In-class activity: Manuscript critiques (as needed)

Session 4 – September 25	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Delivering effective oral presentations - Authorship
---------------------------------	---

Readings On Oral Presentations:

Female Science Professor. (2013, July 8). Talking the talk. The Chronicle of Higher Education. Retrieved August 8, 2017 from: <http://chronicle.com/article/Talking-the-Talk/140111/>.

Shapiro, D. (2012, July 16). Grim job talks are a buzz kill. The Chronicle of Higher Education. Retrieved August 8, 2017 from <http://chronicle.com/article/Grim-Job-Talks-Are-a-Buzz-Kill/132843/>.

Shewchuk, J. (n.d.) Giving an academic talk. Retrieved August 9, 2016 from <http://people.eecs.berkeley.edu/~jrs/speaking.html>

Readings On Authorship:

Albert, T., & Wager, E. (2003). How to handle authorship disputes: a guide for new researchers. The COPE Report, pp 32-34.

American Psychological Association. Authorship determination scorecard
Retrieved August 8, 2017 from <https://www.apa.org/science/leadership/students/authorship-determination-scorecard.pdf>

American Psychological Association. Authorship tie-breaker scorecard.
Retrieved August 8, 2017 from <https://www.apa.org/science/leadership/students/authorship-tie-breaker-scorecard.pdf>

American Psychological Association. Contract regarding publication intent.
Retrieved August 8, 2017 from <http://www.apa.org/science/leadership/students/authorship-agreement.pdf>

American Psychological Association. Publication/Presentation Contract.
Retrieved August 8, 2017 from <https://www.apa.org/science/leadership/students/authorship-agreement.pdf>

Journal of the American Medical Association (n.d). JAMA authorship responsibility, conflicts of interest and funding, and copyright transfer/publishing agreement. Retrieved August 8, 2017 from http://jama.jamanetwork.com/data/ifora-forms/jama/auinst_crit.pdf

Glass, R.L. (2000). A letter from the frustrated author of a journal paper. The Journal of Systems and Software, 54, 1.

Macrina, F.L. (2005). Authorship and peer review (chapter 4). In F.L. Macrina (Ed.), Scientific Integrity: Text and Cases in Responsible Conduct of Research, 4th edition. Washington DC: ASM Press. **(read pp. 83-105 on Scientific Publication and Authorship)**

To be assigned (as needed): Manuscript(s) for peer review

Assignment due – submit discussion questions on this week’s readings at the start of class.

Assignment due – brief (one paragraph) description of proposed 15 minute research-based oral presentation (described on p. 5 of the syllabus).

Assignment due – Reaction paper #3 (1-2 single spaced pages):

Select one: Macrina case studies 4.1 – 4.10 (pp. 123-129). Please e-mail your paper to kdward@memphis.edu by 5:00pm on the Sunday preceding class.

→ **In-class activity:** Viewing of video “Designing effective scientific presentations: using PowerPoint and structuring your talk” by Dr. Susan McConnell, Stanford University. Retrieved August 9, 2017 from <http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=Hp7ld3Yb9XQ>.

→ **In-class activity:** Authorship decision-making exercise

→ **In-class activity:** Discussion of Macrina case studies

→ **In-class activity:** Manuscript critiques (as needed)

Session 5 – October 2

- ***“Ethics and Ethical Decision Making in Public Health”***: Guest presentation by Dr. Erik Carlton
- Time management

Required and Recommended Readings for Dr. Carlton’s presentation:

Required

Thobaben, J. & Holsinger, J.W. (2017 - in press). The ethical basis of public health leadership. In J.W. Holsinger & E.L. Carlton, *Leadership for Public Health: Theory & Practice*. Chicago, IL: Health Administration Press. (*Hard copies of the Thobaben & Holsinger paper will be distributed during Session 4*)

Public Health Leadership Society. (2002). Principles of the ethical practice of public health. Retrieved August 8, 2017 from https://www.apha.org/~media/files/pdf/membergroups/ethics_brochure.ashx.

Recommended

Childress, J.F., Faden, R.R., Gaare, R.D., Gostin, L.O., Kahn, J., Bonnie, R.J., Kass, N.E., Mastroianni, A.C., Morena, J.D., & Nieburg, P. (2002). Public health ethics: mapping the terrain. *Journal of Law, Medicine & Ethics*, 30, 170-178.

Faden, R., & Shebaya, S. (2015). Public health ethics. Stanford Encyclopedia of Philosophy. Retrieved August 9, 2017 from <http://plato.stanford.edu/entries/publichealth-ethics/>.

Readings On Time Management:

Johnson, S.R. (2010). “Code O’: How to recover from *Overwhelm*.” Thriving Amidst Chaos blog. Retrieved August 9, 2017 from <http://www.thrivingamidstchaos.com/articles.html>.

Johnson, S.R. (2010). “The basics of organizing your work and time.” Thriving Amidst Chaos blog. Retrieved August 9, 2017 from <http://www.thrivingamidstchaos.com/articles.html>.

Johnson, S.R. (2010). “Priorities: how to decide what to do, and when.” Thriving Amidst Chaos blog. Retrieved August 9, 2017 from <http://www.thrivingamidstchaos.com/articles.html>.

Johnson, S.R. (2010). “Execution: getting your work *done*.” Thriving Amidst Chaos blog. Retrieved August 9, 2017 from <http://www.thrivingamidstchaos.com/articles.html>.

Johnson, S.R. (2010). “Getting e-mail under control.” Thriving Amidst Chaos blog. Retrieved August 9, 2017 from <http://www.thrivingamidstchaos.com/articles.html>.

Johnson, S.R. (2010). “Becoming a productive academic writer.” Thriving Amidst Chaos blog. Retrieved August 9, 2017 from <http://www.thrivingamidstchaos.com/articles.html>.

Johnson, S.R. (2010). “A plan for professional reading.” Thriving Amidst Chaos blog. Retrieved August 9, 2017 from <http://www.thrivingamidstchaos.com/articles.html>.

Johnson, S.R. (2010). “Time mapping: learning to ‘tell time.’” Thriving Amidst Chaos blog. Retrieved August 9, 2017 from <http://www.thrivingamidstchaos.com/articles.html>.

Johnson, S.R. (2010). “Interruptions.” Thriving Amidst Chaos blog. Retrieved August 9, 2017 from <http://www.thrivingamidstchaos.com/articles.html>.

Johnson, S.R. (2010). “Getting more done through others: the basics of delegation.” Thriving Amidst Chaos blog. Retrieved August 9, 2017 from <http://www.thrivingamidstchaos.com/articles.html>.

Assignment due – submit discussion questions on this week’s readings at the start of class.

To be assigned (as needed): Manuscript(s) for peer review

Assignment due – Reaction paper #4 (1-2 single spaced pages): Discuss the importance of middle axioms to ethical public health practice. Provide and discuss at least one specific example of how the use of middle axioms has impacted a public health intervention. Please e-mail your paper to kdward@memphis.edu by 5:00pm on the Sunday preceding class.

- In-class activity: Discussion of public health ethics and time management
- In-class activity: Manuscript critiques (as needed)

Session 6 – October 9 (Dr. Ward out of town)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Protecting human research subjects - Crafting IRB applications and consent documents - Scientific misconduct and fraud <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Guest presenters: Ms. Beverly Jacobik, Associate Director of Research Compliance, Research Support Services, University of Memphis
---	--

Readings On Protecting Human Research Subjects:

Swerdlow, P.S., and Macrina, F.L. (2014). Use of humans in biomedical experimentation (Chapter 5). In F.L. Macrina (Ed.), Scientific Integrity: Text and Cases in Responsible Conduct of Research, 4th edition, (pp. 135-172). Washington DC: ASM Press.

World Medical Association. (2013). World Medical Association Declaration of Helsinki: ethical principles for medical research involving human subjects. JAMA, 310, 2191-2194.

Reading on Scientific Misconduct and Fraud:

Bhattacharjee, Y. (2013, April 26). The mind of a con man. New York Times. Retrieved August 8, 2017 from <http://www.nytimes.com/2013/04/28/magazine/diederik-stapels-audacious-academic-fraud.html?pagewanted=all&r=0>.

Gunsalus, C.K. (2010). How to blow the whistle and still have a career afterwards. Science and Engineering Ethics, 4,

Macrina, F.L. (2014). Methods, manners, and the responsible conduct of research (chapter 1). In F.L. Macrina (Ed.), Scientific Integrity: Text and Cases in Responsible Conduct of Research, 4th edition, (pp 1-24). Washington DC: ASM Press.

Assignment due – submit discussion questions on this week’s readings. Because Dr. Ward is out of town, these questions should be emailed to kdward@memphis.edu by the start of class. We will use these questions to guide our discussion of IRB documents and scientific misconduct during Session 7 (October 23rd).

Assignment due – Reaction paper #5 (1-2 single spaced pages):

Write an essay based on the Bhattacharjee reading and bringing in any other readings you would like. Suggested reaction topics: *What factors do you think led Diederik Stapel to commit fraud? Who was harmed and in what ways? What consequences did Stapel incur and were they just? What risks, if any, did his students face by reporting his misconduct? How do you think you would have handled this had you been his student?* Please e-mail your paper to kdward@memphis.edu by 5:00pm on the Sunday preceding class.

October 16	- No class: Fall Break
-------------------	-------------------------------

Session 7 – October 23

- Everything you always wanted to know about the U of M School of Public Health (but were afraid to ask): Roundtable discussion with senior doctoral students
- Discussion on Session 6 readings (IRB documents, scientific misconduct)

Readings On Surviving Graduate School:

Fidler, C. (2012, March 22). What I learned about surviving graduate school. The Chronicle of Higher Education. Retrieved August 9, 2017 from <http://chronicle.com/article/What-I-Learned-About-Surviving/131247/>.

Kelsky, K. (2012, March 27). Graduate school is a means to a job. The Chronicle of Higher Education. Retrieved August 9, 2017 from <http://chronicle.com/article/Graduate-School-Is-a-Means-to/131316/>

Schwartz, M.A. (2008). The importance of stupidity in scientific research. Journal of Cell Science, 121, 1771.

Seal, D.W. (2007). Child planning required: a father's perspective on balancing career and family within academic psychiatry. Academic Psychiatry, 31, 143-145.

To be assigned (as needed): Manuscript(s) for peer review

Assignment due – submit discussion questions on this week's readings at the start of class.

→ **In-class activity: Discuss readings from Session 6 (IRB, scientific misconduct) and Session 7 (Surviving graduate school)**

Session 8 – October 30

- Creating effective poster presentations
- Mentoring
- Student oral presentations (Part 1 of 4)

Readings On Creating Poster Presentations:

Erren, T.C., & Bourne, P.E. (2007). Ten simple rules for a good poster presentation. PLOS Computational Biology, 3, 0777-0778.

Hess, G., Tosney, K., & Liegel, L. (n.d.). Creating effective poster presentations: resources. Retrieved August 9, 2017 from <http://www.ncsu.edu/project/posters/>. (Please read this page and peruse some of the links).

Readings On Mentoring:

Chopra, V., Edelson, D.P., & Saint, S. (2016). Mentorship malpractice. JAMA, 315, 1453-1454.

Macrina, F.L. (2014). Mentoring (Chapter 3). In F.L. Macrina (Ed.), Scientific Integrity: Text and Cases in Responsible Conduct of Research, 4th edition, (pp. 53-82). Washington DC: ASM Press.

Vick, J.M., & Furlong, J.S. (2012, May 2). Seeking the mentors you need. The Chronicle of Higher Education. Retrieved August 9, 2016 from <http://chronicle.com/article/article-content/131747/>

To be assigned (as needed): Manuscript(s) for peer review

Assignment due – submit discussion questions on this week's readings at the start of class.

Assignment due – Reaction paper #6 (1-2 single spaced pages):

Select one: Macrina case studies 3.1 – 3.10 (pp. 73-79). Please e-mail your paper to kdward@memphis.edu by 5:00pm on the Sunday preceding class.

- **In-class activity:** Viewing of 3 short videos : “Effective poster presentations: an introduction,” “Headings,” and “Giving an effective poster presentation.” Retrieved August 9, 2017 from <http://www.ncsu.edu/project/posters/Videos.html>
- **In-class activity:** Critique of posters
- **In-class activity:** Discussion of Macrina case studies
- **In-class activity:** Manuscript critiques (as needed)

Session 9 – November 6	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Grantsmanship and Obtaining Funding: Guest presentation by Dr. Wilfried Karmaus - Collaborative research - Student oral presentations (Part 2 of 4)
-------------------------------	---

Readings On Obtaining Funding:

“New and early stage investigator policies.” (n.d.). National Institutes of Health. Retrieved August 8, 2017 from http://grants.nih.gov/grants/new_investigators/. (Please read this page and peruse some of the links).

“Funding opportunities and notices.” (n.d.). National Institutes of Health. Retrieved August 8, 2017 from <http://grants.nih.gov/grants/guide/>. (Please read this page and peruse some of the links).

“Types of grant programs.” (n.d.). National Institutes of Health. Retrieved August 8, 2017 from http://grants.nih.gov/grants/funding/funding_program.htm. (Please read this page and peruse some of the links).

Wysocki, B. Jr. (2004, June 28). “At Pitt, scientists decode the secret of getting grants.” *Wall Street Journal*. Retrieved August 8, 2017 from <http://www.wsj.com/articles/SB108837661519248681>.

To be assigned (as needed): Manuscript(s) for peer review

Reading On Collaboration:

Bennett, L.M., & Macrina, F.L. (2014). Collaborative research (chapter 8). In F.L. Macrina (Ed.), *Scientific Integrity: Text and Cases in Responsible Conduct of Research*, 4th edition, Washington DC: ASM Press.

To be assigned (as needed): Manuscript(s) for peer review

Assignment due – submit discussion questions on this week’s readings at the start of class.

Assignment due -- First draft of informed consent document. As described on p. 5 of this syllabus, the document should be related to a planned or potential research project of yours, and should be created on the University of Memphis’s consent document template, available in the dropbox and also at http://www.memphis.edu/rsp/compliance/irb_forms.php. Please e-mail your document to kdward@memphis.edu by 5:00pm on the Sunday preceding class.

Assignment due – Reaction paper #7 (1-2 single spaced pages):

Select one: Macrina case studies 8.1 – 8.10 (pp. 276-283). Please e-mail your paper to kdward@memphis.edu by 5:00pm on the Sunday preceding class.

- **In-class activity:** Discussion of Macrina case studies
- **In-class activity:** Student oral presentations and critiques by class
- **In-class activity:** Manuscript critiques (as needed)

Session 10 – November 13 (Dr. Ward is out of town)	- Causal inference in public health: Guest presentation by Dr. Jim Gurney
---	--

Readings on causal inference in public health:

Glass, T.A., Goodman, S.N., Hernan, M.A., & Samet, J.M. (2013). Causal inference in public health. *Annual Review of Public Health*, 34, 61-75.

Maldonado, G., & Greenland, S. (2002). Estimating causal effects. *International Journal of Epidemiology*, 31, 422-429.

To be assigned (as needed): Manuscript(s) for peer review

Assignment due – submit discussion questions on this week’s readings at the start of class.

Assignment due -- Peer critique of informed consent document. Please e-mail your critique (Using “Track Changes” on the original document) to kward@memphis.edu by 5:00pm on the Sunday preceding class.

Session 11 – November 20	- Research data and intellectual property - Competing interests - Student oral presentations (Part 3 of 4)
---------------------------------	---

Reading on Research Data and Intellectual Property:

Mays, T.D., & Macrina, F.L. (2014). Research data and intellectual property (chapter 9). In F.L. Macrina (Ed.), Scientific Integrity: Text and Cases in Responsible Conduct of Research, 4th edition, Washington DC: ASM Press.

Reading On Competing Interests:

Bradley, S.G. (2014). Competing interests in research (Chapter 7). In F.L. Macrina (Ed.), Scientific Integrity: Text and Cases in Responsible Conduct of Research, 4th edition, (pp. 209-241). Washington DC: ASM Press.

To be assigned (as needed): Manuscript(s) for peer review

Assignment due – submit discussion questions on this week’s readings at the start of class.

Assignment due -- Revised informed consent document. Please e-mail your paper to kward@memphis.edu by 5:00pm on the Sunday preceding class.

Assignment due – Reaction paper #8 (1-2 single spaced pages):

Select one: Macrina case studies 7.1 – 7.10 (pp. 235-239) OR Macrina case studies 9.1 – 9.10 (pp. 318-323). Please e-mail your paper to kward@memphis.edu by the start of class.

- In-class activity: Discussion of Macrina case studies
- In-class activity: Student oral presentations and critiques by class
- In-class activity: Manuscript critiques (as needed)

Session 12 – November 27	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Scientific record keeping - Student oral presentations (Part 4 of 4)
---------------------------------	---

Reading on Scientific Record Keeping:

Macrina, F.L. (2014). Scientific record keeping. (chapter 10). In F.L. Macrina (Ed.), Scientific Integrity: Text and Cases in Responsible Conduct of Research, 4th edition, Washington DC: ASM Press.

Assignment due – submit discussion questions on this week’s readings at the start of class.

Assignment due – Reaction paper #9 (1-2 single spaced pages):

Select one: Macrina case studies 10.1 – 10.10 (pp. 351-357). Please e-mail your paper to kdward@memphis.edu by the start of class.

→ **In-class activity: Student oral presentations and critiques by class**

→ **In-class activity: Manuscript critiques (as needed)**

Session 13 – December 4	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - CV design workshop (guest presentation Dr. Loel Kim, Dept of English) - Preparing yourself for a job/Course wrap-up
--------------------------------	--

Readings On Curriculum Vitae Preparation:

Eyler, J.R. (2012, April 4). The rhetoric of the CV. The Chronicle of Higher Education. Retrieved August 9, 2017 from <http://chronicle.com/article/The-Rhetoric-of-the-CV/131404/>.

Wecker, M. (2013, September 14). Common pitfalls to avoid in your CV. The Chronicle of Higher Education. Retrieved August 9, 2017 from <https://chroniclevitae.com/news/3-common-pitfalls-to-avoid-in-your-cv>.

Readings On Preparing For a Job:

DeCoker, G. (2012, October 4). “Beyond the one-page cover letter.” The Chronicle of Higher Education. Retrieved August 9, 2017 from <http://chronicle.com/article/Beyond-the-One-Page-Cover/134794/>.

Jenkins, R. (2012, February 20). “What to ask—and not to ask—in your interview.” The Chronicle of Higher Education. Retrieved August 9, 2017 from <http://chronicle.com/article/What-to-Ask-and-Not-to/130837/>.

Lemuel, J. “To the insider candidate who did not get the job.” The Chronicle of Higher Education. Retrieved August 9, 2017 from <http://chronicle.com/article/To-the-Inside-Candidate-Who/131403/>.

Perlmutter, D.D. (2012, June 17). “Show them you really want the job.” The Chronicle of Higher Education. Retrieved August 9, 2017 from <http://chronicle.com/article/Show-Them-You-Really-Want-the/132281/>.

Perlmutter, D.D. (2012, August 12). “Embrace your inner North Dakotan.” The Chronicle of Higher Education. Retrieved August 9, 2017 from <http://chronicle.com/article/Embrace-Your-Inner-North/133493/>.

Perlmutter, D.D. (2012, September 12). “Minding your manners for the conference interview.” The Chronicle of Higher Education. Retrieved August 9, 2017 from <http://chronicle.com/article/Minding-Your-Manners-for-the/134184/>.

Sullivan, P. (2012, March 7). “Withdrawing from a job you’ve accepted.” The Chronicle of Higher Education. Retrieved August 9, 2017 from <http://chronicle.com/article/Withdrawing-From-a-Job-Youve/131075/>.

Trepal, H. (2012, May 16). “This can’t be happening.” The Chronicle of Higher Education. Retrieved August 9, 2017 from <http://chronicle.com/article/article-content/131880/>.

To be assigned (as needed): Manuscript(s) for review

Assignment due -- Bring a hard copy of your CV with you to class.

Assignment due – Reaction paper #10 (1-2 single spaced pages):

At this point in your professional training, what kind of career do you envision for yourself five years after completing your PhD? Have these goals changed since you entered the PhD program? What are some of your accomplishments that have placed you on a solid track for that career? What could you do differently to better prepare yourself, and what are some concrete steps to get there? Please e-mail your paper to kdward@memphis.edu by 5:00pm on the Sunday preceding class.

→ In-class activity: CV mini-workshop

→ In-class activity: Manuscript critiques (as needed)