Academic Citizenship Introduced

Sequence, 4 sessions, 2 days

In this sequence of sessions, students reflect on the concept of "academic citizenship" and the ethical responsibilities of all members of the academic community.

The university plays a unique role in society by creating, developing and conveying knowledge through research and education in order to meet society's needs. To acknowledge the fundamental principles of autonomy – ensuring researchers the freedom to identify research questions – many universities have signed the Magna Charta Universitatum and joined the International Association of Universities.

Within this CARTA Curriculum, students revisit these critical questions towards the end of their PhD journey.

Download the curriculum for this sequence of sessions.

Sessions

Session 1. Academic Citizenship and Research Integrity | 2 hours

As an academic citizen, each student will take responsibility for quality in research and education. They commit to collegial collaboration for society's benefit and to counteracting misconduct and plagiarism in both research and education. In this session, you present and discuss what this means, in international terms, as practised in your institution and in students' individual understanding.

Outcomes
By the end of the session, students can discuss and appreciate the benefits and responsibilities of academic citizenship.

Preparation
As the facilitator
To present the concept of academic citizenship to students (Step 1), prepare notes and/or slides to summarise common views within academia globally and provide examples of how to handle misconduct, including plagiarism.

Consult these resources as the basis for your presentation and share them with your students.
- Macfarlane, B. (2007). Defining and Rewarding Academic Citizenship: The implications for university promotions policy. Journal of Higher Education Policy and Management, 29(3), 26 –273.
- Macfarlane, B. and Burg, D. (2018). Rewarding and Recognising Academic Citizenship. Leadership Foundation for Higher Education.
- The Magna Charta Universitatum.
- International Association of Universities: Vision & Mission.
- University of Alberta. What is Academic Citizenship?
- Wits University. (2023). Managing risk and harm in research ethically.

For participants
Before the session, read the resource materials and reflect on these questions:
- How are the fundamental values of universities lived at your institution?
- How are academic citizenship and responsibilities handled at your institution? Have you been introduced to them during your studies?
- How do you as a researcher avoid being involved in academic misconduct, particularly considering the hierarchy that exists between senior and junior researchers?
- How could you, as a leader, contribute to the academic citizenship?

Self-assessment

Each student writes up their individual commitment to observe academic honesty and integrity, and to address dishonest academic practices.

Steps

Time	Step	Who
45 minutes	1. Present "academic citizenship"	Facilitator, full group
45 minutes	2. Discuss academic citizenship in practice	Small groups
30 minutes	3. Discuss the connection with social change	Plenary

Step 1. Present "academic citizenship"
45 minutes

During your presentation, engage the group in discussing how researchers and teachers practise academic citizenship in order to:

- Maintain ethics in education and research.
- Influence change for to improve people's quality of life.

Step 2. Discuss academic citizenship in practice
45 minutes

Divide students into groups of four or five and invite them to discuss:

- In what concrete ways does your institution put academic citizenship and responsibilities into practice at each level: university leadership, among colleagues, in PhD and postdoc programs?
- How does your institution handle academic misconduct, such as plagiarism?

Step 3. Discuss the connection with social change
30 minutes

How is academic integrity related to social change to improve the quality of people's lives? Invite and facilitate a discussion of the students' views and their conclusions from the readings.

Session 2. Researcher Identifiers | 2 hours

A researcher identifier is a permanent numerical code assigned to a researcher. The identifier identifies the researcher in a given digital environment, such as an institutional information system or publications database. It assigns to that researcher the scholarly production of which they are the author, including datasets, articles, books and book chapters, media stories, theses, protocols, patents articles, patents, scholarships, and funded projects.

In this session, students learn how to create and update accounts on three important identifier platforms: ORCID (Open Researcher and Contributor Identifier), Google Scholar and ResearchGate.

Outcomes
By the end of these steps, students can:

- Create accounts with ORCID, Google Scholar and ResearchGate.
- Update their ORCID, Google Scholar and ResearchGate accounts.

Preparation

- Develop a short presentation to introduce research identifiers (Step 1).
- Prepare a step-by-step guide to creating and updating an account to give students. Alternatively, find and share links to such guides.
- Ahead of your demonstration (Step 2), test all physical equipment and/ or web-based platforms.
- Remind participants to bring their own laptops to the session.

Assessment

Each student creates an account with ORCID, Google Scholar, and ResearchGate (or alternative identifiers). After the session, students populate their accounts and share a link with you or another facilitator for feedback and assessment.

Steps

Time	Step	Who
15 minutes	1. Introduce research digital identifiers	Facilitator
1 hour	2. Create identifier accounts	Facilitator, individuals
45 minutes	3. Plan to populate and update accounts	Plenary

Step 1. Introduce research digital identifiers
15 minutes

Explain what research digital identifiers are, how they work, and why researchers need them. Introduce the specific ones are available and the key strength of each.

Step 2. Create accounts
1 hour

Use a projector to demonstrate how to create an account in ORCID, Google Scholar, and ResearchGate. Students create accounts on their own laptops. They populate one of the platforms with the information they have available – a profile picture, institutional address/es, ongoing projects and publications.

Step 3. Plan to populate and update accounts
45 minutes

Invite and facilitate a discussion of students' reflections on the exercise. Ask how they plan to continuously update accounts.

Session 3. Research Ethical Review Process | 2 hours

Research ethics make up an important part of advanced academic learning. At the beginning of a research career, a doctoral student must become familiar with and adhere to appropriate ethical, legal and professional frameworks, obligations, and standards. In this session, students reflect on ethical issues related their research topic and plan their ethical approval process.

Outcomes

By the end of these steps, students can:

- Describe the role, composition and functioning of Institutional Review Boards (IRBs).
- Write research protocols with human rights protection in mind.
- Identify and discuss ethical issues related to their research.

Preparation

For you, the facilitator

Develop a presentation to introduce ethical issues surrounding research and the ethical review process (Step 1). Consult these resources for your presentation and select which ones to share with students.

- All European Academies (Allea). (2023). The European Code of Conduct for Research Integrity.
- Association of Social Anthropologists (UK). (1999). The Ethical Guidelines for Good Research Practice.
- Institutional Review Board (IRB).
- The Research Ethics Guidebook.

These courses and resources are available online from the Global Health Training Network:

- Good Clinical Laboratory Practice. 7 Modules

- [ICH Good Clinical Practice E6 (R2)](). 60-minutes

For students

Assign reading ahead of the session and ask students to come prepared to describe:
- Key ethical issues surrounding their chosen PhD topics.
- Ways to address and navigate key challenges.

Self-assessment

Students reflect on the ethical issues relevant to their topics of study and submit a short summary to you or a co-facilitator for feedback.

Steps

Time	Step	Who
40 minutes	1. Introduce the ethical review process	Facilitator
40 minutes	2. Identify specific ethical issues	Small groups
40 minutes	3. Share conclusions and issues	Each group to plenary

Step 1. Introduce the ethical review process
40 minutes

Present an introduction to research ethics in general. Explain that ethical processes may delay research. Students need to familiarize themselves with the ethical review process from the outset and consult their supervisor or mentor for clarification and guidance. Your presentation could outline specific aspects such as:
- Principles of research ethics and moral theories.
- Research ethics regulation and management.
- IRB processes.
- Research in vulnerable populations.
- Informed consent.
- Standard of care.
- Conflict of interest.
- Meaning of secrecy and confidentiality.
- Compensation.
- Stored specimens.
- Post-trial management and publication.
- Research non-compliance.
- Clinical trial management.
- Good Clinical Practice (GCP) and Good Clinical Laboratory Practices (GCLP).
- Good research practice, research integrity and scientific misconduct.
- Examples and procedures for establishing, preventing, and sanctioning misconduct and fraud.
- Material transfer agreements (MTA) and when and why to use them.

Step 2. Identify specific ethical issues
40 minutes

Divide students into groups of five. Each one describes, briefly, the ethical challenges they anticipate in relation to their PhD research topic and how they might address them.

Step 3. Share conclusions and issues
40 minutes

Invite a representative from each group to summarize the key ethical issues that emerged from their discussion. Facilitate feedback to each group and a discussion of emerging issues.

Session 4. Community Engagement | 4 hours

This session introduces common effective ways to engage communities throughout the research process. Guide students to:

- Choose, read and summarize case studies involving community engagement.
- Reflect on the respective goals and resources of researchers, and partner communities.
- Identify criteria to evaluate research studies that involve community engagement.

Outcomes

By the end of these steps, students can:

- Articulate different definitions of community engagement in research and discuss their operating principles.
- Discuss criteria for proposals involving community participation in research.
- Discuss the strengths, weaknesses, opportunities, and limitations of selected case studies of community engagement in research.

Preparation

For you, the facilitator

Develop a presentation or talk to introduce community engagement in research (Step 1).

Consult and share resources, such as:

- Syed M. Ahmed, Ann-Gel S. Palermo (2010). [Community Engagement in Research](#): Frameworks for Education and Peer Review. Am J Public Health. 2010 Aug; 100(8): 1380–1387. doi: 10.2105/AJPH.2009.178137.
- Sarah E Asuquo et al. (2021). [Youth engagement in HIV prevention intervention research in sub-Saharan Africa](#): a scoping review. J Int AIDS Soc. 2021 Feb; 24(2): e25666. Published online 2021 Feb 10. doi: 10.1002/jia2.25666.
- Bridget Pratt, Tanya Seshadri, Prashanth N. Srinivas (2020). [What should community organisations consider when deciding to partner with researchers?](#) A critical reflection on the Zilla Budakattu Girijana Abhivrudhhi Sangha experience in Karnataka, India Health Res Policy Syst. 2020; 18: 101. Published online 2020 Sep 11. doi: 10.1186/s12961-020-00617-6.
- Belinda-Rose Young et al. (2020). [Community–University Partnership Characteristics for Translatio](#)n: Evidence From CDC's Prevention Research Centers. Front Public Health. 2020; 8: 79. Published online 2020 Mar 20. doi: 10.3389/fpubh.2020.00079.
- Melody S. Goodman et al. (2021). [Reaching Consensus on Principles of Stakeholder Engagement in Research](#). Prog Community Health Partnersh. Author manuscript; available in PMC 2021 Feb 7. Published in final edited form as: Prog Community Health Partnersh. 2020; 14(1): 117–127. doi: 10.1353/cpr.2020.0014.
- Morenike Oluwatoyin Folayan et al. (2019). [Community stakeholder engagement during a vaccine demonstration project in Nigeria](#): lessons on implementation of the good participatory practice guidelines. Pan Afr Med J. 2019; 34: 179. Published online 2019 Dec 5. doi: 10.11604/pamj.2019.34.179.18458.

Compile links to or copies of case studies for students (Step 2).

Assessment

Note students' ability to demonstrate their understanding of the processes of the community engagement in research.

Steps

Time	Step	Who
40 minutes	1. Introduce community engagement in research	Facilitator
80 minutes	2. Read and discuss case studies	Small groups
2 hours	3. Discuss community engagement as method	Each group, plenary

> ### *Step 1. Introduce community engagement in research*
> *40 minutes*
>
> Present definitions of community engagement as a research method. Describe operating principles the relative roles and responsibilities of researchers, and community members. Invite and facilitate ideas and exchange.

Step 2. Read and discuss case studies

1 hour, 20 minutes

Divide students into groups. Each group reads one of the case studies and prepares a brief presentation to explain the research topic, population and methods, and answer these questions:

- Was that community engagement research the best option for that topic?
- Was there any option?
- What were the strengths and weaknesses of the design?

Step 3. Discuss community engagement as method

2 hours

A representative from each group presents their summary and answers. Facilitate discussion and conclude with a summary of main points from this sequence of sessions.