Transition to Breakout Discussions

Dr. Bruce Herbert, Director
Office of Scholarly Communications
Responses to Poll Questions

DISCUSSION
Why are we here?

PURPOSE OF WORKING GROUP
Organizing a TAMU Program: University Needs and Partners

FALL 2021 RESPONSIBLE CONDUCT OF RESEARCH SESSIONS

We currently have the below RCR sessions scheduled for Fall 2021. Please note that the current workshops will be virtual, and will meet the face-to-face requirement of University SAF 15.39.33.V0.04.

Please note that you only need to take a total of 4 hours to meet the training requirement; however, you are welcome to attend more than 4 hours. The 4 hours must consist of different topics (i.e., you may not sign up for a Data Management session twice to equal 2 hours of your 4-hour requirement).

*non-employees unable to register via the TrainToQ links below should email vpr@tamu.edu for registration information

THURSDAY, AUGUST 26 2021 - FOUR HOURS OFFERED

Research Misconduct: Authorship; Peer Review - Complete

Collaborative Research; Conflict of Interest; Conflict of Commitment - Complete

Mentor/Mentee - Complete

Data Management - Complete

TUESDAY, SEPTEMBER 14TH, 2021 - 1 HOUR OFFERED

Biosafety - Complete

TUESDAY, SEPTEMBER 21ST, 2021 - 1 HOUR OFFERED

2:00-3:00 p.m.: Export Controls

Register here: https://opportunities.tamu.edu/training/web/SessionDetails.aspx?num=8160

FRIDAY, OCTOBER 1ST, 2021 - 1 HOUR OFFERED

5:00-10:00 a.m.: Animal Welfare

Register here: https://opportunities.tamu.edu/training/web/SessionDetails.aspx?num=8161

WEDNESDAY, OCTOBER 26TH, 2021 - 1 HOUR OFFERED

12:00-1:00 p.m.: Human Subjects

Register here: https://opportunities.tamu.edu/training/web/SessionDetails.aspx?num=8162

https://vpr.tamu.edu/manage-research/responsible-conduct-of-research/workshop-information
Organizing a TAMU Program: Possible Library Workshops

Partner with Vice President of Research Office

Workshops – Offered twice a year

Schol comm and subject librarians

Topics
- Authorship
- Plagiarism/citation
- Peer Review
- Data Management
- Research collaboration
- Advising and mentoring
- Communicating with the public
- Conflict of Interest, Commitment & Overlap
Grass-roots action against bad behaviour has spurred reform — and should keep going.

Ten years ago this week, I was startled to see tweets saying that Dutch psychologist Diederik Stapel, a former colleague, had admitted to falsifying and fabricating data in dozens of articles. My inbox filled with mails from fellow methodologists, researchers who examine and refine research techniques and statistical tools. They expressed disbelief about the extent of the misconduct, but also a sense of inevitability. We all knew that sloppiness, low ethical standards and competitiveness were widespread.

What happened next was inspiring: an open debate that went far beyond misconduct and focused on improving research. Numerous researchers, many early in their careers, used social media to call for bias counteracting practices, such as sharing data and plans for analysis. It changed the conversation. Before 2012, my applications for grants to study statistical errors and biases in psychology were repeatedly rejected as low priority. By 2012, I had received funding and set up my current research group.

This August, another incident of data fraud came to light, this time in a 2012 publication from behavioural science supervisor Dan Ariely, who agrees that the data are fabricated, but says he did not fabricate them. This case, ironically, in a study assessing how to encourage honesty, is an example of how the practice could produce statistical evidence for absurd premises (J. P. Simmons et al. Psychol. Sci. 22, 1366–1368, 2011). Since then, others have tirelessly promoted study preregistration and organized large collaborative projects to assess the replicability of published findings.

The Netherlands is showing the way. In 2016, the Dutch Research Council allocated funds for replication research and meta-research aimed at improving methodological practices when they assess the track records of candidates for tenure, promotion and funding.
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Breakout Discussions (23 Minutes)

- Research Data Management
- Introducing Research Integrity concepts into instruction
- Campus partnerships around RI initiatives
- Diversity, Equity, and Inclusion

What would a project around this topic look like? What would be a useful deliverable for you? For the consortium?
Reports from Breakout Discussions (23 Minutes)

- Research Data Management
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What would a project around this topic look like? What would be a useful deliverable for you? For the consortium?