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Project Goal
- Construct and implement a systematic program of education in research ethics and integrity

Guiding Principles
- Program Integration
- Critical Reflection
- Knowledge of standards, regulations, and best practices
Program Development Process

1. Build interest and knowledge
2. Establish principles
3. Identify needs
4. Design the program with faculty and graduate student input
5. Develop resources
Phase 1: Build Interest and Knowledge

- University-wide speaker events
  - Invited nationally recognized speakers to address issues of broad concern:
    - Tina Gunsalus, Nicholas Steneck, Gary Comstock, Greg Koski
  - Invited Emory faculty and graduate students to be panelists
- Mini Grants to support program-level events
  - *Research Ethics Roundtable*
  - *Course in The Ethics of Teaching*
  - Rebecca Scloot, author of *The Immortal Life of Henrietta Lacks*
Phase 2: Establish Principles

- Created a Working Group
  - 9 faculty and 2 graduate students representing diverse programs
  - Looked at CGS publications and programs from other graduate schools

- Result: Principles to guide program formation and expected pedagogical outcomes
Principles and Outcomes

Education in scholarly integrity should:
- Be relevant to each student’s research and career path.
- Be an organic part of each PhD program.
- Include some multi-disciplinary experiences.
- Be dispersed throughout a student’s career.
- Involve faculty from the program.
- Be tracked on the student’s transcript.
- Include regular program assessment.

Graduates should:
- Be able to disentangle complex ethical problems.
- Have communication skills necessary to both prevent, address, and resolve ethical issues.
- Know their disciplinary codes of conduct.
- Receive certification when necessary (e.g. IRB training).
- Be familiar with the resources for addressing ethical problems and reporting misconduct.
Phase 3: Identify Need

- Two elements of the CGS Project for Scholarly Integrity
  - Climate Survey
  - Resource Inventory
- Additional Survey of course content
  - Ask DGSs whether and how scholarly integrity topics are covered in course work
## Course-Based Resources

### Natural Sciences

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>NA</th>
<th>0</th>
<th>1+ hr</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Public Scholarship</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ethics of Teaching</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conflict of Interest</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Misconduct (FFP)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Animal Use</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Human Subjects</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Collaboration</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peer Review</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Authorship</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mentoring</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Data Management</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Social Sciences

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>NA</th>
<th>0</th>
<th>1+ hr</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Public Scholarship</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ethics of Teaching</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conflict of Interest</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Misconduct (FFP)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Animal Use</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Human Subjects</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Collaboration</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peer Review</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Authorship</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mentoring</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Data Management</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Humanities

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>NA</th>
<th>0</th>
<th>1+ hr</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Public Scholarship</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ethics of Teaching</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conflict of Interest</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Misconduct (FFP)</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Animal Use</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Human Subjects</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Collaboration</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peer Review</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Authorship</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mentoring</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Phase 4: Program Design Process

- Discussion with DGSs (September - October)
- 4 Open Forums for faculty and graduate student discussion (October - November)
  - Members of the working group attend and listen
- Working group meets and crafts program structure (December)
- DGS review (January-February)
- Executive Council review (February-March)
- Implementation Fall 2012
The Working Group Recommendation

**Common Experience (6 hrs)**
- Ethical Problem solving
- Survey of RCR areas
- Communication skills

**Regularly available workshops (minimum 8 hrs)**
- Human Subjects
- Animal Use
- FFP
- Data Management
- Conflict of Interest
- Public Scholarship

**Program – level content (minimum 8 hrs)**
- Require 24 total contact hours
- Programs determine developmental staging
- Workshops include invited speakers, occasional events

These requirements are likely to be modified as discussions continue.
Phase 5: Develop Resources

**Challenges:**
- Lack of experience and expertise
- Burden on faculty and students
- Need faculty program leadership

**Responses:**
- Course material archive
- Faculty summer seminar in research ethics
- Develop faculty champions