

## **IN THIS ISSUE:**

- [CGS Workshop Session Highlights PSI Leadership](#)
- [New PSI Blog Post on Peer Responses to Misconduct](#)
- [World Conference Shapes Research Integrity Goals](#)
- [ESF Releases Code of Conduct on Research Integrity](#)

### **Updates on the Project for Scholarly Integrity**

#### **CGS WORKSHOP SESSION HIGHLIGHTS PSI LEADERSHIP**

The technical workshop devoted to the [Project for Scholarly Integrity](#) at the [CGS Summer Workshop](#) took place on July 15, 2010 and drew strong attendance from the graduate deans who attended the conference. The session was the third in a series of PSI workshops held at CGS Annual and Summer Meetings, each of which has featured PSI Awardees and Affiliates and project representatives. The goal of the sessions is to share the outcomes of institutional projects as they are implemented as well as the results of project-wide activities such as the collective assessment efforts, which include an [assessment of activities](#) related to RCR and research ethics education and an [assessment of institutional climates](#) for research integrity.

Three speakers, graduate deans from Awardee institutions, stressed the importance of senior university leaders in communicating the value of the project and implementing project activities:

**Karen Klomparens**, Dean of the Graduate School at Michigan State University (MSU), described the implementation of the climate assessment survey developed by Carol Thrush and Brian Martinson for a consortium of three universities, MSU, Penn State University (PSU), and the University of Wisconsin-Madison, of which two, MSU and PSU, share a PSI award. The [presentation](#) gave particular focus to MSU's use of the survey data to help departments and programs make improvements in areas of vulnerability identified through the climate assessment tool.

**Henry Foley**, Vice President for Research and Dean of the Graduate School at PSU, also discussed the process of implementing the climate assessment survey and plans for data-based interventions. Dr. Foley stressed that the success of the PSI project and any institution-wide effort to improve research ethics depends both on a strong investment on the part of senior leadership and close coordination among different offices with responsibility for graduate education and research.

**Jan Allen**, Associate Dean for Ph.D. Programs at Columbia University gave an overview of current and past project activities within Columbia's Graduate School of Arts and Sciences and discussed the lessons learned by Graduate Deans overseeing the project. Dr. Allen's [presentation](#) emphasized that their project activities have revealed that graduate students have a strong interest in understanding and managing the ethical problems of research. This discovery has given Columbia strong leverage for improving education and mentoring in RCR and research ethics.

Presentations were followed by an active discussion among workshop attendees about the new challenges and opportunities surrounding RCR and research ethics education. Participants gave particular focus to building strong institutional responses to the new NSF and NIH mandates on RCR education and to new and growing challenges surrounding RCR education in the context of international research communities. Workshop presenters indicated that these developments make the need for comprehensive, institution-wide efforts all the more important, and that graduate deans must play a strong role in shaping these efforts and conveying the importance of research integrity to the quality of research and research training.

### **NEW PSI BLOG POST ON PEER RESPONSES TO MISCONDUCT**

A new blog on the PSI Website invites discussion of questions raised in a recent [opinion piece](#) in *Nature*, (July 20, 2010). Authors Gerald Koocher and Patricia Keith-Spiegel report the results of a survey they developed to understand the behaviors and interventions of scientific researchers who suspect colleagues of scientific misconduct. Funded by a grant from the Office of Research Integrity (ORI), the confidential, online survey was fielded among investigators funded by the U.S. National Institutes of Health.

The survey results indicated that there is a much higher rate of informal intervention into cases of suspect misconduct than expected: nearly two-thirds (63%) of survey respondents who had suspected research misconduct intervened in some way. As the

researchers point out, these results complicate earlier studies suggesting that researchers tend to avoid intervention to protect their careers. In addition, many of those who took action reported satisfaction with the results of their interventions: 28% reported that they had been able to resolve the problem, and the chances of a positive or negative outcome were approximately even.

The latest PSI [blog post](#) asks members of the graduate community to consider the relevance of informal peer interventions to the formal efforts of universities to improve the climate of research integrity. Visitors to the PSI website are asked to reflect on questions such as: “What steps can institutions take to promote open and informal discussions among colleagues and graduate students about questionable research practices and suspected acts of misconduct?” and “How can institutions balance the need for compliance and formal investigation of research misconduct with a culture of openness and honest discussion?”

To post a response to these questions, please visit the [Blog page](#) of the [PSI Website](#) and follow the instructions for registering and posting a comment.

## **National and International News**

### **WORLD CONFERENCE SHAPES RESEARCH INTEGRITY GOALS**

The [Second World Conference on Research Integrity](#) was held in Singapore from July 21-24, 2010 and drew 350 participants, including researchers, policymakers, senior university leaders, faculty members, and publishers from 58 countries. Building upon an earlier global forum in Lisbon, Portugal, in September 2007, co-sponsored by the Office of Research Integrity (ORI) and the European Science Foundation (ESF), the conference explored new avenues for leadership in the domains of research, research training, publication, and the development of best practices.

The Singapore conference was hosted by a number of leading research institutions in Singapore, Nanyang Technological University, National University of Singapore, Singapore Management University and the Singapore Agency for Science, Technology, and Research (A\*STAR), and received significant support from local government institutions. Among the other major supporters of the conference were several U.S. agencies and organizations, including the Office of Research Integrity

(ORI), the National Science Foundation (NSF), and the American Association for the Advancement of Science (AAAS).

In his [welcome speech](#) to conference participants, Dr. Su Guaning, President of Nanyang Technological University, emphasized that the conference was designed to support the quality of global research. "With many research activities now taking on a global dimension, it is imperative to discuss positive approaches towards inculcating best research integrity practices," he stated, "including examining the role of academic publications in setting the standards for integrity."

One of the key outcomes of the 2010 Conference was a set of global principles titled "Singapore Statement on Research Integrity," which will address areas of need outlined by the conference organizers and affirmed by conference participants. The draft principles are currently under consideration and will soon be formally announced.

Following the formal conference program was a series of post-conference workshops and training sessions, including an International Responsible Conduct of Research Education Workshop chaired by Nicholas Steneck, Director of the Research Ethics and Integrity Program of the Michigan Institute for Clinical and Health Research and author of the *ORI Introduction to the Responsible Conduct of Research* (2004, 2007). This session addressed four specific areas of development in RCR education: 1) goals and audience; 2) content; 3) tools and resources; and 4) program development.

### **ESF RELEASES CODE OF CONDUCT ON RESEARCH INTEGRITY**

The European Science Foundation (ESF) released a new code of conduct on research integrity at the 2<sup>nd</sup> World Conference on Research Integrity in Singapore. A non-governmental organization, ESF is composed of 79 national funding agencies, research performing agencies, and academies and learned societies in 30 countries. The recent code of conduct is the outcome of an ESF Member Organization Forum devoted to the topic of Research Integrity, whose full report, "Fostering Research Integrity in Europe," is now available in electronic form on the [ESF website](#).

The Code of Conduct states that it is the responsibility of "researchers, public and private research organizations, universities and funding organizations" to promote integrity in scientific and scholarly research through principles such as:

- honesty in communication

- reliability in performing research;
- objectivity;
- impartiality and independence;
- openness and accessibility;
- duty of care;
- fairness in providing references and giving credit; and
- responsibility for the scientists and researchers of the future.

The code also sets out a number of special areas of priority for institutions, including transparency of regulations, a commitment to the training and mentoring of researchers, and “robust management methods that ensure awareness and application of high standards” in research integrity.

In addition to the code of conduct, the report includes recommendations for defining research integrity, promoting awareness, and developing a framework for research integrity governance.

**If you would like to suggest an event, activity, or news item for inclusion in the PSI Newsletter, please contact Julia Kent at the address below. For more information about the Project for Scholarly Integrity, please contact:**

Daniel Denecke  
Director, Project for Scholarly Integrity  
[ddenecke@cgs.nche.edu](mailto:ddenecke@cgs.nche.edu)

Julia Kent  
Program Manager, Project for Scholarly Integrity  
[jkent@cgs.nche.edu](mailto:jkent@cgs.nche.edu)

Council of Graduate Schools  
One Dupont Circle NW, Suite 230  
Washington, DC 20036  
202-223-3791  
[www.cgsnet.org](http://www.cgsnet.org)

If you wish to be removed from this list, please send a reply to this message with the subject line “unsubscribe.”