

# Children’s National RCR Discussion Guide

## Guide Overview

This document will help serve as a reference and roadmap for conversations in responsible conduct of research between a research mentor and mentee(s). Different subjects are listed below, with case studies to help make the topics meaningful and introduce questions for the mentor to review and answer with their mentee. We have also provided a hyperlinked resource from the ORI Introduction to the Responsible Conduct of Research (RCR) handbook. However, research outside of these resources is encouraged. These hours will help fulfill the NIH-required RCR training ([NOT-OD-10-019](#)).

## Process

For each discussion, participants should select one of the below topics and hold a thoughtful, interactive discussion using the included cases and reference materials. These sessions can take the shape of formalized group discussions within a lab/department or one-to-one discussions between a mentor and mentee. **Each discussion must focus on one of the below subjects.** Once the discussion is concluded, participants seeking RCR credit must complete the RCR Discussion Report form and upload it to <http://bit.ly/RCRCredit>. **Each completed discussion counts for 1 credit hour, and a maximum of 2 hours of the 8 required credit hours may be completed through this discussion format.**

Subject	Case Studies	Resource
<a href="#">Authorship and Publication</a>	<input type="checkbox"/> <a href="#">Case One: My Lab Boss Put His Name on My Papers and Proposals</a> <input type="checkbox"/> <a href="#">Case Two: Risky Authorship</a> <input type="checkbox"/> <a href="#">Case Three: Should I Be Listed as an Author?</a>	<a href="#">Chapter 9. Authorship and Publication</a>
<a href="#">Research Misconduct</a>	<input type="checkbox"/> <a href="#">Case One: Were These Slides Falsified?</a> <input type="checkbox"/> <a href="#">Case Two: Struggling to Understand Plagiarism</a> <input type="checkbox"/> <a href="#">Case Three: Haven’t I Seen that Protocol Before?</a> <input type="checkbox"/> <a href="#">Case Four: Accusations of Falsifying Data</a>	<a href="#">Chapter 2. Research Misconduct</a>
<a href="#">Collaboration</a>	<input type="checkbox"/> <a href="#">Case One: Alternative Therapies and Awkward Collaborations</a> <input type="checkbox"/> <a href="#">Case Two: Conflicts with Community Leaders</a>	<a href="#">Chapter 8. Collaborative Research</a>
<a href="#">Data Acquisition and Management</a>	<input type="checkbox"/> <a href="#">Case One: Creating a Public Archive of Sensitive Data</a> <input type="checkbox"/> <a href="#">Case Two: Data Sharing Fever</a> <input type="checkbox"/> <a href="#">Case Three: I Really Can’t Acquire Important Data?</a>	<a href="#">Chapter 6. Data Management Practices</a>
<a href="#">Conflicts of Interest</a>	<input type="checkbox"/> <a href="#">Case One: Age-Old Conflicts</a> <input type="checkbox"/> <a href="#">Case Two: Taking Advantage of Patient Trust</a> <input type="checkbox"/> <a href="#">Case Three: It Slipped My Mind...</a>	<a href="#">Chapter 5. Conflicts of Interest</a>
<a href="#">Peer Review</a>	<input type="checkbox"/> <a href="#">Case One: Pandering to the Public</a> <input type="checkbox"/> <a href="#">Case Two: Getting a Fair Shake</a> <input type="checkbox"/> <a href="#">Case Three: Getting Scooped by a Reviewer</a>	<a href="#">Chapter 10. Peer Review</a>
<a href="#">Mentor and Trainee Relationships</a>	<input type="checkbox"/> <a href="#">Case One: Suspect Motives and Work Ethic</a> <input type="checkbox"/> <a href="#">Case Two: Bullied or Mentored?</a> <input type="checkbox"/> <a href="#">Case Three: Power Struggles in the Lab</a>	<a href="#">Chapter 7. Mentor and Trainee Responsibilities</a>
<a href="#">Social Responsibility</a>	<input type="checkbox"/> <a href="#">Case One: Putting Social Advocacy Before the Data</a> <input type="checkbox"/> <a href="#">Case Two: Career Dreams Up in Smoke?</a> <input type="checkbox"/> <a href="#">Case Three: Magic Key</a>	<a href="#">PMID: 11657884</a> <a href="#">PMID: 16333283</a>