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Mission

To be an advocate for postdoctoral researchers and postdoctoral specific interests, to provide professional development training and create career development opportunities for postdoctoral researchers, and to be a central resource for the postdoctoral community.

Vision

Establish an office that is a national model for providing coordinated, collaborative, and comprehensive support for postdocs.
Goals

- Networking and professional development opportunities and resources
- Coordinated, campus-wide communication and activities
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Postdoctoral community

What is a postdoc?

- National Institutes of Health and National Science Foundation: “An individual who has received a doctoral degree (or equivalent) and is engaged in a temporary and defined period of mentored advanced training to enhance the professional skills and research independence needed to pursue his or her chosen career path.”

- National Postdoctoral Association: “A postdoctoral scholar (‘postdoc’) is an individual holding a doctoral degree who is engaged in a temporary period of mentored research and/or scholarly training for the purpose of acquiring the professional skills needed to pursue a career path of his or her choosing.”

NSF: https://www.ninds.nih.gov/sites/default/files/Reed_Letter_508C.pdf
NIH: https://www.training.nih.gov/resources/faqs/postdoc_irp
NPA: https://www.nationalpostdoc.org/page/What_is_a_postdoc
Postdoctoral community

October 2021

Total: 411

Non-immigrant, 278
- Permanent resident, 28
- US citizen, 105
- Black/African American, 9
- Hispanic/Latino, 31
- Two or more races, 2

Immigrant, 233
- Asian, 194
- Other, 57

Female, 156
- Male, 255
Postdoctoral community

PDA Chapters

- Texas A&M University PDA
  - College of Veterinary Medicine
  - College of Medicine
  - Institute of Biosciences and Technology - Houston
  - Department of Chemistry

- National Postdoctoral Association*

* postdocs and faculty have free access to NPA resources as affiliate members of TAMU Organizational member
Leveraging existing assets

Professional development program

- Annual Postdoctoral Research Symposium
- Professional Development Workshops Series
  - Mentoring Workshops
  - Career Development
  - Teaching Workshops
  - Postdoctoral Affairs
- New Postdoc Orientation
- Travel awards
- Individual Development Plans
Leveraging existing assets
Collaborate across University

- Career Center
- Center for Teaching Excellence (CTE)
- Center for the Integration of Research, Teaching and Learning (CIRTL)
Advantages for postdoc professional development

- Recruiting tool for new faculty and postdocs
- Enhancing success - support training grants and individual fellowships
- Enhance postdoc professional competencies to support their career goals
Assessment

- Assessment of postdoctoral interests
  - Professional development survey
  - Climate survey

- Assessment of faculty and administrators input regarding postdocs
Short-term goals

- PDO website
- Identify college-specific needs of postdocs and faculty
- Educate the campus about support for the postdoctoral scholars
- Advisory committee
Postdoctoral Workshops

- May 11 - Find your niche for career success: From Research to Teaching
  Soon Mi Lim, PhD – Department of Chemistry

- June 8 – Releasing Stress in the Body
  Anna Taggart Minahan, MS - Department of Recreational Sports

- July 13 – Enhancing Your Scholarly Identity and Impact
  Bruce Herbert, PhD – Office of Scholarly Communication
Contact

Dr. Andreea Trache
Faculty Fellow

Shannon Eyre
Senior Administrative Coordinator
opa@tamu.edu

Website: https://vpr.tamu.edu/research-resources/office-of-postdoctoral-affairs/

Listserv sign-up: https://tinyurl.com/OPAPDA

Calendar of events: https://tinyurl.com/opacalendar
RESEARCH MISCONDUCT AND ETHICAL AUTHORSHIP
Federal policy defines research misconduct as fabrication, falsification, or plagiarism in proposing, performing, or reviewing research results:

1. Data Fabrication – *making up* data or results

2. Data Falsification – *manipulating* research materials, equipment, processes or changing data or results such that the research is not accurately represented in the research record.

3. Plagiarism – *appropriation* of another person’s ideas, processes, results, or words without giving appropriate credit
Both agencies have similar definitions of research misconduct and similar processes to determine research misconduct.

NIH – predominantly **F&F**
NSF – predominantly **Plagiarism** (NSF 83.6% vs. NIH 4.8%) (Kornfeld, 2019)
Guilty verdict NSF>NIH (2:1)

**Verbatim Plagiarism** –
Acts of copying, pasting, and integrating (CPI) text into a document.
Relatively easy to establish intent
WHO

- Junior academic positions
- Educated in non-U.S. institutions
- Committed plagiarism in multiple grant applications
Figure 4. Subjects’ Reasons for Plagiarism*

- Unaware Needed Quotation, Citation, and Reference: 51 (37%)
- Believed Used Appropriate Citation: 44 (32%)
- Used Technically Constrained/Common Language: 43 (31%)
- Copied Only in Background (Lit Review/Intro): 43 (31%)
- Believed Did Nothing Wrong: 41 (30%)
- Blamed Others: 41 (30%)
- Time Pressure: 40 (29%)
- Cut/Paste Without Citation then Reused: 38 (28%)
- Submitted Draft/Intended Rewrite: 22 (16%)
- Believed Proposals’ Standards Differ: 17 (12%)
- English Language Challenges: 14 (10%)
- Ideas Were Original: 12 (9%)
- Computer Problem: 11 (8%)
- Personal/Medical Problems: 10 (7%)
- Received Permission/Author Support: 10 (7%)
- Made a Mistake: 10 (7%)
ETHICAL AUTHORSHIP

- Plagiarism of IDEAS – almost impossible to establish in collaborations
- Authorship disputes – treated as an academic matter

AUTHORSHIP: IMPROPER PRACTICES

- Ghost - not including an individual who contributed to the research
- Gift or Guest - including an individual who did not contribute to the research
- Including an author **without their consent**

*Dairy journal retracts paper lacking co-authors’ consent*

A journal about dairy science has retracted a paper after learning that it was published without the consent of all its authors. An independent inquiry found no evidence of research misconduct, but nevertheless recommended that the institution — Curtin University in Perth, Australia — request to retract the paper. Here’s the retraction notice, published in Dairy ... Continue reading →
Criteria for authorship of a manuscript, creative work, or other intellectual product should be **consistent with the norms of the discipline.**

- **The primary author** should be able to assure that he/she has reviewed all the primary data, primary sources, critical information, or major elements on which the publication, creative work, or other intellectual product is based and should be able to provide a brief description of the role of each co-author.

- **The primary author** should be able to demonstrate that each co-author has been afforded the opportunity to review and approve the final product in draft form to the extent possible, given individual expertise.
THE OUNCE OF PREVENTION

AVOID PLAGIARISM

ETHICAL AUTHORSHIP
THANK YOU
MGT Working Group #35: Consolidation of IT
Subgroup 3: Research

Presented by group member and CPI member
Daniel A. Jiménez, Engineering (CSCE)
Objectives

• Determine IT assistance needed for proposal support
• What are IT needs among PIs for services?
• What research technologies are or are not working well? What new technologies would enable strategic growth? What should be replaced?
• How best should research technology support staff meet needs of PIs?
• What do PIs need from IT to ensure compliance?
Activities

- Committee met weekly to discuss and attempt to address objectives
- We surveyed PIs to understand the needs
- Designed survey with 18 questions, iterated with CPI leadership
- Survey administered 23 through 31 March 2022 to all PIs
- Committee processed 172 complete responses
- Findings motivated recommendations sent to Ed Pierson; draft memo to Kathy Banks being reviewed by Ed
Findings

• Research community wants consistent access to common software applications. Many are unaware of access to current products.

• Pre-proposal compute, storage, budget estimation, secure resources, support personnel needed across the university. Currently access varies by organizational unit.

• Understanding the security concerns, researchers still want more administrative access to their own machines to e.g. install software.

• IT personnel lack specialized skills to support research.

• Locally embedded IT personnel should remain, but there is inequity among colleges. Locally embedded personnel improve accountability and research outcomes.
Findings, continued

• Periodic engagement between IT and research community (e.g. CPI) is needed

• Timely IT support that does not first require a ticketing system or central help desk is important to receive support familiar to PIs’ research environment, as opposed to receiving support from a generalist

• Low/no cost storage and computing platform is necessary. ViDaL was good but we need a sustainable long-term solution. Customizable storage often needed for data beyond the lifecycle of the grant.
Findings, continued

- Secure storage needed institution-wide to meet compliance requirements (e.g. HIPAA and FERPA). Resources must satisfy custom compliance requirements to meet contractual obligations (e.g. on-site, encrypted, etc.)

- Need improvement in communication of secure computing practices and access to secure data storage options. Training programs, events, and workshops needed to help research faculty make informed decisions during proposal submission, management of grants, and long-term storage of data
Recommendations

• Advocate research technology support model that minimizes barriers to access support and ensures IT personnel are physically close to the organizational units they serve

• Publish compute, data storage, data management, software deployment, compliance assurance, and endpoint support systems into a collection of resources offering timely, low-cost, rapid access to research information resources

• Unify research software access, methods of software deployment, and renegotiate software contract pricing to enable cost advantages for the research community
  - E.g. develop a web publication that provides a comprehensive catalog of software available, costs, methods for purchase, security ratings.
Recommendations continued

• Build a research data compute and storage platform leveraging the ViDaL concept to provide a long-term, low-cost research platform containing both on-site and cloud resources with secure practices dependent on regulated data

• Establish continuous improvement of research technology services through accountable leadership with the new centralized IT organization to ensure the voices of researchers are prioritized
  • E.g. survey after IT service delivery
  • Accountable leader with authority to enact change
  • Engage with research community through attendance of research-related committees e.g. CPI
Where We Are Now

• A draft memo has been sent to Ed which we expect he will lightly edit and send to Kathy along with recommendations from the other subgroups

• We cannot release the raw survey data due to the ability of answers to deanonymize the participants

• The analysis of survey results in this document is a summary of results in the draft memo. When the memo is finalized I will be happy to provide you with a copy. If you ask for the draft I will be less happy but I will still provide it to you.
Working Group #35 subgroup 3

• Joshua Kisse, Director of IT, Assistant CIO for Texas A&M Health IT
• Jean-Luc Guermond, Professor, Department of Mathematics
• Agatha Alonso, Executive Assistant, College of Pharmacy
• Aaron Brender, Director, Research Technology Services, Research Enterprise Business Services (VPR’s office)
• Kathy Leath, Business Manager, Division of Information Technology
• Daniel A. Jiménez, Professor, Department of Computer Science & Engineering
Federal policy defines research misconduct as fabrication, falsification, or plagiarism in proposing, performing, or reviewing research results:

1. Data Fabrication – making up data or results

2. Data Falsification – manipulating research materials, equipment, processes or changing data or results such that the research is not accurately represented in the research record.

3. Plagiarism – appropriation of another person’s ideas, processes, results, or words without giving appropriate credit
NSF VS. NIH

Both agencies have similar definitions of research misconduct and similar processes to determine research misconduct.

NIH – predominantly F&F
NSF – predominantly Plagiarism (NSF 83.6% vs. NIH 4.8%) (Kornfeld, 2019)
Guilty verdict NSF>NIH (2:1)

Verbatim Plagiarism* –
Acts of copying, pasting, and integrating (CPI) text into a document.
Relatively easy to establish intent
WHO

- Junior academic positions
- Educated in non-U.S. institutions
- Committed plagiarism in multiple grant applications
Figure 4. Subjects’ Reasons for Plagiarism*

- Unaware Needed Quotation, Citation, and Reference: 51 (37%)
- Believed Used Appropriate Citation: 44 (32%)
- Used Technically Constrained/Common Language: 43 (31%)
- Copied Only in Background (Lit Review/Intro): 43 (31%)
- Believed Did Nothing Wrong: 41 (30%)
- Blamed Others: 41 (30%)
- Time Pressure: 40 (29%)
- Cut/Paste Without Citation then Reused: 38 (28%)
- Submitted Draft/Intended Rewrite: 22 (16%)
- Believed Proposals’ Standards Differ: 17 (12%)
- English Language Challenges: 14 (10%)
- Ideas Were Original: 12 (9%)
- Computer Problem: 11 (8%)
- Personal/Medical Problems: 10 (7%)
- Received Permission/Author Support: 10 (7%)
- Made a Mistake: 10 (7%)
ETICAL AUTHORSHIP

- Plagiarism of IDEAS – almost impossible to establish in collaborations
- Authorship disputes – treated as an academic matter
- AuthorshipGuidelines_08-2021.pdf (tamu.edu)
AUTHORSHIP: IMPROPER PRACTICES

- Ghost - not including an individual who contributed to the research
- Gift or Guest - including an individual who did not contribute to the research
- Including an author **without their consent**

Dairy journal retracts paper lacking co-authors’ consent

A journal about dairy science has retracted a paper after learning that it was published without the consent of all its authors. An independent inquiry found no evidence of research misconduct, but nevertheless recommended that the institution — Curtin University in Perth, Australia — request to retract the paper. Here's the retraction notice, published in Dairy ... Continue reading →
SYSTEM AND UNIVERSITY POLICY: AUTHORSHIP

SAP 15.99.03.M1.02

- Criteria for authorship of a manuscript, creative work, or other intellectual product should be consistent with the norms of the discipline.

- The primary author should be able to assure that he/she has reviewed all the primary data, primary sources, critical information, or major elements on which the publication, creative work, or other intellectual product is based and should be able to provide a brief description of the role of each co-author.

- The primary author should be able to demonstrate that each co-author has been afforded the opportunity to review and approve the final product in draft form to the extent possible, given individual expertise.
THE OUNCE OF PREVENTION

AVOID PLAGIARISM

ETHICAL AUTHORSHIP

WRITE ETHICALLY
FROM START TO FINISH

PREPARE

Primary literature
Use
Secondary sources might have
Interpreted
interpreted
their ideas and
the work
terminology

HAVE A
THOROUGH
UNDERSTANDING
OF YOUR SOURCES

WRITE

AVOID
SELECTIVE
REPORTING
Present unbiased
information by
acknowledging
conflicting evidence
and alternative
interpretations

CITE YOUR SOURCES

DO NOT PLAGIARIZE

USE YOUR
OWN WORDS &
SENTENCE
STRUCTURE

MAINTAIN
THE INTENDED
MEANING
OF THE SOURCE

QUOTE VERBATIM

PUBLISH

GIFT AUTHORSHIP
UNETHICAL
Only include
those who have
made substantial
contributions to
a project

AVOID GHOST
AUTHORSHIP

Give proper
acknowledgment to
those who have
contributed to a paper

Learn more about ethical writing: ori.hhs.gov/ethical_writing


ori.hhs.gov
THANK YOU