

## **Statement for OMB on how the recent RIO and the proposed Misconduct Education studies together provide ORI a broader view of research misconduct**

The RIO study was designed and executed to learn what RIOs do and how they have been trained or otherwise prepared to perform in their RIO position. We have hypothesized that the longer the time they have been in the position, the greater their experience in handling research misconduct cases, the closer to the top of the administrative structure they are positioned, the more active they are in a network with other RIOs, and the greater their participation in training activities the better they will be prepared to fill the RIO position. We feel that the information we glean from the RIO study will better position ORI to prepare focused training material and hold open more discussion with institutions on the selection, support, and training of the institution's representative for handling allegations of research misconduct. While ORI is currently conducting training for select institutional leaders, the RIO study will focus ORI efforts on developing workshops and training materials for all RIOs. We are already exploring the development of a one hour film based on the preliminary data set from last year.

However, in the RIO study we did not focus on how well RIOs fulfill their responsibility to educate the institution's entire research community on the importance of research integrity, reporting research misconduct, and active promotion of the responsible conduct of research (RCR). It is with respect to their perspectives on research misconduct issues that the two studies complement each other.

In the Misconduct Education study we will be focused on what the institutions' researchers (principal investigators) know about research misconduct -- how to recognize it, and what to do about it -- as well as the perception of how well the institution itself is promoting research integrity. We expect that the researchers will think they know a lot about research misconduct when in fact they will most likely have had very limited exposure to the Federal regulations in written materials or by attending workshops and presentations. We believe that having two perspectives (RIOs and investigators responses) to describe the institutional culture will allow ORI to have credible basis from

which to demonstrate the degree of attention or lack thereof by institutions to creating and promoting a culture of research integrity.

Findings from the Misconduct Education study will lag about one year behind the RIO study findings. Thus, when we start to present findings that focus on investigators' knowledge and understanding their role in eliminating research misconduct, ORI will be able to raise the bar by providing coordinated materials that address institutional as well as researcher responsibilities for integrity in research. Education for culture change requires a consistent ongoing dialogue and the research findings will provide a channel for some of that dialogue to take place. ORI sees the two studies reinforcing and duplicating each other allowing us to advocate for better training of and by RIOs.