



Short Courses

We are developing a selection of 30-120 minute stand-alone professional development programs including online programs or webinars, in-person instructional kits (lesson plans, facilitator guides, etc.), and options to meld the two. The overall goal is to create a toolbox of development resources that can be used in a targeted way with minimal preparation and a limited time investment. While the primary audience is HHMI Investigators and Lab heads, we also foresee potential uses for topic-specific programs that could be used by wider audiences, including lab members.

Toolkits and Professional Development for Lab Heads

Tangible skills that participants could start practicing right away; many programs could make use of existing scenes.

- Giving and receiving effective feedback
- Interpersonal communication and trust
- Navigating difficult conversations (listening, personal scripts, etc)
- Bystander/upstander interventions: encountering, confronting, managing bias
- Having a difficult authorship discussion
- Personal scripts for everyday work life
- Mentoring: tools for effective interactions (mentoring maps, exercises to uncover goals, boundaries, setting and enforcing expectations), different models (networks, peer-to-peer), etc.
- The use of humor in positive or negative ways
- Using the DMF and personal scripts concepts effectively in lab and professional interactions
- Critical friends as a tool for lab heads
- Structured reflection for solving problems
- Negotiation skills and applications

Topic-Specific Resources for Research and Lab Topics

Resources to support Lab Heads in conducting discussions with lab members around LTW topics.

- Holding a discussion in your lab about lab culture, expectations, and norms
- Focused discussions around specific Module One, Cultures of Excellence topics: upstanding/bystanding; dealing with conflict; collaboration; racial microaggressions; differences over interpretations of data; power dynamics; etc.
- Open science and open publishing: choices and tradeoffs, making good decisions

- Research ethics topics (ultimate goal: replace mandated online RCR compliance programs; focused topics to replace RCR compliance training with more thoughtful, relevant, timely materials; could be matched with lesson plans to fulfill NIH in-person requirements)
- Authorship discussions: values, power dilemmas and how to navigate them
- Whistleblowing (how to blow the whistle/how to have a dispute professionally)
- Reproducibility package; taking an article and how to create a full package for reproducing results (coding, data, figures, etc)
- Federally-mandated responsible conduct topics: human subjects; animal subjects ; hazardous substances; authorship, etc.
- Hiring and supervising in a research lab
- Exploring the tension between empathy, accountability, and the need for productivity.

Applications of Existing and To-Come Video Resources

The greatest strength of the LTW narrative scenes is that they are rich, nuanced, and contain complex interactions—and evoke emotional responses, which is a foundational prerequisite for adult deep learning. While creating and delivering this content, we are constantly choosing among elements of each portrayed interaction to focus on the most evocative and relevant examples, to spark discussion and connect to participants’ experiences. There are many nuanced issues introduced in the long-form narrative that go beyond the scope of any single episode’s learning objectives and time commitment. We know that we have not captured every possible learning moment, and we have received requests to use individual scenes as the basis for in-class discussions around issues of research ethics, inclusion, and equity. The richness of existing content could be leveraged and complemented by incorporation into new topic-focused programs, with new content created as needed to explore other topics.



Possible Storylines / New Scenes

- A lab with all white membership, trying to become more diverse
- A lab that fears it might get scooped... ethics issues abound
- Challenged academic lab; PI has tenure, lots of funding; needs culture revision
- Power abuse: labs with Me Too problems, visa/status threats (implicit or explicit)