

University Senate Research Committee Meeting
4 November 2016
1:00 PM
156 CL

In Attendance: K Cole, K. Erickson, G. Huber R. Melhem, P. Morel, P. Smolinski, M. Redfern N. Spice, M. Spring and C. Wilcox

The minutes of the October Committee meeting were approved.

Professor, Craig Wilcox, Research Integrity Officer, was introduced.

G. Huber stated that the Office of Research Conduct and Compliance (RCCO) is under the Provost and Research Integrity Officer (RIO) is under RCCO. The RIO is for the investigation of cases of potential scientific misconduct such as plagiarism, falsification and fabrication of data and falsification of credentials. Investigations of scientific misconduct follow a quasi-judicial process, but do not have a court level of evidence. Time lines of the investigation must comply with federal requirements.

C. Wilcox stated that investigations are meant to follow a collegial approach, provide a fair review and protect the complainant. He stated there may be three stages process: 1. The assessment (RIO office), 2. The Inquiry (panel of one or more faculty chosen by the Dean) and 3. The Investigation (investigative board of at least 5 members appointed by the Dean). In cases of research misconduct that involve federally funded research the federal government is notified before the Investigation is conducted. The federal government will also conduct an investigation. C. Wilcox stated that there are 3-4 assessments of research misconduct per year and about 15 investigations of misconduct in the past 6 years.

M. Spring stated he would tend toward a longer time for the Respondent to reply to various decisions since they may feel overwhelmed by the process. He suggested some wording that makes clear that the respondent may request more time to respond for cause.

G. Huber stated that the RCCO is careful in accepting admissions to research misconduct to make sure that the Respondent understands the process and implications.

C. Wilcox stated that there is a government requirement of 120 calendar days for the entire process.

K. Erickson state that to process data associated with an investigation may take years.

G. Huber stated that “intent” related to research misconduct being committed intentionally has different meanings in different areas of the federal government and is still being debated.

M. Spring stated that the new wording regarding the appointment of the Inquiry panel that is “one or more objective, qualified persons” was positive in that in prior cases some faculty felt that they were not being judged by peers.

M. Spring also raised a question about the central role played by the Deans when the faculty member in question was employed in a Research Center.

G Huber stated in cases where the Respondent has joint appointments in different schools, the Dean of the school with the primary appointment takes precedence.

It was brought up that some faculty may have joint appointments in Centers and in Schools but have a greater time commitment to the Center than the School and that the Center Director may be more better able to conduct an investigation than the Dean of the School.

P. Morel stated that on the Research Integrity Office she could find no mention of the RIO and no RIO contact information.

C. Wilcox stated the web page is being updated.

M. Spring indicated that he thought many positive changes had been made to the policy and encouraged the administration to carefully highlight the changes. For example, he said he found the places where the Research Integrity Officer worked with the responsible Dean to be encouraging. He also noted the change in policy related to the conditions under which actions were taken related to Human Subjects research to be appropriate – i.e. the original policy allowed the Dean to instigate further audits. Now, it is a matter of separate processing. Finally, he noted that the grounds for appeals had been significantly and appropriately, in his opinion, modified so as to protect faculty.

After this meeting the Committee will provide the minutes to C. Wilcox for consideration and he will provide a draft of the proposed Research Integrity Policy. The Committee will take a vote on the Policy.

Action Item: The Committee will provide a copy of the minutes of this meeting with a list of recommendations (see below) from the committee to C. Wilcox to consider any suggestions.

M. Redfern stated that he will provide a copy of the proposed intellectual property and conflict of interest policies to the Committee once they have been reviewed by the Chancellor.

The meeting was adjourned at 2:50 pm.

Minutes submitted by: Patrick Smolinski and Penny Morel

Summary of Committee suggested changes to the policy

- 1) Revise the page describing the proposed changes to focus on the most substantive changes
- 2) Make some statement reflecting the fact that the deadlines can be “extended for cause”
- 3) Contact information for the RIO should be provided in the policy. The website should be revised to provide more information concerning the RIO, policy etc.
- 4) In section F.2 it should be stated that the respondent will be informed concerning the members of the Inquiry panel and has a right to appeal the composition of the panel
- 5) Concerning the centers such as LRDC or UPCI perhaps language could be included allowing for the Dean to appoint a Center Director to run the Inquiry and Investigation either alone or in collaboration with the Dean