

Wayne State University  
Academic Senate  
Research Committee Minutes  
January 17, 2012

Present: Cinabro, Avrutsky, Ferreira, Golebiowska, Huttemann, Mueller, Stemmler, Tisdale, Wildman, Dunbar, Fazal

Absent with Notice: Cacace, MacArthur, Mordukhovich, Thomas, Kessel, Brock

We approved the minutes of our December meeting. Our meetings for the rest of this semester are Tuesdays at 4:00 in 1279 FAB. Dates are:

14 Feb

20 Mar

17 Apr

We began with a discussion on the Research Misconduct procedure. Phil Cunningham, the current AVP for research compliance tells us that he cannot attend such discussions due to an on going legal action, and he does not know when he will be able to discuss this. The current policy can be found here:

<http://research.wayne.edu/misconduct/docs/university-research-misconduct-procedure-policy.pdf>

and they are based on guidelines that come from the office of research integrity:

<http://ori.hhs.gov/handling-misconduct>

Phil did not disagree with my summary of Charlie Parrish's description of the current procedure. I characterized the changes suggested by Charlie as "tweaks", but see Joe Dunbar's comments. Those were:

- 1) The Deciding Officer, our VPR, appoints the Committee of Inquiry. Charlie suggests that rather than being appointed by a single person that a wider body appoint the Committee of Investigation. It is not easy to decide on this "wider body".
- 2) There should be the opportunity for a face-to-face meeting between the accused and accuser during the inquiry by the Committee of Investigation. No one disagrees that this is likely to be painful, but fairness to the accused really dictates that this must be part of the procedure.
- 3) The accused should be allowed to be accompanied by someone during questioning by the Committee of Inquiry. No one objects to this.

- 4) The final appeal to the Provost should come before the final finding of research misconduct and a report is made to funding agencies. Joe points out that the guidelines make it clear that the University has to accept the findings of the Committee of Inquiry which cannot be overturned by a University officer such as the Provost. In this case the final appeal should be removed, and perhaps the Provost can be involved by having a say in the appointment of the Committee of Inquiry.

There was broad agreement that we should press ahead with recommending changes to the current research misconduct policy. We are talking about small changes, and if they avert legal action by the union this would be a good thing. As a way forward Joe will try to find someone who can discuss the suggested changes with us at a future meeting. For our next meeting the committee chair will draft specific changes to the present policy which will be the basis of further discussion. He will send these to Charlie Parrish to see if they satisfy his concerns, and hopefully we will be able to discuss them with someone from the administration at our next meeting.

The chair noted that he received some materials on the budget of OVPR. They were not terribly detailed, but the chair did not feel it would be helpful to go back to the VPR for more information. His reason for this is that the Huron Group is currently doing a full review of OVPR. The chair thought it would be a waste of effort, for both the committee, the VPR, and her staff, to provide us with more data and explore the OVPR's budget while the Huron Group was doing the same thing in more detail and giving it more attention than the committee would be able to do. After some discussion the chair suggested that the committee should meet with the Huron Group to hear about their review and give them our own view, which might be summarized as sometimes the best research is not terribly efficient. That is efficiency is not the only factor that should be considered for a review of OVPR. This was generally thought of as a good idea, and the chair will try to set this up for a future committee meeting.

Finally we talked about the organization of the graduate school. The basic issue is whether it makes sense to unite the Dean of the Graduate School and the Vice-President for Research in a single person. In recent times it has been done both ways at Wayne State and both models can be found at other research universities in the US. After some discussion the committee members told the chair they did not think this was a pressing issue and the current united organization appears to be working just fine. The chair agreed to shut up about this, and not take it up again unless asked to do so by someone else.