

Committee on Governance Meeting Minutes
Meeting #13 (2017-18)
Monday, November 20, 2017, 1:30 pm – 3:00 pm
HUA Conference Room, SL 124

In Attendance: Leonard Albano, Glenn Gaudette (Chair), Mark Richman (Secretary of the Faculty), Susan Roberts, David Spanagel (Secretary), Bengisu Tulu, and Suzanne Weekes

1. The meeting was called to order at 1:33 pm.
2. The agenda was approved as distributed.
3. The minutes for COG meeting #12 (Nov. 20) were approved as amended.
4. The entire meeting was devoted to a further discussion of the draft Research Misconduct Policy. Since the November 16 faculty meeting, the faculty members on the Working Group (Profs. Boudreau, Gaudette, and Richman) had made several organizational changes to the draft and had incorporated many additional changes suggested by colleagues either by email or at the faculty meeting. COG reviewed each section of the updated draft to see where language could be further clarified, and to identify where any additional substantial changes should be proposed to the Working Group.

Based on feedback received from various faculty members, COG discussed three main points:

- Whether a statute of limitations should be specified within the policy: Given the possibility of a lengthy and unpredictable time lag between when research activity occurs and when its consequences become widely known, the committee decided not to include a specific statute of limitations in the policy.
 - Reliance upon the Provost as the single “Deciding Official” for both the inquiry and investigations stages of review in the case of an allegation of research misconduct: A proposal to permit the Vice Provost for Research to close the review process based on the recommendation of the Inquiry Committee was considered, but the committee was split about whether to request this change. Doing so would distribute the authority of the Deciding Official between two people. But, having the VPR serve this function would move the policy further from the federal Office of Research Integrity’s sample policy that contained just one Deciding Official and would mix VPR’s current role in the draft as the Research Integrity Officer with the role of Deciding Official.
 - Expanding the appeals processes: The draft circulated to the faculty included appeals of the severity of sanctions imposed, but not of the finding of misconduct itself. The committee suggested that an appeal of a finding of misconduct should be possible in the case when it is alleged that violations of proper procedure may have occurred that were consequential to that finding. COG decided to add the possibility of an appeal to the President of the finding of misconduct.
5. The meeting adjourned at 3:03 pm.

Respectfully submitted,
David Spanagel, COG Secretary