

**SENATE RESEARCH COMMITTEE\***

**November 16, 1992**

**Minutes of the Meeting**

**PRESENT:** Paul Sackett, John Basgen, Daniel Feeney, Essie Kariv-Miller, Albert Yonas, WinAnn Schumi (for Tony Potami)

**REGRETS:** Anne Petersen, Eric Klinger

**ABSENT:** Robert Jones, Sara Evans, Jonathan Wirtschafter, Signe Betsinger, Sue Markham, V.S. Mangipudi

**GUESTS:** Mark Brenner, Fay Thompson

The minutes of the last meeting were approved.

The Committee agreed to meet on Monday, December 14, 1992, 1:30 - 3:00. Professor Sackett announced that the agenda items for the December meeting will include a discussion regarding training for individuals that work with hazardous waste and building the agenda for the coming year.

The group agreed on the following meeting schedule: January 7, February 4, March 4, April 8 (note: the group agreed to the first Thursday of the month, but that date falls on the Senate meeting date), May 6, and June 3. The committee will meet from 1:30 - 3:00.

Professor Mark Brenner brought before the Committee for its approval the proposed revisions of the policy and procedures for dealing with academic misconduct.

Professor Brenner provided background information relative to the document. He informed the Committee that the Board of Regents reviewed the document at its September meeting and asked for some revision, specifically the definition of academic misconduct. He said the purpose of the revision was to reduce the introduction. The introduction was considered distracting and possibly unnecessary. The introduction is not part of the policy, but that could be misinterpreted.

Professor Brenner walked the Committee through the revisions of the document. Most of the revisions are clarifications. The endnotes of the document explain the revisions and indicate the various groups who made the recommendations.

The substantive changes Professor Brenner asked the Committee to consider were the changes for the definition of academic misconduct. He said the area of the definition that generated considerable discussion was that the document did not explicitly state that it was misconduct if there was abuse of confidentiality. The Regents thought that it would be a good idea to include an area on confidentiality and a statement about retaliation against the whistle blower.

---

\*These minutes reflect discussion and debate at a meeting of a committee of the University of Minnesota Senate or Twin Cities Campus Assembly; none of the comments, conclusions, or actions reported in these minutes represent the views of, nor are they binding on, the Senate or Assembly, the Administration, or the Board of Regents.

Professor Sackett raised the issue of protecting the respondent in the course of conducting an audit. He inquired whether the auditor would be complainant and if this policy be followed. Professor Brenner responded that it would depend on the nature of what was found. He added that if an allegation comes forth as a consequence of the audit that is consistent with the definition of misconduct as outlined in the policy, then the policy would be involved. If the audit found that there were fiduciary reasons that something was wrong, this policy would not be involved, he said.

Professor Brenner said that the policy outlines the process to determine if there is a claim, to analyze it, document it and put forth such that the administration can charge someone with a bona fide claim; and, where the person can ask for a hearing.

Professor Sackett asked the Committee for comments. Hearing none, motion was made and carried to approve the proposed revisions.

Professor Brenner reported that the Academic Integrity Committee will be working on a consulting policy, conflict of interest policy and practices in the area of research data.

Professor Sackett asked the Committee to turn to the letter from Fred Morrison regarding rights of access to data. The letter asked the Committee to consider the following: The basic question is the extent to which research data which is the property of the University, is available to members of the University community who worked on the particular grant in question, and especially to those who prepared the data itself.

There appears to be no University policy to deal with this question, Professor Sackett commented. Before asking the members for their reaction and/or comments, Professor Sackett read Professor Klinger's comments. Professor Sackett reminded the group that what they should consider are the principles that would govern access to data. The Committee spent considerable time discussing the issue and sharing their own perspectives before coming to a conclusion. It was agreed that this was a very challenging and complicated issue. Many questions were left unanswered because the letter did not provide enough information, although members agreed it was not their role to be in the grievance area.

Members concluded that there is no existing University policy that governs the issue of data access and that the Committee is not in a position to offer advice or recommendations at this time. Professor Sackett will draft a letter to Professor Morrison outlining the sentiment of the Committee.

The next meeting of the Research Committee is December 14, 1992, 1:30 - 3:00, Dale Shephard Room, Campus Club.

- Vickie Courtney

University of Minnesota