Dr. Huntley called the meeting to order.

It was moved (Krumrine) and seconded (Turner) that the minutes of the February 16 meeting be approved. Motion carried. None opposed; no abstentions.

Reports/Announcements from Proposal Development – Pollyanne Frantz
- There has been good turnout at events. There was good conversation at the Confab Cluster workshop regarding the Blue Ridge Parkway held on March 16. Those who attended are interested in working collaboratively.
- On March 23, Grant Writing Fundamentals will be held. The workshop is full with a waiting list.
- On April 8, there will be a TUES (Transforming Undergraduate Education in STEM) – formerly CCLI (Course, Curriculum, and Laboratory Improvement) – web conference featuring some of our funded faculty.

Reports/Announcements from Sponsored Programs – Charna Howson
- Dr. Huntley introduced Charna Howson, Director of Sponsored Programs. She began employment at Appalachian on March 1. Ms. Howson serviced as Associate Director of Sponsored Programs at UNC-Greensboro.
- Submissions are up; awards are slightly down. Although still early in the year, the dollar values of submissions and awards are significantly higher than this time last year. This indicates an emerging trend of Appalachian more aggressively seeking funds. Visit orsp.appstate.edu, click on Awards and Submissions Reports for additional information.
- The big project this Spring is to introduce a new electronic routing system (RAMSeS) to process proposals across campus with electronic signatures. For interdisciplinary
projects, the submissions can be on several desks simultaneously. Sponsored Programs will try and make the transition as painless as possible.

Reports/Announcements from Research Protections – Julie Taubman
• Ms. Taubman introduced Robin Tyndall, Assistant Director of Research Protections.
• IRB turnaround is now approximately three weeks; the web notes a two-week turnaround. IRB will not meet during the summer; requests that require full board review will be addressed on an as-needed basis. To address this increased time for approval, Assistant Director Robin Tyndall will identify common questions asked of PIs to determine what revisions are needed in the IRB application and create a FAQs page in order to streamline a complete submission.
• Dr. Philip Langlais, Vice Provost for Graduate Studies at Old Dominion University (Virginia), will conduct a responsible conduct of research seminar at 4:00 p.m. on March 18 in 307 CAP.

Reports/Announcements from Federal Relations – Meredith Whitfield
• Meredith Whitfield and Susan McCracken traveled to DC to discuss congressionally-directed grant proposals. They met with Senators Hagan and Burr and Representatives McHenry, Coble, Schuler, and Kissell. Informal proposals were submitted, and hopefully these will be submitted to Appropriations by the end of the week. The Chancellor will follow-up with phone calls.
• Mrs. Whitfield and Dr. McCracken visited the Appalachian Regional Commission and submitted earmark proposals. ARC representatives indicated they were impressed with work being done at Appalachian. Although ARC prefers not to give primary funding, it does award secondary funding.
• A representative from the Economic Development Administration will visit campus in April. This is a new relationship. If anyone has questions, concerns, or interests, please notify Meredith Whitfield.
• Federal Agenda earmark proposals for FY 2012 are being accepted. A campus email will invite electronic submissions. Submissions received may determine which congressional staff will be invited to campus for a visit. For additional information, contact Meredith Whitfield.

Other Reports/Announcements
• Mr. Krumrine indicated that Susan Pettyjohn will meet with Susan McGill of the Pew Foundation. A five-page packet will be presented from the RIEEE as well as the Blue Ridge Parkway. We hope Appalachian will receive an invitation to submit a proposal.

Reports/Announcements from Graduate Studies – Holly Hirst
• Graduate admissions applications are up 28% from last year. Last year 95 completed applications exceeded minimum requirements for the Chancellor’s Fellows, Provost’s Fellowships, and Alumni Fellowships; this year there are 162. These will be reviewed by the Student Affairs Committee of the Graduate Council.
• Assistantship monies stay the same, barring last-minute freezes or cuts to the budget. Graduate programs are recruiting the best applicants for admission.
• The Graduate Research Assistantship Mentoring (GRAM) program will continue with ten new and ten continuing awards of $10,000 per research assistant. Review of applications takes place in April with subsequent awards to faculty to support their research. If URC members are interested in reviewing applications, please notify Holly Hirst. Assistantships are awarded for a two-year period as long as a 3.3 GPA is maintained. This award is open to departments that do not have graduate programs.

• Dr. Utter questioned whether funding for NC tuition waivers remains the same, and Dr. Hirst affirmed the same funding in spite of an increase in tuition. To accommodate tuition increases, there has been a 5% cut in the number of NC tuition scholarships, dropping from 70.5 to 66 for 2010-11.

Presentation: RCR and Scholarship – Dr. Rebeca Rufty, Associate Dean of the Graduate School at NC State, oversees NC State’s Responsible Conduct of Research (RCR) program. Dr. Rufty received her undergraduate degree in Philosophy and her Ph.D. in Biology.

Dr. Rufty stated that RCR is broader than just research, so she also speaks to scholarship as we seek integrity in scholarship.

• University values – Honesty, accuracy, efficiency, objectivity
  We are funded with both state and federal funds. We are stewards of the public trust and public resources. It behooves us to take care of these resources. We are training the next generation of faculty and scientists who must be aware of ethical issues. We ask them to be more transparent and accountable, thus we impart this education formally.

• Goals of RCR: recognize ethical issues and understand how they differ from other kinds of issues. Teach students when they are faced with an ethical issue not to take shortcuts.

• Legal issues are not ethical issues. Ethical issues should be handled as follows:
  o Use critical thinking skills when faced with ethical issues to respond appropriately.
  o Act in a morally responsible manner to reason it through and act appropriately.
  o What are ethical responsibilities appropriate to research and scholarship in a given field? What is your duty in a situation? We have a duty to teach them to behave in a morally acceptable way.

• Core elements in RCR
  o What is RCR and why is it important?
  o Data acquisition, management, sharing and ownership. People don’t realize who owns data that you collect. NC State owns the data at NC State. We are stewards of the data.
  o Mentor/trainee responsibilities. What are your duties to the student, project and institution? We think this is embedded in the culture of the university. It happens through faculty modeling, but we need to think explicitly. Sitting at the knee of our mentor is good, but it takes a long time.
Research misconduct (FFP -- fabrication, falsification, plagiarism) or other practices that seriously deviate from those that are commonly accepted within the academic community for proposing, conducting, or reporting research and scholarship. How do you know when you are deviating if you don’t know what’s commonly accepted? People don’t set out to cheat; we have good intentions.

- **FFP**
  - Fabrication – making up data
  - Falsification – manipulating research equipment, materials, or processes or changing or omitting results such that representation is not accurate
  - Plagiarism – appropriation of someone else’s ideas, processes, results, or words without giving proper credit attributes. What constitutes plagiarism?

- Publication practices – responsible authorship, fairness in peer review. Students need to know conventions, know fairness, and how to be reviewers.

Students need to know about….

- Human participants in research
- Use of animals in research
- Conflict of interest
- Professional and social responsibilities and codes of conduct. As members of a scholarly community, what are your obligations to the public? What are the obligations?
- Intellectual property. If you use university resources, who owns the rights and materials?
- Collaborative work – collegiality should be addressed. Sometimes faculty are territorial and can create problems. Teach students to share in the products of our work.
- Obligations to the public (media). Media can distort information, so you need to know how to communicate to the public through media.
- Whistle blowing – serious accusations must be taken seriously.
- Discipline-specific issues – if you work with human participants, there are specific issues.

Institutional commitment

- Provide an environment that fosters standards of excellence
- Trustworthiness and lawfulness are reinforced by institutional policies and practices. There are clearly articulated policies so one doesn’t step into dangerous territories.
- Provide leadership in support of ethical conduct. Can faculty disseminate this information?
- Foster productive interactions for all. Get people to buy into collegiality.
- Provide adequate support systems for students, faculty, and staff. One case can cost an enormous amount of money. The institution should allocate money to preventing misconduct as the reputation of the institution can be harmed with granting institutions. There must be upper administration commitment to rules and regulations of scholarship conduct.
• Management of institutional and individual conflicts of interest.
• Offer educational programs in ethical foundations for research.
• Systematic monitoring of institutional practices.

Expectations of faculty and students
• Understand the range of accepted practices in RCR according to norms of one’s discipline. Rules vary across disciplines.
• Improve the ability for resolving ethical dilemmas. We don’t set out to do the wrong thing but do so because of pressure on time and cutting corners. Alert students so when they begin to get on the edge of a precipice, they should ask for help and know who to go to!
• Increase knowledge of laws, regulations, and policies (government and institutional) that govern RCR. Scholars should be immersed in responsibilities and duties – and know when they are getting into dangerous territory. NSF asks for an institutional plan.
• Integrity in proposing, performing and reporting research/scholarship.
• Accuracy in representing the contributions of others.
• Fairness in all professional interactions – collegiality. Behave in a way that doesn’t necessarily benefit the individual, rather the discipline at large.

Provide motivation for good behavior. NC State revoked two Ph.D degrees a year after because of doctored publication figures. This is the stick!

Carrots:
• Ethical behavior advances knowledge; pursuit of truth; promotes advancement of knowledge.
• Responsible research leads to discoveries that will benefit individuals and society (public trust). The public thinks we are disconnected from the reality of life – an ivory tower! Students need to feel part of the excitement of knowledge and new discoveries. As small as one contribution may be, it may be the building block for something greater. If the blocks are porous or fracture easily, the whole piece fractures.
• Doing the right thing enhances professional advancement. Cheaters will be caught. We want to be part of the good of the university. By doing the right thing, we feel we have personally gained.
• Result is personal gain and satisfaction. We can change the world.

Rules for the road
• professional codes
• government regulations
• institutional policies

Update websites. Keep up with the regulations.

Ways to implement RCR
• Weave it into existing courses for accountability. How do we assess what students are learning?
• Create a seminar series. Get students to talk about these subjects. Bring one or two people in a year; advertise the event as a place for conversations to develop.
• Invited talks.
• Develop institutional policies.
• Develop new RCR courses (online and face-to-face). We must have people who believe this is the right thing to do. Failing to instruct/educate is a failure of the university. We are turning out deficient students from those getting this instruction. RCR is important!

Teaching RCR – RCR must be someone’s job!
• Develop, share & promote best practices. Organize an event. Put information on the web and keep it up-to-date.
• The best approach is two tier learning.
  o General and discipline-specific topics. The first tier is the general information: What is RCR? What are publication practices in the discipline? Who owns the data?
  o Case studies. Assign roles and bring about discussion.
  o What does not work are sermons and philosophical treatise. “Thou Shalt Not” sermons don’t work! No one sets out to be unethical. Talk about the issues. Everyone has ethical issues – injustices. Engage them by making learning fun.
Create a pool of honest exchange of ideas, discussing current topics, norms, duties, and responsibilities.

Resources
1. Office of Research Integrity – ORI (http://ori.dhhs.gov/)
2. Collaborative Institutional Training Initiative – CITI
   https://www.citiprogram.org/rcrpage.asp
3. Council of Graduate Schools – RCR Initiative
4. Project for Scholarly Integrity (http://www.scholarlyintegrity.org)

Questions/answers/discussion

Q: What works for one is not acceptable for all. (Gregory)
A: An example is plagiarism. Have someone paraphrase what they have read. One may copy verbatim. Another may summarize. What is the definition of plagiarism? Is it using three words of the sentence? There must be common standards.

Q: There are cultural issues. There was a recent issue of a Chinese graduate in the world of behavioral and experimental economics who tried to build collaborations by advertising that China doesn’t have human subject committees. Do we enter into collaborations to use their more lax standards? Is our institution aware who is working with whom? (Dickinson)
A: This example could begin conversations. Another example is shipping out-of-date drugs to inferior cultures. Is that acceptable?

Q: There is the issue of co-authoring with graduate students. Some faculty insist on first authorship. This should have its own RCR bullet! There should be discussions of what constitutes co-authorship on work. (Gregory)
A: These are serious issues. There are courtesy authorships! Students need to know the conventions in the field. How do you decide who is senior author on a paper? These are important conversations.

Q: The GRAM program provides case-study driven RCR education. Students get engaged and discuss issues that pose conundrums to them. Of interest are the more subtle ones, such as plagiarism and authorship. What voice is used: I? We? Researchers need to know that collegiality and joint authorship vary across disciplines. More than learning at the knee of the mentor, these conversations need to take place. Appalachian needs an institutional plan. The Office of Research Protections is working to model other institutional RCR plans due to recent NSF/NIH requirements. (Hirst)
A: The URC can talk to upper administration. Engage the new Provost. Engage faculty. The university needs to allocate resources or there may be no more external funding. We must be in compliance if we are to play the game.

Dr. Huntley pointed out that it is not just funded research that needs RCR. Our students are conducting confidential interviews and storing data on unsecured computers. Students are not obtaining IRB approval. In one situation, a master’s degree was rescinded. There was an instance when Sponsored Programs was unaware that a spouse was hired on a funded project. There was an instance of a faculty member publishing others’ research. Another ethical issue relates to amorous relationships with students. Students do not know how to extricate themselves from these types of situations.

Dr. Hirst noted that three seminars with GRAM students were held in the fall to provide a general overview of RCR, raise awareness, and generate discussion. Although the program needs faculty leadership and resources, this doesn’t necessarily have to be in the form of more course work. The investment isn’t much; the rewards are great!

The Office of Research Integrity lists fines for misconduct. Dr. Rufty stated that the institution must weigh the money invested against the misconduct! In one situation, the university had to use an external IRB for a two-year period. The cost is real, but the cost to the institution’s reputation is more damaging! If the university community doesn’t talk about ethics, who does?

Appreciation was expressed to Dr. Rufty for visiting Appalachian.

Other Business
1. Dr. Hirst suggested RCR as a SACS Quality Enhancement Plan – outcome-driven student learning. Dr. Huntley agreed that RCR awareness could begin with freshman seminars, workshops, etc.

2. RCR suggested readings include Dr. Dickinson’s recommendation of *The Immortal Life of Henrietta Lacks* by Rebecca Skloot, and Dr. Rufty’s recommendation of *Plastic Fantastic: How the Biggest Fraud in Physics Shook the Scientific World* by Eugenie Samuel Reich.

3. Megan Johnson distributed a flyer for a workshop by Jim Neal, *Take Control of Your Scholarship*, on March 18 at 2:00 p.m. in 421 Belk Library.

The meeting was adjourned.