Research Policy Committee
Agenda
April 25, 2018
2:30-4:00 pm
Fleming 4006
Members present: Jacob Carlson, Yi-Su Chen, Marisa Conte (phone), Francine Dolins, Kate Eaton, Jessie Lee, Jairam Menon, Sandy Momper, Adam Van Deusen
Guests: Mike Imperiale, Mark Burns

I.   Minutes from 3/23 approved with errors corrected (attached)
II.   Mike Imperiale, AVP for Research Policy and Compliance discussed the changes in SPG 303.3 which were approved yesterday. These changes were first proposed when James Ashton-Miller was AVP for Compliance and the office has been working on them since then.
   a. Major changes are:
        i.   Separation of policy from procedures. This makes it easier to alter procedures as necessary, because unlike policy changes, procedural changes do not have to be approved by the Regents.
        ii. Tighten the definition of research misconduct and align with the federal definition.
   b. Procedural changes were made to ensure fairness and efficiency
   c. By definition, misconduct includes either falsification, fabrication, or plagerism. Those are the only behaviors that count as misconduct by federal and UM definitions.
   d. The process of adjudication involves 3 steps:
        i.   Assignment (does the accusation meet the definition of misconduct?)]
        ii. Is there enough evidence?
        iii. If so, the investigation will proceed.
   e. Procedural changes include appointment of a new assistant Research Integrity Officer (RIO), and performance of the inquiry by members of a standing pool of faculty appointed for the purpose (rather than by the RIO alone) before initiation of the investigation by an ad hoc faculty committee (this part has not changed). The new procedure involved more expertise specific to the complaint and is faster and more fair.
   f. There was brief discussion as to how to make a complaint. The proper approach is to report the suspicion to the RIO (not department chair). This information should be communicated widely.
   g. There was a brief discussion about ownership of intellectual property by visiting scholars and students who are not paid by the U. All intellectual property generated at UM is considered property of the U.
   h. Lab archives is a new program available from UM that allows storage and sharing of lab data among lab members and others.

III. Mark Burns, M-cubed:

a. Mark presented a powerpoint describing M cubed, its purpose, and how it works (attached). URL is: http://mcubed.umich.edu/
b. Tokens are worth $20,000 paid for by the unit and/or university. The split varies according to the unit. Faculty get one cube to use, but they can be on more than one M cubed project.
c. Dearborn and Ann Arbor are included. Flint will be included soon.
d. Supercubes are combinations of multiple cubes and are unlimited in scope. Development of the RNA center was through a supercube.
e. Strengths of Mcubed include new collaborations, internal and external grant fundings, publications, and involvement of students in projects.
f. Other institutions are following UM's example and creating similar programs. Plans are to collaborate with other universities on joint cubes.
g. The next round will start in the summer and will be open for "cubing" in the fall.
h. Mcubed is collecting data to evaluate success and demographics.

IV. New business/other
I. Next meeting:
a. May 11, 2:30 in 4025 Fleming: Karl Jepsen (Lab research Safety Initiative)
b. Last meeting of the semester