



Dartmouth College
Council on Sponsored Activities

11 Rope Ferry Rd. # 6210
Hanover, NH 03755-1404
Phone: 603-646-3007
FAX: 603-646-3670

Annual Report of the Council on Sponsored Activities
Fiscal Year 2005

The Council on Sponsored Activities (CSA) is responsible for proposing and endorsing internal policies regulating activities sponsored by agencies outside the College. In addition, the CSA proposes and endorses institutional positions in response to policies of external sponsoring agencies as they affect the College. On a periodic basis, the CSA reviews the scope and impact of sponsored activities in the relation to institutional purpose. The membership of the committee shall consist of the Provost, the Treasurer, the General Counsel (OGC), the Director of Office of Sponsored Projects, the Deans of the Faculty of Arts & Sciences, Dartmouth Medical School, Thayer School of Engineering, Tuck Business School, and two faculty members appointed by the Steering Committee of the General Faculty (SCGF) and two members from the Faculty of Arts & Sciences delegated from the voting membership of the Committee on the Faculty (COF).

During the 2005 academic year, the CSA met three times: November 22, 2004 February 15, 2005 and June 2, 2005. The CSA was chaired by William Green (SCGF). Other members included: George Cybenko (SCGF), Jane Lipson (COF), Carl Renshaw (COF), Tillman Gerngross (representing Thayer Dean), Bob Hansen (ex officio, Tuck), Bill Hickey (representing, Dartmouth Medical School Dean), Adam Keller (ex officio, EVP/T), Bob Donin (ex officio, OGC), Rob McClung (representing A&S Dean of the Faculty), Roger Sloboda (ex officio, Provost), Martin Wybourne (ex officio, Provost), and Nancy Wray (ex officio, OSP).

The CSA acted upon several new research policy topics, as well as continued the work started in the prior year. The following is the summary of our work over the past year.

Misconduct in Science Policy

At the last meeting of the CSA in FY04, a subcommittee was formed and developed the following goals: (1) review the federal misconduct in science policy, specifically the NIH policy, (2) revise the existing College policy to meet new standards, and (3) revise the process for reviewing scientific misconduct allegations. At the February meeting, Bob Donin presented a draft of the revised policy, created by Subcommittee Members: Ed Berger; Bob Donin (Chair); Harold Frost; William Hickey; William Joyce; Roger Sloboda; Nancy Wray; and Martin Wybourne. The final draft approved by the CSA was reviewed at the June meeting and sent to the Faculties for their review and approval before sending the policy to the Trustees. The date of the vote of the Trustees approving the revised policy will be the implementation date. The OSP will post the revised policy on its website and post notification of the change on the Blitz News.

The Revised Policy alters the definition of Research Misconduct to emphasize the essential aspect of the definition of research misconduct: "A finding of Research Misconduct requires that the misconduct be committed intentionally, knowingly, or recklessly."

In addition, "Practices that seriously deviate from the commonly accepted standards of an institution" are no longer a type of research misconduct. The phrase is now reworded so that fabrication, falsification or plagiarism only will constitute research misconduct where, among other things, "there is a significant departure from accepted practices of the relevant research community."

Other Changes:

1. Investigation Committee The selection of the Investigation Committee now rests solely with the Provost Office; previously, an assortment of committees in the Faculties were responsible.
2. Time Limit for Filing a Charge Allegations of research misconduct must be submitted within six years of the alleged event; previously no time limit was specified.
3. Burden of Proof The College has the burden of providing proof of misconduct and there must be a preponderance of evidence; no burden of proof was previously specified.
4. Criteria Warranting an Inquiry Criteria in the new policy are described as falling within the definition of research misconduct and "sufficiently credible and specific so that potential evidence of research misconduct may be identified." No description of criteria warranting an inquiry was present in the former definition.

SBIR/STTR Programs

At the request of the CSA, Alla Kan, Director of the Technology Transfer Office, outlined two Federal small business programs: SBIR (Small Business Innovation Research) and STTRs (Small Business Technology Transfer Program.) Both of these programs allow for relationships between a small or startup business and a university. Questions had been raised during CSA meetings and at the CSA Conflict of Interest subcommittee meetings concerning the requirements of the SBIR/STTR programs and faculty involvement. Ms. Kan presented a summary of each program and outlined the differences relating to faculty participation in the awards. Since these programs are geared to help small business, the awards are always made to the business with a subcontract back to the university during the first two phases. Both programs have specific faculty time commitments that need to be considered in light of teaching and other research obligations. The STTR program has specific terms requiring an intellectual property agreement between the small business and the university which is agreed upon prior to the award.

The CSA recommended that PIs be familiar with the SBIR/STTR requirements before applying and discuss potential conflicts of commitment with his or her chair or dean. Compliance with SBIR/STTR terms in relationship to possible conflicts of interest or commitment will be managed by entities such as the Thayer Oversight Committee on Standards of Conduct and Conflict of Interest as well as a policy developed by the

Conflict of Interest Review Subcommittee on Best Practices for collaborative research situations.

NIH Public Access

In April 2005, NIH published its Public Access Policy that has the following objectives:

- a. Make published results of NIH-funded research more readily **accessible** to the public including health care providers, educators, and scientists.
- b. Create a stable **archive** of peer-reviewed research publications resulting from NIH-funded research to ensure the permanent preservation of these vital published research findings.
- c. Secure a searchable compendium of these peer-reviewed research publications that will make it easier for:
 - scientists to mine medical research publications
 - NIH to monitor **scientific** productivity, and ultimately, help inform research priorities.

At the present this policy is voluntary and is not a compliance issue. The CSA members discussed whether the Committee should encourage the faculty to participate. Members reported concerns from several of the professional journals that this policy will have a negative impact on their ability to stay in business which would impact the review of publication process. Some members expressed that having a permanent archive of the NIH funded research publication and to have it available to the public was very important. The Committee reviewed a draft memo to the Dartmouth faculty that was adapted from the University of Rochester letter to faculty (with U of R's permission,) discussing the pros and cons for participating in Public Access Policy. One of the recommendations for the faculty was to contact Dartmouth Library personnel to discuss any copyright issues the individual faculty might have, based on existing journal copyright agreements.

The following are additional draft guidelines:

1. Do not rush to use the system immediately.
2. PubMed Central Journals: publication in these journals will provide partial participation with the policy.
3. There will also be public access from some other non-PMC journals.
4. Know the policy of your target journal.
5. Formally request permission from your target journal before publication and obtain written approval.
6. Honor the copyright agreement you have signed.

The CSA decided to hold on any announcements of support or letters of guidance until a later time when more is known about the impact to professional journals and just how NIH intends to implement the policy.

Restricted Research

Restricted research continues to be an issue in the current federal climate. Information Security systems and Bioterrorism are areas of research that continue to push for publication and access restrictions. Accepting either of these conditions voids the fundamental research exemption for Export Controlled laws and may require obtaining Export Control licenses from either the Commerce Department or State Department. Currently, Dartmouth will not normally accept such restrictions and any exceptions to this standard must be approved by the CSA.

The CSA decided to continue to monitor and over the next year re-establish the subgroup to review other options for Dartmouth.

General Faculty Handbook

The CSA discussed the need for a General Faculty Handbook that would contain explicit policies and procedures applicable to all the faculties. It was decided that over the next academic year (FY06) a subcommittee of the CSA would analyze the current policies and procedures in place within each School and make a presentation at the Fall 2005 CSA Meeting. Examples of policies to include in the handbook are: Policy on Scientific Misconduct, Policy on PI eligibility, definition of consulting and the allowable amount of time for consulting per week. Restricted Research, use of institutional space, and IP management are also possible procedures to include in the General Faculty Handbook. Subcommittee members are: Bob Hansen, Bill Hickey, Nancy Wray, Martin Wybourne.

Standing Subcommittees

The *Compliance Committee* met five times over the past year and covered three issues: compliance with approved animal research protocols, development of the compliance education webpage, expansion of Dartmouth EHS to include DHMC, and hosting Compliance Seminars.

The Compliance Committee developed a review process for research compliance with animal protocols and grant proposals. The decision was to sample five grants per term, comparing the protocol approved with the grant application to the actual research being done. This process was reviewed by the ALAC and will bring Dartmouth into compliance with the agency requirements. The IACACU will review at the end of the year.

The compliance webpage will contain several new modules providing information for compliance with use of animals in research, human subject research, use of hazardous materials and appropriate sponsored financial transactions. William Hickey had been working on the modules along with other members of the committee and submitted the modules to the vendor assisting Dartmouth with the compliance website. Roger Sloboda, who now chairs the Compliance Committee will spearhead the other work on the website, including updating contact individuals and any other material noted on the compliance webpages.

The Compliance Committee hosted two compliance seminars and a graduate student lunch with presentations by representatives from the National Institutes of Health and from the White House Office of Science Technology and Policy. Discussions included

misconduct in science and whistleblowers, conflict of interest, allocation of salary dollars vs time commitment on grants and consulting relationships.

After a great deal of discussion, the Compliance Committee agreed with the recommendation of Elizabeth Bankert, the Director of the Office for the Committee for the Protection of Human Subjects, that campus-wide surveys involving students that are part of a classroom assignment will no longer be designated as research. Liz and her staff will continue to be a resource for faculty and students as they put together classroom projects.

The Director of Dartmouth EHS announced that he is working on a statewide hazardous materials management program that is funded by the National Institutes of Health.

Compliance Committee members: Roger Sloboda, Chair, Elizabeth A. Bankert, Michael Blayney, Henry D. James Jr., Christopher D. Boroski, Sara Chaffee, Aine Donovan, Brian L. Ermeling, William F. Hickey, Terry A. Keane, Laura F. Miraldi, Kathy Page, Kenneth E. Spence, Michael Shoob, Rachel M. Turcotte, Pam Vernon, Nancy J. Wray

The *Conflict of Interest Review Subcommittee* is responsible for reviewing potential conflict of interest cases brought forward by the Director of Sponsored Projects and the Associate Provost for Research. The subcommittee reviewed four cases during the year, with three conflict management plans written that in some cases require ongoing reporting to the Associate Provost for Research. Much of the discussion centered around protection of students, use of Dartmouth facilities, time commitment of the faculty, ownership of intellectual property and publication rights. For those cases that involve federal funding, the federal sponsor must be notified that a conflict exists and that Dartmouth has developed a management plan. The subcommittee also is discussing a matrix of risk vs financial conflict for human subject research disclosures that will assist the members in recommending the appropriate management of the financial conflict. Members of the Subcommittee were Tillman Gerngross, Bob Hansen, Bill Hickey, Jane Lipson, Nancy Wray. In addition Liz Bankert and Michael Shoob join the subcommittee when the disclosures involve human subject related research.

Sponsored Awards and Proposals for FY 2005

The summary of the Annual Sponsored Awards and Proposals for FY2005 is attached to this report and the complete report will be located at the Sponsored Projects website (<http://www.dartmouth.edu/~osp/>).

I hope this information provides a useful summary of the CSA activities during the year, but please feel free to contact me if more information or clarification is needed.

Respectfully submitted,

William R. Green, Ph.D.
Professor and Chair
Department of Microbiology and Immunology

Attachment
 CSA Annual Report 2005
 Award/Proposal Summary FY 05

AWARDS			
2005			
Div	Total Recvd	SUM	#
ARTSCI	33,373,990		208
DMS	130,704,945		542
FAID	4,484,544		5
PROVST	1,460,443		19
THAY	13,457,642		83
TUCK	2,582,838		7
Sum	186,064,402		864

2004			
Div	Total Recvd	SUM	#
ARTSCI	31,083,494		180
DMS	129,104,414		541
FAID	3,520,718		6
PROVST	24,889,280		26
THAY	17,324,768		70
TUCK	2,372,640		5
Sum	204,325,434		799

% Change			
Div	Total Recvd	SUM	#
ARTSCI	7%		16%
DMS	1%		0%
FAID	27%		-17%
PROVST	-94%		-27%
THAY	-22%		19%
TUCK	9%		40%
Sum	-9%		8%

PROPOSALS			
2005			
Div	Total Recvd	!	#
ARTSCI	105,350,716		582
DEAN	3,000		1
DMS	288,257,724		1,343
FAID	3,706,872		3
PROVST	2,622,523		31
THAY	31,490,520		157
TUCK	1,340,955		8
Sum	432,772,310		2,125

2004			
Div	Total Recvd	!	#
ARTSCI	137,230,487		517
DEAN	0		0
DMS	233,595,270		1,067
FAID	2,625,497		3
PROVST	20,454,287		29
THAY	41,215,322		184
TUCK	3,656,083		19
Sum	438,776,946		1,819

% Change			
Div	Total Recvd	!	#
ARTSCI	-23%		13%
DEAN	100%		100%
DMS	23%		26%
FAID	41%		0%
PROVST	-87%		7%
THAY	-24%		-15%
TUCK	-63%		-58%
Sum	-1%		17%