

FRPR First Meeting, 12 October, 2016, 10:30-11:30 AM; 1415A LEEP2.

Attendance: Fran Devlin, Richard Hale (chair), Joe Harrington, Sean Seyer and Dean Williams.
(Unable to attend: Mary Banwart, Uma Outka, Eugene Parker)

1. Introductions

2. Review and Discussion of Individual Charges

2.1 Standing Charges

- a. Recent release of new faculty code of rights, responsibilities and conduct (FCRC)
- b. Potential issues on horizon: Intellectual Property Issues
 - Differential treatment of University versus individual rights in patents versus other intellectual property
 - Engineering takes issue with predisclosure assignment, and potential implications for student, faculty and staff consulting

2.2 Specific Charges:

I. Monitor Core implementation

- will continue with the survey, with activity likely in spring

II. UCCC relationship to faculty governance

- to whom do they report?
- does faculty have control over the curriculum

III. Scholarly misconduct procedures

- a. External accusations of scholarly misconduct addressed the same as internal ones
 - issue of opening up a personnel matter to public disclosure since external participants not bound by KU faculty code
- b. addressed timelines for inquiry, investigation, reporting and disciplinary actions in the current policy, noting that phrases such as "shall be" are legally binding and thus may be basis for unintended policy violation
- c. current policy requires disclosure of formal report and evidence germane to committee decision to the complainant, even when from Outside. This leads to concerns for disclosure of information likely deemed to be classified as a personnel/HR matter.
 - Joe: suggestion of a redacted report in case of external complainant.
 - Rick: concern that an accusation, even if unfounded, might allow avenue for external persons to obtain source and/or supporting Data otherwise protected
 - Sean: if the complainant drops the charge, does the committee continue as the complainant?
- d. Rick's recommendations
 - remove "shall" and replace with "should" in references to timing, and potentially in reference to disclosure to external complainant.

- remove requirements and related timeline for review and reporting for external complainant response
- change USRR Article 9.3.2's second to last sentence, at least in case of external complainant suggesting committee membership.
- e. subsequent committee action: review current policies, compare with PHS and KUMC policies, be prepared at next meeting to address specific language for any proposed changes

IV. Inclusion of a statement on conflict of interest

- Reviewed language recommended from prior year FRPR
 - question of the word "divergence" in the Provost's definition
- subsequent committee action: review latest FCRRC to identify potential location for inserting language on conflict of interest (e.g. Article III paragraph 2) and be prepared to discuss specific language at the next meeting.

3. **Adjourn.** Next meeting to be scheduled in early November, time and location TBD.