NRC Offers Visiting Scholars Program for Scientists from the Former Soviet Union

U.S. Labs Can Apply for Grants

A recent project undertaken by the National Research Council's Office of International Affairs (OIA) aims to allow 150 scientists from the former Soviet republics (except the Baltic states) to conduct joint research with American colleagues at U.S. laboratories. The project targets scientists and engineers who have worked in defense research, but is not limited exclusively to them.

OIA invites U.S. laboratories to apply for incentive grants to become host institutions for the visiting scientists, who would conduct joint research in the United States for up to nine months. The program focuses on scientists and engineers with expertise in a range of fields including applied mathematics, aeronautics, nuclear science, electronics, microbiology, and all branches of engineering. Participants must have a doctoral degree or its equivalent.

Proposals will need to identify the mutual benefits to the United States and to the former Soviet Union, such as prospects for longer term collaboration, commercial opportunities, or improvements in the livelihood and quality of life.

Application deadlines are **September 14, 1992** and **March 1, 1993.** For further information, contact Regina Yan at (202) 334-2733. Send requests for applications to:
Office for Central Europe and Eurasia
Visiting FSU Scholars Program
Room FO2014
2101 Constitution Avenue NW
Washington DC 20418
Phone (202) 334-3680

COSEPUP Panel Reports on Misconduct in Science

Misconduct in science is a serious issue that requires the scientific community as a whole to adopt clearer procedures for evaluating and dealing with any misconduct, said Edward E. David Jr. David, president of EED Inc., chaired the 22-member Panel of Scientific Responsibility and the Conduct of Research of the Committee on Science, Engineering, and Public Policy (COSEPUP) that released its findings in a recently published report, *Responsible Science: Ensuring the Integrity of the Research Process.*

The panel identified three categories that require attention: misconduct in science, questionable research practices, and other forms of misconduct.

The absence of a clear, explicit definition of misconduct in science has impeded the development of effective responses to the problem, said the panel. It defined misconduct in science as "fabrication, falsification, or plagiarism in proposing, performing, or reporting research" and urged research institutions and government agencies to adopt the definition. It also recommended that the White House Office of Science and Technology Policy lead the effort to establish government-wide definitions and procedures.

Questionable research practices, actions "that violate traditional values" of scientific research, should not be handled the same way as misconduct but should be discour-

aged through peer disapproval and educational programs that emphasize responsible behavior, said the panel. Questionable practices include such behavior as failing to retain significant research data for a reasonable period, not giving colleagues access to data or research materials, designating as an author one who has made no significant contribution to a paper or failing to acknowledge as an author someone who contributed significantly to reported work, or exploiting graduate students.

Other forms of misconduct include unacceptable behavior that is not unique to the research environment—sexual or other forms of harrassment, misuse of funds, vandalism. The panel noted that institutions ordinarily have clear policies for dealing with these issues, which should not be treated as misconduct in science.

The number of confirmed cases of misconduct in science appears to be low compared to the level of research activity in the United States, the panel determined. But existing data are inadequate to draw firm conclusions, it added.

Lack of information on past episodes of misconduct in science and on steps being taken to reinforce integrity in research prompted the panel to recommend establishing a Scientific Integrity Advisory Board. The nonprofit SIAB would gather data on scientific ethics and misconduct and make it available publicly, and it would provide advice and assistance, on request, to institutions as they develop policies to address allegations. The board would not participate in resolving actual cases nor would it act as a certification board.

The report includes a dissenting statement by two of the panel members, Howard K. Schachman and Keith R. Yamamoto. Their concerns are that (1) the report's overall tone presents an unbalanced treatment of scientists and institutions, failing "to convey the overriding importance of intellectual freedom and trust in a creative process that has been remarkably successful"; (2) the report is equivocal in defining misconduct in science; and (3) the report does not sufficiently stress the importance of establishing a regularized institutional "response pathway" for allegations of misconduct, and for considering problems stemming from institutional and individual conflict of interest.

Responsible Science: Ensuring the Integrity of the Research Process, 189 pages, is available for $24.95 (prepaid) plus $3.00 shipping from:
National Academy Press
2101 Constitution Avenue NW
Washington, DC 20418
Phone (202) 334-3313 or (800) 624-6242

Your opinion is welcome...
Write to:
Letters to the Editor
MRS Bulletin
Materials Research Society
9800 McKnight Road
Pittsburgh, PA 15237
FAX (412) 367-4373