

ORI NEWSLETTER

VOLUME 1, NO. 2, APRIL 1993  
OFFICE OF RESEARCH INTEGRITY, U.S. PUBLIC HEALTH SERVICE

Please Duplicate and Circulate to Offices, Departments,  
Committees and Labs. Thank You.

CONTENTS

NIH Strengthens Responsible Conduct Of Research  
Requirement In Training Grant Applications.....2  
ORI Newsletter Available On Electronic Bulletin Board.....3  
CASE SUMMARY: Fabricated And  
Falsified Clinical Trial Data.....3  
CASE SUMMARY: Fabrication And  
Falsification Of Data In Abstracts.....4  
Publications.....6  
Research Ethics Training Supported  
In Principle, But Not In Practice.....7  
Faculty Ranking Of Ways To Teach Ethics.....9  
NIH Revitalization Act Impacts On ORI .....9  
ORI Hearings Before The Departmental Appeals Board.....10  
ORI To Publish Annual Reports.....11  
PHS Advisory Committee Acts To Foster  
Research Integrity.....12  
24 Misconduct Cases Closed By Investigation.....12  
Conference On Plagiarism And  
Theft Of Ideas: June 21-22, 1993 At NIH.....13  
Meetings.....14  
Federal Register Notices On ORI And  
Scientific Misconduct.....14  
ORI Address And Telephone Numbers.....14

NIH STRENGTHENS RESPONSIBLE CONDUCT OF RESEARCH REQUIREMENT  
IN TRAINING GRANT APPLICATIONS

Effective January 10, 1993, applications submitted to NIH for Institutional National Research Service Award (NRSA) Research Training Grants (T32s and T34s) will not be funded until they include acceptable plans for instructing trainees in the responsible conduct of research.

The notice published in the November 27, 1992 issue of the NIH Guide for Grants and Contracts states that, "regardless of the priority score, applications with unacceptable plans will not be funded until a revised, acceptable plan is provided by the applicant."

The review of the initial plan will be conducted by the IRG. The revised plan will be judged by staff within the awarding NIH component.

The notice further states that "applications without plans for instruction in the responsible conduct of research will be considered incomplete and will be returned to the applicant without review."

Additional modifications to the requirement for providing instruction in the responsible conduct of research follow:

- o Every predoctoral and postdoctoral trainees supported by a T32 or T34 NRSA award must receive instruction in the responsible conduct of research.
- o Plans which include all predoctoral and postdoctoral trainees in a program or department regardless of source of support are encouraged.
- o Specific curriculum or format requirements are not mandated, but all programs are "strongly encouraged" to provide instruction in conflict of interest, responsible authorship, policies for handling misconduct, policies regarding the use of human and animal subjects, and data management.
- o Plans must include subject matter, instructional format, degree of faculty participation, trainee attendance, frequency of instruction, and a rationale for the plan.
- o Progress reports must be included in future competing and noncompeting applications that report the type of instruction provided, topics covered, and other relevant information such as attendance by trainees and faculty participation.

The quality of the plan will not be a factor in determination of

the priority score. Plans will be judged either acceptable or unacceptable. Evaluation of the plan will be described in an administrative note in the summary statement.

For general information on this policy change contact Dr. Walter T. Schaffer, Director, Research Training and Special Programs Office, NIH. Phone: (301) 496-9743.

#### ORI NEWSLETTER AVAILABLE ON ELECTRONIC BULLETIN BOARD

The ORI Newsletter is available 24 hours-a-day, seven days-a-week on the Office of the Assistant Secretary for Health Electronic Bulletin Board System (OASH BBS) for the price of a phone call.

The OASH BBS carries each of the four newsletters published during a calendar year in its entirety.

Anyone with access to a computer, a modem, a communications software package, and a telephone line may access the OASH BBS by dialing (202) 690-5423 to connect at 2400/9600 V.32/V.42 or by dialing (202) 690-5425 at 9600/14.4 V.32/V.42 HST & ASL. Technical assistance is available from 7:30 a.m. to 4:30 p.m., Monday through Friday, by dialing (202) 690-6248 (Vesta Jones or Ted Floor).

The OASH BBS is user-friendly; it handles all popular file transfer protocols. The system requires the caller's communication package settings to be: n (no parity), 8 (8 data bits), 1 (1 stop bit) and full duplex. The system contains text files compressed by PKZIP (PKUNZIP is available for downloading for IBM compatibles and Macs).

The BBS was created by OASH to provide easy access to numerous U.S. Public Health Service (PHS) documents including those related to AIDS, women's health, and the national vaccine program.

#### CASE SUMMARY: FABRICATED AND FALSIFIED CLINICAL TRIAL DATA

An allegation of possible data falsification or fabrication was raised by the Chairman and Project Statistician of the National Surgical Adjuvant Breast and Bowel Project (NSABP), one of the cooperative clinical trials groups supported by the National Cancer Institute.

A data manager in the central data office of the NSABP had found two copies of a report of operation for a patient entered on a breast cancer trial at St. Luc Hospital, Montreal. The two copies were identical except for the date of operation. The date given on one copy made the patient eligible for the study on which she was entered; the date on the other copy represented a longer period of time between the date of operation and the date

of randomization than was allowed by the study eligibility requirements.

An NSABP review of a larger sample of records from St. Luc Hospital revealed five additional discrepancies in dates or estrogen receptor values between copies of reports sent to NSABP and the original reports found in the patient charts at the hospital. NSABP suspended further patient registration from St. Luc Hospital, and informed the National Cancer Institute (NCI) of the suspicious data. The NCI reported the findings to the ORI.

St. Luc Hospital had entered 1504 patients on NSABP clinical trials between 1977 and February 1991. Its participation in NSABP trials was supported by a cooperative agreement with the NCI with Dr. Roger Poisson as the Principal Investigator.

Because of the possible public health implications of falsified data on these clinical trials, the small size of the hospital, and the multicenter nature of the studies, the Division of Research Investigations (DRI) of the ORI opened a direct investigation into possible scientific misconduct. With the help of NCI and NSABP staff, DRI reviewed hospital, clinic and research charts on each of the 1504 patients. The Principal Investigator, other physicians involved in the project, data managers and a research nurse were interviewed regarding the data discrepancies found. ORI staff and two outside experts reviewed a sample of cases in which discrepancies were found with Dr. Poisson.

The ORI investigation exposed 115 separate instances of data fabrication or falsification. Most of the altered or fabricated data involved requirements for study eligibility, dates of biopsy or surgery, or hormone receptor values had been altered or fabricated to meet study requirements. Interviews with the project staff revealed that the actual data changes had been made by the data management staff at the direction of the Principal Investigator, Dr. Roger Poisson.

The DRI concluded that Dr. Poisson had committed data fabrication and falsification which constituted scientific misconduct. Administrative actions taken by PHS were (1) prohibiting Dr. Poisson from serving on PHS advisory or review committees; and (2) debarring Dr. Poisson from receiving Federal grant or contract funds. The actions will be in effect for a period of eight years.

The NSABP plans to publish a re-analysis of clinical trials affected by the data fabrication and falsification.

#### CASE SUMMARY: FABRICATION AND FALSIFICATION OF DATA IN ABSTRACTS

A neurosurgery resident, Dr. Craig T. Shelley, took a two-year

leave of absence from his institution, the University of Tennessee at Memphis, to accept a research fellowship at the NIH. During the fellowship he was assigned to work on tumors using techniques of molecular biology.

The NIH lab chief began raising questions about the research reporting activities of Dr. Shelley in the fall of 1990. Also, at his own institution, his chairman began asking for reports on the research he had done at NIH. The respondent was expected to establish a lab at his own institution that would use the techniques he had learned at NIH. In response, the respondent sent the NIH lab chief a copy of an abstract for comment. The lab chief asked for the experimental results supporting the data reported in the abstract. The respondent sent several autoradiographic slides, two of which appeared to be bona fide, the others were obvious fabrications. The respondent replied that the questionable films were constructed to "represent" the findings, because he was afraid of losing the originals in the mail. He agreed to send the original by Federal Express, but they never arrived and he reported that the Federal Express receipt was lost.

Sometime later, the respondent forwarded two more abstracts along with two slides that were said to be taken from the previously questionable autoradiographs. Upon examination, the NIH lab chief determined that one autoradiograph purportedly showing the results of several tumors was, in fact, a single tumor duplicated several times. The respondent admitted the fabrication when confronted by the NIH lab chief. Subsequently, the respondent also admitted that the material used in one study was from a known clonal cell line rather than from tumors as reported in the abstract. He further admitted that he improperly selected tissues for processing and analysis to ensure support for his hypothesis. Dr. Shelley indicated to the NIH lab chief that he would withdraw the abstracts.

Based on the allegation by the NIH lab chief, the institution conducted a formal inquiry in which Dr. Shelley confirmed the original allegations. The university's inquiry committee and Provost decided that the allegations were true and that there was no need for further investigation. The university terminated the respondent's residency, required him to reimburse the university for salary payments which duplicated the PHS fellowship support, notified the collaborators and coauthors at NIH and notified the State Licensing Board of physicians.

The OSI investigated further to determine the extent of scientific misconduct and to permit the OSI to recommend possible PHS sanctions. OSI reviewed the inquiry report and appendices and transcript of the interview of Dr. Shelley. Dr. Shelley responded to an OSI letter with a hand-written note in which he admitted lying to the NIH lab chief. OSI also conferred with the

NIH lab chief and another scientist, and examined the original materials submitted by the respondent.

The OSI determined in agreement with the University that Dr. Shelley had falsified and fabricated the results of research. Dr. Shelley admitted these actions and accepted responsibility for the unethical behavior in PHS-supported research at the NIH. The ORI recommended and the Deputy Assistant Secretary for Grants and Acquisition Management concurred with a debarment from Federal grants and contracts. Dr. Shelley was also prohibited from service on any PHS advisory or peer review committee for a three-year period.

#### PUBLICATIONS

Beyond the "Framework": Institutional Considerations in Managing Allegations of Misconduct in Research - Provides practical advice on handling allegations of research misconduct. Single copy free. Association of American Medical Colleges, Division of Biomedical Research, 2450 N Street, N.W., Washington, DC 20037-1126.

Courage Without Martyrdom: A Survival Guide for Whistleblowers - A handbook designed to help individuals decide whether and how to blow the whistle. Single copy \$10.00. Government Accountability Project, 810 First Street, N.E., Suite 630, Washington, DC 20002-3633.

Semiannual Report to the Congress, Office of Inspector General, National Science Foundation - Provides information on misconduct in science cases handled by the National Science Foundation. Single copy free. Office of Inspector General, National Science Foundation, Room 1241, 1800 G Street, N.W., Washington, DC 20550.

Research Fraud in the Behavioral and Biomedical Sciences - Edited by David J. Miller and Michel Hersen. Twelve chapters by specialists addressing the history of research fraud, the moral and ethical philosophical aspects of empirical science, legal ramifications of fraud, the review process, case histories, institutional and career pressures, etc. Published by John Wiley & Sons, Inc., Professional, Reference and Trade Group, 605 Third Avenue, New York, NY 10158-0012.

Knowledge: Creation, Diffusion, Utilization, Vol. 14, No. 2, December 1992 - A special issue of this interdisciplinary social science journal that focused on scientific misconduct. Sage Publications, Inc., P. O. Box 5084, Newbury Park, CA 91359. Phone: (805) 499-0721.

A Hand Up: Women Mentoring Women in Science - Contains advice and reflections from accomplished women scientists on mentoring

and an extensive listing of associations, books, and articles relevant to prospective mentors and mentorees. Cost \$19.00 plus \$1.50 for postage. Association for Women in Science, 1522 K Street, N. W., Suite 820, Washington, DC 20005.

Professional Ethics Report - A quarterly newsletter covering ethical issues in science, medicine, and engineering. Free. Sponsored by the AAAS Committee on Freedom and Responsibility and the Professional Society Ethics Group. Contact AAAS, 1333 H Street, N.W., Washington, DC 20005. Phone: (202) 326-6798.

RESEARCH ETHICS TRAINING SUPPORTED IN PRINCIPLE,  
BUT NOT IN PRACTICE

Ninety-nine percent of graduate deans, 88 percent of graduate faculty and 82 percent of graduate students participating in three national surveys believe their institutions and departments should "take a very active to somewhat active role" in preparing students to deal with ethical issues in their fields.

However, 51 percent of the deans reported that their institutions were not effective in doing so. Only 41 percent of the faculty felt their departments were very active or somewhat active in providing ethical preparedness training. Considerably fewer students (22 percent) thought their departments were very active or active in this area.

These findings were presented by Judith P. Swazey, Ph.D., the Acadia Institute, during the AAAS Seminar: Teaching Ethics in Science and Engineering in Boston on February 10. These findings are based on a 1988 national survey of 392 graduate deans with a 66 percent useable response rate, a 1990 national survey of 2,000 doctoral students with a 72 percent adjusted response rate, and a 1991 national survey of 2,000 graduate school faculty with a 59 percent adjusted response rate. The students and faculties were in the same 98 departments in the same major research universities in the same disciplines - chemistry, civil engineering, microbiology, and sociology.

In her presentation, Dr. Swazey cited several factors that appear related to the importance attributed to ethical training and the low rate of implementation. One factor that may contribute to the importance attributed to ethical training is the belief held by the faculty (74 percent) that "to a great extent" they have a "collective responsibility for the professional-ethical conduct of their graduate students". However, only 27 percent of the faculty thought that faculty in their department exercise a "great deal" of collective responsibility; another 61 percent felt such collective responsibility was exercised to "some extent".

Dr. Swazey also identified several factors that appear related to

the low implementation of ethical training:

- o Twenty-seven percent of the faculty believe that all or almost all of their students exhibit an awareness of ethical standards and issues in their discipline, 47 percent that a majority of students do; and 32 percent that a minority, very few, or none do.

- o Forty percent of faculty strongly agreed or agreed with the statement that "by the time students enter graduate school, their values and ethical standards are so firmly established that they are difficult to change."

- o Fifty-nine percent of the faculty strongly agreed or agreed with the statement that "it is hard to make a distinction between professional values and ethical standards and personal values and ethical standards." Dr. Swazey said this finding suggests that "many faculty may not realize that there is anything special to be taught" because they are "unfamiliar with the substantive content of ethics and values studies in various professional fields."

- o Faculty overwhelmingly believe there are only two "very effective" methods for teaching ethics: interaction with faculty in research work and informal discussion of ethical problems when they occur. (See "Faculty Ranking Of Ways To Teach Ethics" below.)

- o Thirty-two percent of the faculty knew their primary professional association had a code of ethics but they were not familiar with its contents; 16 percent did not know whether a code existed.

- o Fifty percent of the deans reported that an informal institutional expectation about teaching ethics exists, but only seven percent of the deans said their universities had clearly stated or written expectations about such teaching. Forty-three percent of the deans reported that "committing instructional time to ethical issues is a departmental decision."

The top three sources of professional values and ethical preparedness cited by students were "supportive faculty members, other graduate students, and family". However, when asked to indicate which of 14 areas they received "a lot" of help from "particularly supportive" faculty, the students cited continuing interest in a student's progress, writing letters of recommendation, and assistance in getting financial support. Substantially fewer students cited "receiving helpful criticism on a regular basis, learning the details of good research practice, advice about teaching, developing professional relationships with others in their field, and learning the 'art of survival' in their field."

Dr. Swazey said, "These findings underscore three important points about advisors and mentors that are relevant, among other things, to assumptions about how professional ethics and values should be or are being transmitted to graduate students. First, it is fallacious to equate a mentor with an advisor or other person directly responsible for a student's research training and, second, therefore to assume that all graduate trainees have mentors. Third as Baird points out, 'although the ideal model of graduate education includes a great deal of student-faculty interaction," our study and other research show that there is little interaction in many areas that are important components of doctoral training and professional socialization, even with faculty whom students consider to be especially supportive of them and their work."

The bottom three sources of professional values and ethical preparedness cited by students were "discussion of ethics and values in courses, labs, seminars, by professional organizations in the student's field, and by courses dealing with ethical issues."

Dr. Swazey said, "Other portions of our survey findings and our interviews, however, support the view that these (bottom) sources are not unimportant per se, but rather that students have had relatively little exposure to them."

#### FACULTY RANKING OF WAYS TO TEACH ETHICS

Faculty ranking of the seven ways of teaching ethics based on the percentage of "very effective" responses:

1. Interaction with faculty in research work (65%)
2. Informal discussion of ethical problems when they occur (61%)
3. Discussion of ethics and values in regular course work (19%)
4. Brown bag session or colloquium (18%)
5. Special courses devoted to these topics (14%)
6. Department and university policies for teaching and research (12%)
7. Codes of ethics and professional standards provided by professional organizations (7%).

#### NIH REVITALIZATION ACT IMPACTS ON ORI

Three sections of the NIH Revitalization Act pending passage by Congress directly impact on the functioning of the ORI.

The sections in Subtitle C--Research Integrity (1) codify the establishment of the Office of Research Integrity as an independent entity within the Department of Health and Human Services reporting to the Secretary of Health and Human Services; (2) require the creation of a Commission on Research Integrity;

and (3) mandate the development of a regulation to protect whistleblowers.

The ORI is currently an independent entity within the U.S. Public Health Service reporting directly to the Assistant Secretary for Health.

The Commission, appointed by the Secretary, will be responsible for developing recommendations for the Secretary on the administration of Section 493 of the Public Health Act which requires applicant and awardee institutions to have an administrative process for handling allegations of research misconduct as a condition for funding. The Commission will submit a report to the Secretary, the Committee on Energy and Commerce of the House of Representatives, and the Committee on Labor and Human Resources of the Senate.

The Act specifies that the 12-member Commission will be composed of three scientists with substantial accomplishments in biomedical or behavioral research, three individuals with experience in investigating allegations of misconduct with respect to scientific research, three representatives of institutions of high education at which biomedical or behavioral research is conducted, an attorney, an ethicist, and another member who is none of the above.

Since 1990, the PHS Advisory Committee on Research Integrity has advised the Secretary of HHS and the Assistant Secretary for Health on issues in the administration of Section 493.

The whistleblower regulation will "establish standards for preventing, and for responding to the occurrence of retaliation" against an employee who has made an allegation in good faith that an institution or its officials or agents have engaged in research misconduct or have failed to adequately respond to an allegation of research misconduct. The regulation also is required to cover employees who cooperate with an investigation of such allegations. Remedies for noncompliance will also be established by the regulation.

At this writing, a single, consolidated bill is expected to be passed by both Houses and signed by the President.

#### ORI HEARINGS BEFORE THE DEPARTMENTAL APPEALS BOARD

Since the ORI began offering hearings before Research Integrity Adjudications Panels of the DAB, ORI has closed 18 cases with findings of scientific misconduct. All of these individuals were advised of their opportunity to request a hearing before the DAB. At the time of publication, 8 individuals have requested a hearing.

The first case heard by the DAB involved an investigator whom the ORI found had fabricated data. In December 1992, the investigator requested a hearing solely on the three-year debarment ORI proposed for the scientific misconduct that he had committed. On February 8, 1993, the DAB heard oral arguments presented by both parties. ORI supplemented its oral argument with a post-hearing brief and a decision is pending.

The second case scheduled to be heard by the DAB involved Raphael B. Stricker, M.D., an individual that a University of California investigation at San Francisco and ORI found to have falsified and misrepresented data in a manuscript submitted to the Journal of Immunology, an article published in the New England Journal of Medicine, and a grant application submitted to the National Institutes of Health. The ORI proposed that Dr. Stricker be debarred for a three-year period. On March 11, 1993, Dr. Stricker and the ORI entered a Voluntary Exclusion and Settlement Agreement. Under the terms of the agreement, Dr. Stricker agreed to exclude himself from receipt of any Federal grants and contracts for a three-year period beginning April 1, 1993. Furthermore, Dr. Stricker agreed voluntarily to exclude himself from serving on any U.S. Public Health Service Advisory Committees, Boards and/or peer review committees for the same three-year period. These exclusions are effectively the same as the administrative actions that ORI proposed. Based on this agreement, Dr. Stricker withdrew his appeal for a hearing before the DAB.

The next case before the DAB is scheduled to begin in mid May. The parties have exchanged lists of proposed witnesses and documents.

#### ORI TO PUBLISH ANNUAL REPORTS

The Office of Research Integrity plans to publish annual reports beginning this summer to inform the American public about its efforts to combat research misconduct and promote research integrity.

In January 1991, the former Office of Scientific Integrity Review issued a report, Scientific Misconduct Investigations, that covered 21 investigations reviewed by OSIR between March 1989 and December 1990. The first ORI report will cover calendar years 1991-1992. Subsequent reports will be issued on an annual basis.

The ORI report will cover significant events that occurred during the reporting period: describe efforts to promote research integrity; report the rate at which cases were opened and closed; provide summaries of individual cases; report on significant legal issues, including the outcome of hearings before the Research Integrity Adjudications Panels; present descriptive statistics on the locus of misconduct cases, characteristics of

complainants and respondents, types of misconduct, and administrative actions; and list the publications produced, conferences/workshops held, and presentations made by ORI staff.

#### PHS ADVISORY COMMITTEE ACTS TO FOSTER RESEARCH INTEGRITY

The PHS Advisory Committee on Research Integrity endorsed six activities proposed by the Office of Research Integrity (ORI) and proposed three measures for fostering research integrity during its meeting in San Francisco on February 27-28.

The Advisory Committee endorsed (1) the publication of the ORI Newsletter, (2) the establishment of the PHS Intramural Research Integrity Committee, (3) the development of an ORI annual report, (4) the production of a brochure containing information on the functions and staffing of ORI, (5) a conference on plagiarism, and (6) support for a AAAS film project on misconduct in science.

The measures recommended by the Advisory Committee were (1) a research integrity checklist for grant applications, (2) a PHS research program on ethical issues in research, and (3) promotion of research on misconduct by the ORI. The Committee also reaffirmed its earlier recommendation that ORI seek a common government definition of misconduct that excludes the "other practices that seriously deviate" category included in current agency definitions.

The Advisory Committee recommended that ORI develop a research integrity checklist that could stand alone or be incorporated into the internal clearance forms already used by institutions. The checklist is intended to remind individual researchers to deal with areas which when ignored create ethical and integrity problems, i.e., authorship, proper citations, retention of data, conflicts of interest, and data integrity. The Committee hoped that institutions would voluntarily employ the checklist. However, the Committee asked the ORI to explore implementation options for discussion at the next meeting.

The other two recommendations made by the Advisory Committee are aimed at expanding the knowledge base related to research ethics and research misconduct. First, the Committee recommended that PHS or HHS develop a research program on ethical issues similar to the Ethics and Values Studies program at the National Science Foundation and the ethics component of the Human Genome Project at the National Institutes of Health. Second, the Committee recommended that ORI stimulate research on research misconduct through articles in this newsletter, through conferences and workshops, and by seeking funding for such studies.

#### 24 MISCONDUCT CASES CLOSED BY INVESTIGATION

Twenty-four cases of alleged scientific misconduct were closed by

the Office of Research Integrity between June 1992, when ORI was established, and February.

Institutions conducted 14 of the investigations and the ORI conducted seven. Three allegations were subjected to both institutional and ORI investigations. Twenty of the 24 investigations focused on extramural research; four centered on intramural research within the U.S. Public Health Service.

Misconduct was found in 18 cases. The findings supported eight allegations of fabrication, 15 allegations of falsification, and three allegations of plagiarism. Hearings before the Departmental Appeals Board were requested in eight cases.

Debarment from receiving Federal grants and contracts funding, was recommended in nine cases. Other administrative actions recommended were (1) prohibition from service on PHS advisory committees, in 14 cases; (2) institutional certification of the validity and accuracy of grant applications in 12 cases; (3) requiring research conducted by the investigator to be specifically supervised and monitored in three cases; (4) retraction or correction of the scientific literature in two cases; and (5) specific internal review of grant applications prior to submission to PHS in one case.

Another 10 cases were closed at the inquiry stage during the same period. Eight of the inquiries were conducted by institutions and two by the ORI, with determination that no further investigation of scientific misconduct was warranted.

CONFERENCE ON PLAGIARISM AND THEFT OF IDEAS:  
JUNE 21-22, 1993 AT NIH

Jointly sponsored by the Office of Research Integrity (ORI) and the American Association for the Advancement of Science's (AAAS) Committee on Scientific Freedom and Responsibility and the National Conference of Lawyers and Scientists, the conference will be held at the Lister Hill Auditorium, by the National Library of Medicine on the National Institutes of Health campus. All interested persons are invited.

The topics will deal with significant issues in the handling of allegations of plagiarism and theft of ideas: (1) defining the problem, in an intellectual and historical or contemporary context of ethical, legal and policy issues; (2) case studies by institutional officials and parties on actual allegations; (3) responses of journal editors and funding agencies in dealing with allegations of plagiarism and theft of ideas in peer review; (4) the computer era and its impact on protecting words and ideas and resolving cases, including the use of computer programs for screening the literature for patterns of plagiarism; and (5) a sharing of ideas and opinions on whether there is general

agreement on what constitutes plagiarism and theft of ideas (and what does not: issues of possible de minimis levels of seriousness and significance, falling out among former collaborators, copyright infringement claims, etc.) and on how problems should be handled.

All research administrators, scientists, students, editors, attorneys, and interested persons are welcome to attend. There is no registration fee, but we would welcome your call or letter on your plan to attend: Dr. Alan Price or Ms. Karen Gorirossi, Office of Research Integrity, 5515 Security Lane, Suite 700, Rockville, Maryland 20852 at (301)443-5330.

#### MEETINGS

June 12-16 - Teaching Ethics in the Biomedical and Biological Sciences. Co-sponsored by the Pacific Center for Ethics and Applied Biology, the Acadia Institute, and the Program on Humanities and Technology in Health Care, University of Texas - Houston Health Science Center. The College of the Atlantic, Bar Harbor, Maine. Contact: Pacific Center at (619) 625-0734.

June 21-22 - Conference on Plagiarism and Theft of Intellectual Property. Co-sponsored by ORI and AAAS. National Institutes of Health, Lister Hill Auditorium, Bethesda, MD. Contact: Dr. Alan Price at (301) 443-5330.

July 18-23 - Conference on Ethics: Practice and Teaching. Association for Practical and Professional Ethics and other sponsors. Colorado College, Colorado Springs. Contact: Ethics Workshop, Poynter Center for the Study of Ethics and American Institutions, 410 North Park Avenue, Bloomington, IN 47405.

#### FEDERAL REGISTER NOTICES ON ORI AND SCIENTIFIC MISCONDUCT

Statement of Organization, Functions, and Delegations of Authority: Notice, Vol. 57, No. 110, pp. 24262-24263, June 8, 1993 and November, Vol. 58, No. 22, pp. 7140-7141, February 4, 1993.

Opportunity for a Hearing on Office of Research Integrity Scientific Misconduct Findings: Notice, Vol. 57, No. 216, pp. 53125-53126, November 6, 1992.

Responsibilities of Awardee and Applicant Institutions for Dealing With and Reporting Possible Misconduct in Science: Final Rule, Vol. 54, No. 151, pp. 32446-32451, August 8, 1989.

#### ORI ADDRESS AND TELEPHONE NUMBERS

Office of Research Integrity  
U.S. Public Health Service

5515 Security Lane, Suite 700  
Rockville, Maryland 20852

Office of the Director	(301) 443-3400
Executive Office	(301) 443-4210
Division of Policy and Education	(301) 443-5300
Assurances Program	(301) 443-5377
Division of Research Investigations	(301) 443-5330
Research Integrity Branch/OGC	(301) 443-3466