

1 February 2019

Copenhagen Business School  
CBS Legal  
Solbjerg Plads 3  
2000 Frederiksberg  
Denmark

Mads Hammer Larsen  
Academic Officer  
Tel.: +45 3815 4475  
mhl.legal@cbs.dk  
www.cbs.dk

## MINUTES OF THE MEETING IN THE PRACTICE COMMITTEE

Date: 31 January 2019

Present at meeting: Søren Friis Hansen, Christina D. Tvarnø, Lucia Reisch, H.C. Kongsted, Kurt Jacobsen, Torsten Ringberg, and Mads Hammer Larsen (secretary).

Page 1 / 3

### The agenda for the meeting is the following:

1. Welcome to the meeting/any brief notifications
2. The decision from NVU on the case Nina Boy vs. Grahame Thompson
3. The Practice Committee's ability to raise new cases
4. Question from the CBS Practice Committee to all Programme Directors at CBS
5. Annual report 2018 for the Academic Council at meeting 5 March 2019
6. Any other business

### Re. 1/Brief notifications

After the latest decision from NVU there are currently no pending cases. However, there is possibly a case on the way. The possible complainant is in dialogue with the Named Person and hopefully it will be resolved there.

### Re. 2/The decision from NVU

The NVU decision states that there was research misconduct. However, it is also stated in the decision that The Practice Committee should not have handled the case initially but should sent it directly to NVU. There is some disagreement between the Practice Committees at the universities and the ministry and NVU. The ministry and NVU interpret the law so that the Practice Committees merely screens the cases and assesses if they hold any merit or is completely unfounded. If they hold merit, the cases should be

sent to be processed by NVU. However, the Practice Committees interpret the law differently, as the law states that there is a distinction between questionable research practice and research misconduct. In case of questionable research practice the case should be decided by the Practice Committee while cases regarding research misconduct is to be decided by NVU. Thus, the Practice Committee must first assess whether it is QRP or RM, and if they find either that the case regards RM or they are unsure whether it is one or the other, the case must be sent to NVU.

### **Re. 3/The Practice Committee's ability to raise new cases**

Søren Friis Hansen has had some questions from the press, specifically Forskerforum. Søren was asked to comment on a possible – not yet raised – case. Yet in case a member of the Practice Committee has commented on a case beforehand, he or she will be “inhabil”. Further, questions about the legal competence of the Practice Committee to raise new cases regarding research misconduct or questionable research practice was raised. However, if the Practice Committee takes up a case on their own account, they will de facto be both prosecutor and judge. Thus, taking up cases on their own would render the Practice Committee “inhabile”.

This lead to a discussion on how active the Committee can be. The Committee cannot raise cases but must nonetheless raise issues in case of general problems with research integrity at CBS – or other issues that reflects poorly on the reputation of CBS. For example regarding financing of research.

It was discussed that it should be taken up with the Dean of Research, that there should be clear guidelines on financing of research, transparency in this regard etc. Thus, the Committee should insist that guidelines regarding conflicts of interest and ethics are made, as transparency is a growing issue. Further, the Committee must obviously be heard in this process.

### **Re. 4/Question from the CBS Practice Committee to all Programme Directors at CBS**

In chapter 3 in the Danish Code of Conduct for Research Integrity (1.1 Responsibilities) it is stated, that undergraduate and graduate programmes should include an introduction to the principles of research integrity etc.

Søren proposes that the Committee should ask the Dean of Education to ask the study boards the following:

*“How do you comply with the requirement to give the students at your programme an introduction to the principles of research integrity and responsible conduct of research?”*

Based on the answers from the dean, the Committee will reflect on where to go from there.

A discussion followed about ethics in research in general. This lead to an agreement that both the Dean of Education and the Dean of Research

1 February 2019

Copenhagen Business School  
CBS Legal  
Solbjerg Plads 3  
2000 Frederiksberg  
Denmark

Mads Hammer Larsen  
Academic Officer  
Tel.: +45 3815 4475  
mhl.legal@cbs.dk  
www.cbs.dk

Page 2 / 3

should be asked about how they deal with ethical issues; if there should be a system in place to deal with such issues.

### **Re. 5/Annual report for 2018**

An annual report will be presented at the meeting in in the Academic Council on 5 March. It will be a short report as there is no pending cases. The issues discussed at here regarding ethics will be briefly presented as well.

### **Re. 6/Any other business**

Again issues regarding ethics were raised. There has been issues with partnerships/sponsorships and ethics. CBS was thrown out of a project due to a sponsorship from a tobacco company. There should be general guidelines on who to partner up with or receive sponsorships from. If someone, somewhere at CBS enters into a partnership with for example a tobacco company, it may have negative consequences for other researchers at CBS. In the case with the tobacco company it was a very minor sponsorship for a career fair which lead to CBS not being able to participate in a major research project. Guidelines could ensure something like that would not happen again. A system for that is needed. Because the ones making for example sponsorship agreements do not necessarily understand the repercussions for researchers. Generally, when it comes to ethics there seem to be need for an ethical council of sorts.

A discussion on plagiarism in PhD thesis' followed. At the moment PhD thesis' are not checked for plagiarism by plagiarism detection software (like Urkund which is used for projects by undergraduate and graduate students). We should use plagiarism detection software on PhD thesis'. But how should the process be? Should there be a screening of PhD thesis' in advance? There was agreement that it would be ideal if it is screened in advance by the supervisor, so that she/he can stop it from being formally handed in.

But what should be done in case the thesis is flagged in the plagiarism detection software after it is handed in? When a PhD thesis is handed in formally it is a scientific product and thus under the law of questionable research practice and research misconduct and should be treated by the Practice Committee/NVU? However, it was pointed out that it is only in case of an actual complaint, it becomes an NVU issue. Thus, it should probably be an issue for the Legal department at CBS when there is possibly plagiarism but no formal complaint.

Torsten: ethical issue. Hiring. Issues regarding legal council; who do they talk to when needing help/legal advice on ethical issues in hiring (the guy from Goldman Sachs hired – then no) – lawyers a top management level needed?

1 February 2019

Copenhagen Business School  
CBS Legal  
Solbjerg Plads 3  
2000 Frederiksberg  
Denmark

Mads Hammer Larsen  
Academic Officer  
Tel.: +45 3815 4475  
mhl.legal@cbs.dk  
www.cbs.dk

Page 3 / 3