

March 12, 1991

DRAFT (III)

Report of the Committee on

Professional Values and Research Integrity

I. Introduction

Two years ago, Dean Graham Allison established a Committee to begin work on defining the "core values" of the Kennedy School. The Committee was chaired by Professor Dennis Thompson. It understood its task to be not only defining the core values, but also setting an agenda for future work by other committees, and stimulating other activities within the school that would help these core values become an intrinsic part of the school's culture. It was a challenging assignment.

The committee responded by issuing a report that identified nine key issues for the faculty to address:

1) Conflicts of Interest

2) Research

3) Secrecy

4) Fundraising

5) Curriculum

6) Sexism and Racism

7) Personal Conduct

8) Free Speech and Protest

9) Governance

In addition, specific committee members assumed the responsibility for submitting reports on these particular issues. These documents included the following:

1) Dutch Leonard, Memorandum to the KSG Faculty
Regarding Conflicts of Interest, April 22, 1988

2) Bill Hogan, Memorandum to the KSG Faculty
Regarding Guidelines for Policy Research, April 26,
1988.

These reports (including some fictional cases developed to facilitate the discussion of conflicts of interest and conflicts of commitment) were discussed at several school-wide faculty meetings in the Spring of 1988.

To continue this work, in the Spring of 1990 Dean Robert Putnam established a Committee on Professional Values and Research Integrity. It was to be chaired by Professor Mark H. Moore, and included many veterans of the Thompson Committee including Thompson, Moore, Cavanagh, Hogan, Leonard, Reich. In addition, Marvin Kalb and Olivia Golden joined the Committee. David Ellwood, as the Chairman of the School's Research Committee was added as an ex Officio member.

This Committee was charged more narrowly than the original Thompson Committee. Its job was to consider in detail what specific rules and procedures might be adopted to deal with conflicts of interest and commitments between the Kennedy School and its faculty and senior staff, and with threats to the independence, objectivity, and quality of its outside sponsored research. Even more specifically, the task was to review the KSG Faculty's existing rules in

these areas (modelled after rules adopted by Harvard's Faculty of Arts and Sciences), and to determine whether and how they needed to be adapted for the Kennedy School's particular situation.

The Committee considered these issues in a series of six discussion meetings over the course of the Spring and Fall. In addition, members of the Committee consulted with those in the Faculty of Arts and Sciences and Harvard's other professional schools (Law School, Business School, Medical School, School of Public Health) to learn what their policies and procedures were. On the basis of these explorations and deliberations, the Committee has drafted some new guidelines regulating potential conflicts of commitment and interest, and the conduct of outside sponsored research. These rules and guidelines are presented as appendices A and B of this report.

These documents are intended to provide specific, concrete advice to faculty members at the school about how to identify and deal with potential conflicts of interest and commitment in their individual relationships with the School, and in the conduct of outside sponsored research. While these documents have the feel of "black letter law", a key element of our approach to enhancing professional values and preserving research integrity is not mere compliance with rules, but instead a heavy reliance on consultation

about particular situations as they arise. In fact, the rules and guidelines explicitly define different situations that present different levels of concern about personal or school integrity, and [require] faculty members to deal with these different levels with different levels of consultation, and with different kinds of protective mechanisms. There are some areas which require no special attention. There are others that require much closer scrutiny to be allowed to go forward.

The purpose of the guidelines and the consultative mechanisms, of course, is to provide and protect the maximum degree of individual freedom consistent with our obligations to one another, and to the institution of which we are all a part. It is also to help create a framework within which we all can continue to learn about these issues, and the best way to respond to them. In fact, we envision a kind of "common law" emerging from on-going consultations stimulated by these new guidelines.

More important than this "black letter law", however, is the understanding that the committee came to about the nature of these issues, and the best way to handle them in the context of the Kennedy School. This report is, in effect, a commentary on the guidelines that we have proposed not only so that other members of the faculty may more easily judge their merit, but also so that they can be

understood and become powerful in the broader context of reaffirming some of the core values of the institution to which we all have committed so much of ourselves.

One final introductory note: once we had considered issues associated with outside sponsored research, it turned out to be convenient for us also to clarify the principles and procedures the School now follows with respect to the acceptance of gifts to the school. Moreover, in thinking through the organizational structures required to support the kinds of oversight and consultation that these new rules implied, it proved useful to reconstitute the existing Gifts Policy Committee in ways that would allow it not only to oversee the school's fundraising activities, but also to assume some of the responsibilities that would arise under the new systems for reviewing outside sponsored research activities, and individual faculty conduct. Consequently, we have included a statement on "fundraising and gifts policy" as well as on "conflicts of interest and commitment" and the regulation of "outside sponsored research."

II. Basic Assumptions

We begin with some key assumptions about the nature of the contract between the Kennedy School and its individual officers.

The Privilege of Academic Freedom

First, as officers of the Kennedy School, we see ourselves first and foremost as members of an academic community. As such, in conducting research, our fundamental commitment must be to objectivity and the pursuit of important truths. In addition, we have the obligation to identify important unasked, and not yet answerable questions, and to put these questions before society and our colleagues in useful and intellectually compelling ways. In teaching we must help to transmit important truths to students, and find ways to stimulate their critical thought.

That complicated enterprise is aided by a firm commitment to sustaining the privilege of academic freedom. History teaches that it is desirable for a society to have some institutions in which truth and understanding can be pursued by allowing individuals to be free to pursue whatever issues they wish to understand, using whatever methods seem appropriate (with some restrictions to protect the subjects of experimentation), and to teach what they believe to be important. The assumption is that, in a University like Harvard, individual faculty members have earned that freedom by succeeding in the rigorous screening methods that lead to their appointments. Furthermore, there is a strong presumption that their continuing virtue and

skill is better tested by the process of external peer review than by internal administrative regulation. Thus, in the academic community there is a strong initial presumption against regulation of the individual conduct of faculty members lest such regulation chill the spirit of free inquiry.

Collective Responsibilities

In considering to what extent the presumption of academic freedom may be abridged, however, it is worth noting that academic freedom is not a right possessed by individuals. It is a privilege that is granted to individuals as a condition of their holding a particular position in a particular kind of institution. Individuals earn the privilege by continuing to live up to the values of the academy (which include the vigorous pursuit of truth), and serve the institution's broader social purposes.

So, although we begin with a strong presumption of individual freedom, we also recognize that individual faculty members have responsibilities to the Kennedy School as an institution. These obligations derive from several sources. First, our appointments as officers of the school require good faith efforts on the part of faculty members to live up to their research, teaching, and administrative responsibilities in the School. Second, we each have a

responsibility to other individuals in the Kennedy School community including colleagues, staff, students and alumni whose lives are affected by the work we do in the name of the institution of which we are all a part. Third, we have responsibilities to Harvard and the Kennedy School as institutions to which many of us have committed a substantial portion of our professional lives.

[For their part, the School and the University have a responsibility to support and protect the reputations and freedom of their researchers. In the long run, the institutions and the individuals have a common interest in preserving the commitment to excellence and integrity]

Obviously, it is best that these obligations be strongly felt and personally honored rather than legislated and collectively required. Nonetheless, it may sometimes be appropriate for the KSG as an institution, and the Faculty as a collegial body, to define the nature of these responsibilities more specifically, and to develop procedures that encourage faculty to seek consultation about these matters and that promote compliance with these common duties and responsibilities.

Collective Responsibility and Private Life

While it is obviously true that individuals have private lives well beyond any legitimate interest or reach of the Kennedy School, it is also true that the Kennedy School may have some legitimate interests in some conduct that is ordinarily considered private. [Of course, from the point of view of an extremist on academic freedom, one might consider all conduct of a faculty member to be private in the sense that they are the only ones who decide what they do with their time. In such a view, the freedom they enjoy could be seen as buttressed by an obligation to respect the privacy of individuals as well as to facilitate the performance of their particular roles as academicians.

But most faculty members have some more particularized notion of their private time in which they feel unburdened by particular obligations to the School and the University. Indeed, they are encouraged to think in these terms by the existence of explicit policies that allow them to do some work for pay outside the boundaries of the university. For some, the conception of private time includes all the time available to them after they have satisfactorily met their teaching and administrative responsibilities to the school. For others, it means that time that they are away from the School working on non-school directed projects. For still others, it means only that time that they are working for pay from someone other than the university.

In this "private time" faculty members engage in many important professional activities. They participate in partisan political activity. They engage in volunteer work in their communities. They consult to governments and corporations affected by governmental policies. Not all of this work is compensated by outsiders. Much of it is in the interest of the School and the broader society.]

Although we might like to, in undertaking such activities, officers of the Kennedy School cannot divorce themselves entirely from their ties to Harvard and to the Kennedy School. Indeed, those who ask for help from KSG faculty members may be relying on their connections with Harvard and KSG to establish the presumptive value of their work. To the extent that is true, to the extent that outsiders are using a faculty member's affiliation with Harvard to enhance their stature, [or, more generally, to the extent that outside activities could reasonably appear adversely to affect the school] Harvard and the Kennedy School retain some interests not only in how much of this activity individual faculty members engage in (which has been the focus of past policies relating to conflicts of commitment), but also in how they do it (which has heretofore been unexamined).

There are some, for example, who believe that the KSG faculty should never be involved in partisan politics, or in close consultative relationships to managers of government agencies. Their reasoning is that such relationships necessarily require deep commitments to people and purposes that are inconsistent with the spirit of objectivity and skepticism that are the hallmarks of academia. In effect, the commitments require the faculty to censor themselves and their judgments in ways that are damaging in the short run (since they remove some potentially useful and critical voices from the public dialogue), and potentially corrupting over the long run (since self-censorship might become a habit, and dull the scholar's commitment to criticism).

What most of our committee believes, however, is that these connections to practice are far too valuable to the overall mission of the school and to the professional development of its faculty to be proscribed. In effect, such relationships constitute our "clinical practice." Our responsibility, then, is not to avoid these activities. Instead, it is to select those activities that give enough scope to use our talents well, and to perform them in ways that set high standards for the profession -- including a continuing, visible commitment to truth and the public interest rather than to any particular client's interests.

As academics engaged in the war of ideas that is an important part of politics, we have to keep a piece of ourselves open to the idea that we might be wrong and our opponents right, and to rely to some degree on dispassionate (but not disinterested) reasoning to continue to shape our views. Indeed, in democratic governance, such a stance may be an important standard of professional conduct for everyone, not just scholars. But it is particularly important for scholars. Just as one might expect a law professor to have a greater commitment to the orderly development of the law (relative to the representation of an individual client's interests) than an ordinary advocate; so one might expect a Kennedy School faculty member to retain a different kind of commitment to the public interest than a politician or manager. In short, there is a strong expectation that the work of individual faculty members in professional activities should continue to be distinguished by the qualities of objectivity and excellence that qualified them for appointment to Harvard.

The Implications of Being a Professional School

The discussion above reveals another key assumption: namely, that the Kennedy School is a professional school rather than a wholly academic enterprise. The implications of that status are, we believe, profound for any efforts to guarantee the school's integrity, objectivity, and

reputation through regulations guiding individual conduct, outside sponsored research, and fundraising activities. As a professional school, we cannot simply retreat to the ivory tower and rely on its aloofness to protect our virtue. We must engage those who are engaged in governing. The challenge is to find ways to engage such people -- our profession -- in ways that will protect us from unwarranted charges of conflicts of interest and commitment, or bias in our research, or inappropriate fundraising efforts.

A professional school of government finds its ultimate worth and meaning not only in its ability to develop important truths, but also in its ability to improve the practice of government. That means that the value of its research cannot be measured solely by its contribution to knowledge, but must also be measured by its relevance, and its utility in helping the society understand where the public interest lies, and how to advance it. It also means that the value of its teaching rests not only in its ability to teach students what is known, and what methods to use to learn more about particular subjects, but also in its ability to teach students to act ethically and effectively in the world.

Given these objectives, the Kennedy School's boundary with "the real world" must be more permeable than the boundary that protects other parts of the University

from challenges to their objectivity and integrity. To fulfill its purposes, the Kennedy School must [enable its faculty to] step out of the ivory tower and into the arena of public policy debate. It cannot choose to ignore important problems facing the government because they are controversial, or because powerful interests have stakes in governmental decisions. It cannot choose to train students without concern for their values and ethics because its purpose is to improve the practice of government.

Instead, it must be attentive to the concerns of the profession, and the developments that are occurring within it. It must seek to influence the practice of government by developing strong relationships with those who work in government. It must incorporate within its faculty those who are interested and skilled in helping the processes of government work better than they now do.

By operating in close contact with "the real world", Kennedy School faculty inevitably expose themselves to temptations that are more remote, and in many ways, more subtle, than the temptations facing many other parts of the University. In various science departments of the Faculty of Arts and Sciences and in the Medical School where discoveries are made that have important commercial applications, the University must take steps to make sure that the commercial interests do not claim too much of the

faculty's time, do not skew the overall research efforts of the University, do not lead to the exploitation of University personnel and graduate students, do not compromise the research product and harm the reputation of the institution, and do not undermine the tradition of openness and service to the public interest that are the defining qualities of a university. (It must also take steps to ensure that if commercial applications are developed, and University resources were used to create them, that the University shares in some of the economic returns.)

In other professional schools such as the Schools of Law and Business Administration where faculty members acquire knowledge through both their scholarship and their independent professional activities that have great practical value, the Schools again, have to guard against faculty members becoming too entangled in outside professional activities, and, to some extent, from using their own time to compete financially with their own institution.

These temptations are real enough. But they are only about money. And they arise in a relatively clear form in which the individual faculty member's economic interests are pitted against his or her responsibilities to the public, or to the employing institution. In effect, they are resolved by asking how much the individual faculty member's right to

academic freedom and a private life must yield to the institution's right to insure that it claims its fair share of the faculty member's attention, and that the faculty member live up to the University's historic commitment to serve the public broadly rather than narrower commercial interests.

In the Kennedy School, as Dutch Leonard's memo on Conflicts of Interest and Conflicts of Commitment illustrates, the currencies that may be used to tempt faculty members are far wider, and can be more easily rationalized as public contributions than in other parts of the University. Because the Kennedy School works on important public issues, it is easy to court, and be tempted by, fame, power and influence as well as by money. Indeed, these as much as money are the powerful currencies that circulate in the public sector. Moreover, because the issues are public, it is easy to persuade oneself that one's actions in developing and advancing policy ideas are well motivated and in the public interest.

It is also easy for others, however, looking at the actions of individual faculty members, to find in their conduct at least the appearance of private interest or political bias. This is particularly true when natural communities of interest arise among people who share a political outlook and a set of beliefs about how the world

works, and what makes for effective public policy. So, it is particularly easy for Kennedy School faculty members to become involved in situations where there appear to be conflicts of interest or commitment between them and the School, or where their research or teaching activities seem tainted by biases of various kinds. The challenge for individual faculty members and the school, then, is to find ways to protect their own and the school's integrity without cutting off the close engagement with the profession that is necessary for the school to achieve its overall goals.

The Implications of Being a New Kind of Institution

The last important assumption we made about the context within which we were trying to legislate was to recognize that, as a professional school of government, the Kennedy School was a new kind of institution. Unlike the Law School, the Medical School, and the Business School, the Kennedy School is new and rapidly developing. This has two important implications for the moral life of the school.

The first is that there are neither long traditions nor powerful models from other institutions to guide our development. We are having to invent ourselves. That means that many of the protections that we can take for granted in other institutions (such as powerful external academic communities and larger peer review processes) are less

convincingly established in the case of the Kennedy School. The path to virtue is less clearly marked, and less closely guarded than in more established and larger national enterprises.

The second is that faculty members at the Kennedy School have been asked to accept unusual levels of responsibility for the development of the institution. They have shouldered fund raising responsibilities, and undertaken to design key administrative features of the school as well as assumed the ordinary burdens of teaching and research. On the positive side, that has produced a culture at the Kennedy School that generates unusual feelings of responsibility for the enterprise. On the negative side, that same fact has given the enterprise a more entrepreneurial and managerial cast than may be healthy.

The net effect of these distinctive features of the Kennedy School is that we have fewer natural controls and more external temptations. We are also extremely visible. Consequently, it is specially important that our policies and procedures be worked out in ways that protect the school [and its researchers] not only from the reality of compromised objectivity and quality, but also from its appearance.

That is what we have tried to do in drafting three distinct sets of guidelines: the proposed Policy on Conflicts of Interest and Commitment; the proposed Rules for Accepting and Conducting Outside Sponsored Research; and the proposed Policies Regulating Fundraising and the Acceptance of Outside-Gifts. [In these provisions, we have sought to find devices that can, at relatively low cost, allow us to continue to do the complicated, value laden, contentious work that we must do to achieve the overall objectives of a professional school of government without exposing the institution to credible charges that our work is biased or politically motivated, and without exposing our faculty members to too much regulation or control. We understand and regret that any effort to introduce more regulation in these areas not only threatens the principle of academic freedom, but also blunts the initiative of faculty, increases the burdens associated with doing policy related research, and may even sow seeds of mistrust that will produce ever more complicated regulatory arrangements to try to restore the trust that was once the sole basis for the relationships that are now being regulated by rule. Yet, if, in the interests of protecting the school's overall reputation, we must work collectively to guard against the appearance of bias in our work, and that is the price that must be paid for continuing to engage important and controversial issues, we believe that price should be paid.

III. The Kennedy School's "Policy on Conflicts of Interest, Commitment, and Value": A Commentary

The basic focus of the School's "Policy on Conflicts of Interest, Commitment, and Value" is the conduct of officers of the Kennedy School. It seeks to advance the collective interests of the Faculty by striking the proper balance between the desire to protect the personal privacy and academic freedom of individual faculty members on the one hand, and to advance the overall mission of the School on the other. The principal interests that the Faculty and the School seek to protect are: 1) that its faculty members not use their positions within the School to influence the School's financial interests in ways that are harmful to the School; 2) that faculty members live up to their professional commitments to the Faculty and the School; and 3) that the School's reputation for objectivity and quality not be impaired by the conduct of individual faculty members.

Note that this body of doctrine does not deal with outside sponsored research conducted within the Kennedy School. That is why we need a separate document governing the conduct of outside sponsored research. It does apply to faculty members conduct both inside and outside the school. It is concerned not only with making sure that outside activities do not grow so large that they detract from the

Faculty member's professional efforts on behalf of the school, but also that the activities be conducted in a way that contributes to the School's reputation for objectivity, and for its support of democratic values.

The Committee began with policies previously promulgated at the Kennedy School. These, in turn, were based largely on the faculty of Arts and Sciences. Upon examination, these policies seemed less than perfectly suited to the Kennedy School, and were, in some important respects, incomplete. As a result, the Committee re-drafted the proposals. They now differ from the former KSG and FAS policies in the following important respects,

First, to reflect the School's special status as a professional school, the new policies place greater emphasis on the positive value of many kinds of outside professional activities. The FAS policies allowed such activities, but did so grudgingly. [The Business School's current policies give a ringing endorsement to outside activities such as consulting for private companies. In our policies, we seek to affirm the value of on-going contact with professional world that we seek to understand and aid, but to encourage faculty members to be discriminating about the different value and potential hazards of different kinds of contact.]

Second, they add a new domain of concern beyond conflicts of interest and conflicts of commitment -- something we have called "conflicts in value." This addition seemed necessary to reach a kind of conduct that is particularly important in the Kennedy School context -- namely, private activities carried out for money, fame, and policy impact, that could nonetheless have an adverse impact on the reputation of the School.

Third, the new policies explicitly include the 20% rule that seems to be uniformly but tacitly adopted throughout the University, and extends reporting to include time-consuming but unpaid activities.

Fourth, we have extended some, but not all, of the restrictions that would apply to outside research sponsored within the Kennedy School to research that is undertaken during one's "private time." On one hand, under these provisions, faculty members are still allowed to engage in some proprietary or confidential research on their private time. On the other hand, these provisions reinforce the expectation that faculty members will bring to their private consulting activities the same intellectual qualities and value commitments that justified their appointment as faculty members. These provisions also [encourage faculty members to consider the consequences for the school and their colleagues of maintaining relationships with]

individuals or causes that are commonly seen as the enemies of such important values as the vigorous pursuit of truth, the love of freedom, or the tolerance of diversity.]

[This later concern about faculty members establishing relations with individuals or causes that are commonly seen as enemies of important values deserves some special discussion. We are motivated to suggest such provisions for essentially three reasons. First, we do not believe that it is entirely possible to separate oneself and one's private life from one's institutional identity. Each of us carries a little of everyone else's reputation around with us. We think it is important as a matter of collegial responsibility to think about how our commitments and associations affect the reputations of others in the community. Second, we note that concerns about these matters figure prominently in our decisions to accept gifts and endowment. If such concerns are important in that domain, it is not obvious to us why they should not be important in the domain of our professional work and associations as well. In effect, if we are fussy about whom we honor in accepting gifts, perhaps we should be a little fussy about whom we work with.]

[Of course, there are important differences in the school's stakes in avoiding "conflicts of value" in the separate domains of: 1) "private time"; 2) outside sponsored

research; and 3) endowment and gifts. The interests are greatest and most tightly regulated in the area of endowment, for, in accepting gifts, we are honoring the donors. They are somewhat less in the domain of outside sponsored research where no endorsement of the sponsor is indicated. And they are least important in the domain of private time where no school endorsement is implied, and where faculty members are protected by concerns about academic freedom and privacy as well.

For this reason, potential "conflicts of value" in the domain of individual conduct are not subject to any particular limitations. One is not even required to consult about them. We are simply urging that, as a matter of conscience, faculty members think about the opinions of their colleagues before establishing relations with those who could be regarded as enemies of tolerance, truth and humanity.]

Fifth, we have extended some obligations to disclose work one is doing on one's own time to the School's administration when the relations created by that work might jeopardize the objectivity of one's individually published work, or the work that emerges from outside sponsored research carried out within the Kennedy School. These changes are important to deal with one of the principal threats to the actual or perceived objectivity of our

research efforts -- whether performed as an individual researcher, or in the context of outside sponsored research.

IV. The Kennedy School's "Policies Relating to Outside Sponsored Research": A Commentary

The focus of the "Policies Relating to Outside Sponsored Research" are research agreements made between the University and outside sponsors. Research activities carried out by individuals in their private time are regulated in the "Policies Regulating Conflicts of Interest, Commitment and Value", but there are some features of those regulations that are utilized in the regulation of outside sponsored research as well.

In working this terrain, the Committee had more disjoint, and less well developed materials on which to rely. We had the the University's "Policies Relating to Sponsored Projects" for which we are all accountable, and which are published in our Principal Investigator's Handbook. Also included in that publication are "Guidelines for Research Projects Undertaken in Cooperation with Industry." We also had the recent report of the Medical School -- including the "Faculty of Medicine Statement on Research Sponsored by Industry". Finally, we had Bill Hogan's memorandum entitled "Guidelines for Funding Policy Research."

A. The Value of Sponsored Research

In discussing this subject, we also found that we had to take a step backward before we could address the issue intelligently. We understood that it might be important to allow individual faculty members to engage in outside activities so as to protect academic freedom, and in the interests of their professional development. But it was less clear why it was proper for the School as a whole to be involved in outside sponsored research.

One committee member argued powerfully that it was improper for the School to accept any outside money to carry out research. The argument was that acceptance of money from outside sources -- particularly from private entities with well defined commercial interests, and governments with well defined political and bureaucratic interests -- was fundamentally compromising. In this view, researchers could not help but be influenced by the interests that lay behind the money. It would shape the research agenda of the school in ways that were inconsistent with objectivity and academic freedom. And it might even influence the results. Even if that were not true, soliciting outside funds damaged the reputation of the school. It suggested that the school were for sale for money or glory. At a minimum, it was simply undignified, and could not help but undermine our independence over the long run.

This position was a useful starting point for it forced other members of the committee to consider once again why it is valuable for us to accept outside research; and what dangers must be warded off. The conclusions a majority of the committee came to were the following.

The principal reason to accept outside sponsored research projects is that it allows important intellectual activities to occur that would otherwise not. It is not important that the school grow larger. It is important that it engage in valuable intellectual inquiry, and through that process, develop its own faculty and students. The basic business of the school is to produce quality ideas that matter, and to develop the methods and people who can produce more of these. The activities made possible by outside sponsored research allow us to accomplish these objectives. Research results are produced. Faculty are not only gainfully employed, but developed. Opportunities for junior faculty and students to learn about the arts of policy analysis and management are created. The school develops capacities and reputations in new areas.

Of course, all this is valuable only if: 1) the project to be undertaken is something that is of intellectual interest to the faculty members who are involved; 2) the ultimate product is of both high quality

and utility; and 3) the faculty member can be effectively insulated from the pressure of the interests that lie behind the funding. Otherwise, the line between the School and notorious "Beltway Bandits" disappears.

The alternative way of financing such activities would be through endowment or current use gifts. At the outset, such sources look far more attractive because the interests that lie behind such gifts are often quite different than those that lie behind sponsored research. The claims are more personal and often more remote, therefore less threatening to research objectivity. And this suggests that, all other things being equal, we would prefer to fund the research activities of the school through these rather than more determinedly interested sources.

But there are potential problems in relying only on endowment on these sources. [One is the practical problem that there may not be enough of them to support the level of effort the school would like to make across the wide variety of fronts in which it is trying to work.] But even in principle, there may be objections to gifts analogous to those raised by accepting outside sponsored research: the donor may have a powerful interest in seeing particular areas studied, and particular conclusions reached. To a great degree, we are protected from such influence by long established university policies that prohibit the school

from accepting gifts that threaten to compromise the "four essential freedoms" of the University: namely, the freedoms to appoint faculty members, conduct research, select students, and develop and field a curriculum. In addition, objections may be raised if the University's acceptance of a gift seems to honor ignoble people or causes. So even endowment can leave a potentially corrupting taint that must be dispelled:

[There is one further reason to be concerned about sole reliance on gifts or endowment: There is a risk that if all the research conducted in the School were supported by endowment, we might lose some of its immediate relevance and utility. Of course, one must ordinarily presume the value of independent scholarship and acknowledge the potential long run contribution that such scholarship can make to the future practice of government. Moreover, one must admit that there are many other ways in which faculty members can stay close to the practice of government other than by competing for governmental research grants and contracts.

But still, one must also acknowledge that in the ivory tower, there is no requirement for relevance, and therefore that some of the pressure to be useful, and that some of the learning that might be occasioned by the need to be useful might be lost. That loss may not be particularly costly for a Department of the Faculty of Arts and Sciences

that reckons its contributions to the world in different dimensions and longer time scales than a professional school of government. But one can argue that such losses would badly undermine the rationale for the Kennedy School as a whole.

This risk can be minimized by having the school engaged in some outside sponsored research. In effect, some "market exposure" may be a useful corrective to the insulation that endowment or disinterested gifts provide. What is dangerous is when costs or financial pressures drive us to take up subjects or projects that are not appropriate on terms that are not appropriate.

The reasons to accept outside sponsored research, then, are: first, to do valuable work that would otherwise not be done; second, to develop the school and establish important working relationships with the members of our professional constituency; and third, to keep the school in touch with important issues. These are all particularly important given that the Kennedy School is a professional school.

This discussion also makes clear what we should guard against. Just as we must guard against infringements on the four freedoms in accepting endowment, we must do that in accepting outside sponsored research. Just as we must

avoid honoring dishonorable institutions or individuals in accepting endowment, we should avoid too close ties with outside sponsors who are particularly corrupting. In addition, we must take steps to protect culture of University -- particularly openness, objectivity, criticism, and independence. Finally, we must set up more particular efforts to insure the objectivity and quality of the research.

Of course, the most important way to ensure the objectivity and quality of the research is by hiring good faculty and making sure that they are intimately engaged in the research efforts. Even here, some correction may be necessary, for our current policies are a little loose with respect to required levels of faculty involvement in outside sponsored research projects.

Even if we were satisfied with the level of faculty involvement in outside sponsored research, however, we would still have to do more. The reason is simply that the relations we set up to carry out research are often potentially corrupting -- particularly in situations where the faculty member has a larger, longer lasting, more personal relationship with some of the sponsors of outside research. And even if the relationships are not corrupting, they can easily appear to be so. Finally, we must acknowledge that the peer review mechanisms for our work are

not as strong as those for traditional academic work. Some of our work is published outside the context of peer reviewed publications -- in our own working paper series, in reports, in pamphlets and so on. And the standards for judging the quality of policy work -- much of which includes important assumptions about values and purposes and possibilities as well as fact -- are not as clear as for strictly academic work. Consequently, we must work a little harder to assure ourselves and others about the objectivity and quality of our work.

To deal with these problems, we propose a system of prior review that seeks to identify the extent to which the potential for bias exists in the study, and to propose more or less elaborate methods of guarding against bias based on the size of the threat. The most sensitive projects are those that are funded exclusively by outside sponsors with concrete, immediate interests in the results of the research, and that are led by faculty members with continuing professional relationships outside the boundaries of the school. Such projects may be undertaken, but they require extraordinary efforts to guard against bias including more diversified funding, disclosure of both financial support and on-going relationships, outside review, and so on.

Somewhat less sensitive cases would be those where there was either a powerful, single outside sponsor, but no on-going professional relationship with a faculty member; or where there was a powerful professional interest of a faculty member. In these cases, fewer special protections would have to be established than in the most sensitive cases.

The principal devices available to the School to be used to provide some degree of protection while working in situations where the appearance of a conflict of interest is strong include: disclosure of funding; disclosure of prior interests and positions; multiple funding sources; and external technical review.

Even with prior review of research projects, criticisms of our research efforts can be expected. An important question is how the School will respond to such criticism. The answer should be that the School should, as a matter of firm policy, act on the presumption that its Faculty members are unbiased and professional. Complaints that do not go beyond an observation of an apparent conflict of interest that had already been acknowledged and dealt with in the prior review process should be responded to with an explanation of how the research is being conducted by the appropriate faculty member. [More serious complaints can and should be reviewed by the Dean, or the Associate Dean, or

the Research Committee, but in conducting such reviews, it is important to keep in mind the importance of protecting the internal and external reputation of the faculty member involved, and the climate of trust that must exist between the school administration and its faculty if we are to remain a collegial body. Only the most serious complaints offering credible evidence that the research is in fact biased should trigger a close, comprehensive investigation.]

In addition, the Committee thinks that regular external peer reviews of the activities of Research Centers (in which a great deal of the School's outside sponsored research is done) should be conducted.

Finally, the Committee believes it is important not only to guard against bias in individual research projects, but also to guard the school against too great an overall dependence on outside sponsored research, and the "skewing" effects that such dependence could produce. To deal with this threat, we have recommended an annual review and report on the aggregate pattern of research being carried out by the School. This could be done by the Research Committee in the context of the publication of our Annual Research Report.

Appendix A:

Kennedy School Policies Regarding
Conflicts of Interest, Commitment, and Value

(Format and Language From: Faculty of Arts and Sciences,
Policies Relating to Research and Other Professional
Activities Within and Outside the University)

1. With the acceptance of a full-time appointment in the Kennedy School as a Faculty member or as a Senior Administrative Officer, an individual makes a commitment to the University and the School that is understood to be full-time in the most inclusive sense. Every member is expected to accord the University and the School his or her primary professional loyalty, and to arrange outside obligations, financial interests, and activities so as not to conflict or interfere with this over-riding commitment to the University and the School.

(Identical with Paragraph 1 of FAS document)

2. How individual officers discharge their responsibilities to the University and the School is left largely to the discretion of the individual officers of instruction and administration. There is a strong presumption that such officers, carefully selected through the University's and the School's rigorous appointment policies, will both understand and do their duty to the University and the School. That is consistent with the powerful presumption of academic freedom, as well as respect for the accomplishments of those who are appointed.

(Rewritten version of Paragraph 2 of FAS document)

3. The University and the School recognize that the involvement of faculty members in outside professional activities, both public and private, often serves not only the participants, but the University and the School as a whole. Indeed, for professional schools like the Kennedy School, the engagement of the faculty in the work of their profession may be particularly important and contributory to the School's overall quality and achievement.

(Adds emphasis to one line in Paragraph 2 of FAS to reflect KSG's status as professional school, and to bring into closer alignment with the Business School's Outside Activities Committee Report)

4. While the involvement of faculty members in outside professional activities is often beneficial, it can also create circumstances in which legitimate interests of the University or the School are, or appear to be, adversely affected. These circumstances fall into three broad categories.

a. Conflicts of Interest

The first relates to conventional conflicts of interest -- situations in which members of the School have the opportunity to influence the University's financial decisions or interests in ways that could lead to personal gain or give improper advantage to their associates. This category also includes those situations where faculty members face a decision about whether to carry on an activity either within or outside the auspices of the School, and where this decision has financial implications for the faculty member and the school. In particular, if a faculty member is about to engage in an activity privately for personal gain that could just as easily be done through the auspices of the school, and particularly if that activity is advantaged by the faculty member's association with Harvard, or uses KSG resources, then faculty members have an obligation to consult with the Academic Dean about this decision.

b. Conflicts of Commitment

The second is concerned with conflicts of commitment -- situations in which members' external activities, often valuable in themselves, interfere, or appear to interfere with their paramount obligations to students, colleagues, and the School. This category includes those situations where outside interests and obligations become so compelling, that it becomes difficult for the faculty member to live up to his or her obligations to the school, or to maintain the confidence and trust of his or her colleagues.

c. Conflicts of Value

The third is concerned with conflicts of value -- situations in which the outside activities of the faculty member are inconsistent with, or appear to be inconsistent with, the most important values of the University and the School. [Two different kinds of situations create conflicts of value.]

[In one kind of situation, the faculty member involves himself, as an individual, in a relationship with people who have important political or policy interests, and then publishes material that bears on the interests of those people without indicating that he has a prior relationship with the interested parties. Such conduct raises doubts

about the objectivity of the work which has been produced, and is analogous to the threats to objectivity associated with outside sponsored research in which the sponsors have an interest in the outcome. To protect the overall reputation of the faculty, faculty members should always disclose such relationships when they publish their work. They should also take steps to encourage wide peer review of their work prior to and following publication even if that is not required of the medium in which they are publishing. They should also take steps to encourage wide peer review of their work prior to and following publication even if that is not required of the medium in which they are publishing.]

The second kind of situation is even more difficult. It involves situations where faculty members, in an individual capacity, establish working relationships with those who are commonly viewed as enemies of some of the most important values of the University including the commitment to truth seeking, to tolerance of diverse opinions, and to the encouragement of intellectual and personal freedom. Obviously, this is an extremely sensitive area where it is best to establish a strong presumption of academic and personal freedom. Yet, one can easily imagine situations in which the University or the School's reputation would be adversely affected by individual faculty members entering into relationships and undertaking work that would, in an important sense, cast doubt on the quality and virtue of the institution as a whole.

Given the extreme sensitivity of this second kind of situation that creates "conflicts of value", no particular rules are established. Instead, we define this area as an area where individual faculty members must appeal to their own conscience, taking into account the impact that their actions will have on their colleagues and their institution.

(Substantially re-written version of paragraph 4 of FAS rules. Re-written to clarify nature of conflicts of interest and commitment that could arise particularly in the context of the Kennedy School. Also, new area of concern added -- namely, Conflicts of Value. This addition makes our regulations in this domain of the individual conduct of faculty members more consistent with our regulation of outside sponsored research, and the acceptance of gifts. It also is responsive to the greater sensitivity and visibility of the work we do in the professional domain during our private time.)

5. Given that outside professional activities undertaken by individual faculty members could harm as well as benefit collective purposes of the Faculty, the University and the School, it is proper that such activities come under some

scrutiny and guidance. At the same time, to protect the academic freedom and personal privacy of faculty members, we should seek to avoid cumbersome and intrusive methods of regulation of their legitimate external activities. Teachers and scholars are given great freedom in scheduling their activities with the understanding that their external activities will enhance the quality of their direct contributions to the University. Officers of instruction who fulfill their primary full-time duties -- teaching at the School, conducting objective and valuable research under its sponsorship, and meeting the other obligations to students and colleagues that faculty must share -- should be granted a presumption of freedom and responsibility.

(This paragraph is assembled from pieces of paragraphs 2 and 3 of the FAS document)

6. Instead of developing a system of specific rules governing conflicts of interest, commitments, and values, and an elaborate oversight procedure for enforcing them, the School has adopted a more consultative and informational approach to the regulation of outside activities. This consists of the following elements:

(This system is adapted from paragraphs 4 and 5 of the FAS document)

a. The Standing Committee on Professional Values and Research Integrity

A Standing Committee on Professional Values and Research Integrity will be created by the Dean and the Academic Dean with representation from the School's Faculty. It should have the following responsibilities.

First, [the individuals assigned to the committee should be available to individual faculty members who, under these guidelines, seek consultation and informal advice about their responsibilities. Such consultations should ordinarily be the first step taken by individual faculty members who believe they might have a problem.]

Second, the committee, meeting as a committee, can be asked to deal with specific cases of misconduct by individual faculty members that cannot be resolved in informal discussions with the Academic Dean.

Third, the committee, meeting as a committee, should seek to develop ways of educating faculty members about the nature of their responsibilities to the school (including the development and promulgation of a kind of case law that reveals good and bad examples of faculty conduct).

Fourth, the committee meeting as a committee should advise the Dean and the Academic Dean of any needed changes and policies and procedures governing conflicts of interest, commitment, and value.

(Note: this Standing Committee should include members who overlap with the Gifts Policy Committee to minimize the number of particular committees necessary to implement the various provisions of these new guidelines, and to allow for the most rapid accumulation of expertise and case law in these domains.)

b. Annual Reporting of Outside Professional Activities.

At the beginning and at the end of each academic year, faculty members at the school should file a report describing their commitments and obligations to those outside the School [including time in the summer if they are being paid by the university for their summer work.] The most important are those that involve outside paid activities. In addition, however, faculty members should report unpaid activities that will take a substantial amount of time (say, more than ten days) over the course of the year.

(This is a new provision necessary to implement the procedures. It follows the practice at the Business School that asks for the information in advance and in retrospect. It also extends the reporting requirements to include substantial work not for pay.)

As a matter of ordinary practice, no more than 20% of a faculty member's overall professional effort should be committed to outside work for pay. In calculating that amount, the time required for preparation and travel should be included.

(This provision makes formal what has been an informal rule. It also uses the Business School accounting practices which include preparation and travel time.)

c. Annual Reporting of Potential Conflicts of Interest, Commitment and Value

Each year, at the same time that faculty file reports on outside professional activities, they should file a report indicating areas where they, or others, might see a potential conflict of interest, commitment or value. Ordinarily, this would include substantial financial interests in areas that might be affected by their research conclusions, continuing financial or professional relationships with people or organizations that have strong, visible interests in the areas where one is conducting

research, and firm stands that one has taken in areas where one is intending to continue to do research. The purpose of such statements would be to heighten faculty member's sensitivities about such matters, and to begin to build a base of case law. These statements should be reviewed by the Standing Committee on Professional Values and Research Integrity.

(This is a new provision that is necessary to ensure that faculty members are sufficiently aware of potential conflicts of interest in undertaking outside sponsored research in the school. It follows what has become standard practice at the National Academy of Sciences for those who serve on Panels and Committees.)

d. Guidelines for Consultation

It is assumed that minor conflicts of interest, commitment and value will still be resolved primarily through individual discretion or informal administrative adjustment. However, if a member is engaged in an outside activity that could lead to serious conflict, it is mandatory that he or she inform the School of this possibility by consulting with the Academic Dean, or with the Chairman of the Committee on Professional Conduct. Whenever members have doubts about whether some outside activity may involve a conflict of interest or commitment, they are expected to seek such consultation either formally from the Associate Dean, or informally from members of the Committee on Professional Conduct.

In the absence of specific rules (beyond the requirement for consultation) and in light of the difficulty of applying general statements of principle to specific cases, Table 1 presents a sampling of activities that may present conflicts of interest or commitment. They are divided into three different categories:

- 1) Activities that are ordinarily clearly permissible and do not require consultation;
- 2) Activities that should be discussed with the Academic Dean or the Chairman of the Committee on Professional Responsibility even though the problems they present can probably be resolved, often simply by ensuring that the appropriate authorities know all the pertinent facts;
- 3) Activities that should be brought to the attention of the Academic Dean or the Chairman of the Committee on Professional Responsibility and that appear to present such serious problems that the burden of demonstrating their compatibility with University and School policy rests with the faculty member.

4) If a faculty member is in doubt about whether consultation is required, and what particular kind, he or she should seek out members of the Committee on Professional responsibility for informal discussions.

Obviously, the list of examples presented in Table 1 does not include all potential problems and the separation into categories is somewhat arbitrary.

[Incorporate Table built from FAS examples here]

e. Penalties for Misconduct

We do not anticipate problems that cannot be resolved through effective counselling. However, on occasion the need for some penalties for failure to meet one's duties under these provisions might arise. Penalties could be appropriate as a response to failures to comply with reporting requirements as well as instances of egregious misconduct. Obviously, the sanctions should be fitted to individual cases but could range from more or less public reprimands to suspension. Such decisions would be made by the Academic Dean acting with the Committee on Professional Responsibility. An appeal to the Dean is provided for.

(This is a new paragraph simply to establish the possibility of penalties for non-compliance. This is consistent with the Medical School's Statement on Conflicts and Commitment)

Appendix B

Kennedy School of Government's Policies Relating to Outside Sponsored Research Projects

(This statement borrows the format and much of the language from the Faculty of Medicine's Statement on Research Sponsored by Industry. It draws additional language and substantive positions from the University's Policies Relating to Sponsored Research, and from Bill Hogan's Memo entitled Guidelines for Funding Policy Research)

I. Preamble

The Kennedy School of Government welcomes externally supported research agreements because they can stimulate its investigators, promote the development and transfer of important policy ideas, and provide the School with valuable support. At the same time, it recognizes the need to avoid arrangements that might compromise, or seem to compromise, its intellectual principles and purposes and the freedom of inquiry the members of the faculty enjoy. As an institution, the School benefits from external research funds and the public's trust, and it has an obligation to develop its research findings with concern for the public's interest.

(This paragraph is virtually identical to the first paragraph of the Medical School statement)

This "Statement of Policies Relating to Sponsored Research Projects" outlines some general principles that should govern the undertaking of outside sponsored research. By "outside sponsored research" we include all research agreements including activities supported by government, foundations, professional associations, private industry, and private individuals. Whereas other schools may distinguish among these different kinds of outside sponsors, and focus their concerns primarily on arrangements with private, commercial institutions, and less on government and foundations (trusting in the public interest character of these institutions), the Kennedy School must be equally concerned about these other institutions.

The reason is that we understand that the government and foundations may have some biases as to our research work which focuses on important questions of public policy, and that we may be as vulnerable to influences from these outside sponsors as from private industry. We can be a

little less concerned about the issue of exclusive research and patents than other parts of the University for it is a little less likely that the knowledge we develop in the course of our research work will be patentable. Still, we retain the general responsibility to do our work in the open without infringements on publication, and to develop the value of our findings in the public interest as rapidly as possible.

(These two paragraphs adapt a paragraph of the Medical School statement for the particular circumstances of the Kennedy School)

I. Balancing Individual Academic Freedom with Institutional Interests in Outside Sponsored Research

The principle of academic freedom establishes the rights of scholars to determine the subject matter, conclusions, and sponsorship of their own research, and protects them from having criteria or goals imposed on their work other than those that apply to their profession. As a matter of principle, there should be as little infringement on the individual scholars right to undertake outside sponsored research as possible. The principal means by which the School as a whole can best exercise control over the quality of its research activities is through its role in selecting its own members, and through the processes of external peer review to which all scholars are subject.

(This is a clarification of principle 1 of the University's Policies Relating to Sponsored Projects)

While the principle of academic freedom is paramount in assuring the quality of outside sponsored research, the University and the School both have some interests that must be protected in accepting and conducting outside sponsored research. Some of these have to do with protecting the individual scholar who seeks the funds from undue pressures and restrictions. Others have to do with guarding the University and the School from the appearance or the reality of compromised objectivity, or dishonorable associations. Still others have to do with ensuring that important social values such as the obligations to avoid inflicting harm on individuals, to respect individual privacy, and to refuse to treat people and animals as instrumental objects are not outraged in the conduct of the research. And still others have to do with ensuring that the School operates in a way that protects the rights and capabilities of all its individual members to engage in scholarship, and that it does not unwittingly contribute to the degradation of the overall environment of the scholarly community which it represents.

(This paragraph is new and establishes the principle reasons for the Faculty and the School to be interested in regulating the conduct of outside sponsored research)

To ensure that outside sponsored research is consistent with the principles of the University and the School, some principles defining the proper scope and purposes of these activities must be articulated, and some procedures established to insure that faculty members understand their obligations. It is important to understand the character of the proposed oversight. The principles must be seen as guidelines rather than as black letter law. The procedures must be understood as a mechanism through which individual faculty members can obtain consultation about how to do their work in a way that does not damage the legitimate interests of the University and the School, or interfere with their colleagues' interests. It is only this form of oversight that is consistent with the protection of academic freedom, and with the development of a culture of mutual responsibility for the healthful develop of the School.

(This paragraph is new and sets out the KSG's approach to the regulation of outside sponsored research.)

II. The Motivations for Research: Avoiding Conflicts of Commitment and the Potential for Bias

Faculty members have a responsibility to maintain the scholarly character of their research. It should be directed at subjects which have wide and enduring intellectual value, or could make important contributions to the public interest. They should avoid being diverted towards subjects that have nothing more than commercial value or immediate policy fashion to commend them. These obligations are consistent with occupying a position within the School and the University.

Outside sponsored research should also be conducted in a way that avoids bias, and, to the degree possible, the appearance of bias. This is particularly important in cases where there is some larger relationship between the outside sponsor and the individual faculty member, and where the outside sponsor has particular interests in the outcomes of the proposed research. For example, if the faculty member has an on-going private consulting relationship with the outside sponsor in addition to research support; or if the faculty member has been supported over a long period of time almost exclusively by a particular outside sponsor; there is a risk that the research he conducts will be biased; or be perceived to be biased.

In these situations, it is important that that larger relationship be disclosed in the process of reviewing the proposal (see Policies Regulating Conflicts of Interest and Commitment), and that any questions about the propriety of undertaking the research be resolved between with the Research Committee or the Dean before the School and the University accepts the proposal. In many such cases, special arrangements would have to be made in the conduct of the research to guard against perceived or actual bias.

(These paragraphs are adapted from the Faculty of Medicine's Statement on Research Sponsored by Industry, first two paragraphs under "II. Motivation for Research")

III. Maintaining the Quality and Integrity of the Research

The distinction between fundamental intellectual inquiry and commercially motivated enterprises is not always clear and no clear line of demarcation can be stipulated in advance. Many, indeed most, scholars at the School are committed to studying policy instruments and governmental processes whose primary purpose is to benefit the health and welfare of society. Many such projects will produce results that have social or commercial utility, and can be used to produce individual fame and fortune as well as value for the society. Once this result has occurred, no one will know for sure what the scholars' original motivations were, and they might well become vulnerable to the charge that they were badly motivated.

Nor is it always clear when a research project has been conducted in an unbiased way. The principal guarantees of quality remain the process of selecting faculty members, maintaining mechanisms that insure their participation in and control over research projects, and the processes of peer review following publication. But these mechanisms cannot always be relied upon -- particularly when one is engaged in policy research where the standards for appointing faculty, and the criteria and mechanisms of peer review are less fully developed than they are in more traditional academic disciplines.

(The above paragraphs have been adapted from the Medical School's Statement on Research Sponsored by Industry, Section III. Quality of Research)

To ensure the quality of research, and to guard against the reality or appearance of bias in conducting the research, the School has adopted the following principles and guidelines:

1. Since the primary assurance of the quality of research carried out under University and School auspices

stems from the scholarly qualifications required of individual principal investigators, only faculty members of the school can be permitted to be principal investigators. [Some grants and gifts to the school are not, strictly speaking, for research. For these activities, administrative officers of the school may be authorized as Principal Investigators, or the Directors of the project.]

(This is a new provision, and returns to what had been our practice in the past. It is consistent with the principles articulated in the recent Report of the Ad Hoc Committee on Research Centers -- otherwise known as the Ellwood Committee Report)

2. To ensure that process of peer review works, appropriately, and that individual faculty members feel appropriately accountable for their conduct, any results obtained and any papers published or lectures given by investigators on research grants will be treated as the sole responsibility of the investigator concerned. Neither Harvard nor the Kennedy School provides any institutional endorsement of the work of the sponsor or the principal investigator. All those who sign the research product as authors, including, in particular, the senior investigators listed as authors, will be responsible for the integrity of the research.

(This is taken from the Medical School's Statement on Research Sponsored by Industry, Section III. Item C. It also adds a provision that is designed to promote closer quality control over the contents of jointly authored works by senior academics by holding them strictly accountable for the work that they sign. To say that they did not review the work before publication should not be an excuse.)

3. Maximum reliance should be made on the peer review processes of the outside agencies to assess the substantive quality of the proposed research rather than on the internal review of proposals. Since many governmental agencies and foundations do conduct serious peer reviews of proposals before funding, the School's internal review in those cases can be relatively perfunctory. In situations where the substantive character of the proposal will not be subjected to peer review processes, however, it is the duty of the faculty member who is the applicant to alert the School's Research Committee to this fact so that the Research Committee can undertake a more exacting internal substantive review. This is to prevent the school from becoming committed to carrying out a research project whose methods are seriously flawed.

(This is taken from the Medical School's Statement, Section III. Item B.)

4. The source of sponsorship and the purpose of the research must be of such a nature that they can be publicly disclosed.

(This is taken from the University's Policies Relating to Sponsored Projects, Principle 3. It substitutes for the Medical School Statement, Section I.)

5. All research projects must be undertaken with clear understanding that the investigators concerned have the full right to publish any result obtained by them, subject only to established safeguards for the protection of privacy or confidentiality of personal data.

(This is taken from the University's Policies, Principle 5.)

6. The sources of funding, and the people who have influenced the research with comments and suggestions, should always be disclosed.

(This is taken from Bill Hogan's Memo, "Guidelines for Funding Policy Research")

7. On particularly controversial subjects, it will ordinarily be desirable to include funding from several different sources, and to create both a "Board of Advisors" to accommodate people with diverse interests, and a "Research Advisory Committee" to review the research plan, and offer critiques as the research is conducted.

(This provision is taken from Bill Hogan's "Guidelines")

IV. Maintaining the Quality of the Research Environment of the School, and the Values of the Institution

In undertaking outside sponsored research, there is always the concern that the interests and pressures created by the outside sponsors will, in some important way, contaminate the general environment of the school, and sacrifice important values of the institution in ways other than influencing the orientations of individual faculty members, or the execution of particular research projects. It is possible, for example, that the School could become too dependent on outside sponsored research, and that that would skew the School's overall research focus, and leave some important potential areas of research neglected. There is also the worry that constraints imposed by the outside sponsors such as a requirement for secrecy would not only frustrate the ordinary processes of peer review on which the School relies so heavily to assure quality, but also frustrate the free exchange of information which is the

distinction of an academic institution. Finally, there is the worry that the research might be conducted in ways that sacrifice important social values. To deal with these varied threats to the School, the following guidelines have been adopted.

(This section is new and integrates ideas from both the Medical School and the University)

1. To ensure that communications remain open throughout the School, and between the School and the larger world, the School will not accept research which carries security classification, requires security clearance of School personnel, or otherwise precludes the general publication of results. Nor will it undertake to grant any special or exclusive information to a research sponsor. The results of the School's work must be available to all.

(This provision combines rules against secret and proprietary research that appear in the Medical School's Statement, and the University's Policies.)

2. To insure that the overall pattern of research not be skewed towards those topics for which there is current policy interest and funds to back them up, the Research Committee of the School should conduct an annual review of the aggregate pattern of outside research, and seek to identify any areas in which research seems to be becoming excessively concentrated, or is being entirely neglected. Their report to the Dean should trigger consideration of some internal funding of neglected areas of research.

(This is new and responds to a frequently expressed concern at the Kennedy School)

3. All research projects undertaken by the School must conform to the University's policies regulating human and animal experimentation, and the use of any hazardous procedures or substances.

(This provision incorporates provisions from both the Medical School's Statement, and the University's Policies)

4. Any employment of students in outside sponsored research projects must contribute, and be perceived to contribute, to their scholarly development. As part of the regular review of KSG Research Centers it is important that the use of students in sponsored research projects be considered against this criterion.

(This provision adapts a provision from the Medical School's Statement for use at the Kennedy School)

V. The Process of Review

Outside sponsored research comes under review in three different ways at three different stages. Each particular project is reviewed in advance of the research agreement between the outside sponsor and the School being finalized. In addition, a project may come under review if some significant concerns arise in the course of the project. Finally, the Research Centers that rely on outside sponsored research should be routinely evaluated to insure that the quality of their work remains high, and that they have not developed too close a relationship with any particular funding source or interest.

(This paragraph is new and proposes a three step process of review of outside sponsored research. The University and the Medical School have procedures only for the initial review of applications. We have set out procedures that call for a more extensive prior review, and also some procedures that allow for the review of on-going projects, and for the regular, routine review of research centers in which outside sponsored research is conducted.)

A. Prior Review of Proposed Research

The normal process of prior review of proposed outside sponsored research is conducted by the Chairman of the School's Research Committee, the Kennedy School's Financial Office, the Dean of the Kennedy School, the Office for Sponsored Research, and the Administrative Vice President of the University. The final research agreement must be accepted by the President and Fellows.

The extent of the prior review will vary. The general practice is to trust the judgment of the principal investigator. Proposals are almost never turned down internally, but they may be modified on an informal basis. As noted above in section III, a close internal review is particularly important in situations where the research proposal is being submitted to a process that does not include close peer review. Faculty members are required to alert the Research Committee to this fact.

The factors taken into consideration in the School's review of research proposals include the following:

- 1) Inclusion in the budget of all costs legitimately chargeable to the project, such as fringe benefits, indirect costs, computer time, etc.
- 2) Commitments to personnel that are inconsistent with the general practices of the School, or

commitments for the future which are inconsistent with the terms of appointment of the principal investigator;

3) Commitments, explicit or implied, on the unrestricted funds available to the School as a whole;

4) Aspects that might call for further review such as potential bias, or experiments on human subject.

(This section is adapted from the University's Policies, specifically, the section that outlines Principle 1 that says that all outside sponsored research must have the sanction of the University)

A particularly important aspect of this review is the part that focuses on potential bias. Several features of the relationship between the principal investigator, the funding source, and the subject of research should ordinarily trigger a very close review, and the establishments of requirements to use some of the School's most powerful mechanisms for guarding against bias, or the appearance of bias. These conditions include:

1. Joint sponsor and researcher self interest (i.e. situations where the sponsored research is almost entirely supported by a client with a strong, well-defined, and immediate financial or political self interest in the outcome of the research project, and where the researcher has a separate, on-going financial or professional relationship with the sponsor that is of direct financial and professional benefit to the researcher)

2. Strong client self interest (i.e. situations where the research is sponsored almost entirely by a single client who has a strong, clear, and immediate financial or political interest in the outcome of the research)

3. Strong researcher self interest (i.e. situations where the researcher has a strong, clear, and immediate financial or professional interest in the outcome of the research project)

Note that, to some degree, these conditions are arranged in a hierarchy of threats to objectivity and integrity. But it is also true, that cases will vary in difficulty within these different kinds of relationships according to the strength of the various interests.

The devices that the school has to protect its integrity even in situations characterized by these relations include the following:

1. A decision not to undertake the research
2. A requirement that the research not be undertaken without additional sources of funding.
3. A requirement that the research be undertaken only with the creation of some internal or external research advisory committee.
4. A requirement that the researchers and clients disclose their relationship, or the interests, or the previous positions that seem to threaten the objectivity of their conclusions.

(This review process for specially sensitive outside research projects is new, and designed to meet some special problems of the Kennedy School)

B. Review of Complaints

These describe the ordinary processes of review in advance of undertaking a project. To complete the mechanisms of review, one must, in addition have some procedures for responding to concerns about objectivity that arise in the course of particular research projects (complaints).

5) [Many complaints can be disposed of with the most cursory of reviews. If they are casually made; if they allege problems that were known at the outset of the research and adequate measures were installed to prevent conflicts of interest introducing bias into the research results, and nothing has changed in the interim; if there is no basis for the claim being made and the faculty member involved has carried out complicated contentious research in the past; all that would be necessary is to establish these facts, and the complaint could be considered answered.]

6) [Other complaints that claim a more serious problem and do so credibly may be responded to with a more sustained investigation. This would include situations where the initial review of the project turned out to be flawed, or where the situation changed in some material respect but the change did not trigger an adjustment in the mechanisms for guarding against bias, or where a question arose about compliance with the agreed to conditions. While such circumstances could justify a review, that review should be conducted with the aim of

protecting the internal and external reputation of the faculty members involved, and in maintaining the spirit of trust and collegiality that must mark an academic enterprise if it is to succeed.]

7) When the complaint includes evidence beyond the mere appearance of a conflict of important errors in the work indicative of bias, then it would be proper for the Chairman of the Research Committee or the Dean to develop special mechanisms to review the quality of the work.

(This provision is new and designed to meet some special problems in the Kennedy School)

C. Routine Review of Research Centers

In addition to prior review of proposals, and responses to complaints, the School should have some mechanism for reviewing the cumulative impact of outside research on the institution. We have already recommended that as part of the annual review of research carried out by the School's Research Committee, a report should be made to the Dean about key areas of research that should be considered high priority for internal funding. In addition, however, we also think it would be desirable to conduct reviews of the Research Centers in which much of the School's outside sponsored research will probably be conducted. Consequently, we propose that:

8) Each Research Center or Program at the Kennedy School that relies on outside sponsored research be reviewed at least every five years by an external review committee composed of both academics and reflective practitioners. That review should focus on the quantity, quality, and utility of the research activities of the Center.

(This provision is new and is designed to meet some special problems of the Kennedy School. It is also consistent with recommendations of the Ellwood Committee Report)

Appendix C

Kennedy School of Government's Policies Regulating the Acceptance of Gifts from Donors

The Kennedy School of Government is grateful for the generosity of those who contribute financially to its purposes. Such gifts allow the School to operate with the independence and scale that are necessary to fulfill the promise of an outstanding professional school of government.

At the same time, the donors, the faculty, and the administration of the school must all understand that they should not undermine the fundamental principles of the University in soliciting or accepting gifts. Three key principles govern the solicitation and acceptance of gifts:

First, there should be nothing in the solicitation or acceptance of a gift that abridges the fundamental "four freedoms" of the University: the freedom to appoint its own faculty; the freedom to conduct research; the freedom to select students; and the freedom to teach.

Second, the School should avoid appearing to honor individuals or organizations that have behaved ignobly, or attacked important democratic and human values.

Third, the School should treat its donors with respect and interest, take their advice and counsel seriously, and live up to the commitments that the School makes to them.

To ensure that the first and second principles are adhered to, the School has established a Gifts Policy Committee to advise the Dean on the propriety of large gifts (over \$100,000), and those that may be seen as controversial or unusual. The Committee comprises three faculty members and two administrators. The Committee works in tandem with the University's Gifts Policy Committee composed of 5 senior administrators that reviews unusual or potentially controversial gifts throughout Harvard.