

July 19, 2013

Helene Hill, Ph.D.
Professor, Department of Radiology
Rutgers New Jersey Medical School

Dear Dr. Hill:

The Dean's Office has received a complaint regarding your most recent actions directed at Dr. Roger Howell and Dr. Anupam Bishayee concerning their findings and publication of research data relative to Bystander effects caused by non-uniform distributions of DNA-incorporated ¹²⁵I. Having reviewed the long history of your dispute with Drs. Howell and Bishayee regarding the efficacy of this data, our Office has found that your allegations involving research integrity against Drs. Howell and Bishayee were reviewed repeatedly, and dismissed uniformly as unfounded, by both scientific and non-scientific neutral bodies, including the Federal District Court of New Jersey and the 3rd Circuit Court of Appeals. A copy of the District Court's decision and the 3rd Circuit's affirmance are attached.¹

As you are well aware, your participation and membership in an academic profession carries with it special responsibilities. To that end, your bargaining unit, the American Association of University Professors, has issued many policy statements over the years to guide its members. Chief among these is the AAUP's *Statement on Professional Ethics*. I quote from *The Statement* at Paragraph 3:

As colleagues, professors have obligations that derive from common membership in the community of scholars. Professors do not discriminate against or harass colleagues. They respect and defend free inquiry of associates. In the exchange of criticism and ideas, professors show due respect for the opinions of others. Professors acknowledge academic debt and strive to be objective in their professional judgment of colleagues.

¹Our review has revealed that you have brought this issue before the following bodies, and your allegations were unfounded by all of them:

- UMDNJ Campus Committee on Research Integrity
- NIH Office of Research Integrity
- UMDNJ Campus Committee on Research Integrity (second time)
- US Federal courts all the way to the Third Circuit of Appeals
- NIH Office of Research Integrity (second time)
- UMDNJ Campus Committee on Research Integrity (third time)
- Nature (Journal)
- PLoS One (Journal)
- Radiation Research (Journal)
- Annals of Applied Statistics (Journal)
- Accountability in Research (Journal)

In this same vein, the AAUP's *Statement of the Association's Counsel: Freedom and Responsibility* contains the following language:

Membership in the academic community imposes on students, faculty members, Administrators, and trustees an obligation to respect the dignity of others, to acknowledge their right to express differing opinions, and to foster and defend Intellectual honesty, freedom of inquiry and instruction, and free expression on and off campus. The expression of dissent and the attempt to produce change, therefore, may not be carried out in ways that injure individuals or damage institutional facilities or disrupt the classes of one's teachers or colleagues.

Your continued pursuit of this disputed issue for so many years and to so many different tribunals, every one of which have rejected your claims, compromises the precepts cited above, and is, moreover, inconsistent with the conduct expected of NJMS faculty and an AAUP member. Therefore, I am issuing to you this formal Letter of Reprimand. Moreover, because your actions towards your colleagues also represent conduct unbecoming a member of the faculty of this University you are directed that this harassing and disruptive behavior must now cease; and, you are advised that further incidents of this unprofessional and non-collegial conduct will subject you to additional disciplinary action, up to and including termination of your employment at Rutgers New Jersey Medical School.

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in blue ink, appearing to be 'R. Johnson', followed by a horizontal line extending to the right.

Robert L. Johnson, MD, FAAP
The Sharon and Joseph L. Muscarelle Endowed Dean