

MEMORANDUM

To:

Donna E. Shalala, President

From:

Date:

March 28, 2006

Subject: Faculty Senate Legislation #2005-13(B) - Modification of the Faculty Manual

regarding Misconduct in Research Policy (Addendum to Legislation #2005-04(B)

approved on 12/28/05)

The Faculty Senate, at its December 14, 2005 meeting, voted unanimously to approve the modification to the Faculty Manual pertaining to the Misconduct in Research Policy to match the newly revised federal rules. This was approved with the understanding that the policy needed clarifications and/or modifications other than those required by federal law, and that a revised policy responding to these concerns would be brought forward to the Senate. You approved that legislation on December 28, 2005.

At its March 22, 2006 meeting, the Faculty Senate voted unanimously to approve additional proposed modifications that incorporate the clarifications and modifications as noted above to be integrated with the policy as approved in December.

The additional changes to the Faculty Manual are shown as underlined additions and strikethrough deletions in the enclosed document. For your reference, a clean version of the document that incorporates all of the changes is also enclosed.

This legislation is now forwarded to you for your action.

MC/kl

cc:

Thomas LeBlanc, Executive Vice President and Provost

Norman Altman, Vice Provost for Research

email: facsen@miami.edu

Faculty Senate Legislation #2005-13(B) — Modification of the Faculty Manual regarding Misconduct in Research Policy (Addendum to Legislation #2005-04(B) approved on12/28/05)

PRESIDENT'S RESPONSE

APPROVED: DATE:
OFFICE OR INDIVIDUAL TO IMPLEMENT: <u>Senate Office to Update Manual</u>
EFFECTIVE DATE OF LEGISLATION: (if other than June 1 next following)
NOT APPROVED AND REFERRED TO:
REMARKS (IF NOT APPROVED):

[a clean version of the proposed modifications is includes at the end of this document]

POLICIES AND PROCEDURES OF THE UNIVERSITY OF MIAMI RELATING TO ALLEGATIONS OF MISCONDUCT IN RESEARCH

Research in an institution such as the University of Miami is grounded upon the principles of academic freedom and mutual trust. The fostering of inquiry and creativity requires an atmosphere in which all are presumed to adhere to high ethical standards in the conduct of research and other academic pursuits. Misconduct in research is a fundamental violation of this trust and represents an assault upon the integrity of the University community.

Acts of misconduct are fortunately rare events, but because of the seriousness of such-allegations of misconduct and the special responsibilities of the University in such circumstances, both to individual researchers and to society, it is recognized that explicit procedures must be provided for dealing with instances of alleged misconduct. It is the purpose of this document to outline the policies and procedures that will be followed in the investigation and reporting of allegations of research misconduct at the University of Miami.

In establishing these procedures, however, it must be emphasized that the best mechanism for dealing with misconduct is to prevent it. Thus it is imperative that those who participate in research reaffirm their responsibility for the ethical conduct of all research activities with which they are associated. Principal investigators, laboratory supervisors and others who lead research <u>must recognize their ultimate responsibility</u> for the authenticity of research conducted and published in their names and realize that they must provide adequate supervision for their trainees and research teams. It is also their responsibility to see that all persons who have contributed to the research receive appropriate credit for their work. It is incumbent upon collaborators and other contributors to research to understand that the inclusion of their names as co-authors of publications reflects a genuine contribution to the work, and signifies that they have approved the publication and are prepared to accept responsibility for the work reported.

In order to respond to allegations regarding the integrity of any published report, adequate records of the original protocols and research records, including all raw data, must be preserved for at least seven years (or longer if required by the funding agency), so they can be made available for inspection.

This policy is applicable to research misconduct arising from research conducted at the University, and/or conducted by University faculty and employees, including misconduct involving: (1)

Applications or proposals for support for extramural or intramural research, research training or activities related to that research or research training, such as the operation of tissue and data banks and the dissemination of research information; (2) Supported extramural or intramural research; (3) Supported extramural or intramural research training programs; (4) Supported extramural or intramural or intra

Page 1 of 12	lanced 00 1 1 4000
	<u>Issued 28 July 1988</u>
	Revised 30 January 1996
	Revised 1 May 2002
	Revised 22 March 2006

produced in the course of supported research, research training or activities related to that research or research training. This includes any research proposed, performed, reviewed, or reported or any research record generated from that research, regardless of whether an application or proposal for funds resulted in a grant, contract, cooperative agreement, or other form of extramural or intramural support

This policy applies only to research misconduct occurring within six years of the date the University receives an allegation of research misconduct, unless (1) the respondent continues or renews any incident of alleged research misconduct that occurred before the six-year limitation through the citation, republication or other use, for the potential benefit of the respondent, of the research record that is alleged to have been fabricated, falsified, or plagiarized, or (2) the institution University, following consultation with the Office of Research Integrity Interinafter "ORI"]"), determines that the alleged misconduct, if it occurred, would possibly have a substantial adverse effect on the health or safety of the public. In the event the alleged misconduct occurred outside the time limit described above, the matter should be referred to the Committee on Professional Conduct.

Definitions

Research means a systematic experiment, study, evaluation, demonstration or survey designed to develop or contribute to general knowledge (basic research) or specific knowledge (applied research). Research, as used herein, includes all basic, and applied, and demonstration research in all fields of science, engineering, mathematics and other disciplines. This includes, but is not limited to, research in economics, education, the humanities, linguistics, medicine, nursing, psychology, the natural and social sciences, engineering, mathematics and statistics, and includes any research involving human subjects or animals.

Research misconduct means fabrication, falsification, or plagiarism in proposing, performing, or reviewing research, or in reporting research results. Fabrication is making up data or results and recording or reporting them. Falsification is manipulating research materials, equipment, or processes, or changing or omitting data or results such that the research is not accurately represented in the research record. Plagiarism is the appropriation of another person's ideas, processes, results, or words without giving appropriate credit. Plagiarism may also include self-plagiarism. Self-plagiarism refers to the author's re-use of their earlier work and passing it off as new or original material. Research misconduct does not include honest error or honest differences of opinion.

 Research record means the record of data or results that embody the facts resulting from scientific inquiry, including but not limited to, research proposals, laboratory records, both physical and electronic, progress reports, abstracts, theses, oral presentations, chapters, books, audio or video; tapes, CD's CDs, internal reports, journal articles, and any documents and materials provided to institution or an institutional the University or to a University official by a respondent in the course of the research misconduct proceeding.

Page 2 of 12	Issued 28 July 1988
	Revised 30 January 1996
	Revised 1 May 2002
	Revised 22 March 2006

Research involving PHS support means: (i) Applications or proposals for PHS support for biomedical or behavioral extramural or intramural research, research training or activities related to that research or research training, such as the operation of tissue and data banks and the dissemination of research information; (ii) PHS supported biomedical or behavior extramural or intramural research; (iii) PHS supported biomedical or behavioral extramural or intramural research training programs; (iv) PHS supported extramural or intramural activities that are related to biomedical or behavioral research or research training, such as the operation of tissue and data banks or the dissemination of research information; and (v) Plagiarism of research records produced in the course of PHS supported research, research training or activities related to that research or research training. This includes any research proposed, performed, reviewed, or reported or any research record generated from that research, regardless of whether an application or proposal for PHS funds resulted in a grant, contract, cooperative agreement, or other form of PHS support. Research support means funding, or applications or proposals, for research, research training, or activities related to that research or training, that may be provided through: (1) funding for intramural or extramural research by grants, cooperative agreements, or contracts; or (2) subgrants or subcontracts under those funding instruments; or (3) salary or other payments under those grants, cooperative agreements, or contracts.

Research misconduct means fabrication, falsification, or plagiarism in proposing, performing, or reviewing research, or in reporting research results. Fabrication is making up data or results and recording or reporting them. Falsification is manipulating research materials, equipment, or processes, or changing or omitting data or results such that the research is not accurately represented in the research record. Plagiarism is the appropriation of another person's ideas, processes, results, or words without giving appropriate credit. Plagiarism may also include self-plagiarism. Research misconduct does not include honest error or honest differences of opinion.

.23

The Committee to Investigate Misconduct in Research

The Committee to Investigate Misconduct in Research (hereinafter referred to as the Committee) is charged with the responsibility of investigating allegations of research misconduct by members of the academic community of the University of Miami. It is the Committee's responsibility to determine if allegations of research misconduct can be substantiated, to insure ensure that the relevant authorities are informed of the existence and progress of any formal investigations, to make a final report on the findings of investigations, and to recommend appropriate action to the dean of the seheolSchool or eollegeCollege and to the Provost.

The Committee shall be <u>drawn from</u> a standing body (<u>the "pool"</u>) consisting of <u>six-twenty-one</u> tenured members of the faculty appointed by the Provost. There shall be at least <u>one member three members</u> from each of the three major campuses <u>represented in the pool</u>. Membership terms <u>in the pool</u> are for non-renewable three <u>year termsyears</u> and shall be staggered-such that there are two new members each academic year. Members whose terms are ending while a specific matter is under consideration shall continue to serve for the duration of that matter. The Assistant Provost for Research Standards shall be an ex-officio member of the committee. The members of the committee The Vice Provost for Research shall select six members from that twenty—one member pool to serve as the Committee for each investigation.

Members of a Committee shall continue to serve for the duration of that matter. The Assistant Provost for Research Standards shall be a non-voting ex-officio member of the Committee. The members of the Committee will elect a chair to conduct the proceedings. Additional ad hoc members of the Committee with special expertise in the area of investigation may be appointed to the Committee from within or outside the full-time faculty of the school University at the request of the Committee or

by the Vice Provost for Research. Only those ad hoc members who are full-time University faculty 1 may vote. In accordance with federal law, reasonable steps shall be taken to ensure an impartial and 2 unbiased investigation to the maximum extent practicable, including participation of persons with 3 appropriate scientific expertise who do not have unresolved personal, professional, or financial 4 conflicts of interest with those involved with the inquiry or investigation. Members of the Committee 5 whose participation in the investigation of allegations against a specific individual could be construed 6 as inappropriate or who are involved in the research in question will be expected to recuse themselves 7 from such proceedings; in. In case of doubt, the Vice Provost for Research, or the Committee, by 8 majority vote, may require a member to recuse himself or herself. Reasonable steps shall be taken to ensure 9 an impartial and unbiased investigation to the maximum extent practicable, including participation of persons with 10 appropriate scientific expertise who do not have unresolved personal, professional, or financial conflicts of interest with 11 those involved with the inquiry or investigation. § 93.310(f) 12 13

In the event the Vice Provost for Research has a conflict of interest related to an allegation, he or she will recuse himself or herself. The Provost will appoint an appropriate individual to act for the Vice Provost for Research under these circumstances.

Procedures for the Investigation of Alleged Misconduct

The goal of the procedures is to investigate and resolve allegations of research misconduct in an expeditious, responsible and fair manner. The responsibility of protecting the rights and reputations of all who are involved in any investigation of research misconduct is recognized as an-very important one. For this reason, disclosure of the identity of respondents and complainants in research misconduct proceedings shall be limited, to the extent possible, to those who need to know, consistent with a thorough, competent, objective and fair research misconduct proceeding, and as required or allowed by lawstatute or required by regulation. The University shall protect, to the extent possible, the privacy of those who in good faith report apparent research misconduct and shall undertake all reasonable and practical efforts to protect the positions and reputations of any complainant, witness, or committee Committee member and to counterprevent potential or actual retaliation against these complainants, witnesses, and eommittee Committee members. Individuals responsible for carrying out any part of the research misconduct proceeding must not have unresolved personal, professional or financial conflicts of interest with the complainant, respondent or witnesses. The University and Committee shall afford the respondents, complainants and research subjects identifiable from research records or evidence confidential treatment to the extent possible. Persons accused of misconduct may consult with legal counsel, but legal counsel for neither the accused nor for the University may participate in any hearing or interview.

Steps in an investigation

14

15

16 17

18 19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

27

28

29

30

31

32

33

34

35

36 37 38

39

40

41

42

43

44

1. Allegation — Allegation means a disclosure of possible research misconduct through any means of communication. The disclosure may be by written or oral statement or other communication to an institutional official. Allegations of misconduct should normally be reported directed to the Vice Provost for Research or designee, who shall determine if an inquiry is warranted. Others who receive an allegation of misconduct should immediately

Page 4 of 12	Issued 28 July 1988
	Revised 30 January 1996
	Revised 1 May 2002
	Revised 22 March 2006

forward it to the Vice Provost for Research.

1

2

14

15

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

27

28

29 30

31

32

33

34

35

36

37 38

39

40

41

42

43

44

An inquiry is warranted if the Vice Provost for Research determines that the allegation (1) 3 2. Falls falls within the definition of research misconduct and (2) is sufficiently credible and 4 specific so that potential evidence of possible research misconduct may be identified. 5 6

Inquiry - An inquiry is an information gathering and initial fact finding process to determine 7 3. if a formal investigation of misconduct should be undertaken. An inquiry will be conducted 8 by an Inquiry Panel, made up of three tenured faculty members at largemembers chosen by the 9 Vice Provost for Research from the pool. Members who serve on the Inquiry Panel may not 10 serve on the Investigation Committee for the same matter. The Assistant Provost for 11 Research Standards shall be an a non-voting ex-officio member of the Inquiry Panel. At the 12 time of or before beginning an inquiry, the Inquiry Panel Vice Provost for Research must make a 13 good faith effort to notify in writing the presumed respondent. If the Inquiry Panel subsequently identifies additional respondents, the University must Inquiry Panel will notify the Vice Provost for Research who in turn will notify them as wellin writing. 16

> To the extent it has not already done so at the allegation stage, the University must, on or before the date on which the respondent is notified or inquiry begins, whichever is earlier, promptly take all reasonable and practical steps to (1) obtain custody of all the research records and evidence needed to conduct the research misconduct proceeding, (2) inventory the records and evidence, and (3) sequester them in a secure manner, except that, where the research records or evidence encompass scientific instruments shared by a number of users, custody may be limited to copies of the data or evidence on such instruments, so long as those copies are substantially equivalent in evidentiary value to the original data or evidence on the instruments. The University shall, where appropriate, give the respondent copies of, or reasonable, supervised access to, the research record. The University shall undertake all reasonable and practical efforts to take custody of additional research records or evidence that is discovered during the course of a research misconduct proceeding.

> An inquiry must be completed within 60 calendar days of its initiation unless circumstances clearly warrant a longer period. A draft written report shall be prepared that states what evidence was reviewed, summarizes relevant interviews, and includes the conclusions of the inquiry Inquiry Panel as to whether an investigation is warranted. An investigation is warranted if there is (1) a reasonable basis for concluding that the allegation falls within the definition of research misconduct and (2) preliminary information-gathering and preliminary fact-finding from the inquiry indicates that the allegation may have substance.

The individual(s) against whom the allegations were made shall be given a copy of the draft report of inquiry. If they wish to comment on that report, their comments must be submitted in writing to the Inquiry Panel within 14 calendar days of the date on which the individual(s) received the draft report and will be made part of the record. If the inquiry takes longer than 60 days to complete, the record of the inquiry shall include documentation of the reasons for exceeding the 60-day period.

Page 5 of 12	Issued 28 July 1988
	Revised 30 January 1996
	Revised 1 May 2002
	Revised 22 March 2006

4.

The <u>final</u> report <u>of the Inquiry Panel</u>, including any comments received from the individual(s) against whom the allegations were made, shall be sent to the Vice Provost for Research.

An investigation is warranted if there is (1) A reasonable basis for concluding that the allegation falls within the definition of research misconduct and (2) Preliminary information-gathering and preliminary fact-finding from the inquiry indicates that the allegation may have substance.

_The reasons for the decision whether an investigation is warranted should be documented in the writtenthat report of the Inquiry Panel...

The Vice Provost for Research shall maintain sufficiently detailed documentation of inquiries to permit a later assessment of the reason for determining that an investigation was not warranted decision. Such records shall be maintained in a secure manner for a period of at least seven years after the termination of the inquiry, and shall, upon request, be provided to authorized federal agency personnel as may be required by law.

Within 30 days of finding that an investigation regarding research involving federal agency support is warranted, the University shall provide ORI with the written findings and a copy of the inquiry report of the Inquiry Panel which includes shall include the following information—:

(1) The name and position of the respondent; (2) A description of the allegations of research misconduct; (3) The federal agency support, including for example, grant numbers, grant applications, contracts, and publications listing federal agency support; (4) The basis for recommending that the alleged actions warrant an investigation; and (5) Any comments on the report by the respondent or the complainant. The University shall provide the following information to ORI upon request—: (1) The institutional policies and procedures under which the inquiry was conducted; (2) The research records and evidence reviewed, transcripts or recordings of any interviews, and copies of all relevant documents; and (3) The charges for the investigation to consider.

Formal investigation of misconduct - If findings from the inquiry provide a -sufficient basis -for conducting an investigation by the Committee, the Vice Provost for Research will initiate an investigation within 30 days of the completion of the inquiry. following receipt of the Inquiry Panel report. An investigation means the formal development of a factual record and the examination of that record leading to a decision either not to make a finding of that research misconduct was not shown or to recommend a finding of research misconduct; the latter finding may include a recommendation for other-appropriate actions, including administrative actions. The accused Vice Provost for Research will inform the respondent and any collaborators will be informed promptly, in writing, of the allegations, of the decision to initiate a formal investigation, and of the procedures that will be followed. The Committee shall give the respondent and the Vice Provost for Research written notice of any new allegations of research misconduct within a reasonable amount of time of after deciding to pursue any such new-allegations not addressed during the inquiry or included in the initial notice of investigation.

The Committee is empowered to call for and examine all relevant documentation, including, but not limited to, research data and proposals, laboratory notebooks, grant applications, publications, correspondence, memoranda of telephone calls and computer data, files and programs. These materials may relate to any research with which the accused is involved. To the extent the University has not already done so at the allegation or inquiry stages, the Committee shall take all reasonable and practical steps to (1) obtain custody of all the research records and evidence needed to conduct the research misconduct proceeding, (2) inventory the records and evidence, and (3) sequester them in a secure manner, except that, where the research records or evidence encompass scientific instruments shared by a number of users, custody may be limited to copies of the data or evidence on such instruments, so long as those copies are substantially equivalent in evidentiary value to the data or evidence on the instruments. Whenever possible, the University shall take custody of the records (1) before or at the time the Committee Vice Provost for Research notifies the respondent; and (2) promptly thereafter, whenever additional items become known or relevant to the investigation. The University shall, where appropriate, give the respondent copies of, or reasonable, supervised access to, the research record.

A first round of hearings will be conducted in which those who have brought the charges, those alleged to have committed research misconduct, and any others who might have knowledge relevant to the alleged misconduct will be interviewed individually in closeddoor session.s. A transcription or recording of these interviews shall be prepared and given to each interviewed party for comment or revision, and included as part of the investigatory file. The Committee shall consider and address any comments of the respondent and complainant before issuing a final report. Comments by any interviewed party or the accused must be made within 30 days of receipt of the transcription or recording. The Committee shall consider and address any comments of the interviewed parties and the respondent before issuing a final report. The Committee shall use diligent efforts to ensure that the investigation is thorough and sufficiently documented and includes examination of all research, records and evidence relevant to reaching a decision on the merits of the allegations. The Committee shall pursue diligently all significant issues and leads discovered that are determined relevant to the investigation, including any evidence of additional instances of possible research misconduct, and continue the investigation to completion.

At the conclusion of these hearings, the Committee will review the evidence and apprise all those who may bear some responsibility for the alleged misconduct of the results of the investigation to that point. These individuals will then be granted the right of rebuttal and the opportunity to present additional evidence to the Committee. Following this, the Committee may recall earlier witnesses for re-examination, call new witnesses, or close the investigative phase. In any case, before the Committee moves toward final deliberations, those bearing potential responsibility will always be given an opportunity to review and comment upon any new evidence uncovered subsequent to their last appearance before the Committee.

Page 7 of 12

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16 17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

27

28

29

30

31

32

33 34

35

36

37

38

39

40

41

42

43 44

Issued 28 July 1988
Revised 30 January 1996
Revised 1 May 2002
Revised 22 March 2006

The Committee must complete within 120 days all aspects of investigation within 120 days of beginning it, including conducting the investigation, preparing the report of findings, providing the draft report for comment and sending the final report to the appropriate University officials in order that the final report can be submitted to ORI where required. If unable to complete the investigation in 120 days, the University Committee must provide the reasons for the delay to the Vice Provost for Research who must ask ORI for an extension in writing, where required.

7 8 9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

1

2

3

4

5

6

Committee Report and Recommendations

The Committee will evaluate all evidence and testimony in order to determine if the allegations of misconduct are substantiated and, if so, who must bear responsibility. Because of the negative impact of charges of misconduct, whether ultimately substantiated or not, on the research career of an individual, it is important that the Committee's final decision be rendered in clear terms. The University has the burden of proof to make a finding of research misconduct. The destruction, absence of, or respondent's failure to provide research records adequately documenting the questioned research is evidence of research misconduct where the University establishes by a preponderance of the evidence that the respondent had research records and intentionally, knowingly, or recklessly had research records and failed to produce them in a timely manner and that the respondent's conduct constitutes a significant departure from accepted practices of the relevant research community. The respondent has the burden of going forward with and the burden of proving, by a preponderance of the evidence, any and all affirmative defenses raised. In determining whether the University has carried the burden of proof imposed by this part, the Committee shall give due consideration to admissible, credible evidence of honest error or difference of opinion presented by the respondent. The respondent has the burden of going forward withwith and proving by a preponderance of the evidence any and all affirmative defenses raised and proving by a preponderance of the evidence any mitigating factors that are relevant to a decision to impose administrative actions following a research misconduct proceeding.

27 28 29

30

31

32

33

34

35

36

37

38

A finding of research misconduct made requires a determination by the Committee (by a five-sixthsby an eighty percent (80%) majority vote) that (a) There 1) there was a significant departure from accepted practices of the relevant research community; (b) The 2) the misconduct was committed intentionally, knowingly, or recklessly; and (e) The 3) the allegation was proven by a preponderance of the evidence. Preponderance of the evidence means proof by information that, compared with that opposing it, leads to the conclusion that the fact at issue is more probably true than not. If the Committee can-not reach this conclusion, then it will report that the individual(s) under investigation have been exonerated. A minority report by a Committee member may be written which will be included inwith the final report. The Committee may make other relevant recommendations for action to be taken by the University, including, but not limited to, referring the matter to the Committee on Professional Conduct.

39 40

At the close of its investigation, the Committee will prepare a two-part draft written report, and make 41 that draft report available for comment by the subjects respondent(s). The comments of the investigation. 42 The respondent(s), if any, must be submitted in writing to the Committee will submit the report to the 43 Provost, Deanwithin 30 days of the School or College and date on which the respondent(s) received the Vice 44

Page 8 of 12	Issued 28 July 1988
	Revised 30 January 1996
	Revised 1 May 2002
	Revised 22 March 2008

Provest for Research. draft report. If they can be identified, the complainant(s) should be provided with 1 those portions of the report that address their role and opinions in the investigation. The comments of 2 the complainant, if any, must be submitted in writing to the Committee within 30 days of the date on 3 which the complainant received the draft investigation report or relevant portions of it. The 4 Committee will submit the final report including any comments received from the respondent(s) or 5 the complainant to the Provost, Dean of the School or College at which the respondent has an 6 appointment, and the Vice Provost for Research. 7 8 The final institutional investigation Committee report must be in writing and must: (a) 9 10 Describe the nature of the allegations of research misconduct; (b) 11 (1)Describe and document the funding support, if any, including for example, any grant 12 (2)numbers, grant applications, contracts, and publications listing funding agency 13 14 support; (e) Describe the specific allegations of research misconduct for consideration in the 1.5 (3) investigation: (d) 16 If not already provided where required to ORI with the inquiry report, include the 17 <u>(4)</u> institutional policies and procedures under which the investigation was conducted; (e) 18 Identify and summarize the research records and evidence reviewed, and identify any 19 evidence taken into custody but not reviewed; (f) 20 For each separate allegation of research misconduct identified during the 21 investigation, provide a finding as to whether research misconduct did or did not 22 23 occur, and if so, (1) Identify whether the research misconduct was falsification, fabrication, or 24 plagiarism, and if it was intentional, knowing, or in reckless disregard. (2) 25 Summarize the facts and the analysis which support the conclusion and 26 (b) consider the merits of any reasonable explanation by the respondent; (3) 27 Identify the specific funding agency support, if any, (4) 28 (c) 29 Identify whether any publication needs correction or retraction; (5) (d) Identify the person(s) responsible for the misconduct; and (6) 30 (e) For research involving federal agency funding, list any current support or 31 (f) known applications or proposals for support that the respondent has pending 32 with Federal agencies. (g) 33 Include and consider any comments made by the respondent and complainant on the 34 (7)35 draft investigation report. The Committee 36 For studies involving federal agency funding, the University must maintain and provide to ORI upon 37 request all relevant research records and records of the institution's research misconduct proceeding, 38 including results of all interviews and the transcripts or recordings of such interviews. 39 40 All recommendations of the Committee shall be considered as advisory to the dean of the school or 41 eollege School or College and to the Provost, who shall be responsible for further action consistent with 42 University policy. In principle, anyone found to have committed research misconduct should, in the 43 absence of extenuating circumstances, be recommended for dismissal from the University. In the 44 Page 9 of 12 Issued 28 July 1988

Revised 30 January 1996 Revised 1 May 2002 Revised 22 March 2006

case of tenured faculty, this is consistent with initiation of termination for cause proceedings as a consequence of dishonesty in research as defined in the Faculty Manual. If it is found that misconduct was committed by a collaborator or other member of a research team, and the supervisor of the research is found to have failed to make reasonable and periodic inquiry as to the authenticity 4 of the data, and if this inquiry would have been likely to prevent or uncover the fraudulent research, the supervisor should be recommended for appropriate sanction. The Provost will determine what sanctions and/or other-corrective action will be taken in accordance with University policy (including the provisions of the Faculty Manual) and submit the reportensure that the report is submitted to any appropriate agencies.

 If the Committee determines that the allegations of misconduct were made in bad faith, the Committee may recommend sanctions be imposed against those making bad faith allegations. This recommendation will be forwarded to the appropriate human resource department or and to the Provost.

Notification During Inquiry or Investigation

The relevant governmental agency shall be notified by the Provost or designee when the institution_University determines that an investigation involving federally funded research is warranted. AFor all research, a determination of the need to inform other interested parties including the dean and the chair will also be made at this time. A determination as to whether other interested parties, such as collaborators, supervisors, and officials of sponsoring or funding agencies or institutions, shall be notified will normally be made only after a formal investigation is initiated.

The Provost or designee is responsible for immediately notifying the ORI if the Provost or designee ascertains at any stage of the inquiry or investigation of research misconduct involving federally sponsored research activities that there is reason to believe that any of the following conditions exist:

- (a)(1) Health or safety of the public is at risk, including an immediate need to protect human or animal subjects.
- (b)(2) Department of Health and Human Services (HHS) resources or interest are threatened.
- (e)(3) Research activities should be suspended.
- (d)(4) There is reasonable indication of possible violations of civil or criminal law.
- (e)(5) Federal action is required to protect the interests of those involved in the research misconduct proceeding.
- (f)(6) The research misconduct proceeding may be made public prematurely and HHS should be enableenabled to take appropriate steps to safeguard evidence and protect the rights of those involved.
- (9)(7) The research community or public should be informed.

In such circumstances, consideration may be given to the advisability of notifying a funding agency as well.

Page 10 of 12	Issued 28 July 1988
	Revised 30 January 1996
	Revised 1 May 2002
	Revised 22 March 2006

For federally funded studies, the Vice Provost for Research -will keep ORI apprised of any developments during the course of the investigation which disclose facts that may affect current or potential agency funding for the individual(s) under investigation or that the agency needs to know to ensure appropriate use of Federal funds and otherwise protect the public interest or as may be required by federal law or regulations.

Interim Action

1.7

If at any time during the formal investigation, the Committee feels that interim action by the
administration is needed in order to safeguard the interests of any of the involved parties or funding
agencies or to expedite the investigation, it may recommend appropriate measures to the Vice Provost
for Research. It will be the responsibility of the Vice Provost for Research to consult regularly with
the Committee during the investigation and to apprise funding appropriate agencies of any

developments material to their interests, and take appropriate action to protect sponsoring agency funds.

Notification of Third Parties after Investigation

The Committee shall identify and advise the Vice Provost for Research of all parties who should be notified of its findings; these may include the Faculty Senate, editors of journals or officers of societies where research papers or abstracts related to the research have appeared or are pending, and the officials of current or past granting agencies involved in funding or otherwise sponsoring any compromised research. The Vice Provost for Research shall notify the Institutional Review Board or Institutional Animal Care and Use Committee where appropriate. The Committee may also recommend actions concerning the release of information regarding the incident to the media and corrective actions to prevent further instances of misconduct in light of the experience gained from the investigation.

For research involving <u>Public Health Service</u> (PHS) funding, the Vice Provost for Research shall provide the ORI with a copy of the investigative report, including all attachments; a statement of whether the University found research misconduct and if so, who committed the misconduct; a statement whether the University accepts the Committee's findings; and a description of any pending or completed administrative actions against the respondent.

In the event the research is funded by a federal agency other than PHS agencies with scientific misconduct rules different from those of PHS, the University shall comply with the other funding agency rules and reporting requirements if they differ from this policy.

If the charges of misconduct are not substantiated, those under investigation shall be so notified in writing, and the University shall undertake diligent efforts to ensure that the reputations of those involved are restored as fully as possible. This may require, with approval of the accused, notification of collaborators, granting agencies, and any others who might have become aware of the

 Page 11 of 12
 Issued 28 July 1988

 Revised 30 January 1996

 Revised 1 May 2002

 Revised 22 March 2006

investigation.

The University agrees to cooperate fully with ORI during its oversight review or any subsequent administrative hearings or appeals as may be authorized by federal regulations. This includes providing all research records and evidence under the institution's control, custody, or possession and access to all persons within its authority necessary to develop a complete record of relevant evidence.

Dissemination of This Statement of Policies and Procedures

This document shall be distributed to each faculty member on initial appointment and the faculty at large shall be notified through posting on the University website and through appropriate University list servers whenever changes are made.

10

11

[clean version incorporating proposed changes]

POLICIES AND PROCEDURES OF THE UNIVERSITY OF MIAMI RELATING TO ALLEGATIONS OF MISCONDUCT IN RESEARCH

Research in an institution such as the University of Miami is grounded upon the principles of academic freedom and mutual trust. The fostering of inquiry and creativity requires an atmosphere in which all are presumed to adhere to high ethical standards in the conduct of research and other academic pursuits. Misconduct in research is a fundamental violation of this trust and represents an assault upon the integrity of the University community.

Acts of misconduct are fortunately rare events, but because of the seriousness of allegations and the special responsibilities of the University in such circumstances, both to individual researchers and to society, it is recognized that explicit procedures must be provided for dealing with instances of alleged misconduct. It is the purpose of this document to outline the policies and procedures that will be followed in the investigation and reporting of allegations of research misconduct at the University of Miami.

2.4

In establishing these procedures, however, it must be emphasized that the best mechanism for dealing with misconduct is to prevent it. Thus it is imperative that those who participate in research reaffirm their responsibility for the ethical conduct of all research activities with which they are associated. Principal investigators, laboratory supervisors and others who lead research must recognize their ultimate responsibility for the authenticity of research conducted and published in their names and realize that they must provide adequate supervision for their trainees and research teams. It is also their responsibility to see that all persons who have contributed to the research receive appropriate credit for their work. It is incumbent upon collaborators and other contributors to research to understand that the inclusion of their names as co-authors of publications reflects a genuine contribution to the work, and signifies that they have approved the publication and are prepared to accept responsibility for the work reported.

In order to respond to allegations regarding the integrity of any published report, adequate records of the original protocols and research records, including all raw data, must be preserved for at least seven years (or longer if required by the funding agency), so they can be made available for inspection.

This policy is applicable to research misconduct arising from research conducted at the University, and/or conducted by University faculty and employees, including misconduct involving: (1) Applications or proposals for support for extramural or intramural research, research training or activities related to that research or research training, such as the operation of tissue and data banks and the dissemination of research information; (2) Supported extramural or intramural research; (3) Supported extramural or intramural research training programs; (4) Supported extramural or intramural activities that are related to research or research training, such as the operation of tissue and data banks or the dissemination of research information; and (5) Plagiarism of research records produced in the course of supported research, research training or activities related to that research or

research training. This includes any research proposed, performed, reviewed, or reported or any research record generated from that research, regardless of whether an application or proposal for funds resulted in a grant, contract, cooperative agreement, or other form of extramural or intramural support

This policy applies only to research misconduct occurring within six years of the date the University receives an allegation of research misconduct, unless (1) the respondent continues or renews any incident of alleged research misconduct that occurred before the six-year limitation through the citation, republication or other use, for the potential benefit of the respondent, of the research record that is alleged to have been fabricated, falsified, or plagiarized, or (2) the University, following consultation with the Office of Research Integrity (hereinafter "ORI"), determines that the alleged misconduct, if it occurred, would possibly have a substantial adverse effect on the health or safety of the public. In the event the alleged misconduct occurred outside the time limit described above, the matter should be referred to the Committee on Professional Conduct.

Definitions

Research means a systematic experiment, study, evaluation, demonstration or survey designed to develop or contribute to general knowledge (basic research) or specific knowledge (applied research). Research, as used herein, includes all basic and applied research in all disciplines. This includes, but is not limited to, research in economics, education, the humanities, linguistics, medicine, nursing, psychology, the natural and social sciences, engineering, mathematics and statistics, and includes any research involving human subjects or animals.

Research misconduct means fabrication, falsification, or plagiarism in proposing, performing, or reviewing research, or in reporting research results. Fabrication is making up data or results and recording or reporting them. Falsification is manipulating research materials, equipment, or processes, or changing or omitting data or results such that the research is not accurately represented in the research record. Plagiarism is the appropriation of another person's ideas, processes, results, or words without giving appropriate credit. Plagiarism may also include self-plagiarism. Self-plagiarism refers to the author's re-use of their earlier work and passing it off as new or original material. Research misconduct does not include honest error or honest differences of opinion.

Research record means the record of data or results that embody the facts resulting from scientific inquiry, including but not limited to, research proposals, laboratory records, both physical and electronic, progress reports, abstracts, theses, oral presentations, chapters, books, audio or video tapes, CDs, internal reports, journal articles, and any documents and materials provided to the University or to a University official by a respondent in the course of the research misconduct proceeding.

Research support means funding, or applications or proposals, for research, research training, or activities related to that research or training, that may be provided through: (1) funding for intramural or extramural research by grants, cooperative agreements, or contracts; or (2) subgrants or subcontracts under those funding instruments; or (3) salary or other payments under those grants,

cooperative agreements, or contracts.

1 2 3

The Committee to Investigate Misconduct in Research

4 5

6

7

8

9

10

The Committee to Investigate Misconduct in Research (hereinafter referred to as the Committee) is charged with the responsibility of investigating allegations of research misconduct by members of the academic community of the University of Miami. It is the Committee's responsibility to determine if allegations of research misconduct can be substantiated, to ensure that the relevant authorities are informed of the existence and progress of any formal investigations, to make a final report on the findings of investigations, and to recommend appropriate action to the dean of the School or College and to the Provost.

11 12 13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26 27

28

29

30

31

32

The Committee shall be drawn from a standing body (the "pool") consisting of twenty-one tenured members of the faculty appointed by the Provost. There shall be at least three members from each of the three major campuses represented in the pool. Membership terms in the pool are for three years and shall be staggered. Members whose terms are ending while a specific matter is under consideration shall continue to serve for the duration of that matter. The Vice Provost for Research shall select six members from that twenty-one member pool to serve as the Committee for each investigation. Members of a Committee shall continue to serve for the duration of that matter. The Assistant Provost for Research Standards shall be a non-voting ex-officio member of the Committee. The members of the Committee will elect a chair to conduct the proceedings. Additional ad hoc members of the Committee with special expertise in the area of investigation may be appointed to the Committee from within or outside the full-time faculty of the University at the request of the Committee or by the Vice Provost for Research. Only those ad hoc members who are full-time University faculty may vote. In accordance with federal law, reasonable steps shall be taken to ensure an impartial and unbiased investigation to the maximum extent practicable, including participation of persons with appropriate scientific expertise who do not have unresolved personal, professional, or financial conflicts of interest with those involved with the inquiry or investigation. Members of the Committee whose participation in the investigation of allegations against a specific individual could be construed as inappropriate or who are involved in the research in question will be expected to recuse themselves from such proceedings. In case of doubt, the Vice Provost for Research, or the Committee by majority vote, may require a member to recuse himself or herself.

33 34

35

In the event the Vice Provost for Research has a conflict of interest related to an allegation, he or she will recuse himself or herself. The Provost will appoint an appropriate individual to act for the Vice Provost for Research under these circumstances.

36 37 38

Procedures for the Investigation of Alleged Misconduct

39 40

41

42

43

44

The goal of the procedures is to investigate and resolve allegations of research misconduct in an expeditious, responsible and fair manner. The responsibility of protecting the rights and reputations of all who are involved in any investigation of research misconduct is recognized as very important. For this reason, disclosure of the identity of respondents and complainants in research misconduct proceedings shall be limited, to the extent possible, to those who need to know, consistent with a

thorough, competent, objective and fair research misconduct proceeding, and as required or allowed by statute or regulation.. The University shall protect, to the extent possible, the privacy of those who in good faith report apparent research misconduct and shall undertake all reasonable and practical efforts to protect the positions and reputations of any complainant, witness, or Committee member and to prevent potential or actual retaliation against these complainants, witnesses, and Committee members. Individuals responsible for carrying out any part of the research misconduct proceeding must not have unresolved personal, professional or financial conflicts of interest with the complainant, respondent or witnesses. The University and Committee shall afford the respondents, complainants and research subjects identifiable from research records or evidence confidential treatment to the extent possible. Persons accused of misconduct may consult with legal counsel, but legal counsel for neither the accused nor for the University may participate in any hearing or interview.

Steps in an investigation

14 Ste

1. Allegation — Allegation means a disclosure of possible research misconduct through any means of communication. The disclosure may be by written or oral statement or other communication to an institutional official. Allegations of misconduct should normally be directed to the Vice Provost for Research or designee, who shall determine if an inquiry is warranted. Others who receive an allegation of misconduct should immediately forward it to the Vice Provost for Research.

2. An inquiry is warranted if the Vice Provost for Research determines that the allegation (1) falls within the definition of research misconduct and (2) is sufficiently credible and specific so that potential evidence of possible research misconduct may be identified.

3. Inquiry - An inquiry is an information gathering and initial fact finding process to determine if a formal investigation of misconduct should be undertaken. An inquiry will be conducted by an Inquiry Panel, made up of three tenured faculty members chosen by the Vice Provost for Research from the pool. Members who serve on the Inquiry Panel may not serve on the Investigation Committee for the same matter. The Assistant Provost for Research Standards shall be a non-voting ex-officio member of the Inquiry Panel. At the time of or before beginning an inquiry, the Vice Provost for Research must make a good faith effort to notify in writing the presumed respondent. If the Inquiry Panel subsequently identifies additional respondents, the Inquiry Panel will notify the Vice Provost for Research who in turn will notify them in writing.

To the extent it has not already done so at the allegation stage, the University must, on or before the date on which the respondent is notified or inquiry begins, whichever is earlier, promptly take all reasonable and practical steps to (1) obtain custody of all the research records and evidence needed to conduct the research misconduct proceeding, (2) inventory the records and evidence, and (3) sequester them in a secure manner, except that, where the research records or evidence encompass scientific instruments shared by a number of users, custody may be limited to copies of the data or evidence on such instruments, so long as those

copies are substantially equivalent in evidentiary value to the original data or evidence on the instruments. The University shall, where appropriate, give the respondent copies of, or reasonable, supervised access to, the research record. The University shall undertake all reasonable and practical efforts to take custody of additional research records or evidence that is discovered during the course of a research misconduct proceeding.

An inquiry must be completed within 60 calendar days of its initiation unless circumstances clearly warrant a longer period. A draft written report shall be prepared that states what evidence was reviewed, summarizes relevant interviews, and includes the conclusions of the Inquiry Panel as to whether an investigation is warranted. An investigation is warranted if there is (1) a reasonable basis for concluding that the allegation falls within the definition of research misconduct and (2) preliminary information-gathering and preliminary fact-finding from the inquiry indicates that the allegation may have substance.

The individual(s) against whom the allegations were made shall be given a copy of the draft report. If they wish to comment on that report, their comments must be submitted in writing to the Inquiry Panel within 14 calendar days of the date on which the individual(s) received the draft report and will be made part of the record. If the inquiry takes longer than 60 days to complete, the record of the inquiry shall include documentation of the reasons for exceeding the 60-day period.

The final report of the Inquiry Panel, including any comments received from the individual(s) against whom the allegations were made, shall be sent to the Vice Provost for Research. The reasons for the decision whether an investigation is warranted should be documented in that report.

The Vice Provost for Research shall maintain sufficiently detailed documentation of inquiries to permit a later assessment of the reason for that decision. Such records shall be maintained in a secure manner for a period of at least seven years after the termination of the inquiry, and shall, upon request, be provided to authorized federal agency personnel as may be required by law.

Within 30 days of finding that an investigation regarding research involving federal agency support is warranted, the University shall provide ORI with the written findings and a copy of the report of the Inquiry Panel which shall include the following information: (1) The name and position of the respondent; (2) A description of the allegations of research misconduct; (3) The federal agency support, including for example, grant numbers, grant applications, contracts, and publications listing federal agency support; (4) The basis for recommending that the alleged actions warrant an investigation; and (5) Any comments on the report by the respondent. The University shall provide the following information to ORI upon request: (1) The institutional policies and procedures under which the inquiry was conducted; (2) The research records and evidence reviewed, transcripts or recordings of any interviews, and copies of all relevant documents; and (3) The charges for the investigation to consider.

Formal investigation of misconduct - If findings from the inquiry provide a sufficient basis for conducting an investigation by the Committee, the Vice Provost for Research will initiate an investigation within 30 days following receipt of the Inquiry Panel report. An investigation means the formal development of a factual record and the examination of that record leading to a decision either to make a finding that research misconduct was not shown or to recommend a finding of research misconduct; the latter finding may include a recommendation for appropriate actions, including administrative actions. The Vice Provost for Research will inform the respondent and any collaborators promptly, in writing, of the allegations, of the decision to initiate a formal investigation, and of the procedures that will be followed. The Committee shall give the respondent and the Vice Provost for Research written notice of any new allegations of research misconduct within a reasonable amount of time after deciding to pursue any such allegations not addressed during the inquiry or included in the initial notice of investigation.

The Committee is empowered to call for and examine all relevant documentation, including, but not limited to, research data and proposals, laboratory notebooks, grant applications, publications, correspondence, memoranda of telephone calls and computer data, files and programs. These materials may relate to any research with which the accused is involved. To the extent the University has not already done so at the allegation or inquiry stages, the Committee shall take all reasonable and practical steps to (1) obtain custody of all the research records and evidence needed to conduct the research misconduct proceeding, (2) inventory the records and evidence, and (3) sequester them in a secure manner, except that, where the research records or evidence encompass scientific instruments shared by a number of users, custody may be limited to copies of the data or evidence on such instruments, so long as those copies are substantially equivalent in evidentiary value to the data or evidence on the instruments. Whenever possible, the University shall take custody of the records (1) before or at the time the Vice Provost for Research notifies the respondent; and (2) promptly thereafter, whenever additional items become known or relevant to the investigation. The University shall, where appropriate, give the respondent copies of or reasonable, supervised access to, the research record.

A first round of hearings will be conducted in which those who have brought the charges, those alleged to have committed research misconduct, and any others who might have knowledge relevant to the alleged misconduct will be interviewed individually in closed-door sessions. A transcription or recording of these interviews shall be prepared and given to each interviewed party for comment or revision, and included as part of the investigatory file. Comments by any interviewed party or the accused must be made within 30 days of receipt of the transcription or recording. The Committee shall consider and address any comments of the interviewed parties and the respondent before issuing a final report. The Committee shall use diligent efforts to ensure that the investigation is thorough and sufficiently documented and includes examination of all research, records and evidence relevant to reaching a decision on the merits of the allegations. The Committee shall pursue diligently all significant issues and leads discovered that are determined relevant to the investigation, including any evidence of additional instances of

4.

possible research misconduct, and continue the investigation to completion.

At the conclusion of these hearings, the Committee will review the evidence and apprise all those who may bear some responsibility for the alleged misconduct of the results of the investigation to that point. These individuals will then be granted the right of rebuttal and the opportunity to present additional evidence to the Committee. Following this, the Committee may recall earlier witnesses for re-examination, call new witnesses, or close the investigative phase. In any case, before the Committee moves toward final deliberations, those bearing potential responsibility will always be given an opportunity to review and comment upon any new evidence uncovered subsequent to their last appearance before the Committee.

The Committee must complete within 120 days all aspects of investigation, including conducting the investigation, preparing the report of findings, providing the draft report for comment and sending the final report to the appropriate University officials in order that the final report can be submitted to ORI where required. If unable to complete the investigation in 120 days, the Committee must provide the reasons for the delay to the Vice Provost for Research who must ask ORI for an extension in writing, where required.

Committee Report and Recommendations

The Committee will evaluate all evidence and testimony in order to determine if the allegations of misconduct are substantiated and, if so, who must bear responsibility. Because of the negative impact of charges of misconduct, whether ultimately substantiated or not, on the research career of an individual, it is important that the Committee's final decision be rendered in clear terms. The destruction, absence of, or respondent's failure to provide research records adequately documenting the questioned research is evidence of research misconduct where the University establishes by a preponderance of the evidence that the respondent had research records and intentionally, knowingly, or recklessly failed to produce them in a timely manner and that the respondent's conduct constitutes a significant departure from accepted practices of the relevant research community. In determining whether the University has carried the burden of proof imposed by this part, the Committee shall give due consideration to admissible, credible evidence of honest error or difference of opinion presented by the respondent. The respondent has the burden of going forward with and proving by a preponderance of the evidence any and all affirmative defenses raised and any mitigating factors that are relevant to a decision to impose administrative actions following a research misconduct proceeding.

A finding of research misconduct requires a determination by the Committee by an eighty percent (80%) majority vote that (1) there was a significant departure from accepted practices of the relevant research community; (2) the misconduct was committed intentionally, knowingly, or recklessly; and (3) the allegation was proven by a preponderance of the evidence. Preponderance of the evidence means proof by information that, compared with that opposing it, leads to the conclusion that the fact at issue is more probably true than not. If the Committee cannot reach this conclusion, then it will report that the individual(s) under investigation have been exonerated. A minority report by a Committee member may be written which will be included with the final report. The Committee may

1.4

For studies involving federal agency funding, the University must maintain and provide to ORI upon

request all relevant research records and records of the institution's research misconduct proceeding,

41

43

including results of all interviews and the transcripts or recordings of such interviews.

All recommendations of the Committee shall be considered as advisory to the dean of the School or College and to the Provost, who shall be responsible for further action consistent with University policy. In principle, anyone found to have committed research misconduct should, in the absence of extenuating circumstances, be recommended for dismissal from the University. In the case of tenured faculty, this is consistent with initiation of termination for cause proceedings as a consequence of dishonesty in research as defined in the Faculty Manual. If it is found that misconduct was committed by a collaborator or other member of a research team, and the supervisor of the research is found to have failed to make reasonable and periodic inquiry as to the authenticity of the data, and if this inquiry would have been likely to prevent or uncover the fraudulent research, the supervisor should be recommended for appropriate sanction. The Provost will determine what sanctions and/or corrective action will be taken in accordance with University policy (including the provisions of the Faculty Manual) and ensure that the report is submitted to any appropriate agencies.

If the Committee determines that the allegations of misconduct were made in bad faith, the Committee may recommend sanctions be imposed against those making bad faith allegations. This recommendation will be forwarded to the appropriate human resource department and to the Provost.

Notification During Inquiry or Investigation

The relevant governmental agency shall be notified by the Provost or designee when the University determines that an investigation involving federally funded research is warranted. For all research, a determination of the need to inform other interested parties including the dean and the chair will also be made at this time. A determination as to whether other interested parties, such as collaborators, supervisors, and officials of sponsoring or funding agencies or institutions, shall be notified will normally be made only after a formal investigation is initiated.

The Provost or designee is responsible for immediately notifying the ORI if the Provost or designee ascertains at any stage of the inquiry or investigation of research misconduct involving federally sponsored research activities that there is reason to believe that any of the following conditions exist:

- (1) Health or safety of the public is at risk, including an immediate need to protect human or animal subjects.
- (2) Department of Health and Human Services (HHS) resources or interest are threatened.

(3) Research activities should be suspended.

- (4) There is reasonable indication of possible violations of civil or criminal law.
- (5) Federal action is required to protect the interests of those involved in the research misconduct proceeding.
- (6) The research misconduct proceeding may be made public prematurely and HHS should be enabled to take appropriate steps to safeguard evidence and protect the rights of those involved.
- (7) The research community or public should be informed.

In such circumstances, consideration may be given to the advisability of notifying a funding agency as well.

For federally funded studies, the Vice Provost for Research will keep ORI apprised of any developments during the course of the investigation which disclose facts that may affect current or potential agency funding for the individual(s) under investigation or that the agency needs to know to ensure appropriate use of Federal funds and otherwise protect the public interest or as may be required by federal law or regulations.

Interim Action

If at any time during the formal investigation, the Committee feels that interim action by the administration is needed in order to safeguard the interests of any of the involved parties or funding agencies or to expedite the investigation, it may recommend appropriate measures to the Vice Provost for Research. It will be the responsibility of the Vice Provost for Research to consult regularly with the Committee during the investigation and to apprise appropriate agencies of any developments material to their interests, and take appropriate action to protect sponsoring agency funds.

Notification of Third Parties after Investigation

The Committee shall identify and advise the Vice Provost for Research of all parties who should be notified of its findings; these may include the Faculty Senate, editors of journals or officers of societies where research papers or abstracts related to the research have appeared or are pending, and the officials of current or past granting agencies involved in funding or otherwise sponsoring any compromised research. The Vice Provost for Research shall notify the Institutional Review Board or Institutional Animal Care and Use Committee where appropriate. The Committee may also recommend actions concerning the release of information regarding the incident to the media and corrective actions to prevent further instances of misconduct in light of the experience gained from the investigation.

For research involving Public Health Service (PHS) funding, the Vice Provost for Research shall provide the ORI with a copy of the investigative report, including all attachments; a statement of whether the University found research misconduct and if so, who committed the misconduct; a statement whether the University accepts the Committee's findings; and a description of any pending or completed administrative actions against the respondent.

In the event the research is funded by a federal agency other than PHS agencies with scientific misconduct rules different from those of PHS, the University shall comply with the other funding agency rules and reporting requirements if they differ from this policy.

If the charges of misconduct are not substantiated, those under investigation shall be so notified in writing, and the University shall undertake diligent efforts to ensure that the reputations of those involved are restored as fully as possible. This may require, with approval of the accused, notification of collaborators, granting agencies, and any others who might have become aware of the

investigation.
The University agrees to cooperate fully with ORI during its oversight review or any subsequent
administrative hearings or appeals as may be authorized by federal regulations. This includes
providing all research records and evidence under the institution's control, custody, or possession and
access to all persons within its authority necessary to develop a complete record of relevant evidence.
Dissemination of This Statement of Policies and Procedures
This document shall be distributed to each faculty member on initial appointment and the faculty at
large shall be notified through posting on the University website and through appropriate University
list servers whenever changes are made.