

Summary of Process for Investigating Allegations of Research Misconduct

- I. Allegations are received by Standing Committee on Research Misconduct (SCRM). The SCRM Chair, consulting with University Legal Counsel or the full committee as needed, determines whether the allegations fall within the purview of the SCRM.
- II. An **inquiry** to determine if the allegations warrant further investigation
 - The Standing Committee may choose to designate a sub-committee, called an Inquiry Committee, to conduct the preliminary inquiry.
 - The Inquiry Committee may interview the complainant to determine whether further inquiry is warranted.
 - The committee notifies the respondent in writing that an inquiry is to be conducted, outlines potential consequences of misconduct, and informs the respondent of his or her due process rights.
 - The Inquiry Committee then conducts a preliminary fact-finding inquiry and determines within 60 calendar days whether or not a full investigation is warranted.
 - During the preliminary inquiry, the Inquiry Committee may interview or obtain written statements from relevant parties and examine documents or other exhibits.
 - The Inquiry Committee prepares a written report summarizing interviews conducted, evidence reviewed and the conclusions of the inquiry, which is submitted to the Standing Committee for action.
 - The respondent receives a copy of the inquiry report and is allowed to make comments for the record.
- III. When warranted, an **investigation** to gather and examine evidence
 - If a full investigation is warranted, the Standing Committee names an Investigative Committee composed of faculty members who do not serve on the Standing Committee.

- The Investigative Committee is charged with conducting a thorough review to be initiated within 30 days of completion of the preliminary inquiry and completed within 120 calendar days of its initiation.
- The Office of Research Integrity at the U.S. Department of Health and Human Services, or the Office of the Inspector General at the National Science Foundation may be informed of the decision to initiate an investigation, if the research is funded by the U.S. Public Health Service or by NSF.
- At the conclusion of the investigation, the Investigative Committee may reach one of the following decisions:
 - A finding of misconduct
 - A finding of no culpable conduct, but serious research error
 - A finding of no misconduct and no serious research error
- After completion of the investigation, the Investigative Committee reports its findings to the Standing Committee.
- The respondent may make comments on the report, which are included in the final report.

IV. A formal **finding** and appropriate disposition of the allegations.

- The Standing Committee reviews the report of the Investigative Committee and notifies the respondent, the complainant, and the appropriate dean and vice chancellor of the outcome.
- If research misconduct is found, the Standing Committee may recommend to the appropriate dean and vice chancellor possible disciplinary action, policy change or other action designed to prevent similar misconduct in the future.
- The committee also may determine whether the respondent's reputation has been unjustly damaged by the investigation and, if so, suggest efforts to repair that damage.

V. **Actions subsequent** to the SCRM's report

- The relevant dean or vice chancellor is responsible for ensuring that any disciplinary action is consistent with University policies and due process. The dean or vice chancellor will also respond to all recommendations made by the committee protecting the complainant, for restoring the reputation of the respondent, or for changes in policy and procedures.

- Disciplinary action may be taken only in accordance with University rules and procedures for faculty, staff, students or administrators. Potential sanctions range from warning to dismissal. Examples of disciplinary action include reprimand, reduction in pay, suspension and dismissal.
- Misconduct involving faculty may require involvement of the University's Committee on Privilege and Tenure, following completion of the research misconduct process. If any form of discipline is imposed, the respondent may choose to pursue a hearing before the Committee on Privilege and Tenure.