



## MEMORANDUM

To: Sue Ott Rowlands, Provost and Vice President for Academic Affairs  
From: Matthew Zacate, Faculty Senate President  
Re: Consideration of the so-called Executive Committee version of the Scientific/Research Misconduct Policy and Faculty Senate's reaffirmation of the version it passed at its October 28, 2019 meeting  
Date: April 6, 2020

---

After sharing your e-mail of February 13, 2020 about the proposed Scientific/Research Misconduct Policy with the Faculty Senate at its February 24, 2020 meeting, a motion was made to recommend the so-called Executive Committee version of the Scientific/Research Misconduct Policy – the version that you attached to your e-mail and that you indicated you find acceptable. This prompted an excellent discussion on the pros and cons of various versions of the policy. The discussion carried over to the March 30, 2020 meeting at which the senate rejected the motion to approve the Executive Committee version of the policy. Later in the meeting, a motion was made to reaffirm the Faculty Senate's support of the version it approved at the October 28, 2019 meeting. This motion passed. It is my expectation based on the Faculty Senate Constitution, which is a Board-of-Regents-approved document, that the October 28 approved version of the Scientific/Research Misconduct Policy be presented to the Board of Regents for its consideration even if Pres. Vaidya or you, acting as his designee, does not recommend it.

When I helped make modifications to the Professional Concerns Committee (PCC) version of the Scientific/Research Misconduct Policy from April 19, 2019 to create what is now known as the Executive Committee version of the policy, I did so with the understanding that the definition of research misconduct currently in the Faculty Handbook, which reads, "Research 'misconduct,' as used herein, is defined as fabrication, falsification, plagiarism, or other serious deviations from those accepted practices in proposing, carrying out, or reporting results from research..." includes certain instances of duplicate publishing by virtue of the phrase "other serious deviations from those accepted practices." That phrase was interpreted to include duplicate publication in 2002, when an investigation into research misconduct by five professors at NKU was launched. In part because of that 2002 case and in part because of accepted norms of research practices, the faculty at NKU considers certain instances of duplicate publication to be research misconduct.

After recommending the Executive Committee version of the Scientific/Research Misconduct Policy, I learned indirectly of two instances – in different colleges – where RPT committees uncovered possible instances of duplicate publishing and wanted to have it investigated, but deans said that the language in our current research misconduct policy does not cover duplicate publishing (in conflict with its usage in the past). I acknowledge that I don't know much about these claims. For example, I don't know if General Counsel was consulted and if she gave a different interpretation of handbook language or if deans interpreted the Faculty Handbook differently on their own. As another example, I don't know if there were other circumstances that suggested further investigations were not warranted. Also, I realize that not hearing directly from those involved can give misleading or even incorrect



impressions. Still, as long as there is the possibility that the language in the Faculty Handbook could be interpreted as not including duplicate publishing, I cannot support the definition as it currently appears in the handbook and as was presented in the Executive Committee version of the policy.

The question of whether or not duplicate publication should be included in the definition of research misconduct in the Faculty Handbook is not a legal one. The answer is determined properly by members of the faculty who are actively engaged in scientific and other research and who, therefore, are most familiar with the norms and expectations of peers in their respective fields of study. Of course, a policy on scientific/research misconduct cannot be in conflict with the law or with federal and state regulations. Members of the Faculty Senate are aware of General Counsel's October 11, 2019 memo, in which she outlined concerns about elements of the now senate-approved Scientific/Research Misconduct Policy. Senators were not persuaded by arguments in the memo, instead agreeing with opinions in FAQs put together by the PCC and arguments in a memo by one of the PCC's members that addressed specific points in the General Counsel's memo. Without additional arguments from General Counsel to counter opinions in the FAQs and memo and without additional explanation as to why the October 28, 2019 version is not "in the best interest of the university," as you put it in your memo, the position of the Faculty Senate did not change, and the Faculty Senate still recommends the October 28, 2019 version of the Scientific/Research Misconduct Policy, which is appended at the end of this memo for your convenience.

Along with this memo, I am sending you a copy of the PCC memo and the shorter PCC FAQ for you to consider. I hope after considering those documents and after considering discussion at Faculty Senate meetings (for example, that students are not permitted to "submit an examination, assignment, or graduation requirement that the student has or will submit for credit in another course, without express approval from the professors in each of the courses" [in section V.H of the Code of Student Rights and Responsibilities], which is comparable to those instances of duplicate publication the faculty consider to be research misconduct) that you will recommend to the Board of Regents that it approves the October 28, 2019 version of the Scientific/Research Misconduct Policy.

## **Text of proposed policy approved at the October 28, 2019 meeting of Faculty Senate**

### **16.7. SCIENTIFIC/RESEARCH MISCONDUCT**

#### **16.7.1. PREAMBLE AND POLICY STATEMENT**

The preeminent principle in all research is the quest for truth. The credibility of such research must be above reproach if the public trust is to be maintained. Any compromise of the ethical standards required for conducting academic research cannot be condoned. While breaches in such standards are rare, these must be dealt with promptly and fairly by all parties in order to preserve the integrity of the research community.

A critical element of any policy on research misconduct is that it be a fair and effective process for distinguishing instances of genuine and serious misconduct from insignificant deviations from

acceptable practices, technical violations of rules, or simple carelessness. The policy defined in this [Handbook](#) will allow such distinctions to be made in a manner that minimizes disruption and protects the honest researcher from false or mistaken accusations.

Research misconduct, as defined in Section 16.7.2., below, is not condoned at Northern Kentucky University and allegations of such misconduct will be investigated in accordance with the procedures described below. The policy and procedure discussed herein do not restrict or limit any legal options available to any of the parties through appropriate courts and/or administrative agencies. NKU must comply with federal regulations, and additional policies may apply to faculty engaged in federally sponsored research or submitting work to a federal agency.

## **16.7.2. DEFINITIONS**

### **16.7.2.1. COMPLAINANT**

Complainant means a person who in good faith makes an allegation of research misconduct.

### **16.7.2.2. GOOD FAITH**

Good faith as applied to a complainant or witness, means having a belief in the truth of one's allegation or testimony that a reasonable person in the complainant's or witness's position could have based on the information known to the complainant or witness at the time. An allegation or cooperation with a research misconduct proceeding is not in good faith if made with knowing or reckless disregard for information that would negate the allegation or testimony. Good faith as applied to a committee member means cooperating with the research misconduct proceeding by carrying out the duties assigned impartially for the purpose of helping an institution meet its responsibilities under this part. A committee member does not act in good faith if his/her acts or omissions on the committee are dishonest or influenced by personal, professional, or financial conflicts of interest with those involved in the research misconduct proceeding.

### **16.7.2.3. INQUIRY**

Inquiry means preliminary information-gathering and preliminary fact-finding.

### **16.7.2.4. INVESTIGATION**

Investigation means the formal collection, examination, and evaluation of all relevant facts to determine whether research misconduct has occurred.

### **16.7.2.5. RESEARCH MISCONDUCT**

The question of what constitutes research misconduct must be resolved by applying the standards and norms of the particular academic discipline at issue.

Research “misconduct,” as used herein, is defined as:

- I. Fabrication, falsification, plagiarism, or other serious deviations from those accepted practices in proposing, performing, or reviewing research, or in reporting results from research.
  - A. Fabrication is making up data or results and recording or reporting them.
  - B. 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.
  - C. Plagiarism is the appropriation of another person's ideas, processes, results, or words without giving appropriate credit.
  - D. Substantial recycling of material in redundant or duplicate publications, if compounded by a failure to cite prior work, can constitute a serious deviation from accepted research practices.
    - a. “Redundant or duplicate publications” refers to publications in which a substantial portion of the work has already been published. It also includes the situation in which the work is either so similar to previously published material or so modest an extension of previously published work that it would not be viewed as significant were the previous publication acknowledged.
    - b. “Failure to cite prior work” refers to papers that are presented as if the material were new when in fact the authors have previously published much of the body of the work before. An extension or recycling of previous work must be viewed as such, not as new and original publication.
- II. Material failure to comply with federal requirements that are uniquely related to the conducting of research.
- III. Failure to comply with federal requirements for protection of researchers, human subjects, or the public, or for insuring the welfare of laboratory animals or
- IV. Failure to meet other material legal requirements governing research.

Research misconduct does not include honest error or difference of opinion.

In cases of allegations involving activities submitted to or supported by a federal agency and definitions or procedures for research misconduct specified in the agency's regulations differ from those in this policy, the definitions and procedures in the agency’s regulations will be used.

In cases of allegations involving activities not submitted to or supported by a federal agency, the definitions of research misconduct specified in this policy should be supplemented by (or interpreted in light of) applicable substantive standards of the relevant research community or the academic discipline at issue.

**16.7.2.6. RESEARCH RECORD**

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, internal reports,

journal articles, and any documents and materials provided to federal agencies or institutional officials by a respondent in the course of the research misconduct proceeding.

#### **16.7.2.7. RESPONDENT**

Respondent means the person against whom an allegation of research misconduct is directed or who is the subject of a research misconduct proceeding.

#### **16.7.2.8. RETALIATION**

Retaliation for the purpose of this part means an adverse action taken against a complainant, witness, or committee member by an institution or one of its members in response to (a) a good faith allegation of research misconduct or (b) good faith cooperation with a research misconduct proceeding.

### **16.7.3. POLICIES**

#### **16.7.3.1. CONFIDENTIALITY**

All parties involved in the inquiry and investigation shall strive to maintain confidentiality of information, respondents, complainants, and research subjects that may be identified from research records or evidence.

#### **16.7.3.2. INTERIM ADMINISTRATIVE ACTION**

As provided by federal regulations, at any stage in the process of inquiry, investigation, formal finding and disposition, NKU may take interim administrative action to protect the welfare of human or animal subjects of research, to prevent the inappropriate use of funds, or to protect the interest of students, colleagues, or the University. A suspension or restriction of activities does not in any way imply that research misconduct has taken place. This action will be temporary and used as an interim measure prior to the conclusion of the formal investigation.

#### **16.7.3.3. EXTRAMURAL ASSURANCE AND REPORTING REQUIREMENTS**

If applicable, NKU will fully and continually cooperate with the appropriate federal agency during its oversight review or any subsequent administrative hearings or appeals. This may include providing 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. If required by a funding agency, the Institutional Official (IO) or designee shall submit written assurance that the institution is in compliance with the agency's requirements for handling allegations of misconduct. If the research is supported by an extramural funding agency, the IO or designee is responsible for ensuring compliance with the applicable funding agency's reporting requirements.

#### **16.7.3.4. STATUTE OF LIMITATION**

There is no statute of limitation on investigations of research misconduct at Northern Kentucky University.

However, Federal agencies do not require assurance and reporting of research misconduct allegations made more than six (6) years after publication or submission of the final report on a project for which data was collected. Exceptions to the federal six (6) year limitation are as follows:

- 1) Subsequent use by the respondent by continuation or renewal of any incident of alleged research misconduct that occurred before the six (6) 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.
- 2) If the appropriate funding agency or the University in consultation with the funding agency, determines that the alleged misconduct, if it occurred, would possibly have a substantial adverse effect on the health or safety of the public.

**16.7.3.5. CONFLICT OF INTEREST**

Individuals responsible for carrying out any part of the research misconduct proceeding must not have any real or apparent unresolved, personal, professional, or financial conflicts of interest with the complainant, respondent, or witnesses. Any conflict of interest must be disclosed.

A conflict of interest may include, but is not limited to, co-authorship on a paper or book, a professional or personal relationship, professional or personal relationship or antagonism, financial ties, or contact regarding possible employment with either the respondent or the complainant.

**16.7.3.6 ABSENCE OF THE RESPONDENT OF THE ALLEGATION**

Should the respondent leave NKU before the case is resolved, the dean, on behalf of NKU, when possible, shall continue the examination of the allegation and reach a conclusion. NKU shall cooperate with the process of another institution to resolve such questions to the extent possible under state and federal law.

**16.7.3.7. RESTORING REPUTATION**

The dean, or designee, or Provost shall undertake all practical and reasonable efforts to protect and restore the reputation of the individual(s) alleged to have engaged in research misconduct but against whom no finding of research misconduct has been made, if requested by the individual(s) as appropriate. The dean, or designee, or Provost shall undertake reasonable and practical efforts to protect or restore the position and reputation of the individual(s) who in good faith, made an allegation of research misconduct, if requested by the individual(s) and as appropriate. The dean, or designee, or Provost shall undertake reasonable and practical efforts to protect or restore the position and reputation of any complainant, witness, or committee member and to counter potential or actual retaliation against these individuals.

#### **16.7.3.8. FALSE ACCUSATIONS**

Regardless of the outcome of an inquiry or investigation, it is the policy of the University that no individual who, in good faith, has reported apparent research misconduct shall be subject to retaliation by the University or by any member of the University community. However, if it is determined that the charges were brought against the respondent with malicious or dishonest intent such that the complainant had a clear understanding that they were probably untrue and that they were designed to harm the respondent, the dean may recommend to the provost that appropriate administrative action be taken against the complainant consistent with the University's governing and administrative regulations.

#### **16.7.4. PROCEDURES**

##### **16.7.4.1. ALLEGATIONS OF RESEARCH MISCONDUCT**

It is the policy of Northern Kentucky University to treat fairly both the complainant and the respondent. All allegations of research misconduct will be treated seriously and, to the extent possible, the confidentiality of those who submit allegations will be maintained.

Though allegations of research misconduct may be by any means of communication to an institutional or federal official, the allegation of misconduct shall initially be documented in writing by either the complainant or the person receiving the allegation. If the allegation is made through the Ethics and Compliance Helpline, the person receiving the allegation should document the allegation in writing. Any other person receiving an allegation of research misconduct should relay the information to the appropriate dean for preliminary inquiry. The Provost may receive reports of research misconduct in situations where the appropriate dean may have a conflict of interest.

Either before or when the institution notifies the respondent of the allegation, inquiry or investigation, the institution must promptly take all reasonable and practical steps to obtain custody of all the research records and evidence needed to conduct the research misconduct proceeding, inventory the records and evidence, and 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 to the evidentiary value of the instruments. Respondents may be given supervised access to the research records throughout the inquiry and/or investigation.

##### **16.7.4.2. PRELIMINARY INQUIRY**

The purpose of the preliminary inquiry is to conduct an initial review of evidence to determine if there are sufficient grounds to warrant a formal investigation of the charge of research misconduct. The preliminary inquiry will be conducted by the dean of the college in which the respondent faculty member is appointed. If the allegation of misconduct is brought against a dean, the provost will appoint another dean to conduct the preliminary inquiry. The dean will



notify university legal counsel and the provost regarding the nature of the allegations. University counsel shall determine whether the research at issue is governed by any federal legal regulations, and shall instruct the dean to ensure that the preliminary inquiry is conducted in compliance with any applicable regulations. When deemed necessary, the dean may select one or two other individuals to assist in the preliminary inquiry. Any such individuals should have no real or apparent conflict of interest related to the case in question. A conflict of interest may include, but is not limited to, co-authorship on a paper or book, professional or personal relationship or antagonism, financial ties, or contact regarding possible employment with either the respondent or the complainant.

The preliminary inquiry should begin with an informal discussion with the complainant to verify that the allegation should be classified as possible research misconduct. Within ten (10) business days after this discussion with the complainant, the dean shall begin an informal discussion with the respondent regarding the allegations. If federal or state regulations so require, the dean shall also present the respondent with a letter that states: the nature of the allegations; the focus of the inquiry; an invitation to the respondent to provide comments and other relevant information to the dean; other relevant information; and a statement that the respondent has the right to be represented by an attorney.

The preliminary inquiry should be completed within sixty (60) days of receipt of the written allegation of misconduct. If the preliminary inquiry determines that there are not sufficient grounds within the context of the definition of misconduct for a formal investigation, the respondent and the complainant will be sent letters informing them of the results. All records will be sent to the office of the provost.

A formal investigation will be found to be warranted if:

- a. A reasonable basis for concluding that the allegation falls within the definition of research misconduct; and
- b. Preliminary information-gathering and preliminary fact-finding from the inquiry indicates the allegation may have substance

If the preliminary inquiry determines that there are sufficient grounds for a formal investigation within the context of the definition of misconduct, the respondent and the complainant will be sent letters informing them of this decision. The letter to the respondent may include (or be deemed) the “draft preliminary inquiry report.” The letter to the respondent (i.e., “the draft preliminary inquiry report”) must include, but is not limited to, the following:

- The name and position of the respondent(s);
- That a formal investigation is to be conducted;
- Information pertaining to federal agencies involved including funding numbers, grant applications, contracts, etc., if applicable;
- The nature of the allegation, including a summary of all evidence that currently exists and the right to review it;
- The basis for recommending that the alleged actions warrant an investigation;
- That the respondent will have an opportunity to respond to the charges; and
- That the respondent has the right to be represented by an attorney.



The respondent shall have the opportunity to respond to this letter, in writing, within thirty (30) calendar days of the date on which the respondent receives it. The draft preliminary inquiry report, combined with any comments received from the respondent, shall constitute the preliminary inquiry report.

In the event a formal investigation is deemed to be warranted, the dean shall inform the following individuals and/or organizations: university legal counsel, chairs of any departments that may be involved, the provost, and appropriate regulatory bodies. As required by law or regulation, University counsel shall notify appropriate government agencies when a formal investigation is convened.

If a formal investigation is judged to be unwarranted and it is determined that the charges were brought against the respondent with malicious or dishonest intent such that the complainant had a clear understanding that they were probably untrue and that they were designed to harm the respondent, the dean may recommend to the provost that appropriate administrative action be taken against the complainant. Such appropriate administrative action shall be consistent with the University's governing and administrative regulations.

Any records produced during the preliminary inquiry stage, including the preliminary inquiry report, must be maintained by University Counsel for at least seven (7) years and, upon request, be provided to the applicable government agencies.

#### **16.7.4.3. FORMAL INVESTIGATION**

Before any formal investigation commences, the respondent(s) and any involved collaborators must be notified by written statement of allegations that an investigation is to be conducted. The written statement shall:

- Include a copy of the preliminary inquiry report, which includes information on the nature of the allegations and the focus of the investigation, and inform those being investigated of the opportunity to provide comments and other relevant information to the dean
- Inform the respondent(s), prior to beginning the investigation, of his or her right to be represented by an attorney in preparing and/or giving his or her response in this and all subsequent phases of the investigation.
- Give the respondent a copy of or refer to the institution's policies and procedures related to research misconduct.
- Indicate there can be no actions that are, or could be perceived as, retaliatory against the investigation committee members, witnesses, or the person who raised an allegation or is thought to have raised an allegation.

The dean shall appoint an Investigative Body (IB) with three or more members to initiate an investigation thirty (30) calendar days after receipt of the preliminary inquiry report. IB members must be tenured faculty members with sufficient expertise in the area of investigation to insure a sound base from which to evaluate the nature of the charges. One member of the IB may be from outside the University if necessary to insure an accurate

and knowledgeable evaluation of the evidence. All IB members must be free of real or apparent conflicts of interest regarding the investigation. The dean shall document the rationale for selecting IB members based on their expertise and impartiality. All IB members shall be required to sign a statement that they will maintain the confidentiality of the investigation, and that they have no interest that would conflict with those of the respondent, the complainant, the University, or the sponsoring agency for the research. Prior to the beginning of the formal investigation, the respondent shall be given the opportunity to object in writing to the appointment of any member of the IB, based on conflict of interest. If the member is appointed to the IB despite the respondent's objection, this fact shall be noted in the IB's final report.

The IB shall conduct a formal examination and evaluation of all relevant facts to determine if the allegations of misconduct are valid. In order to maintain the integrity of the review process and avoid any appearance of institutional influence over the panel's deliberations or decision-making, the IB shall be insulated from any administrative influence and any *ex parte* communications with the parties. The IB shall seek the advice of university counsel and may engage in, but is not limited to, the following investigative procedures:

- Interviewing witnesses;
- Sequestering and examining research data (both published and unpublished) and other evidence;
- Seeking expert counsel both inside and outside the University; and
- Conducting a hearing in which the respondent may respond to the charges, call witnesses, and question the complainant.

The IB shall pursue diligently all significant issues and leads discovered that are determined relevant to the investigation. A written summary or transcript of each interview conducted must be completed. A copy of the interview summary or transcript shall be provided to the interviewed party for comment.

The investigation must be completed within 120 days of beginning it, including conducting the investigation, preparing the report findings, providing the draft report for comment, and, if applicable, sending the final report to the appropriate federal agency. If a federal agency is to be involved, the IB must notify the Provost, who will facilitate arrangements for the report to be sent. If the IB is unable to complete the investigation in time, a written request for extension that includes an explanation for the delay shall be submitted to and approved by the Provost and be included in the investigation record. Except: if no federal or state regulation requires the investigation to be completed within 120 days, then the timeline for a particular investigation shall automatically be extended until the IB completes the investigation, without any need for written request of extension.

A finding of research misconduct requires that acts constitute research misconduct as defined above and that:

- 1) There is a significant departure from accepted practices of the relevant research community;

- 2) The misconduct is committed intentionally, or knowingly, or recklessly; and
- 3) The allegation is proven by a preponderance of evidence.

The IB shall prepare a draft Investigation Report. The draft report will be sent to all respondents, and all respondents shall be afforded the opportunity to comment upon the draft report and have the comments included in the formal record of the investigation. Any comments shall be submitted in writing within thirty (30) calendar days of the date on which the respondents received the draft report. The IB shall review all respondents' comments prior to issuing the final Investigation Report.

At the completion of the investigation, the IB shall submit its findings, comments from the respondents, and recommend institutional actions (also known as the Investigation Report) in writing to the dean who shall provide a copy to the respondents of the investigation, the Provost, Legal Counsel, and chair(s) of the affected department(s). The dean shall ensure that publishers and editors of journals are informed if manuscripts emanating from fraudulent research have been submitted or published.

The Investigation Report will include the following:

- 1) Description of the nature of the allegations of research misconduct
- 2) Description and documentation of federal financial support, if applicable (e.g., grant numbers, grant applications, contracts, etc.)
- 3) Institutional charge (e.g., description of specific allegations of research misconduct for consideration in the investigation)
- 4) Copy of the institutional policies and procedures under which the investigation was conducted
- 5) Research records and evidence. Identify and summarize the research records and evidence reviewed, and identify any evidence taken into custody but not reviewed.
- 6) Statement of findings. For each separate allegation of research misconduct identified during the investigation, provide
  - a. A finding as to whether research misconduct did or did not occur as follows:
    - i. Identify whether research misconduct was falsification, fabrication, plagiarism, or other serious deviation from accepted practices and if it was intentional, knowing, or in reckless disregard;
    - ii. A finding that serious research irregularities have occurred, but that the irregularities are insufficient to constitute misconduct; or
    - iii. A finding that no research misconduct or research irregularities were committed.
  - b. A summary of the facts and the analysis that support the conclusion and consideration of the merits of any reasonable explanation by the respondent;
  - c. Information about the specific federal support affected, if applicable
  - d. Identification of any publications in need of correction or retraction;
  - e. Identification of the person(s) responsible for the misconduct; and
  - f. Listing of any current support or known grant proposal applications that the respondent has pending with federal agencies.

- 7) Comments. Include and consider any comments made by the respondent and complainant on the draft investigation report.

The investigation must be thorough and sufficiently documented including examination of all research records and evidence relevant to reaching a decision on the merits of the allegations. The IB must ensure that it maintains and provides all records from the investigation to the Provost. This is necessary so that they can be provided to any applicable federal agencies, which may request all relevant research records and records of the institution’s research misconduct proceeding, including results of all interviews and the transcripts or recordings of such interviews.

**16.7.4.4. DOCUMENTATION**

At the conclusion of an allegation assessment, inquiry, or investigation, the dean shall forward all documentation pertaining to the allegation assessment, inquiry, or investigation to the Provost who shall arrange that the documentation be maintained for seven (7) years and ensure that documentation is provided to the appropriate federal agency upon request, if appropriate. Documentation to be maintained for federal agencies must include the following, as applicable:

- 1) Allegation assessment statement
- 2) Preliminary Inquiry final report
- 3) Formal Investigation Report, including a copy of the report, all attachments, and any appeals
- 4) Findings: statement whether or not the institution accepts the investigation’s findings
- 5) Final institutional action: statement if the institution found research misconduct, and if so, who committed the misconduct
- 6) Institutional administrative actions: description of any pending or completed administrative actions against the respondents

The institution must notify the relevant federal agency (if applicable), if the institution plans to close out a case at the inquiry, investigation, or appeal stage on the basis that the respondent has admitted guilt, a settlement with the respondent has been reached, or for any other reason, except the closing of a case at the inquiry stage on the basis that an investigation is not warranted.

**16.7.4.5. DISCIPLINARY ACTION**

If the findings of the investigation substantiate allegations of research misconduct, the Provost, in consultation with Legal Counsel, shall determine appropriate administrative action, consistent with the University’s governing and administrative regulations.

**16.7.4.6. APPEAL**

The respondent may appeal the decision of the investigative committee in writing to the provost. The respondent shall have thirty (30) days to file an appeal. A reinvestigation of the case will be warranted if one or more of the following conditions are judged by the

provost to exist:

- Significant omission of new evidence that was not known or reasonably available at the time of the formal investigation;
- A member of the committee had a conflict of interest; or
- A member of the committee did not accurately interpret the evidence due to lack of expertise concerning the research topic.

The provost must rule within fifteen (15) days of receipt of the respondent's written appeal on whether or not an appeal is warranted. If the provost determines that an appeal is warranted, a new investigative committee will be appointed by the Provost to reexamine the case. The provost's ruling on the issue of appeal is final. The criteria for appointing members to the original investigative committee shall also apply to the qualifications of members of the new investigative committee. The procedures that applied to the original investigative committee will also apply to the new investigative committee. The new committee shall have one hundred twenty (120) days to complete the investigation. The decision of this review committee is final.