Research Misconduct Concern reported to RIO

Assessment of Allegation
Conducted by: Research Integrity Officer (RIO)
Complete in: brief/reasonable time period

Determines:
- Allegation sufficiently credible and specific
- Falls under definition of misconduct (FFP)
- Jurisdiction under policy and specific federal/funding source requirements

By:
No interviews or data gathering necessary beyond the initial allegation, except as necessary to determine the above criteria.

DO/DO's designee and Provost are notified of the Inquiry, and may provide input on Inquiry Committee membership (expertise, conflicts of interest)

Inquiry
Conducted by: Inquiry Committee
Starts: at RIO notification of committee chair
Complete in: 60 calendar days

Determines:
- Whether an Investigation is warranted
  - reasonable basis for concluding that allegation falls within definition of research misconduct
  - allegation may have substance

By:
- Initial review of available evidence
- Initial testimony of respondent, complainant, and key witnesses
- Evaluation of evidence and testimony

Inquiry Committee drafts Inquiry report

- Sends to RIO, who provides to respondent for comment (10 days)

- Final Inquiry report – incorporates respondent's comments and revised as appropriate.
- Provided to RIO, DO/designee and Provost
- Provided to federal/sponsoring agencies as required, includes decision to conduct investigation (or not)

Inquiry report and decision to Investigate (or not) provided to DO/DO's designee and Provost, who may provide input on Investigation Committee membership (expertise, conflicts of interest)

Investigation
Conducted by: Investigation Committee
Starts: within 30 days of Inquiry Determination
Complete in: 120 days

Determines:
- If Research Misconduct Occurred and by Whom
  - Preponderance of the evidence
  - The research misconduct is a significant departure from accepted practices of the relevant research community
  - The respondent committed the misconduct intentionally, knowingly, or recklessly

By:
- Thorough, impartial and unbiased examination of all relevant research records and evidence
- Additional interviews of respondent, complainant, any other person identified as having relevant information (interviews are recorded, transcribed, and provided to interviewee for correction)
- Pursue diligently all significant issues/leads, including evidence of additional instances of misconduct

Investigation Committee drafts Investigation report

- Sends to RIO, who provides to respondent for comment (30 days). May provide relevant portions to complainant for comment if warranted.

- Final Investigation report – incorporates comments and revised as appropriate.
- Final copy provided to IO, DO designee and Provost

Institutional Decision
Conducted by: Deciding Official/DO's Designee

Determines:
- Whether institution accepts the investigation report and its findings (DO may send back for further fact-finding/analysis.)
- Administrative actions in response to the accepted findings of research misconduct

RIO provides Final Institutional Report (with DO acceptance and indicating pending/completed administrative sanctions) to federal/sponsoring agencies as required

Close-Out and Appeal

- RIO notifies respondent and complainant in writing
- DO/DO's designee informs law enforcement agencies, professional societies, professional licensing boards, journal editors, collaborators, and other relevant parties as appropriate
- Respondent may appeal within 15 calendar days of receiving the findings. DO may request that RIO reconvene previous committee, or a new committee may be convened.
- If no finding of misconduct, actions taken to restore respondent's reputation