

ROGER WILLIAMS UNIVERSITY
Policy and Procedures for Responding to Allegations of Research Misconduct
in Accordance with Public Health Service Policies on Research Misconduct, 42 CFR Part 93

Table of Contents

- I. Introduction
 - A. General Policy
 - B. Scope
- II. Definitions
- III. Rights and Responsibilities
 - A.

F.

I. Introduction

A. General Policy

Roger Williams University condemns any form of dishonesty or misconduct in research and accepts responsibility for developing and maintaining the highest standards of intellectual integrity. A climate of intellectual honesty mandates that all scholars have an obligation to conduct research in a manner reflecting these principles.

B. Scope

This Policy, along with its accompanying procedures, is intended to carry out this institution's responsibilities under the Public Health Service (PHS) Policies on Research Misconduct, 42 CFR Part 93. This document applies to allegations of research misconduct (fabrication, falsification, or plagiarism in proposing, performing, or reviewing research, or in reporting research results) involving:

A person who, at the time of the alleged research misconduct, was employed by, was an agent of, or was affiliated by contract or agreement with this institution; and

(1) PHS support biomedical or behavioral 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) applications or proposals for PHS support for biomedical or behavioral research, research training or activities related to that research or research training, or (3) 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.

This Policy does not apply to authorship or collaboration disputes and applies only to allegations of research misconduct that occurred within six years of the date the institution or HHS received the allegation, subject to the subsequent use, health or safety of the public, and grandfather exceptions in 42 CFR § 93.105(b).

II. Definitions

Research misconduct (as defined in 42 CFR Section 93.103) means fabrication, falsification, or plagiarism in proposing, performing, or reviewing research, or in reporting research results.

- (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) Research misconduct does not include honest error or differences of opinion.

Deciding Official (DO) means the institutional official who makes final determinations on allegations of research misconduct and any institutional administrative actions. The DO will not be the same individual as the Research Integrity Officer and should have no direct prior involvement in the institution's inquiry, investigation, or allegation assessment. A DO's appointment of an individual to assess allegations of research misconduct, or to serve on an inquiry or investigation committee, is not considered to be direct prior involvement. The current DO is Andrew A. Workman, Ph.D., Provost and Senior Vice President.

Research Integrity Officer (RIO) means the institutional official responsible for: (1) assessing allegations of research misconduct to determine if they fall within the definition of research misconduct, are covered by 42 CFR Part 93, and warrant an inquiry on the basis that the allegation is sufficiently credible and specific so that potential evidence of research misconduct may be identified; (2) overseeing inquires and investigations; and (3) the other responsibilities described in this Policy. The current RIO is Robert Eisinger, Ph.D., Dean, Feinstein College of Arts & Sciences.

Other terms used have the same meaning as given them in the Public Health Service Policies on Research Misconduct, 42 CFR Part 93. 42 CFR Part 93 is available here:

http://ecfr.gpoaccess.gov/cgi/t/text/text-idx?c=ecfr&tpl=/ecfrbrowse/Title42/42cfr93_main_02.tpl

III. Rights and Responsibilities

A. Research Integrity Officer

The Provost appoints the RIO who will have primary responsibility for implementation of the institution's policies and procedures on research misconduct under this Policy. A detailed listing of the responsibilities of the RIO

In cooperation with other institutional officials and departments (e.g. the DO, Department of Human Resources and Office of General Counsel), take all reasonable and practical steps to protect or restore the positions and reputations of good faith complainants, witnesses, and committee members and counter potential or actual retaliation against them by respondents or other institutional members;

Keep the DO and others who need to know apprised of the progress of the review of the allegation of research misconduct;

Notify and make reports to ORI as required by 42 CFR Part 93;

Ensure that administrative actions taken by the institution and ORI are enforced and take appropriate action to notify other involved parties, such as sponsors, law enforcement agencies, professional societies, and licensing boards of those actions; and

Maintain records of the research misconduct proceeding and make them available to ORI in accordance with Section VIII.F. of this policy.

B. Complainant

The complainant is responsible for making allegations in good faith, maintaining confidentiality, and cooperating with the inquiry and investigation. As a matter of good practice, the complainant should be interviewed at the inquiry stage and given the transcript or recording of the interview for correction. The complainant must be interviewed during an investigation, and be given the transcript or recording of the interview for correction.

C. Respondent

The respondent is responsible for maintaining confidentiality and cooperating with the conduct of an inquiry and investigation. The respondent is entitled to:

A good faith effort from the RIO to notify the respondent in writing at the time of or before beginning an inquiry;

An opportunity to comment on the inquiry report and have his/her comments attached to the report;

Be notified of the outcome of the

Be notified in writing of the allegations to be investigated within a reasonable time after the determination that an investigation is warranted, but before the investigation begins (within 30 days after the institution decides to begin an investigation), and be notified in writing of any new allegations, not addressed in the inquiry or in the initial notice of investigation, within a reasonable time after the determination to pursue those allegations;

Be interviewed during the investigation, have the opportunity to correct the recording or transcript, and have the corrected recording or transcript included in the record of the investigation;

Have interviewed during the investigation any witness who has been reasonably identified by the respondent as having information on relevant aspects of the investigation, have the recording or transcript provided to the witness for correction, and have the corrected recording or transcript included in the record of investigation; and

Receive a copy of the draft investigation report and, concurrently, a copy of, or supervised access to the evidence on which the report is based, and be notified that any comments must be submitted within 30 days of the date on which the copy was received and that the comments will be considered by the institution and addressed in the final report.

The respondent should be given the opportunity to admit that research misconduct occurred and that he/she committed the research misconduct. With the advice of the RIO and/or other institutional officials, the DO may terminate the institution's review of an allegation that has been admitted, if the institution's acceptance of the admission and any proposed settlement is approved by ORI.

D. Deciding Official

The DO will receive the inquiry and have the opportunity to admit or deny the

carry out a thorough, competent, objective and fair research misconduct proceeding; and (2) except as otherwise prescribed by law, limit the disclosure of any records or evidence from which research subjects might be identified to those who need to know in order to carry out a research misconduct proceeding. The RIO should use written confidentiality agreements or other mechanisms to ensure that the recipient does not make any further disclosure of identifying information. The RIO shall consult with the DO and OGC in the event confidentiality has been breached, or is believed to have been breached, to discuss appropriate sanctions.

D. Protecting complainants, witnesses, and committee members

Institutional members may not retaliate in any way against complainants, witnesses, or committee members. Institutional members should immediately report any alleged or apparent retaliation against complainants, witnesses or committee members to the RIO, who shall review the matter and, as necessary, and in cooperation with other institutional officials and departments (e.g. the DO, Department of Human Resources and Office of General Counsel), make all

and sequester all research records and evidence needed to conduct the research misconduct proceeding, as provided in paragraph C. of this section.

B. Initiation and Purpose of the Inquiry

If the RIO determines that the criteria for an inquiry are met, he or she will immediately initiate the inquiry process. The purpose of the inquiry is to conduct an initial review of the available evidence to determine whether to conduct an investigation. An inquiry does not require a full review of all the evidence related to the allegation.

C. Notice to Respondent; Sequestration of Research Records

At the time of or before beginning an inquiry, the RIO must make a good faith effort to notify the respondent in writing, if the respondent is known. If the inquiry subsequently identifies additional respondents, they must be notified in writing. On or before the date on which the respondent is notified, or the inquiry begins, whichever is earlier, the RIO must 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. Where appropriate, the RIO may provide the respondent with copies of, or reasonable, supervised access to the research records. The RIO may consult with ORI for advice and assistance in this regard.

D. Appointment of the Inquiry Committee; Use of Outside Experts

The RIO, in consultation with the DO and, as appropriate, other institutional officials

The RIO may consult with the DO, OGC, and/or ORI for advice and assistance in this regard.

misconduct has been committed, by whom, and to what extent. The investigation will also determine whether there are additional instances of possible research misconduct that would justify broadening the scope beyond the initial allegations. This is particularly important where the alleged research misconduct involves clinical trials or potential harm to human subjects or the general public or if it affects research that forms the basis for public policy, clinical practice, or public health practice. Under 42 CFR § 93.313 the findings of the investigation must be set forth in an investigation report.

B. Notifying ORI and Respondent; Sequestration of Research Records

On or before the date on which the investigation begins, the RIO must: (1) notify the ORI Director of the decision to begin the investigation and provide ORI a

The investigation is to be completed 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 ORI. However, if the RIO determines that the investigation will not be completed within this 120-day period, he/she will submit to ORI a written request for an extension, setting forth the reasons for the delay. The RIO will ensure that periodic progress reports are filed with ORI, if ORI grants the request for an extension and directs the filing of such reports.

VIII. The Investigation Report

A. Elements of the Investigation Report

The investigation committee and the RIO are responsible for preparing a written draft report of the investigation that:

Describes the nature of the allegation of research misconduct, including identification of the respondent;

Describes and documents the PHS support, including, for example, the numbers of any grants that are involved, grant applications, contracts, and publications listing PHS support;

Describes the specific allegations of research misconduct considered in the investigation;

Includes the institutional policies and procedures under which the investigation was conducted, unless those policies and procedures were provided to ORI previously;

Identifies and summarizes the research records and evidence reviewed and identifies any evidence taken into custody but not reviewed; and

Includes a statement of findings for each allegation of research misconduct identified during the investigation. Each statement of findings must: (1) identify whether the research misconduct was falsification, fabrication, or plagiarism, and whether it was committed intentionally, knowingly, or recklessly; (2) summarize the facts and the analysis that support the conclusion and consider the merits of any reasonable explanation by the respondent, including any effort by respondent to establish by a preponderance of the evidence that he or she did not engage in research misconduct because of honest error or a difference of opinion; (3) identify the specific PHS support; (4) identify whether any publications need correction or retraction; (5) identify the person(s) responsible for the

misconduct; and (6) list any current support or known applications or proposals for support that the respondent has pending with non-PHS federal agencies.

B. Comments on the Draft Report

investigation committee with a request for further fact-finding or analysis.

When a final decision on the case has been reached, the RIO will normally notify both the respondent and the complainant in writing. After informing ORI, the DO will determine whether law enforcement agencies, professional societies, professional licensing boards, editors of journals in which falsified reports may have been published, collaborators of the respondent in the work, or other relevant parties should be notified of the outcome of the case. The RIO is responsible for ensuring compliance with all notification requirements of funding or sponsoring agencies.

D. [RESERVED]

E. Notice to ORI of Institutional Findings and Actions

Unless an extension has been granted, the RIO must, within the 120-day period for completing the investigation, submit the following to ORI: (1) a copy of the final investigation report with all attachments; (2) a statement, signed by the DO, of whether the institution accepts the findings of the investigation report; (3) a statement, signed by the DO, of whether the institution found misconduct and, if

investigation is not warranted; or (2) a finding of no misconduct at the investigation stage, which must be reported to ORI, as prescribed in this policy and 42 CFR § 93.315.

X. Institutional Administrative Actions

If the DO determines that research misconduct is substantiated by the findings, he or she will decide on the appropriate actions to be taken, after consultation with the RIO. The administrative actions may include:

Withdrawal or correction of all pending or published abstracts and papers emanating from the research where research misconduct was found;

reputation. Depending on the particular circumstances and the views of the respondent, the RIO should consider notifying those individuals aware of or involved in the investigation of the final outcome, publicizing the final outcome in any forum in which the allegation of research misconduct was previously publicized, and expunging all reference to the research misconduct allegation from the respondent's personnel file. Any institutional actions to restore the

Appendix A
Research Integrity Officer (RIO)

institution believes that the research misconduct proceeding may be made public prematurely, or the research community or the public should be informed.

Providing confidentiality to those involved in the research misconduct proceeding as required by 42 CFR § 93.108, other applicable law, and institutional policy.

Determining whether each person involved in handling an allegation of research misconduct has an unresolved personal, professional or financial conflict of interest and taking appropriate action, including recusal, to ensure that no person with such a conflict is involved in the research misconduct proceeding. The RIO may consult with the DO, OGC, and/or ORI for advice and assistance in this regard.

Keeping the Deciding Official (DO) and others who need to know apprised of the progress of the review of the allegation of research misconduct.

In cooperation with other institutional officials and departments (e.g. the DO, Department of Human Resources and Office of General Counsel), taking all reasonable and practical steps to protect or restore the positions and reputations of good faith complainants, witnesses, and committee members and to counter potential or actual retaliation against them by respondents or other institutional members.

Making all reasonable and practical efforts, if requested and as appropriate, to protect or restore the reputation of persons alleged to have engaged in research misconduct, but against whom no finding of research misconduct is made.

Assisting the DO in implementing his/her decision to take administrative action against any complainant, witness, or committee member determined by the DO not to have acted in good faith.

Maintaining records of the research misconduct proceeding, as defined in 42 CFR § 93.317, in a secure manner for 7 years after completion of the proceeding, or the completion of any ORI proceeding involving the allegation of research misconduct, whichever is later, unless custody of the records has been transferred to ORI or ORI has advised that the records no longer need to be retained.

Assessing each allegation of research misconduct to determine if an inquiry is warranted because the allegation falls within the definition of research misconduct, is within the jurisdictional criteria of 42 CFR § 93.102(b), and is sufficiently credible and specific so that potential evidence of research misconduct may be identified.

C. Inquiry

The RIO is responsible for:

Initiating the inquiry process if it is determined that an inquiry is warranted.

At the time of, or before beginning the inquiry, making a good faith effort to notify the respondent in writing, if the respondent is known.

On or before the date on which the respondent is notified, or the inquiry begins, whichever is earlier, taking all reasonable and practical steps to obtain custody of all research records and evidence needed to conduct the research misconduct proceeding, inventorying the records and evidence and sequestering 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 the instruments, so long as those copies are substantially equivalent to the evidentiary value of the instruments.

Appointing an inquiry committee and committee chair as soon after the initiation of the inquiry as is practical.

Preparing a charge for the inquiry committee in accordance with the institution's policies and procedures.

Convening the first meeting of the inquiry committee and at that meeting briefing the committee on the allegations, the charge to the committee, and the appropriate procedures for conducting the inquiry, including the need for confidentiality and for developing a plan for the inquiry, and assisting the committee with organizational and other issues that may arise.

Providing the inquiry committee with needed logistical support, e.g., expert advice, including forensic analysis of evidence, and clerical support, al p,7ud

Upon determining that the investigation cannot be completed within 120 days of its initiation (including providing the draft report for comment and sending the final report with any comments to ORI), submitting a request to ORI for an extension of the 120-day period that includes a statement of the reasons for the extension. If the extension is granted, the RIO will file periodic progress reports with ORI.

Assisting the investigation committee in preparing a draft investigation report that meets the requirements of 42 CFR Part 93 and the institution's policies and procedures, sending the respondent (and complainant at the institution's option) a copy of the draft report for Part r

the outcome of the case.

Maintaining and providing to ORI upon request all relevant research records and records of the institution's research misconduct proceeding, including the results of all interviews and the transcripts or recordings of those interviews.