

# **Guidelines and Procedures for Responding to Allegations of Scientific Misconduct**

**February 15, 2019**

<b>I. INTRODUCTION .....</b>	<b>4</b>
<i>A. General Policy .....</i>	<i>4</i>
<i>B. Scope.....</i>	<i>4</i>
<b>II. DEFINITIONS.....</b>	<b>5</b>
<i>A. Research.....</i>	<i>5</i>
<i>B. Misconduct in Research .....</i>	<i>5</i>
<i>C. Public Health Service Office of Research Integrity (PHS/ORI) .....</i>	<i>6</i>
<b>III. ROLES AND RESPONSIBILITIES .....</b>	<b>6</b>
<i>A. Research Integrity Officer .....</i>	<i>6</i>
<i>B. Research Ethics Committee.....</i>	<i>7</i>
<i>C. Deciding Official .....</i>	<i>7</i>
<i>D. Complainant .....</i>	<i>7</i>
<i>E. Respondent .....</i>	<i>8</i>
<b>IV. GENERAL POLICIES AND PRINCIPLES .....</b>	<b>8</b>
<i>A. Responsibility to Report Misconduct .....</i>	<i>8</i>
<i>B. Cooperation with Research Misconduct Proceedings .....</i>	<i>8</i>
<i>C. Confidentiality.....</i>	<i>9</i>
<i>D. Non-Retaliation .....</i>	<i>10</i>
<i>E. Interim Administrative Actions and Notifying PHS/ORI of Special Circumstances.....</i>	<i>10</i>
<b>V. THE RESEARCH ETHICS COMMITTEE .....</b>	<b>11</b>
<i>A. Composition and Appointment.....</i>	<i>11</i>
<i>B. Meeting Schedule.....</i>	<i>11</i>
<i>C. Voting Procedures.....</i>	<b>Error! Bookmark not defined.</b>
<i>D. Conflict of Interest or Bias .....</i>	<b>Error! Bookmark not defined.</b>
<i>E. Role of the University Counsel.....</i>	<i>11</i>
<i>F. Amendments to the Guidelines and Procedures .....</i>	<i>12</i>
<i>G. Education of the Academic Community.....</i>	<i>12</i>
<i>A. Procedures for Making Allegations.....</i>	<i>12</i>
<i>B. Initial Review.....</i>	<i>12</i>
<i>C. Conduct of Inquiry.....</i>	<i>14</i>
1. Initiation and Purpose of the Inquiry .....	14
2. Protection of Evidence.....	14
3. Notice to Respondent .....	14
4. Inquiry Process – General Requirements.....	15
<i>D. Inquiry Procedures .....</i>	<i>16</i>
1. Stage One .....	16
2. Stage Two .....	17
<i>E. The Inquiry Report.....</i>	<i>18</i>
1. Content of Inquiry Report .....	18

2. Solicitation of Comments .....	18
F. REC Review of Inquiry Report and Determination .....	19
1. Notification to Complainant and Respondent.....	19
2. Notification to PHS/ORI (if applicable) .....	20
<b>VII. INVESTIGATIVE PHASE.....</b>	<b>20</b>
A. Initiation and Purpose.....	20
B. Notifying ORI and Respondent; Sequestration of Research Records .....	21
C. Appointment of Investigative Committee .....	21
D. Charge to the Investigative Committee .....	22
E. Investigative Process.....	22
F. Time for Completion.....	24
A. Decision by the Investigative Committee.....	24
B. Comments on the Investigative Report and Access to Evidence .....	25
1. Respondent .....	25
2. Complainant.....	26
<b>IX. DISPOSITION BY THE REC .....</b>	<b>26</b>
<b>X. FINAL DISPOSITION.....</b>	<b>26</b>
A. Decision by the DO.....	26
B. Communication of Decision .....	27
C. Appeals .....	28
D. Completion of Cases; Reporting Premature Closures to ORI .....	28
E. Notice to PHS/ORI or Other Funding Agencies of Institutional Findings and Actions .....	28
<b>XI. OTHER CONSIDERATIONS .....</b>	<b>29</b>
A. Termination or Resignation Prior to Completing Inquiry or Investigation .....	29
B. Restoration of the Respondent's Reputation .....	29
C. Protection of the Complainant, Witnesses and Committee Members .....	30
D. Allegations Not Made in Good Faith .....	30
II. Notification, Reporting and Cooperation with PHS/ORI .....	31
III. Research Misconduct Proceeding.....	32
A. General .....	32
B. Allegation Receipt.....	33
C. Inquiry .....	34
D. Investigation .....	35

# I. Introduction

## A. General Policy

The University of Colorado Denver | Anschutz Medical Campus, herein referred to as the “University”, has the responsibility to foster a research environment that promotes the responsible conduct of research, discourages research misconduct, and deals promptly with allegations or evidence of possible research misconduct.

To fulfill its obligations and ensure the public trust, the University must prevent, identify, and investigate research misconduct. The University’s obligations arise under Article V of the Laws of the Regents, *University of Colorado Administrative Policy Statement on Misconduct in Research and Authorship* and the requirements of federal agencies, including the National Institutes of Health/Public Health Service and the National Science Foundation.

The leadership of the schools and colleges of the University have a responsibility to identify faculty to serve on research misconduct committees to fulfill its obligation of investigating allegations of research misconduct. These Guidelines and Procedures are intended to provide guidance with respect to the manner in which the University will carry out these responsibilities.

Nothing in these Guidelines and Procedures is intended to override or contradict provisions of other regulations or policies of the University of Colorado or the applicable funding agencies.

Although these Guidelines and Procedures set forth the presumptive time frames for the conduct of proceedings, these time frames are not absolute and may be modified as necessary for the Research Integrity Officer (“RIO”) and/or the applicable committees to adequately perform their functions. Failure to complete an inquiry, investigation, or other process within these time frames shall not be grounds for dismissal of an allegation of research misconduct, but any undue delay may be considered by the RIO or other appropriate official when reviewing the relevant committee’s findings and recommendations.

While every effort will be made to follow the proscribed procedures, unanticipated situations including but not limited to the nature of the allegation and events related to its investigation may necessitate reasonable changes in our approaches to obtaining a fair and timely decision.

## B. Scope

These Guidelines and Procedures apply to:

1. Any person who, at the time of the alleged research misconduct, was employed by, was an agent of, and/or was affiliated by contract or agreement with the University of Colorado Denver | Anschutz Medical Campus.
2. Any person who is alleged to have committed research misconduct prior to his or her employment, agency or affiliation with the University of Colorado Denver | Anschutz Medical Campus, provided the RIO determines that such allegations of research misconduct may violate University policies and impact the reputation of the

University in coordination with the applicable external institution.

The University has academic dishonesty procedures but such policies do not take precedence over these policies and procedures for allegations involving alleged research misconduct in student course work.

In the event that potential research misconduct is alleged to have occurred in the course of federally-funded research, the RIO shall attempt to comply with both these Guidelines and Procedures and the funding agency's requirements for the investigation of research misconduct. In any such case, the RIO shall refer to the requirements delineated by each federal agency, including, for example, the Public Health Service requirements contained in 42 C.F.R. 93 and the National Science Foundation requirements described in Section 930 of the NSF Grant Policy Manual. In the event that these Guidelines and Procedures materially conflict with the requirements of any funding agency, the RIO will apply the requirements of the funding agency.

## II. Definitions

### A. Research

The University broadly defines "research, scholarship and creative activities" to include all forms of scholarship and creative activities within the responsibilities of faculty, staff, or students that are designed as original works or are intended to contribute to generalizable knowledge in a field of academic inquiry. The terms "research" and "research, scholarship and creative activities" are used interchangeably throughout this document.

### B. Misconduct in Research

Misconduct in research includes the following and means:

1. **Fabrication, falsification, plagiarism** and other forms of misrepresentation of ideas, and other serious deviations from accepted practices in proposing, carrying out, reviewing, or reporting results from research.

The following definitions apply:

*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

2. Failure to comply with established standards regarding author names on publications;
3. Retaliation of any kind against a person who, in good faith, reported or provided

information about suspected or alleged research misconduct.

Research misconduct does not include honest error or honest differences in opinion, or differences in interpretations or judgments of data.

However, where a person's conduct otherwise constitutes research misconduct, the burden of proof lies with that person to establish by a preponderance of the evidence that his or her conduct represents honest error or differences in interpretation.

A finding of research misconduct requires that:

- There is a significant departure from accepted practices of the relevant research community; and
- The misconduct be committed intentionally, knowingly, or recklessly; and
- The allegation be proven by a preponderance of the evidence.

If, in the course of an investigation, it is determined that the allegations of research misconduct relate to federally-funded research and the federal funding agency's definition of research misconduct is more limited than the definition set forth in these Guidelines and Procedures, the federal funding agency's definition of research misconduct shall apply for determining whether such research misconduct shall be reported to the federal funding agency or other appropriate authority. The University's definition of research misconduct, however, shall continue to apply for the University's internal administrative purposes, including the imposition of discipline against any person who is determined to have engaged in conduct that meets the University's definition of research misconduct.

## **C. Public Health Service Office of Research Integrity (PHS/ORI)**

As used in these Guidelines and Procedures, PHS/ORI refers to the Office of Research Integrity within the Public Health Service of the National Institutes of Health (NIH). This office oversees research misconduct investigations involving research funded by the NIH.

# **III. Roles and Responsibilities**

## **A. Research Integrity Officer**

The Vice Chancellor for Research shall appoint the RIO. The RIO is the institutional official who has primary responsibility for implementing these Guidelines and Procedures.

The RIO's duties are described in Appendix A, but generally include:

Advising any person who is considering whether to submit an allegation of research misconduct about the requirements of these Guidelines and Procedures;

Receiving allegations of research misconduct, assessing allegations of research misconduct to determine if they fall within the definition of research misconduct 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;

Overseeing inquiries and investigations;

Administering these Guidelines and Procedures to provide timely notice and an opportunity to respond to any person alleged to have engaged in research misconduct;

Providing timely notifications of research misconduct inquiries and investigations to appropriate University and federal agency officials;

Notifying the Office of Grants & Contracts of any requirements of funding organizations concerning research misconduct; and

Acting as liaison between the appropriate dean, vice chancellor, or other University official if that party is required to communicate with the funding agency on research matters.

## **B. Scientific Research Integrity Officer**

The Scientific Research Integrity Officer (SRIO) is a member of the faculty whose role is to support the RIO. The basic responsibilities of the RIO and SRIO are to promote exemplary ethical standards of research conduct, to publicize the Guidelines and Procedures for reporting research misconduct, and ensure that the procedures are appropriately followed and documented.

## **C. Deciding Official**

The Deciding Official (DO) is the institutional official who receives the investigative report and determines the appropriate institutional response. The University has designated the Vice Chancellor for Research as the DO. The DO shall not be the same person as the RIO. To the extent possible, the DO should have no direct prior involvement in the institution's inquiry, investigation, or allegation assessment; the fact that the DO received an allegation of research misconduct or referred such an allegation to the RIO shall not constitute direct prior involvement.

If the Vice Chancellor for Research is conflicted or is otherwise unable to render a decision regarding the referred matter, then the RIO should consult with the University's leadership to determine, as early as practicable in the process, an appropriate individual to serve as the DO. In the event of such a conflict, or if the Vice Chancellor for Research is unable to render a decision, the designated DO will be either the Provost or the Dean of the appropriate School or College, depending on the nature of the allegation.

## **D. Complainant**

The Complainant is the individual who brings forward an allegation (preferably in writing) of

misconduct in research to the RIO. The University requires any person who makes an allegation of research misconduct to make allegations in good faith, maintain confidentiality, and cooperate with the inquiry and investigation. Most anonymous complaints will not be investigated. As a matter of good practice, the complainant should be initially interviewed by the RIO and/or SRIO.

## **E. Respondent**

The Respondent is the person against whom an allegation of research misconduct has been made. The Respondent is responsible for maintaining confidentiality and cooperating with the conduct of an inquiry and investigation. As further described in these Guidelines and Procedures, the Respondent has rights that the RIO and the committees shall attempt to preserve during the inquiry and investigation processes. In the event the RIO or the committees fail to provide the rights identified in these Guidelines and Procedures, the DO may consider any such failure when determining the appropriate institutional response to an allegation of research misconduct.

# **IV. General Policies and Principles**

## **A. Responsibility to Report Misconduct**

University employees have an obligation to report observed or suspected research misconduct to the RIO or SRIO. If an individual is unsure whether a suspected incident falls within the definition of research misconduct, he or she may contact the RIO to discuss the suspected research misconduct informally, which may include discussing it anonymously and/or hypothetically. If the circumstances described by the individual do not meet the definition of research misconduct, but are appropriately addressed to another University entity or third party, the RIO will refer the individual or allegation to other offices or officials with responsibility for resolving the problem. Except to the extent necessary to comply with reporting requirements or state law or to defend any legal action which might be asserted against the University, the RIO will maintain confidentiality of any such discussions or consultations regarding concerns of possible research misconduct.

Allegations of suspected research misconduct that are brought by faculty or staff to their supervisor or University leadership must be immediately forwarded to the RIO for evaluation. The applicable school, college, or department shall not undertake any level of internal review regarding the allegation(s). This is important to protect the chain of evidence and ensure the investigation is conducted in accordance with applicable federal regulations.

## **B. Cooperation with Research Misconduct Proceedings**

In accordance with the University of Colorado Administrative Policy Statement on Misconduct in Research and Authorship, members of the University community are obligated to cooperate with and provide evidence relevant to a research misconduct



allegation to the RIO, and other institutional officials. Any member of the University community who fails or refuses to cooperate with the inquiry or investigative processes shall be reported to the appropriate dean or vice chancellor; such non-cooperation may constitute the basis for disciplinary action. Nothing herein will be interpreted in such a way as to infringe on an employee's, or, when applicable, a student's right to invoke the protection of the Fifth Amendment to the U.S. Constitution with regard to self-incrimination.

During both inquiry and investigation, the RIO and the SRIO shall elicit the cooperation of the Complainant, the Respondent, and any other persons who have knowledge of the alleged research misconduct. Any person's failure to provide such cooperation, however, shall not preclude the University's investigation of potential research misconduct.

## **C. Confidentiality**

The RIO, the SRIO, and the appropriate committee members shall take reasonable steps to maintain the confidentiality of an allegation of research misconduct through the inquiry and investigative stages. The RIO, the SRIO, and the committees shall request that the Complainant, the Respondent, and any other involved persons maintain confidentiality during the inquiry and investigative processes, including requiring signature to confidentiality agreements.

During the course of the inquiry and investigative stages, the RIO, and the appropriate committees, may disclose information related to an allegation of research misconduct through the inquiry and investigative stages to the extent required by law.

The RIO or the committee may also disclose information related to the inquiry and investigative processes if the seriousness of the alleged research misconduct warrants disclosure prior to the outcome of the inquiry or the investigation.

Without limitation such instances include where the disclosure is necessary:

- (1) To prevent an immediate health hazard;
- (2) To protect the University's resources or reputation;
- (3) To protect the interests of the academic community;
- 4) To protect any person's resources or reputation;
- (5) To comply with the University's obligations to any state or federal agency, or
- (6) To correct misinformation made available to the public about the alleged research misconduct and the University's response.

To the extent possible, the RIO, SRIO, and/or the committee shall limit disclosure of the identity of the Complainant, Respondent, or witnesses in the inquiry and investigative processes. For example, unless the circumstances merit direct identification of the participants in their reports and other documents, the committees should refer to the participants as "Complainant," "Respondent," and "Witness 1." In the event that the committees refer to individuals using generic identifiers, it should also include a confidential

appendix containing those persons' identities.

The DO may disclose the final inquiry report and/or investigative report and /or DO memo as necessary for it to meet its obligation of discouraging research misconduct in the University community, to remediate the harm caused by research misconduct, as necessary to comply with the requirements of funded research or to comply with the Colorado Open Records Act, C.R.S. §§ 24-72-201 to 206. In the event that the DO finds that a Respondent has not engaged in research misconduct, the DO may disclose the final inquiry report and investigative report as necessary to protect the reputation of the Respondent.

Notwithstanding any other provision in these Guidelines and Procedures, the University, the RIO, the DO, and the committees shall disclose any information reasonably necessary for it to comply with state or federal law.

## **D. Non-Retaliation**

Members of the University community or the Respondent(s) may not retaliate in any way against Complainants, witnesses, or committee members for their participation in an investigation of Research Misconduct. Institutional members should immediately report any alleged or apparent retaliation to the RIO or to the CU Ethics Line. The RIO shall review the allegation of retaliation and, if warranted, make all reasonable and practical efforts to redress any retaliation that has already occurred and to prevent any further retaliation.

All parties involved in an allegation of research misconduct should continue, whenever feasible, maintain business as usual until such times as findings are made unless a party has a concern for their safety, wellbeing or productivity.

## **E. Interim Administrative Actions and Notifying PHS/ORI of Special Circumstances**

Throughout the research misconduct inquiry and investigation, the RIO will monitor the proceedings to determine if there is any threat of harm to public health, federal funds and equipment, or the integrity of the federally-supported research process. In the event of such a threat, the RIO will, in consultation with other Institutional officials and the funding agency, take appropriate interim action to protect against any such threat.

Interim action might include additional monitoring of the research process and the handling of federal funds and equipment, reassignment of personnel or of the responsibility for the handling of federal funds and equipment, additional review of research data and results, delaying publication, or notifying appropriate persons of errors in published research.

The RIO shall, at any time during a research misconduct proceeding, notify PHS/ORI or NIH, if applicable under NOT-OD-19-20, immediately if he/she has reason to believe that any of the following conditions exist:

- Health or safety of the public is at risk, including an immediate need to protect human

or animal subjects;

- HHS resources or interests are threatened;
- Research activities should be suspended;
- There is a reasonable indication of possible violations of civil or criminal law;
- Federal action is required to protect the interests of those involved in the research misconduct proceeding;
- The research misconduct proceeding may be made public prematurely and HHS action may be necessary to safeguard evidence and protect the rights of those involved; or
- The research community or public should be informed.

The RIO will also ensure that any individual involved in the process, including the Complainant, Respondent, and committee members, is referred to the appropriate resources on campus that can provide additional support during an Inquiry and/or Investigation, including but not limited to, the CARE Team, FAST Team, and/or the Office of Professionalism for concerns relating to:

- Supporting parties to continue to work productivity;
- Address how to interact on campus; and
- Field questions by colleagues related to the situation.
- Handle stress related to the process

## **V. The Scientific Research Integrity Officer**

### **A. Appointment .**

The Deciding Official appoints the Scientific Research Integrity Officer (SRIO) in consultation with the RIO.

### **B. Meeting Schedule**

The RIO and SRIO shall meet at least twice each academic year or more frequently as needed to address research integrity concerns involving the institution.

### **C. Role of the University Counsel**

As it deems necessary, the RIO and the constituted committees may seek advice and assistance from the Office of the University Counsel. In this role, University Counsel is representing the University, and not any individual involved in any part of the process.

Complainant, Respondent, and witnesses may retain their own counsel to represent their interests during any part of the proceedings.

The Office of the University Counsel shall be notified of any allegations that are brought forward. University Counsel may send a representative to attend the proceedings of any inquiry or Investigation committee appointed if the University Counsel considers that such attendance is in the best interests of the University.

## **D. Amendments to the Guidelines and Procedures**

Amendments may be proposed by the RIO, SRIO or University Counsel and approved by the DO.

## **E. Education of the Academic Community**

Deans, directors, chairs and graduate advisors shall be reminded annually of the University of Colorado Administrative Policy on *Research Misconduct and Authorship* and of these Guidelines and Procedures. The University shall also inform all faculty, students, and staff of (1) the need for integrity in research performance and (2) the role of the RIO in considering allegations of research misconduct.

Training with regard to Responsible Conduct of Research is the responsibility of all faculty, mentors and trainers who conduct research. The RIO is responsible for ensuring that appropriate training and educational opportunities are made available.

# **VI. Conducting an Assessment & Inquiry**

## **A. Procedures for Making Allegations**

All persons having knowledge of research misconduct or having reason to believe that such misconduct may have occurred, should submit written allegations of research misconduct to the Research Integrity Officer and/or the SRIO.

Individuals who are uncertain about whether to file an allegation may consult with the RIO prior to filing a written complaint. Except as described in the section of these Guidelines and Procedures detailing confidentiality, the RIO will maintain confidential any such discussions or consultations regarding concerns of possible research misconduct.

## **B. Initial Review and Assessment**

Upon receiving a written allegation of research misconduct, the RIO, in collaboration with the SRIO, will immediately assess the allegation to determine whether it (a) is sufficiently credible and specific so that potential evidence of research misconduct may be identified, and (b) the substance of the complaint, if it is assumed true, meets the definition of research misconduct described under these Guidelines and Procedures or under any federal

standard applicable to the research. The RIO may utilize available resources such as the SRIO, University Counsel and/or other experts in making the determination.

The assessment period should be sufficiently robust to make an assessment. In conducting the assessment, the RIO may but, is not required to, interview the Complainant, or other witnesses. The RIO need not conduct any research or gather any data beyond any that may have been submitted with the allegation, except as necessary to determine whether the allegation is sufficiently specific so that a potential instance of research misconduct may be identified.

Should multiple complaints about the Respondent be received, the RIO in collaboration with the SRIO shall determine how best to proceed. Generally, multiple complaints will be handled as follows:

1. If an *inquiry* is already in process, the new complaint will be forwarded to the current Inquiry Committee. The current Inquiry Committee may recommend to the RIO that the new complaint be included as part of the ongoing inquiry, that a new Inquiry Committee be formed to explore the new complaint, or that the new complaint be rejected as being duplicative with the allegations already being reviewed.
2. If an *investigation* is underway when a new complaint arrives, the RIO will confer with the chair of the Investigative Committee to determine if the new complaint is most appropriately included in a revised charge to the Investigative Committee, or whether it should be referred to an Inquiry Committee.
3. If a complaint is received after an Investigation has been *completed*, the RIO will determine whether the new complaint merits an Inquiry or is redundant with the prior complaint(s) that have already been investigated.
4. If the Inquiry or Investigation Committee identifies new areas of concern as part of their process, then the appropriate committee may notify the Respondent verbally during the interview process or in writing of any additional concerns. If the new allegations involve new Respondents, then the new Respondents should be notified in writing of the allegations against them.

If the RIO in collaboration with the SRIO determines that the Complainant has stated a possible instance of research misconduct, the complaint will be referred for inquiry as described below. If not, the RIO and/or Chair shall notify the Complainant and the DO of the decision not to pursue the allegations. Such decisions may be over-ruled by the DO. The DO's decision is final, and cannot be appealed.

## **C. Conduct of Inquiry**

### **1. 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.

### **2. Protection of Evidence**

The RIO shall, on or before the date on which the Respondent is notified of the allegation, take all reasonable and practical steps to obtain custody of all records and evidence necessary to conduct the inquiry unless the Respondent can provide a reasonable explanation of the allegation. The RIO shall inventory and, in collaboration with the Office of Information Technology (OIT) Security Officer or delegate, sequester all such records and evidence in accordance with the RIO's guidance document on sequestration. The RIO shall confer with the Respondent to identify the records and evidence needed for the inquiry and the best means of preserving and maintaining the integrity of the records and evidence. Whenever feasible, three (3) forensic copies of all sequestered data will be made and stored by OIT.

Where the 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. The RIO may consult with NIH/PHS/ORI or other similar parties for advice and assistance in this regard.

### **3. Notice to Respondent**

The Respondent is normally not informed of an allegation until an Inquiry Committee has completed Phase I and determined that the inquiry procedure should proceed. Once this determination has been made, the RIO, must make a good faith effort to notify the Respondent in writing. The Respondent will be informed of the specifics of the allegation and will be provided with University rules and procedures governing the inquiry process; in the case of funded research, the RIO will provide Respondent with the relevant federal regulations.

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, the Deciding Official may terminate the Institution's review of an allegation that has been

admitted. In the case of allegations that fall under the purview of the Public Health Service, the institution's acceptance of the admission and any proposed settlement must be approved by PHS/ORI. NIH must be informed of Respondent's admission of research misconduct if the study is funded by NIH.

If the Inquiry Committee, as part of its Phase I inquiry, determines that a complaint should not be pursued, it will so advise the RIO. If the RIO concurs, the Respondent may be informed of the complaint and the reasons for not pursuing it but only if the RIO determines such an approach is appropriate.

#### 4. Inquiry Process – General Requirements

The RIO, in consultation with the SRIO Chair and other institutional officials as appropriate, shall appoint the Inquiry Committee and Inquiry Committee chair as soon after the initiation of the inquiry as possible. The Inquiry Committee may include the SRIO but must also consist of individuals who do not have unresolved personal, professional, or financial conflicts of interest with either the Complainant or Respondent. The Inquiry Committee members should also have the appropriate scientific or related subject matter expertise to evaluate the evidence and issues related to the allegation, interview the principals and key witnesses and conduct the inquiry. Each member of the Inquiry Committee must sign a confidentiality agreement prior to reviewing any information related to Complainant's allegations.

The RIO will prepare a charge for the inquiry committee that:

- Sets forth the timeline for completion of the inquiry;
- Describes the allegations and any related issues identified during the allegation assessment;
- States the purpose of the inquiry is to conduct an initial review of the evidence, including the testimony of the respondent, complainant and key witnesses, to determine whether an investigation is warranted, not to determine whether research misconduct definitely occurred or who was responsible;
- States that an investigation is warranted if the committee determines: 1) there is a reasonable basis for concluding that the allegation falls within the definition of research misconduct and 2) the allegation may have substance, based on the committee's review during the inquiry.
- Informs the Inquiry Committee that they are responsible for preparing or directing the preparation of a written report of the inquiry that meets the requirements of these guidelines and procedures.

The inquiry is a two-stage, fact-finding, non-adversarial proceeding intended to provide an initial review of the evidence so that a preliminary evaluation can be made as to whether there is sufficient evidence of research misconduct to warrant full investigation. The inquiry

is intended only to provide a means of initially evaluating the merits of the allegations of research misconduct to identify and dismiss non-meritorious allegations. Consequently, because of the limited nature of the inquiry proceedings, an inquiry does not require the Inquiry Committee to fully review all of the evidence related to the allegation.

The RIO will provide copies of all documentation and interview summaries obtained as part of the preliminary assessment to the Inquiry Committee members. This material may be sufficient for the Inquiry Committee to make a determination. If the inquiry committee decides additional information is needed, then the Inquiry Committee shall request confidentiality from all participants in the inquiry committee process. Each participant will be asked to sign a confidentiality agreement and be provided with a summary of their rights and responsibilities with regard to the inquiry. Each interested party shall be interviewed separately. Any person—whether a Complainant, Respondent, or witness—may have an advisor or attorney present at any interview of such person to act as such person's personal advisor. Such advisors may assist in the presentation of information but may not speak for these persons or conduct cross-examinations. The inquiry proceedings may be recorded, although the members of the Inquiry Committee may also take informal written notes during the proceedings.

The inquiry shall be initiated and conducted as expeditiously as possible. The inquiry, including preparation of the final inquiry report and the decision on whether an investigation is warranted, shall be completed within sixty (60) calendar days of the initial written notification of the Respondent unless the RIO or Inquiry Committee determine that circumstances warrant a longer period. If a time extension is granted, the final report of the Inquiry Committee must include the reasons for the extension.

## **D. Inquiry Procedures**

### **1. Stage One**

The Inquiry Committee begins its proceedings by reviewing the written allegations of research misconduct and the supporting materials, if any, to determine whether to pursue further investigation. This stage of the inquiry is intended to allow the Inquiry Committee to identify baseless and groundless allegations of research misconduct.

The Inquiry Committee, in extraordinary cases where it is unable to form an opinion whether the written allegations are baseless or groundless, may interview additional witnesses, but shall conduct the interviews in a manner designed to protect the confidentiality of the inquiry process, including, to the extent possible, the Respondent's identity.

Upon a majority vote of the members of the Inquiry Committee determining that some or all of the allegations of research misconduct are potentially meritorious, the Inquiry Committee shall notify the RIO of its intention to proceed to the second stage of the inquiry.

The members of the Inquiry Committee may by majority vote may also recommend that the RIO dismiss any baseless and groundless allegations before proceeding to the second stage of the inquiry. If the Inquiry Committee votes to recommend dismissal of some or all of the allegations, the Inquiry Committee shall submit its written recommendation and



reasons to the DO. The RIO shall review the Inquiry Committee's recommendation and decide whether to accept it.

If the RIO accepts the Inquiry Committee's recommendation of dismissal of some or all of the allegations, the inquiry shall be deemed concluded as to those allegations, and the RIO shall inform the Respondent of the determination and the bases for its determination. If the RIO determines that some or all of the Complainant's allegations were made without reasonable basis in fact and with malicious intent, the RIO may refer the Complainant to appropriate entities within the University or other institutions to properly address the matter.

If the RIO rejects the Inquiry Committee's recommendation of dismissal, in whole or in part, s/he shall return the allegations that s/he did not dismiss to the Inquiry Committee for the second stage of the inquiry.

## 2. Stage Two

If the Inquiry Committee or the RIO decide, after Stage One is complete, that some or all of the allegations of research misconduct are potentially meritorious, the RIO shall notify the Complainant in writing of this determination after all relevant data has been sequestered.

The RIO shall inform the Respondent in writing about the nature of the research misconduct allegations, including a copy of the written allegations and any supporting materials. The Inquiry Committee shall request that the Respondent provide a written response to the allegations of research misconduct within fourteen (14) calendar days, but the Inquiry Committee may grant reasonable extension of this deadline at its discretion in consultation with the RIO/SRIO.

After receiving and reviewing the Respondent's written response to the allegations of research misconduct, or if the Respondent does not respond within the allowed period of time, the Inquiry Committee may invite the Respondent for a personal interview to discuss the details of the alleged misconduct. This interview shall be fact-finding rather than adversarial. If the Respondent declines a personal interview, or in addition to such a personal interview, the Inquiry Committee may also interview the Respondent by telephone or through solicited responses to questions or other methods.

The Inquiry Committee, at its discretion, may interview other individuals to obtain information pertinent to the inquiry. Any such interviews may be conducted in person, by telephone, or through solicited responses to written questions, or other methods. Additional sources of information, such as documents and physical evidence, may be considered by the Inquiry Committee.

## 3. Decision of Inquiry Committee

The inquiry should be completed within sixty (60) calendar days of its initiation unless circumstances warrant a longer period. If the inquiry takes longer than sixty (60) days to complete, the inquiry report must include documentation of the reasons for exceeding the sixty (60)-day period. Upon concluding its inquiry, the Inquiry Committee shall decide by recorded simple majority vote whether a full investigation of any or all of the allegations is

needed.

The criteria for warranting an investigation are met if the following findings can be made:

- There is a reasonable basis for concluding that the allegation(s) fall within the definition of research misconduct; and
- Preliminary information-gathering and preliminary fact-finding from the inquiry indicates that the allegation may have substance

The Inquiry Committee shall provide its recommendation in a fully documented written report to the RIO for appropriate action.

## **E. The Inquiry Report**

At the conclusion of the second stage of the inquiry proceedings, the Inquiry Committee shall prepare a written report for consideration by the DO.

### **1. Content of Inquiry Report**

The Inquiry Committee's report shall include the following:

- The name and position of the Respondent;
- A description of the allegations of research misconduct;
- Grant or other funding support (if applicable), including, for example, grant numbers, grant applications, the source of the grant funding, contracts and publications listing the source of support;
- The names and titles of the committee members who conducted the inquiry;
- A summary of the inquiry process used;
- A list of the research records reviewed;
- Summaries of any interviews (if applicable);
- The basis for recommending or not recommending that the allegations warrant a full investigation;
- Whether any other actions should be taken if an investigation is not recommended; and
- Any comments on the report by the Respondent or Complainant.

### **2. Solicitation of Comments**

Before the Inquiry Committee submits its report to the RIO under Stage Two, the Institution's legal counsel shall review the report for legal sufficiency. Modifications should

be made as appropriate in consultation with the RIO and the Inquiry Committee. The RIO shall provide a copy of its proposed report to the Respondent for review. This report may include suggestions to broaden the scope for the Investigation process. If the Respondent wishes to submit any comments on the proposed report to the DO, the RIO shall include those comments with the final report that is transmitted to the DO. The Respondent's comments shall be received by the RIO within ten (10) days after the Respondent's receipt of the proposed report.

Upon receipt of comments by the Respondent, the Inquiry Committee may modify its proposed report before submitting a final report to the RIO to provide to the DO. The Inquiry Committee is not required to provide the Respondent with its modifications before submitting the final report to the RIO.

The Complainant will not review the final Inquiry report unless the RIO or Inquiry Committee determines that it is appropriate.

The RIO will transmit the final inquiry report and any comments to the DO.

## **F. DO Review of Inquiry Report and Determination**

Upon review of the Inquiry Committee's report, the DO may:

(a) Dismiss some or all of the allegations of research misconduct. The inquiry shall be deemed concluded as to any dismissed allegation. The RIO shall inform the Complainant and the Respondent of the DO's determination and the bases for his/her determination. If the DO determines that some or all of the Complainant's allegations were made without reasonable basis in fact and with malicious intent, the DO may refer the Complainant to appropriate entities within the University or other institutions, as appropriate to address the matter.

(b) Initiate a full investigation of some or all of the allegations of research misconduct. The DO shall refer any appropriate allegations for investigation to the Investigation Committee.

### **1. Documentation of Decision Not to Investigate**

If the DO decides that an investigation is not warranted, the RIO shall secure and maintain for 7 years after the termination of the inquiry sufficiently detailed documentation of the inquiry to permit a later assessment by ORI, or the appropriate funding agency, as required, of the reasons why an investigation was not conducted. These documents must be provided to ORI or other authorized HHS personnel upon request.

### **2. Notification to Complainant and Respondent**

The RIO shall inform the Complainant and the Respondent of the determination and the bases for its determination. The RIO will provide the Respondent with a copy of the final Inquiry report.

The RIO may, but is not required to, provide a copy of the Inquiry report to the Complainant. The RIO shall not provide the Complainant with a copy of the report unless the Complainant agrees to be bound by a confidentiality agreement preventing disclosure of the contents of the report.

If either the Complainant or Respondent wishes to submit any comments upon the report to the DO, they will be included as an attachment to the final report (and will be provided to the Investigating Committee if applicable). Such comments do not constitute an appeal of the DO's decision after the Inquiry proceeding, which is final.

### 3. Notification to PHS (including NIH)/ORI (if applicable)

Within thirty (30) calendar days of the decision by the DO that an investigation is warranted, the RIO will so inform PHS/ORI and provide PHS/ORI with a copy of the inquiry report.

The RIO will provide the following information to PHS/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 to be considered in the investigation.

The RIO will also notify those institutional officials who need to know of the DO's decision.

If the DO decides that an investigation is not warranted, the RIO shall secure and maintain for 7 years after the termination of the inquiry sufficiently detailed documentation of the inquiry to permit a later assessment by PHS/ORI of the reasons why an investigation was not conducted. These documents must be provided to PHS/ORI or other authorized HHS personnel upon request.

## **VII. Investigative Phase**

### **A. Initiation and Purpose**

Unless the DO determines otherwise, due to extraordinary circumstances, the investigation phase must begin within 30 calendar days after the determination by the DO that an investigation is warranted. The purpose of the investigation is to develop a factual record by exploring the allegations in detail and examining the evidence in depth. The ultimate purpose of the investigation is to determine whether research 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. Such expansion of the allegation is not consider a new allegation but is instead managed as part of the current Investigation

## **B. Notifying ORI (or PHS, if applicable) 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 copy of the inquiry report; and
- 2) Notify the respondent in writing of the allegations to be investigated. The RIO must also give the respondent written notice of any new allegations of research misconduct within a reasonable amount of time of deciding to pursue allegations not addressed during the inquiry or in the initial notice of the investigation.

The RIO will, prior to notifying respondent of the allegations, take all reasonable and practical steps to obtain custody of and sequester in a secure manner all research records and evidence needed to conduct the research misconduct proceedings that were not previously sequestered during the inquiry.

The need for additional sequestration of records for the investigation may occur for any number of reasons, including the institutions' decision to investigate additional allegations not considered during the inquiry stage or the identification of records during the inquiry process that had not been previously secured.

## **C. Appointment of Investigative Committee**

As soon as possible after the DO decides to pursue an investigation, the RIO, in consultation with the SRIO, appropriate vice chancellor or dean, will appoint an ad hoc committee of three to five members, including a chair, from the broader research community depending on the nature of the allegation to serve as an Investigative Committee. Scientists external to the institution should be considered if there is any concern of potential or perceived conflict of interest with the local research community or institution. The investigational committee must consist of individuals who do not have unresolved personal, professional, or financial conflicts of interest with those involved with the investigation and should include individuals with the appropriate scientific expertise to evaluate the evidence and issues related to the allegation, interview the respondent and complainant and conduct the investigation. Individuals appointed to the investigation committee may also have served on the inquiry committee or can be members from outside the institution. The Investigative Committee is charged with conducting a thorough and unbiased investigation of the allegations of misconduct.

The RIO shall notify the Respondent and Complainant of the names of potential Investigative Committee members, to ensure that Investigative Committee members do not have a bias or conflict of interest in considering the case. If a potential member's impartiality is questioned, the RIO will determine whether the potential member should be excluded from the Investigation Committee. If, during the course of an investigation, a member's impartiality is questioned, the RIO will determine whether the potential member should be removed and replaced.

## D. Charge to the Investigative Committee

The RIO will convene the first meeting of the Investigative Committee at which the RIO will review with the Investigation Committee the charge, the inquiry report, and these Guidelines and Procedures. The RIO will inform the members of the Investigative Committee of the confidentiality requirements of these Guidelines and Procedures and obtain the members' agreement to these requirements. The RIO shall provide each member with these Guidelines and Procedures, as well as any federal standards applicable to the investigation. The RIO will be available throughout the investigation to advise the Investigative Committee as needed.

The RIO will provide the Investigation Committee with a written charge that:

- Describes the allegations and related issues identified during the inquiry;
- Identifies the Respondent(s);
- Informs the committee that it must conduct the investigation as prescribed in these Guidelines and Procedures;
- Informs the committee that it must evaluate the evidence and testimony to determine whether, based on a preponderance of the evidence, research misconduct occurred and, if so, the type and extent of it and who was responsible;
- Informs the committee that the Respondent(s) has the burden of proving **by a preponderance of the evidence** any affirmative defenses raised, including honest error or a difference of opinion;
- Informs the committee that in order to determine that the respondent committed research misconduct it must find on a preponderance of the evidence, research misconduct occurred it must find that a preponderance of the evidence establishes that:
  - 1) research misconduct, as defined by this policy occurred;
  - 2) the research misconduct is a significant departure from accepted practices of the relevant research community;
  - 3) the respondent committed the relevant research misconduct intentionally, knowingly, or recklessly.
- Informs the committee that it must prepare or direct the preparation of a written investigation report that meets the requirements of this policy and, if applicable, 42 CFR § 93.313.

## E. Investigative Process

The Investigative Committee has the responsibility for conducting a thorough and unbiased investigation. In accordance with this mandate, the investigation committee and the RIO

must:

1. Begin its proceedings by studying the information and evidence collected by the Inquiry Committee and/or RIO.
2. Determine what additional evidence the Investigative Committee needs to make an informed determination as to whether research misconduct has occurred, including interviews of witnesses (including witnesses already interviewed by the Inquiry Committee and/or RIO) and review of additional evidence.
3. 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 each allegation;
4. Take reasonable steps to ensure an impartial and unbiased investigation to the maximum extent practical;
5. Interview each Respondent, Complainant, and any other available person who has been reasonably identified as having information regarding any relevant aspects of the investigation, including witnesses identified by the Respondent;
6. Pursue diligently all significant issues and material leads discovered that are determined relevant to the investigation, including any evidence of any additional instances of possible research misconduct, and continue the investigation to completion.
7. Provide the Respondent with an opportunity to provide oral or documentary evidence related to the allegations and/or research misconduct.
8. Provide the Respondent with an opportunity to identify witnesses (internal and/or external) with knowledge in the area of the alleged research misconduct.
9. Provide the Respondent with an opportunity to review and respond to any evidence that the Investigative Committee relies upon in making its determinations.
10. Preserve the evidence that it relies upon in making its determinations.

When the Investigative Committee conducts any interviews as part of its investigation, it shall record or transcribe each interview, provide the recording or transcript to the interviewee for correction, and include the recording or transcript in the record of the investigation.

The Chair of the Investigative Committee shall control the proceedings and determine the admissibility of evidence. The Investigative Committee shall not be bound by the Colorado Rules of Evidence and may admit any evidence that the Chair deems reasonably related to the allegations of research misconduct. The Chair shall have the ability to limit the presentation of irrelevant or repetitious evidence.

Any party appearing before the committee may have an advisor present, who may be an attorney. The advisor may assist the party in the presentation of information but may not speak on the party's behalf.

## **F. Time for Completion**

The Chair of the Investigative Committee shall keep the RIO informed of the status of its investigation. The Investigative Committee shall normally complete its investigation, including conducting the investigation, preparing the report of findings, providing the draft report for comment and sending the final report to the RIO, within 120 days of the Investigative Committee's first meeting. However, if the RIO determines that the investigation cannot be completed within this 120-day period, he/she may extend the time within which the Investigative Committee is to complete its investigation. The rationale for this extension should be included in the final report of the Investigation Committee. If the investigation falls under the jurisdiction of the Public Health Service, the RIO will submit to PHS/ORI a written request for an extension, setting forth the reasons for the delay and, if such an extension is granted and PHS/ORI direct the filing of periodic progress reports, the RIO will ensure that such periodic progress reports are filed with PHS/ORI. If applicable, the RIO may inform NIH of any extension of the Investigation process.

# **VIII. The Investigation Report**

## **A. Decision by the Investigative Committee**

When it considers that its task has been completed, the Investigation Committee shall determine by majority vote whether the allegations of misconduct are supported by a preponderance of evidence. The Investigation Committee shall reach one of the following decisions as to each allegation of research misconduct:

1. A finding of research misconduct (as defined in this document or applicable regulation) as well as a determination of the level of intent;
2. A finding of no culpable research misconduct, but serious research error; or
3. A finding of no misconduct and no serious research error.

The Investigative Committee shall communicate this decision to the RIO in an initial written investigative report. The investigative report shall:

- Describe the nature of the allegation of research misconduct, including identification of the Respondent;
- Describe any external support, including, for example, the numbers of any grants that are involved, grant applications, contracts, and publications listing this support;
- Describe the specific allegations of research misconduct considered in the



investigation;

- Describe the institutional policies and procedures under which the investigation was conducted;
- Identify and summarize the sources of evidence that the Investigative Committee relied upon in making its determination;
- Include 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 or other form of conduct outlined in University policies and rules; (2) identify whether the research misconduct was committed intentionally, knowingly, or recklessly; (3) 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 that he or she did not engage in research misconduct because of honest error or a difference of opinion; (4) identify the specific evidence that the Investigative Committee relied upon in making its determination; (5) identify whether the research misconduct would require any publications to need correction or retraction; (6) identify the person(s) responsible for the research misconduct; (7) list any current support or known applications or proposals for support that the respondent has pending with non-PHS federal agencies.

If the Investigation Committee determines that the Respondent did not engage in an alleged act of research misconduct, the final report should indicate whether the Investigation Committee finds that allegation was made without reasonable basis in fact and with malicious intent.

## **B. Comments on the Investigative Report and Access to Evidence**

### **1. Respondent**

Upon receipt of the draft investigation report, the RIO shall provide the Respondent with a copy of the final investigation report for comment and, concurrently, a copy of, or supervised access to, the evidence upon which the report is based.

The Respondent will be allowed thirty (30) days from the date he/she received the final investigation report to provide the RIO with his/her written response to the final investigation report. The Respondent's comments must be included and considered in the final report.

The expectation is that the response will be received by the RIO within thirty (30) days after the day of receipt. Only requests for an extension for cause will be considered by the RIO.

## 2. Complainant

At their discretion, the RIO may, but is not required to, provide the Complainant with a copy of the investigation report, or relevant portions of it, for Complainant's response. The RIO shall not provide the Complainant with a copy of the report unless the Complainant agrees to be bound by a confidentiality agreement preventing disclosure of the contents of the report. If the RIO allows the Complainant to receive the report, the Complainant will be allowed thirty (30) days from the date he/she received the final investigation report to provide the RIO with his/her written response to the final investigation report.

## **IX. Disposition by the RIO**

Upon receipt of the Investigation Committee's final investigation report and the responses thereto, if any, from the Respondent or Complainant, the RIO shall review the same and create a final RIO report. The final RIO report is not intended to be a separate investigation of the allegations. Rather, it shall include recommendations based on the findings included in the Investigative Committee Report regarding:

- Possible disciplinary action, policy changes, or other actions that might ensure that similar misconduct does not occur in the future.
- Steps to correct or ameliorate the effects of the misconduct.
- Steps to be taken to prevent retaliation against the Complainant or other persons providing information in the investigation and to restore the positions and reputations of persons who have made allegations in good faith.
- Whether the Respondent's reputation has been unjustly damaged by the investigation and, if so, what steps might be taken to repair that damage.
- Whether any allegation is judged to have been made without reasonable basis in fact and with malicious intent.

The final report of the RIO, along with the final report of the Investigation Committee, shall be submitted to the Deciding Official.

## **X. Final Disposition**

### **A. Decision by the DO**

Upon receipt of the final reports of the RIO and the Investigation Committee, the DO will determine in writing:

(1) whether the University accepts the investigation report, its findings, and the RIO's recommendations; and

(2) set forth the institution's actions in response thereto.

If this determination varies from the findings of the investigation committee and/or the recommendations of the RIO, the DO will, as part of his/her written determination, explain the basis for the decision. Alternatively, the DO may return the report to the Investigation Committee with a request for further fact-finding or analysis.

## **B. Communication of Decision**

When the DO has reached a final decision on the case, the DO will so notify both the Respondent and the Complainant in writing.

The DO, in consultation with the RIO and the Office of University Counsel, will determine whether other university officials, PHS/ORI, NIH, 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.

As a public entity of the state of Colorado, the University is subject to the Colorado Open Records Act (CORA). If an individual submits a request seeking the Investigation Report or any other materials considered a public record and related to the Investigation, the University may be required to produce the records relevant to the request. Any University response to a CORA request must be processed by the Office of University Counsel in consultation with the relevant University stakeholders.

## **C. Other Issues**

During the Inquiry and/or Investigation process, other issues may be discovered or identified that should be addressed by the University, or the applicable school, college, or department. In such situations, the responsible party in the University should be informed of the recommendations of the DO, RIO and / or Investigational Committee. It is the responsibility of the responsible party to ensure that any issues are appropriately addressed.

## **D. Possible Institutional Administrative actions**

If the DO determines that research misconduct as defined under these guidelines and procedures 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;

- Removal of the responsible person from the particular project, letter of reprimand, special monitoring of future work, probation, suspension, salary reduction, or initiation of steps leading to possible rank reduction or termination of employment;
- Restitution of funds to the grantor agency as appropriate;
- Revocation of a degree awarded to the Respondent from the University; and
- Other action appropriate based on the nature of the research misconduct.

## **E. Appeals**

Any disciplinary or personnel action taken as a result of a finding of Research Misconduct may be appealed in accordance with existing University policy.

## **F. Completion of Cases; Reporting Premature Closures to ORI**

Generally, all inquiries and investigations will be carried through to completion and all significant issues will be pursued diligently. The RIO must notify ORI, or, if applicable, the NIH in advance if there are plans to close a case at the inquiry, investigation, or appeal stage on the basis that respondent has admitted guilt, a settlement with the respondent has been reached, or for any other reason, except: (1) closing of a case at the inquiry stage on the basis that an 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

## **G. Notice to PHS/ORI or Other Funding Agencies of Institutional Findings and Actions**

To the extent applicable, unless an extension has been granted, the RIO must, within the 120-day period for completing the investigation submit the following to PHS/ORI or other funding agencies that require such reporting:

- (1) a copy of the final investigation report with all attachments;
- (2) a statement of whether the institution accepts the findings of the investigation report;
- (3) a statement of whether the institution found misconduct and, if so, who committed the misconduct;

(4) a description of any pending or completed administrative actions against the Respondent; and

(5) a description of any pending or completed administrative actions to correct or ameliorate the effects of the misconduct and/or to ensure that that similar misconduct does not occur in the future.

## **XI. Other Considerations**

### **A. Termination or Resignation Prior to Completing Inquiry or Investigation**

The termination of the Respondent's Institutional employment or status as a student or trainee, by resignation or otherwise, before or after an allegation of possible research misconduct has been reported, will not preclude or terminate the research misconduct proceeding or otherwise limit any of the Institution's responsibilities under 42 CFR Part 93, other applicable regulations or these guidelines and procedures.

If the Respondent, without admitting to the misconduct, elects to resign his or her position after the Institution receives an allegation of research misconduct, the assessment of the allegation will proceed, as well as the Inquiry and Investigation, as appropriate based on the outcome of the preceding steps. If the Respondent refuses to participate in the process after resignation, the RIO and any Inquiry or Investigation Committee will use their best efforts to reach a conclusion concerning the allegations, noting in the report the respondent's failure to cooperate and its effect on the evidence or proceedings.

### **B. Restoration of the Respondent's Reputation**

Following a final finding of no research misconduct, including ORI concurrence where required by 42 CFR Part 93, the RIO must, at the request of the Respondent, undertake all reasonable and practical efforts to restore the Respondent's 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 ensuring any reference to the research misconduct allegation from the respondent's personnel file is accurate. Any institutional actions to restore the Respondent's reputation should first be approved by the DO.

## **C. Protection of the Complainant, Witnesses and Committee Members**

During the research misconduct proceeding and upon its completion, regardless of whether the institution or ORI determines that research misconduct occurred, the RIO must undertake all reasonable and practical efforts to protect the position and reputation of, or to counter potential or actual retaliation against, any Complainant who made allegations of research misconduct in good faith and of any witnesses and committee members who cooperate in good faith with the research misconduct proceeding. The DO will determine, after consulting with the RIO, and with the Complainant, witnesses, or committee members, respectively, what steps, if any, are needed to restore their respective positions or reputations or to counter potential or actual retaliation against them. The RIO is responsible for implementing any steps the DO approves.

## **D. Allegations Not Made in Good Faith**

If relevant, the DO will determine whether the Complainant's allegations of research misconduct were made in good faith, or whether a witness or committee member acted in good faith. If the DO determines that there was an absence of good faith, he/she will determine and recommend whether any administrative action should be taken against the person who failed to act in good faith.

## **E. Responsibility for maintaining all records**

The RIO must maintain and provide to ORI upon request "records of research misconduct proceedings" as defined by 42 CFR § 93.317. Unless custody has been transferred to HHS or ORI has advised in writing that the records no longer need to be retained, records of research misconduct proceedings must be maintained in a secure manner for seven (7) years after completion of the proceeding or the completion of any PHS proceeding involving the research misconduct allegation. The RIO is also responsible for providing any information, documentation, research records, evidence or clarification requested by ORI to carry out its review of an allegation of research misconduct or of the institution's handling of such an allegation.

# Appendix A: Research Integrity Officer Responsibilities

## **I. General**

The Research Integrity Officer (RIO) has lead responsibility for ensuring that the institution:

- Takes all reasonable and practical steps to foster a research environment that promotes the responsible conduct of research, research training, and activities related to that research or research training, discourages research misconduct, and deals promptly with allegations or evidence of possible research misconduct.
- Has written policies and procedures for responding to allegations of research misconduct and reporting information about that response to PHS/ORI, as required by 42 CFR Part 93.
- Complies with its written policies and procedures and the requirements of 42 CFR 93.
- Informs its institutional members who are subject to 42 CFR Part 93 about its research misconduct policies and procedures and its commitment to compliance with those policies and procedures.
- Takes appropriate interim action during a research misconduct proceeding to protect public health, federal funds and equipment, and the integrity of the PHS supported research process.

## **II. Notification, Reporting and Cooperation with PHS (including NIH)/ORI (if applicable)**

The RIO has lead responsibility for ensuring that the institution:

- Files an annual report with PHS/ORI containing the information prescribed by PHS/ORI.
- Sends to PHS/ORI with the annual report such other aggregated information as PHS/ORI may prescribe on the institution's research misconduct proceedings and the institution's compliance with 42 CFR Part 93.
- Notifies PHS/ORI and NIH, if applicable, immediately if, at any time during the research misconduct proceeding, s/he has reason to believe that health or safety of the public is at risk, HHS resources or interests are threatened, research activities should be suspended, there is reasonable indication of possible violations of civil or criminal law, federal action is required to protect the interests of those involved in the research misconduct proceeding, the Institution believes that the research misconduct proceeding may be made public prematurely, or the research community or the public should be informed.
- Notifies NIH, if the project that is the subject of the research misconduct proceedings is NIH funded, when the University finds, learns of, or suspects research misconduct that impacts or might impact the conduct or performance of NIH-supported projects, whether at the University or at a University sub-contractor, in order to work with NIH to assess the effect on the ability to continue the project as originally approved by

the NIH. Notifies NIH, if the project that is the subject of the research misconduct proceedings is NIH funded, when University finds, learns, or suspects that falsified, fabricated, or plagiarized information has affected the integrity of NIH-supported research, including but not limited to, applications for funding and progress reports, or published research or research products supported by NIH funds, where NIH has a need to know this information, and the University must immediately provide information on the affected research to the NIH Office of Extramural Research – Research Integrity (OER-RI), in a manner consistent with the ORI confidentiality regulations set forth in 42 CFR § 93.108.

Provides PHS/ORI with the written finding by the responsible institutional official that an investigation is warranted and a copy of the inquiry report, within thirty (30) days of the date on which the finding is made.

- Notifies PHS/ORI of the decision to begin an investigation on or before the date the investigation begins.

When appropriate, conducts a materiality analysis in consultation with the Office of University Counsel to determine whether the inclusion of inauthentic data was material to the sponsor's decision to fund the project.

- Within 120 days of beginning an investigation, or such additional days as may be granted by PHS/ORI, (or upon completion of any appeal made available by the institution) provides PHS/ORI with the investigation report, a statement of whether the institution accepts the investigation's findings, a statement of whether the institution found research misconduct and, if so, who committed it, and a description of any pending or completed administrative actions against the Respondent.
- Seeks advance PHS/ORI approval if the institution plans to close 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 or a finding of no misconduct at the investigation stage.
- Cooperates fully with PHS/ORI during its oversight review and any subsequent administrative hearings or appeals, including 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.

### **III. Research Misconduct Proceeding**

#### **A. General**

The RIO is responsible for:



- Promptly taking all reasonable and practical steps to obtain custody of all research records and evidence needed to conduct the research misconduct proceeding, inventory the records and evidence, and sequester them in a secure manner.
- Taking all reasonable and practical steps to ensure the cooperation of Respondent(s) and other institutional members with research misconduct proceedings, including, but not limited to their providing information, research records and evidence.
- 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.
- 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, 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.
- In conjunction with the DO, 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 PHS/ORI proceeding involving the allegation of research misconduct, whichever is later, unless custody of the records has been transferred to PHS/ORI or PHS/ORI has advised that the records no longer need to be retained.

## B. Allegation Receipt

The RIO is responsible for:

- Consulting confidentially with persons uncertain about whether to submit an allegation of research misconduct. The RIO is not required to file a complaint with regard to allegations discussed during these confidential sessions.
- Receiving allegations of research misconduct.

- Assessing each allegation of research misconduct to determine if an inquiry is warranted because the allegation falls within the definition of research misconduct, 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:

- 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. 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.
- Providing the Inquiry Committee with needed logistical support, e.g., expert advice, including forensic analysis of evidence, and clerical support, including arranging witness interviews and recording or transcribing those interviews.
- Being available or present throughout the inquiry to advise the committee as needed and consulting with the committee prior to its decision whether to recommend that an investigation is warranted on the basis of the criteria in these policies and procedures and 42 CFR § 93.307(d).
- Determining whether circumstances clearly warrant a period longer than 60 days to complete the inquiry (including preparation of the final inquiry report and the decision of the DO on whether an investigation is warranted), approving an extension if warranted, and documenting the reasons for exceeding the 60-day period in the record of the research misconduct proceeding.
- Within 30 days of a RIO decision that an investigation is warranted, providing PHS/ORI with the written finding and a copy of the inquiry report and notifying those institutional officials who need to know of the decision.
- Notifying the Respondent (and the Complainant, if the RIO determines that doing so is appropriate) whether the inquiry found an investigation to be warranted and including in the notice copies of or a reference to 42 CFR Part 93 and the University of Colorado research misconduct policies and procedures.
- Providing to PHS/ORI, upon request, the institutional policies and procedures under which the inquiry was conducted, the research records and evidence reviewed, transcripts or recordings of any interviews, copies of all relevant documents, and the allegations to be considered in the investigation.
- If the RIO, based on the Inquiry Committee report, decides that an investigation is not warranted, securing and maintaining for 7 years after the termination of the inquiry

sufficiently detailed documentation of the inquiry to permit a later assessment by PHS/ORI of the reasons why an investigation was not conducted.

## D. Investigation

The RIO is responsible for:

- On or before the date on which the investigation begins: (1) notifying the Respondent in writing of the allegations to be investigated and (2), if applicable, notifying PHS/ORI of the decision to begin the investigation and providing PHS/ORI a copy of the inquiry report;
- Prior to notifying Respondent of the allegations, taking all reasonable and practical steps to obtain custody of and sequester in a secure manner all research records and evidence needed to conduct the research misconduct proceeding that were not previously sequestered during the inquiry.
- Assisting the SRIO in preparing a charge for the Investigation Committee in accordance with the institution's policies and procedures.
- Convening the first meeting of the investigation committee and providing committee members a copy of the institution's policies and procedures and 42 CFR Part 93.
- Providing the investigation committee with needed logistical support, e.g., expert advice, including forensic analysis of evidence, and clerical support, including arranging interviews with witnesses and recording or transcribing those interviews.
- Being available or present throughout the investigation to advise the committee as needed.
- On behalf of the institution, the RIO is responsible for ensuring that the investigation committee: (1) uses diligent efforts to conduct an investigation that includes an examination of all research records and evidence relevant to reaching a decision on the merits of the allegations and that is otherwise thorough and sufficiently documented; (2) takes reasonable steps to ensure an impartial and unbiased investigation to the maximum extent practical; (3) takes reasonable steps to interview each Respondent, Complainant, and any other available person who has been reasonably identified as having information regarding any relevant aspects of the investigation, including witnesses identified by the Respondent, and records or transcribes each interview, provides the recording or transcript to the interviewee for correction, and includes the recording or transcript in the record of the research misconduct proceeding; and (4) pursues diligently all significant issues and leads discovered that are determined relevant to the investigation, including any evidence of any additional instances of possible research misconduct, and continues the investigation to completion.
- When applicable, 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 PHS/ORI), submitting a request to

PHS/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 PHS/ORI.

- Assisting the investigation committee in preparing a draft investigation report that meets the requirements of 42 CFR Part 93 and University policies and procedures, sending the Respondent (and Complainant at REC's option) a copy of the draft report for his/her comment within 30 days of receipt, taking appropriate action to protect the confidentiality of the draft report, receiving any comments from the Respondent (and, optionally, the Complainant) and ensuring that the comments are included and considered in the final investigation report.
- Transmitting the draft investigation report to institutional counsel for a review of its legal sufficiency.
- Assisting the investigation committee in finalizing the draft investigation report and receiving the final report from the committee.
- If applicable, transmitting to PHS/ORI within the time period for completing the investigation, a copy of the final investigation report with all attachments, a statement of whether the institution accepts the findings of the report, a statement of whether the institution found research misconduct, and if so, who committed it, and a description of any pending or completed administrative actions against the Respondent.
- When a final decision on the case is reached, the DO will normally notify both the Respondent and the Complainant in writing
- Maintaining and providing to PHS/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.