

Appendix A

Research Integrity Policy

OFFICE OF RESEARCH AND SPONSORED PROGRAMS
CENTRAL MICHIGAN UNIVERSITY

POLICY ON RESEARCH INTEGRITY

Integrity in research and creative endeavors is at the heart of many academic endeavors and a fundamental principle of the university community. Faculty, staff, students, and independent contractors all have a responsibility to assure that research and creative endeavors meet accepted standards of scholarly performance. The increasing complexity of the research and creative process, the requirements of federal and state agencies, and the accountability of university personnel to colleagues, students, the university, and the larger community necessitate that CMU specify an acceptable code of conduct, provide a mechanism for investigating alleged violations of accepted standards, delineate appropriate sanctions for faculty, staff, students, and independent contractors, and assure that corrections to the public record follow any discovery of misconduct.

Following is the policy for dealing with allegations of research misconduct at Central Michigan University.

I. GENERAL PROVISIONS

A. Applicability

1. This policy shall apply to all faculty, staff, students, and independent contractors involved in research or creative endeavors.
2. Nothing in this policy is intended to diminish or waive an individual's rights under any applicable collective bargaining agreement to which CMU is a party, or other university policies and procedures.
3. This policy shall apply to students involved in the following research and creative endeavors:
 - (a) Those conducted jointly with a CMU faculty or staff member or with any person from another university,
 - (b) Those externally funded under a grant or contract to CMU or one or more of its employees,
 - (c) Those expected to be published, presented, or shared with the broader academic community outside the student's classroom,
 - (d) Those done in conjunction with a thesis or dissertation, and
 - (e) Those done in conjunction with a graduate Plan B paper, which also satisfy Paragraph 3.a, 3.b, or 3.c.

Except as noted above, this policy does not apply to a student's class assignments, independent study projects, Plan B papers, or directed research work which is not expected to be submitted for

publication, presentation, or sharing with a community of scholars other than the members of the class.

In cases where it is unclear whether this policy or a different university policy should be followed for an allegation against a student, the Assistant Vice President for Research shall have the responsibility for determining which policy shall apply.

B. Research Misconduct

"Research misconduct" shall mean, for the purposes of this policy, fabrication, falsification, plagiarism, or other practices that seriously deviate from those that are commonly accepted within the scholarly community for proposing, conducting, or reporting research and creative endeavors. It does not include honest error or honest differences in interpretations or judgments of data. Research misconduct consists of, but is not limited to, commission of one of the following:

1. Falsification of data, including fabrication of data, selective reporting of data, and manipulation of experiments, statistical procedures or analytical procedures, with the intent to deceive.
2. Improper assignment of authorship, such as excluding other contributors or claiming the work of another person as one's own, presenting substantially the same materials as an original article in more than one publication, including individuals as authors who have not made a definite contribution to the work published, and submitting multi-authored publications without the concurrence of all authors.
3. Claiming another person's research as one's own, including plagiarism, appropriation of ideas as expressed in grant proposals or articles received for peer review, or in student papers, and violation of intellectual property laws.
4. Misappropriation of research funds, including expenditure of funds (a) for purposes not appropriately related to the research or (b) in ways explicitly prohibited by the internal or external funding source.

C. "CMU" shall mean, for purposes of this policy, the administration of Central Michigan University.

D. "Day" shall mean, for purposes of this policy, a calendar day.

E. Responsibilities

1. All members of the academic community are encouraged to report research misconduct if and when they believe substantive evidence exists. Persons who in good faith report alleged misconduct will be protected, to the maximum extent possible, against personal and institutional reprisals.

2. The mere suspicion or allegation of wrongdoing, even if totally unjustified, is potentially damaging to an individual's career. Consequently, no information about charges of alleged misconduct in research may be disclosed except to the appropriate CMU and federal or state authorities or as otherwise required by law.
3. When an allegation related to research misconduct has been directed at an individual, that individual must, in a timely fashion, be advised in writing of the nature of the allegation. The individual must be offered an opportunity to present information to CMU before a decision is made. The affected individual must be afforded confidential treatment to the extent possible and a prompt and thorough investigation consistent with any applicable collective bargaining agreement, or other university policies and procedures. An individual shall have the right to have a representative of the applicable collective bargaining unit, employee group or student group present when the individual meets with the representatives of CMU or any inquiry or investigative bodies in connection with the allegation made.
4. The Assistant Vice President for Research is responsible for coordinating and implementing this policy, disseminating this policy to all faculty and to others involved in research or creative endeavors, maintaining all documents and records relating to this policy, and obtaining and keeping current any and all assurances of compliance with federal and state regulations pertaining to misconduct.

II. PROCEDURES FOR HANDLING ALLEGATIONS OF MISCONDUCT

A. The Inquiry Stage

1. Inquiry is the stage of the review process where factual information is gathered and reviewed to determine if an investigation of the allegation is warranted. An inquiry is not a formal investigation; its purpose is to separate allegations deserving of further investigation from frivolous, unjustified or clearly mistaken allegations.
2. Before making a written allegation, a person is encouraged to discuss the matter with the Assistant Vice President for Research. The Assistant Vice President for Research will advise the person about responsibilities and rights under this policy, and the procedure that shall be followed once an allegation is formally presented.
3. An allegation against any faculty, staff, student, or independent contractor for misconduct in research or creative endeavors shall be submitted in writing to the Assistant Vice President for Research. An allegation may be submitted by any person, including the Assistant Vice President for Research. The identity of a person making an allegation shall remain confidential so long as such confidentiality does not compromise the inquiry or due process.

or contractual rights of the individual against whom an allegation has been filed.

4. The Assistant Vice President for Research shall notify the individual against whom an allegation is made and the appropriate supervisor. In the Academic Affairs Division, the dean of the college should be notified concerning an inquiry, and the dean may inform the appropriate chairperson.
 5. The Assistant Vice President for Research, in consultation with the supervisor, or their designees, is responsible for conducting an inquiry regarding the allegation. The purpose of this inquiry is to determine whether an investigation is warranted. The Assistant Vice President for Research will be responsible for preparing a written report at the conclusion of the inquiry. The report must include a description of the evidence reviewed, a list and summary of interviews, and a recommendation as to whether an investigation is warranted. The individual against whom the allegation was made shall be given a copy of the report, and he/she may respond in writing about any part of the inquiry. This response shall become part of the inquiry report.
 6. The inquiry stage must be completed within 60 days of receipt of the written allegation unless circumstances clearly warrant a longer period. If the inquiry takes longer than 60 days to complete, the written inquiry report shall include documentation of the reasons for extending the 60 day period.
 7. Upon completion of the inquiry, the Assistant Vice President for Research shall forward the report (as specified in Paragraph II.A.5.) to the Provost. If the Provost concludes that no misconduct has occurred, the issue will be dropped. If the Provost suspects that research misconduct has occurred, he/she shall initiate an investigation.
 8. The Assistant Vice President for Research shall maintain sufficiently detailed documentation of inquiries. The documentation shall be used only where required by law, to assist in the defense of the University and/or its employees in legal actions, and to assist in responding to duplicative claims of research misconduct. Such records shall be maintained in a place and manner calculated to provide maximum confidentiality.
- B. The Investigative Stage
1. Where an investigation is warranted, the Provost shall commence an investigation within 30 days of the receipt of the inquiry report.
 2. Where required by regulations or law, the Provost will inform appropriate state and federal agencies that an investigation is to be conducted. The Provost will take any interim steps that he/she deems necessary to protect university, state, or federal funds and property.

3. The Provost shall appoint an Investigative Committee. The Investigative Committee should contain members who have the appropriate expertise to carry out a thorough search for and an authoritative evaluation of the relevant evidence. The committee may include members or consultants from outside the university community having appropriate substantive expertise if such expertise is not present within the university community or if a conflict of interest could arise from appointing a member of the university community to evaluate the evidence.
 4. The Provost will appoint the chair of the Investigative Committee. The Assistant Vice President for Research or her/his designee shall serve as secretary and be responsible for maintaining committee minutes and detailed records of all documentary evidence.
 5. The investigation normally will include examination of all documentation including, but not necessarily limited to, relevant research data and proposals, publications, correspondence, and memoranda of telephone calls. Whenever possible, interviews shall be conducted with all individuals either involved in making the allegation or against whom the allegation is made. In addition, every effort should be made to interview others who might have information regarding relevant aspects of the allegation. The individual against whom the allegation was made shall have the right to have a representative of the applicable collective bargaining unit, employee group or student group present in interviews in which he/she may be asked or required to be involved.
 6. Before the Investigative Committee makes its final recommendation, the individual against whom the allegation was made shall be given a copy of the Committee's report, and he/she may respond in writing to any part of the investigation and report. This response shall be a part of the investigative report.
 7. The investigation should be conducted and completed within 90 days of its initiation. If the report cannot be completed within 90 days, the Provost may request an interim report and an explanation for the delay. The Provost shall notify the individual against whom the allegation has been made of the delay and of the probable date of completion.
 8. When completed, the Investigative Committee shall prepare for the Provost a written report containing its findings, with evidence attached, and its recommendations as to whether the allegation is supported by the evidence. The comments of the individual against whom an allegation was made shall be part of the investigative report forwarded to the Provost.
- C. Complying with Federal and State Regulations
1. During the inquiry and investigative stages, CMU will comply with all applicable federal and state regulations governing allegations of research misconduct.

For example, all Public Health Service grants require that the Office of Research Integrity (ORI) be notified of the following: the decision to begin an investigation, including the name of the person against whom the allegation is made, the general nature of the allegation, and the PHS application or grant number; termination of an inquiry or investigation before completion; any developments during the investigation which may affect funding for the individual under investigation or that PHS needs to know to ensure appropriate use of federal funds and protect the public interest; if any stage of the inquiry or investigation reveals that any of the following conditions exist: (a) there is an immediate health hazard involved; (b) there is an immediate need to protect federal funds or equipment; (c) there is an immediate need to protect the interests of the person making the allegation or of the individual who is the subject of the allegation as well as her/his co-investigators and associates, if any; (d) it is probable that the alleged incident is going to be reported publicly; or (e) there is a reasonable indication of possible criminal violation. Public Health Service grants also require that all documentation substantiating findings of an investigation must be made available to ORI, and that ORI must approve any extension of the period for completing an investigation beyond 120 days, and that a final report shall be submitted to ORI. Federal regulations also require that, for federally sponsored projects, the institution must take appropriate interim action to protect federal funds. This might include suspending an investigator from a research project while an investigation is being carried out.

III. RESOLUTION

A. Absence of Misconduct

1. If the result of the investigation reveals that the allegation of misconduct is not substantially supported by the evidence, the Provost shall notify in writing the individual against whom the allegation was made. In making any further announcement, the Provost should consult with the individual who was the subject of the allegation to determine whether the announcement should be public or selective and what organizations should receive information about the findings. The Provost should be guided by whether a public announcement will be helpful or cause further harm in restoring the reputation of an individual against whom an unfounded allegation was made.
2. Irrespective of the results of any inquiry or investigation, if an allegation was made in good faith, the Provost will ensure that no disciplinary action is taken against the person making the allegation and will make diligent efforts to prevent retaliatory action.
3. If, during the course of any inquiry or investigation, it is determined that an allegation of misconduct was not made in good faith, the Provost shall initiate appropriate action against the person making such an allegation.

4. If the allegation of research misconduct against an individual is not supported during the inquiry or investigative stage, records of the inquiry or investigation will be maintained by the Assistant Vice President for Research. The documentation shall be used only where required by law or to assist in the defense of the University and/or its employees in responding to duplicative claims of research misconduct. No records of the inquiry or investigation will be maintained in official CMU personnel files pertaining to that individual.

B. Presence of Misconduct

1. Upon completion of the investigation, and prior to CMU issuing its written decision regarding what disciplinary action to take, the following procedures shall be followed:
 - (a) The Provost will offer the individual against whom an allegation has been made an opportunity to meet with her/him. If the individual against whom an allegation has been made requests such a meeting, at the meeting the Provost will share with the individual notice of the action he/she intends to take and an explanation of the evidence in support of the proposed action. The individual against whom an allegation has been made shall be given an opportunity to present her/his view of the matter along with any evidence he/she considers relevant to the proposed action.
 - (b) At the conclusion of any meeting conducted pursuant to Paragraph 2.(a), the Provost shall offer the individual against whom an allegation has been made two (2) weeks to file a written response to the proposed action. An election by the individual not to respond shall not be interpreted as an admission of, or agreement with, any of the information provided by the Provost.
2. The Provost shall provide to the individual against whom an allegation has been made a written decision regarding what disciplinary action, if any, is to be taken, together with her/his rationale for the decision.
3. Disciplinary actions will be based on just cause and may include, but are not limited to:
 - (a) Removal from the research project;
 - (b) Written reprimand;
 - (c) Financial restitution of grant funds;
 - (d) Denial of access to university research funds;
 - (e) Notification to journal editors, book publishers;
 - (f) Notification to professional organizations;
 - (g) Suspension from the university; and/or
 - (h) Separation from the university.

4. The Provost shall make a decision and take action within 30 days from the receipt of the Investigative Committee's report.
5. When there is a finding of research misconduct, the Provost will promptly notify the university supervisor, federal and state agencies where required by law, the person who made the allegation, and organizations informed of the investigation.
6. In any disciplinary action, the grievance and hearing provisions of any applicable collective bargaining agreements, Academic Senate grievance procedures, and other university policies or procedures will be strictly adhered to. A challenge (i.e., an appeal or a grievance) to the disciplinary action may be made under one university procedure only.
7. The Assistant Vice President for Research will maintain the records of the investigation where there is a finding of research misconduct.

Approved by: Leonard E. Plachta Date: 6-26-95
Leonard E. Plachta
President

NOTE: This document is based upon several sources from which language is taken in whole or in part to fit the situation at Central Michigan University:

Department of Health and Human Services, Responsibilities of Awardee and Applicant Institutions for Dealing with Reporting Possible Misconduct in Science, Federal Register, Vol. 54, No. 151, August 8, 1989, pp. 32446-32451.

Guidelines for the Conduct of Research at the National Institutes of Health, 1991.

1993-1996 Agreement between CMU and the Central Michigan University Faculty Association.

National Science Foundation regulations on misconduct in science and engineering research (45 CFR Part 689).

Policy on Integrity in Research, Executive Memorandum No. C-22, Purdue University, September, 1991.

Policy on Misconduct in Research, Bowling Green State University, November, 1990.

Research Integrity at Northern Illinois University, Spring, 1991.

University Policy Regarding Misconduct in Research and Scholarship, Kent State University, June, 1989.