Research Misconduct Review Process

Allegation of research misconduct

Research Misconduct Review Process

Department or Unit Head / Whistleblower Hotline / Research Integrity Officer (RIO)

Refers

RIO

Potential Research Misconduct (FFP):
- Fabrication
- Falsification
- Plagiarism

RIO reviews and determines type of concern

Potential Research Misconduct (FFP):
- Fabrication
- Falsification
- Plagiarism

Assessment of Allegation Conducted by: RIO (to be completed in brief/reasonable time period)
Determines:
- Allegation sufficiently credible and specific
- Falls under definition of misconduct (FFP)
- Jurisdiction under policy and specific federal/funding source requirements

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

Yes

Allegation lacks substance

Inquiry Concluded by: Inquiry Committee
Starts at: RIO notification of committee chair; complete in: 60 calendar days
Determines:
- Whether an Investigation is warranted
  - Reasonable basis for concluding that allegation falls within definition of research misconduct
  - Allegation may have substance
  - Probable cause
- By:
  - Initial review of evidence
  - Initial testimony of respondent, complainant, and key witnesses
  - Evaluation of evidence and testimony

Finding that Research Misconduct may have occurred

Inquiry Committee drafts Inquiry Report within 30 days
- Sends to RIO, who provides to respondent for comment (15 days)
- Final Inquiry report incorporates comments and revised as appropriate
- Final copy provided to RIO

End

Initiate Investigation per PPM 100-4

Inquiry Concluded by: Inquiry Committee
Starts at: RIO notification of committee chair; complete in: 60 calendar days
Determines:
- Whether an Investigation is warranted
  - Reasonable basis for concluding that allegation falls within definition of research misconduct
  - Allegation may have substance
  - Probable cause
- By:
  - Initial review of evidence
  - Initial testimony of respondent, complainant, and key witnesses
  - Evaluation of evidence and testimony

Inquiry Committee drafts Inquiry Report within 30 days
- Sends to RIO, who provides to respondent for comment (15 days)
- Final Inquiry report incorporates comments and revised as appropriate
- Final copy provided to RIO

Potential Research Misconduct (FFP):
- Fabrication
- Falsification
- Plagiarism

Assessment of Allegation Conducted by: RIO (to be completed in brief/reasonable time period)
Determines:
- Allegation sufficiently credible and specific
- Falls under definition of misconduct (FFP)
- Jurisdiction under policy and specific federal/funding source requirements

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

Investigators:
- Conducts within 30 days of Inquiry Determination; complete in: 120 days
Determines:
- If Research Misconduct occurred and by whom
- Preponderance of the evidence
- The research misconduct is a significant departure from accepted practices of the relevant research community
- The respondent committed the misconduct intentionally, knowingly, or recklessly

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

Definitions:
- Allegation: Oral or written statement or other evidence of apparent instance(s) of Research Misconduct.
- Department Head: Head of the Academic or Research Unit in which Research Misconduct is alleged to have occurred.
- Research Integrity Officer (RIO): The Vice Chancellor for Research is the RIO for UCSD and is responsible for implementation of the University Research Misconduct Policy.

Useful Contacts:
- Research Compliance and Integrity:
  - Web: http://rci.ucsd.edu; Email: rci@ucsd.edu
  - Phone: (858) 822-4939
- Research Misconduct FAQs: https://blink.ucsd.edu/research/policies-compliance-ethics/ethics/faq.html
- UCSD Whistleblower Hotline:
  - For reporting possible fraud such as misuse of assets, potential false billings, conflict of interest, or other compliance issues, (877) 319-0265
- Graduate Division: http://grad.ucsd.edu
- Office of Postdoctoral & Research Scholar Affairs: http://postdoc.ucsd.edu
- Office of the Ombuds: https://ombuds.ucsd.edu

Policies and Guidelines:
- Integrity of Research Policy PPM 100-4
- UCSD Guidelines on Access and Management of Research Data
- Postdoctoral Scholars Discipline and Grievances
- Graduate Division Conflict Resolution and Student Appeals
- Research Ethics Program
- ICMJE Defining the Role of Authors and Contributors
- Copyright and Library Policy

DEFINITIONS:
- Allegation: Oral or written statement or other evidence of apparent instance(s) of Research Misconduct.
- Department Head: Head of the Academic or Research Unit in which Research Misconduct is alleged to have occurred.
- Research Integrity Officer (RIO): The Vice Chancellor for Research is the RIO for UCSD and is responsible for implementation of the University Research Misconduct Policy.