



Research Integrity Policy

Policy Introduction

Moravian University expects its officers, faculty, staff, and students to adhere to the highest ethical and professional standards in the conduct and management of research. While breaches in such standards are rare, all parties must deal with these promptly and fairly in order to preserve the integrity of the research community and of the University. Therefore, it is the responsibility of every research investigator to assure integrity in the collection of data, storage of records, and proper assignment of credit in publication. It is also the responsibility of all faculty and personnel to report instances of misconduct, as well as instances of retaliation against those who, in good faith, bring charges of scholarly misconduct.

Policy Guidelines

Scope

Federal law (see 42 CFR 93) requires the University to maintain uniform policies and procedures for investigating and reporting instances of alleged or apparent misconduct involved in research supported by the National Institutes of Health or other Public Health Service (PHS) agencies or in applications for the support of such research.

This policy is consistent with those requirements, but applies to research undertaken in all disciplines, whether or not it is supported by a grant from either internal or external sources.

This policy applies to any person paid by, subject to the rules and policies of, or affiliated with Moravian University including faculty, trainees, technicians and other staff members, administrators, fellows, visiting scholars or other collaborators at the University

This policy is limited to misconduct occurring within six years of the date the University receives the allegation of misconduct, unless otherwise determined by federal guidelines (42 CFR 93.105).

This policy is based on and incorporates the federal guidelines put forth by the U. S. Department of Health and Human Services Office of Research Integrity (ORI) in the area of scientific misconduct. These guidelines shall be considered amended by all current changes in federal laws and regulations.

Definitions

Research misconduct means fabrication, falsification, or plagiarism in proposing, performing, or reviewing research or in reporting research results:

- 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 (42 CFR 93.103).

Research misconduct does not include honest error or differences of opinion (42 CFR 93.103). Misconduct includes a violation of regulations or ethical codes for the treatment of human and animal subjects.

Misconduct includes serious misappropriation of research funds, including but not limited to diversion of such funds to personal or non-university use. The term “serious misappropriations” is not contemplated to include minor deviations within budget categories.

Procedures

Reporting Misconduct

All employees or individuals associated with Moravian University will immediately report observed, suspected, or apparent scholarly misconduct, or retaliation for having made such allegations (“Complainant”), to the Research Integrity Officer (RIO). The report will be made in writing and signed by the Complainant. The confidentiality of those who, in good faith, report apparent misconduct and those against whom allegations are made will be protected to the fullest extent possible. In addition, any research subjects identifiable from research records or evidence will also be protected to the fullest extent possible. The role of the Complainant is limited. Once the Complainant has made an allegation of research misconduct, that person does not participate in the proceeding other than as a witness. Any comments made by the Complainant on the draft report must be included in the final investigation report.

Initial Inquiry

The purpose of the initial inquiry is to conduct a review of the evidence to determine whether to conduct an investigation. An investigation is warranted if:

A reasonable basis for concluding that the allegation falls within the definition of research misconduct under 42 CFR 93 and invA6t c-2 (nv)4.9 [(A9a)4 (nd i)-2 (2 (e)6 C9v)4.9 2 (e(et)14gd on ofd ird irPt

Use Committee) may be one source for members of this Investigative Committee. Committee members must have appropriate expertise and no real or apparent unresolved personal, professional, or financial conflicts of interest with those involved with the inquiry or investigation. The President or the Provost may, however, request one or more members from external entities to ensure appropriate expertise in the review. The need for impartiality and objectivity must be honored. All parties have the right to comment on the composition of the Investigative Committee and may raise questions concerning membership.

When the Investigative Committee is appointed, the Provost shall inform in writing the Respondent(s) and any involved collaborators that an investigation will be conducted and shall present to them a written statement of the allegations before the investigation begins. The Respondent shall be informed of their right to have a campus colleague and/or legal counsel present for preparing and/or giving their

-1 (e)4 (nt)-2 (h w)2n02 Ta8mcf

1. The Respondent must receive a draft of the investigative report, and a copy of, or supervised access to, the evidence, and be given thirty (30) days for written comments. These comments must be considered by the University and included in the final report (42 CFR 93.312).
2. If scholarly misconduct is not confirmed, all participants shall be notified in writing. Diligent efforts will be undertaken to restore the reputation of the Respondent.
3. Reasonable and practical efforts to protect or restore the position and reputation of any Complainant, Witness, or Committee Member, will also be taken. The institution will counter any potential or actual retaliation against these Complainants, Witnesses, and Committee Members.
4. If the allegations of scholarly misconduct are confirmed, the Investigative Committee shall recommend a course of action to the President. The recommendations may include sanctions, as well as adequate steps to insure that the institution meets its obligations to third parties, including collaborators and the scholarly community. The Provost shall make those notifications, if any, that are required by any external grant or contract sponsors.
5. After considering the recommendations of this group, the President shall follow established University procedures for taking disciplinary action against the Respondent.
6. The University shall provide notice to ORI of institutional findings and actions, including the investigation report, final institutional action, findings, and institutional administrative actions (42 CFR 93.315).
7. The University may make a finding of research misconduct or other breaches of research integrity under internal policies and standards, even if no misconduct is found under the HHS ORI regulations.

Within thirty (30) days after receiving official notification of the decision, the Respondent has the right to appeal the decision by submitting a written request to the Research Integrity Officer, with a copy to the Provost. The appeal will be reviewed by the Provost and the Research Integrity Officer. The appeal will be reviewed by the Provost and the Research Integrity Officer. The appeal will be reviewed by the Provost and the Research Integrity Officer.

University shall also take custody of additional records and evidence uncovered during the proceeding,