

Research Misconduct

Effective: January 1, 2012
Updated/Revised: November 30, 2012
Contact: [Office of University Counsel](#)

Contents

- Introduction**
- Policy Statement**
- Scope**
- Definitions**
- Responsibilities**
 - 1. **Reporting Research Misconduct**
 - 2. **Assessment**
 - 3. **Inquiry**
 - 4. **Investigation**
 - 5. **Response to the Investigation Report**
 - 6. **Other Considerations**
- Resources**

Introduction

In a community of scholars dedicated to the pursuit of knowledge and truth, conduct that jeopardizes research integrity undermines the advancement of knowledge, erodes public support, wastes resources and may jeopardize safety and health. In addition, federal policies and regulations require, as a condition of eligibility for funding, that the university have policies to investigate research misconduct and, when found, to take corrective action. For these reasons, Iowa State University condemns research misconduct and is committed to addressing allegations and findings of such behavior.

This Research Misconduct policy incorporates definitions and procedures set forth in the Office of Science and Technology's Federal Research Misconduct Policy, as well as the Public Health Services Policies on Research Misconduct, as of 2010. When appropriate, federal policies and regulations, and interpretations of them, will be considered in making determinations under this policy.

Policy Statement

Iowa State University prohibits research misconduct as defined in this policy and in the policies of federal sponsoring agencies and encourages all members of the university community to report observed, suspected, or apparent research misconduct. Upon receipt of such reports, Iowa State University shall investigate them in a thorough, competent, and fair manner and in accordance with this policy and applicable federal policies and regulations.

Scope

This policy applies to all current faculty, staff, students, individuals with postdoctoral appointments, and others at Iowa State University alleged to have engaged in research misconduct. In certain circumstances, Iowa State University's Research Integrity Officer may determine it is appropriate to address the allegations of research misconduct through other policies or procedures. For example, the Research Integrity Officer will generally refer allegations of research misconduct against undergraduate students who are not involved in federally funded projects to the Office of Student

44 Conduct. Allegations of research misconduct reported more than six years after the alleged
45 misconduct occurred will not be addressed through this policy unless the Research Integrity Officer
46 determines that special circumstances warrant otherwise.

47 **Definitions**

48 **Research misconduct** means fabrication, falsification, or plagiarism in proposing, performing, or
49 reviewing research or in reporting research results. It also includes ordering, advising or suggesting
50 that subordinates engage in research misconduct. The misconduct must depart significantly from
51 accepted practices of the relevant research community and must be committed intentionally,
52 knowingly, or recklessly. It does not include honest error or differences of opinion.

53 **Fabrication** is making up data or results and recording or reporting them.

54 **Falsification** is manipulating research materials, equipment, or processes, or changing or omitting
55 data or results such that the research is not accurately represented in the research record.

56 **Plagiarism** is the appropriation of another person's ideas, processes, results, or words without
57 giving appropriate credit.

58 **Respondent** is the individual alleged to have engaged in the research misconduct. In some
59 proceedings there may be more than one respondent.

60 **Research Integrity Officer (RIO)** is the individual appointed by the Vice President for Research to
61 manage research misconduct cases for the university.

62 **Responsibilities**

63 **1. Reporting Research Misconduct**

64 All members of the university community are encouraged to report observed, suspected, or apparent
65 research misconduct to Iowa State University's Research Integrity Officer (RIO) or anonymously to
66 ISU's Confidential Hotline. If an individual is unsure whether a suspected incident falls within the
67 definition of research misconduct, he or she may meet with or contact the RIO to discuss the
68 suspected research misconduct.

69 **2. Assessment of Allegation**

70 Upon receiving a verbal or written allegation of research misconduct, the RIO shall determine
71 whether an inquiry is warranted by assessing whether the allegation falls within the scope of this
72 policy (including whether it falls within the definition of "research misconduct") and whether it is
73 sufficiently credible and specific so that potential evidence of research misconduct may be identified.
74 The RIO need not conduct interviews or gather data except as necessary to make the assessment.
75 In making the assessment, the RIO may consult with individuals the RIO believes to have relevant
76 expertise. The RIO shall also try to ascertain whether the research is funded and, if so, the identity of
77 the sponsor.

78 If the RIO determines that no inquiry is warranted, the RIO may notify the individual(s) who made the
79 allegation. As set forth in the section on Scope of Policy, the RIO may also refer the allegation of
80 research misconduct to other Iowa State University authorities.

81 If the RIO receives a complaint that involves a mix of claims of research misconduct and other
82 misconduct, the RIO will coordinate with the university office responsible for handling the other
83 misconduct claims.

84 **3. Inquiry**

85 If the RIO determines that an inquiry is warranted, the RIO will initiate the inquiry process. The
86 purpose of the inquiry is not to resolve whether research misconduct occurred. Rather, the inquiry
87 process involves gathering information and engaging in preliminary fact-finding for the purpose of
88 determining whether an investigation is warranted. An investigation is warranted if there is a
89 reasonable basis for concluding that the allegation falls within the definition of research misconduct
90 and may have substance.

91 **3.1 Notifying Supervisors and Administrators**

92 If it is determined that an inquiry is warranted, the RIO shall notify the Senior Vice President and
93 Provost and the Vice President for Research of the allegation and the determination. For each
94 respondent, the RIO shall also notify the respondent's supervisor. The RIO shall also notify the
95 following individuals ("approved recipients"):

- 96 • If the respondent is a faculty member, the respondent's chair and dean.
- 97 • If the respondent is a graduate student, the Dean of the Graduate College and the student's
98 Director of Graduate Education.

99 **3.2 Preservation of Research Records**

100 The RIO shall take all reasonable and practical steps to obtain custody or make copies of all the
101 research records and evidence needed to conduct the research misconduct proceedings. The RIO
102 has authority to order preservation of research records and evidence residing on university
103 equipment and servers. The RIO shall be responsible for inventorying and securing the research
104 records and evidence. The RIO may consult with individuals the RIO believes to have relevant
105 expertise concerning the preservation of research records. The respondent(s) may appeal the RIO's
106 preservation decision to the Vice President for Research.

107 **3.3 Notifying Respondent**

108 The RIO shall provide the respondent(s) with written notice of the allegation and the determination
109 that an inquiry is warranted. The notification will normally occur simultaneously with any preservation
110 of research records and evidence. The RIO shall also inform the respondent of his/her obligation to
111 preserve any research records and evidence that may be relevant to the research misconduct
112 proceedings, any steps the RIO has taken to preserve research records and evidence, and the
113 respondent's right to appeal the RIO's preservation decision to the Vice President for Research. The
114 RIO shall advise the respondent to avoid taking retaliatory action against persons he or she believes
115 may have raised the allegation, as well as others involved in the research misconduct proceedings.
116 The RIO shall enclose a copy of this policy and any applicable sponsor regulations or policies with
117 the notice.

118 **3.4 Interim Action**

119 The RIO may make recommendations for interim action to the Senior Vice President and Provost
120 and the Vice President for Research. Conditions when interim action may be necessary include, but
121 are not limited to, when there is:

- 122 • Immediate physical danger to persons or property;
- 123 • Reasonable indication of serious criminal violation;
- 124 • An immediate health hazard;
- 125 • An immediate need to protect equipment or funds, including federal funds or federal financial
126 assistance;

- 127 • An immediate need to protect the safety or interests of the person(s) making the allegation, of
128 witnesses or of the subject(s) of the allegation or his/her collaborators and associates;
129 • A need to assure evidence is preserved or to prevent improper influence of witness testimony;
130 • A need to protect the working or educational environment of affected co-workers or students; or
131 • A need to protect against liability of the university or its employees.

132 Interim action taken must be appropriate to the interests to be protected and reasonably limited so
133 as not to have an undue damaging effect on the respondent or others. Interim action may include,
134 but is not limited to, restrictions on engaging in research activities and contacting certain persons.
135 Either the Senior Vice President and Provost or the Vice President for Research may impose interim
136 actions within their authority. Except in cases of emergency, they shall make a good faith effort to
137 implement interim action through discussion with the respondent prior to taking interim action. The
138 official imposing the interim action shall be responsible for notifying the respondent.

139 The Senior Vice President and Provost shall have the right to review both interim actions and
140 preservation decisions, as needed, to protect the integrity of the investigation and to avoid undue
141 consequences to the respondent or others of these actions.

142 **3.5 Conducting the Inquiry**

143 The RIO shall conduct the inquiry. In doing so, the RIO shall consult individuals with sufficient depth
144 of expertise and experience to understand the issues in the case. The individuals consulted should
145 not have any real or apparent conflict of interest in the case. If the RIO has a conflict of interest in
146 the case, the Vice President for Research shall appoint an ad hoc RIO to conduct the inquiry.

147 **3.6 Inquiry Report**

148 After completing the information gathering and fact-finding, the RIO shall prepare a written report
149 that contains the following:

- 150 • The name and position of the respondent;
151 • The allegation of research misconduct;
152 • Any relevant external sponsor support;
153 • A summary of the inquiry process used, including a list of any individuals interviewed and any
154 evidence reviewed;
155 • A recommendation of whether an investigation is warranted; and
156 • The basis for the recommendation.

157 The RIO shall submit the inquiry report to the respondent for comment. If there are multiple
158 respondents, the RIO shall provide to each respondent only the portion of the inquiry report relevant
159 to that applicable respondent. The RIO may submit relevant portions of the inquiry report to the
160 individual(s) who made the research misconduct allegation for comment. The respondent (and the
161 individual(s) who made the research misconduct allegation, if applicable) shall have seven calendar
162 days from the receipt of the report to provide any comments. The RIO shall attach the comments to
163 the final inquiry report. The RIO may revise the inquiry report as appropriate to address the
164 comments. If changes are made to the inquiry report, the RIO will not seek additional comments or
165 responses unless the RIO determines it is warranted.

166 The RIO shall submit the final inquiry report to the Vice President for Research. The RIO shall also
167 provide the respondent with a copy of the final inquiry report. If there are multiple respondents, the
168 RIO shall provide to each respondent only the portion of the final inquiry report relevant to that
169 applicable respondent. The RIO may provide relevant portions of the final inquiry report to the
170 individual(s) who made the research misconduct allegation.

171 The RIO may establish reasonable conditions to protect the confidentiality of the inquiry report in
172 both its draft and final stages.

173 **3.7 Inquiry Decision and Notification**

174 Upon receipt of the final inquiry report, the Vice President for Research shall review the final inquiry
175 report and determine whether an investigation is warranted.

176 The Vice President for Research shall notify the respondent, the RIO, the Senior Vice President and
177 Provost, the respondent's supervisor and the approved recipients of the determination. The Vice
178 President for Research may notify the individual(s) who made the research misconduct allegation.

179 The RIO shall notify, where required, the research sponsor.

180 **3.8 Deadline for Completing the Inquiry**

181 The inquiry (including the Vice President for Research's determination) shall be completed within 60
182 calendar days of the date the RIO begins to conduct the inquiry unless circumstances clearly
183 warrant a longer period. The RIO shall maintain documentation stating the reason for exceeding the
184 60-day period. The RIO shall notify the respondent of any extension.

185 **4. Investigation**

186 If the Vice President for Research determines that an investigation is warranted, an Investigative
187 Committee will conduct an investigation. The purpose of the investigation is to--

- 188 • Examine thoroughly the evidence (including research records and information provided by
189 interviewed individuals),
- 190 • Gather additional evidence,
- 191 • Perform any additional needed interviews, and
- 192 • Make a recommendation as to whether the respondent engaged in research misconduct.

193 **4.1 Formation of Investigative Committee**

194 The Investigative Committee shall consist of three members, one of whom will act as chair.
195 Additional members may be added if needed to ensure that the Investigative Committee has
196 sufficient depth of expertise and experience. The membership of the Investigative Committee
197 depends on the status of the respondent.

198 **4.1.1 Respondent is Faculty Member, Student, Volunteer or Employee Other Than P&S**
199 **Employee.** If the respondent is a faculty member, student, volunteer or an employee other than a
200 P&S employee, one member of the Investigative Committee will be nominated from the faculty pool
201 by the Faculty Senate President and confirmed by the Senior Vice President and Provost. That
202 member should have experience running a hearing panel and shall serve as the chair. The other
203 members of the Investigative Committee will be nominated by the Senior Vice President and Provost
204 and confirmed by the Faculty Senate President. Those members shall have expertise relevant to the
205 subject matter and may be (but are not required to be) external to Iowa State University. This
206 membership shall also be used where there are multiple respondents, so long as none of the
207 respondents is a P&S employee.

208 **4.1.2 Respondent is P&S Employee.** If the respondent is a P&S employee, one member of the
209 Investigative Committee will be a P&S employee nominated by the P&S Council President and
210 confirmed by the Senior Vice President and Provost. That member should have experience running
211 a hearing panel and shall serve as the chair. The other members of the Investigative Committee will
212 be nominated by the Senior Vice President and Provost and confirmed by the P&S Council

213 President. Those members shall have expertise relevant to the subject matter and may be (but are
214 not required to be) external to Iowa State University. This membership shall also be used where
215 there are multiple respondents and one of the respondents is a P&S employee and none of the
216 respondents is a faculty member.

217 **4.1.3 Multiple Respondents - P&S Employee and Faculty.** If there are multiple respondents and
218 at least one is a P&S employee and at least one is a faculty member, one member of the
219 Investigative Committee will be nominated from the faculty pool by the Faculty Senate President and
220 confirmed by the Senior Vice President and Provost. That member should have experience running
221 a hearing panel and shall serve as the chair. Another member will be a P&S employee nominated by
222 the P&S Council President and confirmed by the Senior Vice President and Provost. The other
223 members of the Investigative Committee will be nominated by the Senior Vice President and Provost
224 and confirmed by the Faculty Senate President and the P&S Council President. These members
225 shall have expertise relevant to the subject matter and may be (but are not required to be) external
226 to Iowa State University.

227 In all instances, the Faculty Senate President, the P&S Council President, and the Senior Vice
228 President and Provost shall seek an objective Investigative Committee with sufficient depth of
229 expertise and experience to understand the issues in the case and with sufficient availability to
230 complete the investigation in the allotted time. The members should not have any real or apparent
231 conflict of interest in the case. The respondent shall have the right to challenge the nominees to the
232 Investigative Committee. The respondent shall submit any challenge, including reasons for the
233 challenge, to the Senior Vice President and Provost in writing in no more than two calendar days
234 following the naming of the nominees. If the Senior Vice President and Provost approves the
235 challenge, the Faculty Senate President, the P&S Council President, and the Senior Vice President
236 and Provost shall submit additional nominees until a committee with the required expertise and
237 experience is confirmed.

238 **4.2 Initial Meeting of Investigative Committee**

239 The initial meeting of the Investigative Committee must be held within thirty calendar days of the
240 date the Vice President for Research makes the determination that an investigation is warranted. At
241 the initial meeting of the Investigative Committee, the Investigative Committee members will receive
242 the RIO's final inquiry report, the Vice President for Research's recommendation, and a copy of this
243 policy and any applicable sponsor regulations or policies. The Investigative Committee shall also be
244 instructed on the appropriate procedure for conducting the investigation.

245 The Investigative Committee shall also review prior decisions made with respect to the preservation
246 of records and determine whether those decisions need to be modified. If the Investigative
247 Committee determines that additional evidence should be preserved, the RIO shall be responsible
248 for securing and inventorying the additional records and evidence. If the Investigative Committee
249 determines that all or part of the previously preserved research records and evidence no longer
250 need to be preserved, the RIO shall document which research records and evidence have been
251 released and the justification for the release. The Investigative Committee should revisit this issue as
252 needed throughout the investigative process.

253 The Investigative Committee may also assess any interim action taken by the Senior Vice President
254 and Provost or the Vice President for Research and make recommendations to them as to whether
255 the interim action should continue and/or whether any further or additional action is needed.

256 **4.3 Investigation**

257 The Investigative Committee shall conduct a thorough investigation and maintain documentation of
258 its investigative efforts. The Investigative Committee shall take reasonable steps to ensure an

259 impartial and unbiased investigation to the maximum extent possible and shall pursue diligently all
260 significant issues and leads relevant to the investigation, including any evidence of additional
261 instances of possible research misconduct. The investigation shall include an examination of all
262 relevant research records and evidence. The Investigative Committee shall also interview the
263 respondent, the individual(s) who made the research misconduct allegation, and any other available
264 person who has been reasonably identified as having relevant information, including witnesses
265 identified by the respondent. The Investigative Committee shall record or transcribe each interview
266 and provide the recording or transcript to the interviewee for correction. The recording or transcript
267 shall be maintained with the record of the investigation.

268 The Investigative Committee shall notify the RIO if it discovers information that substantially changes
269 the subject matter of the investigation or implicates additional respondents. The RIO shall take
270 appropriate action in response to the information, including promptly notifying the respondent in
271 writing of any new allegations that will be pursued.

272 **4.4 Investigation Report**

273 After completing its investigation, the Investigative Committee shall prepare a written report that
274 contains the following:

- 275 • The name and position of the respondent;
- 276 • The allegation of research misconduct;
- 277 • A summary of the investigative process used, including a list of any individuals interviewed and
278 any evidence reviewed;
- 279 • Any relevant external sponsor support;
- 280 • A finding by a preponderance of the evidence for each separate allegation of research
281 misconduct as to whether the research misconduct occurred; and
- 282 • The basis for each finding.

283 If there is more than one respondent, the Investigative Committee shall indicate which of the
284 respondents engaged in the misconduct.

285 If the Investigative Committee finds that misconduct has occurred, the Investigative Committee shall
286 also make a recommendation as to whether any publications need correction or retraction and
287 whether any sanctions should be imposed against the respondent. If the respondent is a faculty
288 member, the Investigative Committee may recommend that the Senior Vice President and Provost
289 either: (i) take nondisciplinary corrective action; (ii) impose a minor sanction (with a recommendation
290 as to what minor sanction should be imposed); or (iii) refer the matter to a Major Sanction
291 Committee.

292 The Investigative Committee shall provide the investigation report to the RIO and the respondent for
293 comment. If there are multiple respondents, the Investigative Committee shall provide to each
294 respondent only the portion of the investigation report relevant to that applicable respondent. The
295 RIO may submit relevant portions of the investigation report to the individual(s) who made the
296 research misconduct allegation for comment. The Investigative Committee shall also give the
297 respondent a copy of, or supervised access to, the evidence on which the report is based. The
298 respondent, the RIO and the individual(s) who made the research misconduct allegation, if
299 applicable, shall have seven calendar days from the receipt of the report to provide any comments.
300 The Investigative Committee shall attach the comments to the final investigation report. The
301 Investigative Committee may revise the investigation report as appropriate to address the
302 comments. If changes are made to the investigation report, the Investigative Committee will not seek
303 additional comments or responses from the parties unless the Investigative Committee determines it
304 is warranted.

305 The Investigative Committee shall send a copy of the final investigation report to the respondent, the
306 RIO, the Vice President for Research, the Senior Vice President and Provost, the respondent's
307 supervisor, and the approved recipients. If there are multiple respondents, the Investigative
308 Committee shall provide to each respondent only the portion of the final investigation report relevant
309 to that applicable respondent. The RIO may submit relevant portions of the final investigation report
310 to the individual(s) who made the research misconduct allegations. The RIO shall notify, where
311 required, the funding agency.

312 The Investigative Committee and the RIO may establish reasonable conditions to protect the
313 confidentiality of the investigation report in both its draft and final stages.

314 **4.5 Deadline for Completing Investigation Report**

315 The Investigative Committee shall complete the final investigation report within 115 calendar days of
316 its initial meeting unless circumstances clearly warrant a longer period. The RIO shall maintain
317 documentation stating the reason for exceeding the 115-day period. The RIO shall notify the
318 respondent(s) of any extension, as well as any sponsor if required. In some circumstances a
319 sponsor may need to give permission to exceed the deadline, in which case the RIO shall be
320 responsible for seeking such permission.

321 **5. Response to the Investigation Report**

322 Upon receipt of the final investigation report, the Senior Vice President and Provost shall determine
323 whether to accept the recommendation of the Investigative Committee and determine any
324 appropriate actions. In making such determinations, the Senior Vice President and Provost shall
325 consult with the Vice President for Research and proceed as set forth below. The Senior Vice
326 President and Provost and the Vice President for Research may impose or modify interim actions
327 while the response to the Investigation Report is pending. The RIO shall inform the Senior Vice
328 President and Provost of any sponsor deadlines for completing appeals and, where required, notify
329 the research sponsor of any actions taken against the respondent.

330 **5.1 Faculty Member**

331 If the respondent is a faculty member, the Senior Vice President and Provost shall follow the
332 procedures set forth in Section 7.2.5.2.3 of the Faculty Handbook upon receipt of the Investigative
333 Committee's final report except that communications shall be with the Investigative Committee rather
334 than the Faculty Review Board and with the RIO rather than the individual(s) who made the
335 allegations.

336 If the Senior Vice President and Provost accepts a recommendation by the Investigative Committee
337 that the matter be referred to a Major Sanction Committee, the Senior Vice President and Provost
338 shall initiate the Major Sanction Process (Faculty Handbook Section 7.2.5.3).

339 Respondent may appeal as set forth in Section 7.2.6 of the Faculty Handbook.

340 **5.2 P&S Employees**

341 If the respondent is a P&S employee, the Senior Vice President and Provost shall consult with
342 University Human Resources and the respondent's supervisor regarding the action against the
343 respondent. If the Senior Vice President and Provost determines that the appropriate action is
344 something other than summary dismissal, the respondent may appeal the action to the Office of the
345 President. If the Senior Vice President and Provost determines that the appropriate action is
346 summary dismissal pursuant to the P&S Summary Dismissal policy, the P&S Procedures for
347 Requesting and Approving Summary Dismissal are waived. The respondent, however, may appeal
348 in accordance with the P&S Procedures for Appealing a Summary Dismissal Decision. If the

349 respondent appeals, the Senior Vice President and Provost shall notify the Office of the President
350 and request that an appropriate individual be delegated the responsibilities of the Senior Vice
351 President and Provost set forth in the P&S Procedures for Appealing a Summary Dismissal
352 Decision.

353 **5.3 Merit Employees**

354 If the respondent is a merit employee, the Senior Vice President and Provost shall consult with
355 University Human Resources and the respondent's supervisor regarding any action against the
356 respondent. The respondent may grieve and appeal the action if permitted by the Regent Merit
357 System Rules.

358 **5.4 Graduate Students**

359 If the respondent is a graduate student, the Senior Vice President and Provost shall consult with the
360 Dean of the Graduate College and the student's Director of Graduate Education regarding any action
361 against the respondent. The respondent may appeal the action to the Office of the President.

362 **5.5 Others**

363 If the respondent is not covered by Sections 5.1 through 5.4, the Senior Vice President shall consult
364 as needed with the university administrator or supervisor responsible for the respondent regarding
365 any action against the respondent. The respondent may appeal the action to the Office of the
366 President.

367 **6. Other Considerations**

368 **6.1 Confidentiality**

369 All information regarding the research misconduct proceeding, including the identity of the
370 respondent and the individual(s) who made the research misconduct allegation, shall be kept
371 confidential. Information about the proceeding shall be disclosed only to those who need to know.
372 Similarly, any records or evidence from which research subjects or participants might be identified
373 shall be kept confidential. Disclosures may be made where permitted or required by law.

374 **6.2 Cooperation**

375 The respondent, the individual(s) who made the research misconduct allegation, witnesses and
376 other members of the university community shall cooperate with the RIO, the Investigative
377 Committee, other institutional officials and sponsor representatives during the research misconduct
378 proceedings. Such cooperation includes, but is not limited to, preserving and providing in a timely
379 fashion information, research records, and evidence.

380 **6.3 Protection of Individuals Who Make Research Misconduct Allegations, Witnesses and 381 Committee Members**

382 In accordance with the university's Non-Retaliation Against Persons Reporting Misconduct policy,
383 the university will undertake reasonable and practical efforts to protect from retaliation individuals
384 who make allegations of research misconduct in good faith and any witnesses, committee members
385 or others who cooperate in good faith with research misconduct proceedings.

386 **6.4 Restoration of the Respondent's Reputation**

387 If no research misconduct is found, the university, after consulting with the respondent, shall
388 undertake reasonable and practical efforts to restore the respondent's reputation. The RIO, the
389 Senior Vice President and Provost and the Vice President for Research shall be responsible for
390 ensuring compliance with this requirement.

391 **6.5 Allegations Not Made In Good Faith**

392 If there is a determination by the RIO, the Vice President for Research or the Senior Vice President
393 and Provost that the allegation of research misconduct is frivolous, malicious, or mischievous or
394 otherwise not made in good faith, the university may take appropriate action against the individual(s)
395 who made the research misconduct allegation.

396 **6.6 Notification to Sponsor**

397 Sponsors shall be notified as required by federal policies and regulation or by terms and conditions
398 in grants or contracts with the sponsor. This includes any notification of special circumstances as
399 defined by the sponsor, such as risk to public health and safety, threat to sponsor resources or
400 interest, and possible violation of law.

401 If required, the RIO shall notify the sponsor within the timeframe specified by the sponsor if the Vice
402 President for Research determines that an investigation is warranted. The RIO shall also notify the
403 sponsor of the Investigative Committee's recommendation, whether the Senior Vice President and
404 Provost accepted the Investigative Committee's recommendation, and any action taken against the
405 respondent. If required, the RIO shall submit to the sponsor the investigation report and other
406 documentation required by the sponsor. If the investigative finding is overturned in a subsequent
407 process, the RIO shall notify the sponsor of the new findings and the basis for them. In some
408 circumstances a sponsor may need to give permission if a review or appeal of an investigative
409 finding will exceed certain deadlines, in which case the RIO shall be responsible for seeking such
410 permission.

411 A sponsor may require that it be notified in advance if the university closes a research misconduct
412 proceeding on the basis that the respondent has admitted guilt, a settlement has been reached, or
413 any other basis. No one may close a research misconduct proceeding without first consulting the
414 RIO to determine whether there are any applicable sponsor requirements.

415 **6.7 Retention of Records; Assurances**

416 The RIO shall maintain the records of the research misconduct proceeding in a secure manner for a
417 period of at least seven years after the proceeding is completed. The RIO is responsible for
418 submitting assurances to sponsors of ISU's adoption of and compliance with this Research
419 Misconduct policy. The RIO may allow others to make such assurances, including employees in the
420 university's Office for Sponsored Programs Administration

421 **Resources**

422 **Links**

- 423 • [Research Integrity Officer \(RIO\) Guru Rao](#)
424 • [Faculty Handbook - 7. Faculty Conduct Policy](#)
425 • [Federal Research Misconduct Policy](#)
426 • [Links to Federal Agency and Department Policies](#)
427 • [Non-Retaliation Against Persons Reporting Misconduct Policy](#)
428 • [ISU Confidential Hotline](#)
429 • [Professional and Scientific Summary Dismissal Policy](#)

430