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Major Improvements

• More fully aligned with federal requirements
• Replaces broad definition of “Academic Misconduct” with “Research Related Misconduct” to more clearly limit policy scope.
• Aligns with Weill Cornell Medicine policy, providing similar standards and procedures for the increasing number of collaborate across campuses
• Reduced DoF workload to avoid delays while maintaining oversight, process managed by Research Integrity Officer (RIO)
• Specific confidentiality clauses improve mechanisms for confidentiality
Alignment with Federal Regulations

• Research Misconduct Policy is required by Federal Regulations
  • OSTP - Requires federal sponsors to have policies conforming to 65 FR 76260.
  • PHS, NSF, and USDA policies are all similar.
  • PHS policy is the most detailed.

• New Research Integrity Policy 1.2 is better aligned:
  • Roles and responsibilities of researchers are clarified to reduce possibility of misconduct and large financial penalties
  • Preliminary Assessment Stage avoids nonspecific allegations and determines whether alleged misconduct is under Policy 1.2 or other Cornell policies.
  • More easily understood process clearly defines roles and responsibilities for conducting cases, determining sanctions and conducting appeals.
Research, Academic, and Research Related Misconduct

• Research Misconduct is defined in all Federal Regulations as FFP:
  • **Fabrication:** making up data or results and recording or reporting them.
  • **Falsification:** 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:** the appropriation of another person’s ideas, processes, results, or words without giving appropriate credit.

• “Academic Misconduct” is defined in Policy 1.2 broadly as:
  • “Any act that violates the standards of integrity in the conduct of scholarly and scientific research and communication.”

• “Research Related Misconduct” is non FFP Academic Misconduct except:
  • Allegations are investigated under other Cornell policies, such as IACUC and IRB policies, where such policies apply.
Misconduct is Intentional

• A finding of misconduct requires that:
  • There be a significant departure from accepted practices of the relevant research community; and
  • The misconduct be committed intentionally, or knowingly, or recklessly; and
  • The allegations be proven by a preponderance of the evidence.

• Misconduct does not include unintentional error or honest differences in interpretations or judgements of data.
Fairness and Confidentiality Requirements:

• **Safeguards for complainants** give individuals the confidence that they can bring allegations made in good faith without suffering retribution.

• **Safeguards for respondents** give individuals the confidence that their rights are protected and that the mere filing of an allegation will not be the basis for adverse action.

• **Reasonable time limits** provide the confidence that the process will be well managed.

• **Knowledge about the identity of respondents, complaints, and human research subjects, is limited to those who need to know.**
Main Differences between Academic Misconduct and Research Integrity Processes
Academic Misconduct Process (Current Policy 1.2)

Inquiry by **DoF**: Gather evidence & conduct interviews. Is the allegation Academic Misconduct? Is the evidence Substantive?

**Dean of College** appoints **faculty Committee** to: Gather evidence & conduct interviews. Determine if Misconduct Occurred? If so, recommend sanctions.

- **Allegation Received by DoF**
  - **Inquiry by DoF**: Gather evidence & conduct interviews. Is the allegation Academic Misconduct? Is the evidence Substantive?
  - **Dean of College** appoints **faculty Committee** to: Gather evidence & conduct interviews. Determine if Misconduct Occurred? If so, recommend sanctions.
  - **Case Closed**
  - **Case Closed**

- **NO**
- **NO**
Academic Misconduct Process (Current Policy 1.2)

Allegation Received by DoF

Inquiry by DoF:
- Gather evidence & conduct interviews.
- Is the allegation Academic Misconduct?
- Is the evidence Substantive?

Dean of College appoints faculty Committee to:
- Gather evidence & conduct interviews.
- Determine if Misconduct Occurred?
- If so, recommend sanctions.

Case Closed

DoF reviews report and determines sanctions

Mis conduct

Case Closed

NO Misconduct
Academic Misconduct Process (Current Policy 1.2)

Allegation Received by DoF

Inquiry by DoF:
- Gather evidence & conduct interviews.
- Is the allegation Academic Misconduct?
- Is the evidence Substantive?

Dean of College appoints faculty Committee to:
- Gather evidence & conduct interviews.
- Determine if Misconduct Occurred?
- If so, recommend sanctions.

- NO
  - Misconduct
  - DoF reviews report and determines sanctions
  - Case Closed

- YES
  - Misconduct
  - Sanctions Imposed by “applicable university procedures”

Respondent may appeal “using applicable grievance procedures”

- NO
  - Misconduct

Case Closed
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New Research Integrity Process

Allegation Received by RIO

Assessment by RIO & DO*: Is the allegation:
Specific and credible?
Research Misconduct?
Research Related Misconduct?

NO

Case Closed

Case Closed

SANCTIONS imposed by DO.

DO consults with DoF and appoints faculty Inquiry Committee to:
Gather evidence & conduct interviews.
Determine if evidence is substantive.

Substantive

DO consults with DoF and appoints faculty Investigation Committee.

Committee gathers evidence & conducts interviews.
Determines if Misconduct Occurred.
If so, recommends sanctions.

Misconduct

DO reviews report and determines sanctions in consultation with DOF.

Respondent may appeal in writing to Provost. Provost decision is final.

*DO = Deciding Official, most senior research official, currently the Vice President for Research and Innovation.
Questions?