

STANDARD ADMINISTRATIVE PROCEDURE

15.99.03.M1.01 Guidelines for Scientific Misconduct Investigation and Inquiry**

Approved June 14, 1999

Revised March 31, 2011

Revised July 16, 2013

Next scheduled review: July 16, 2018

Standard Administrative Procedure Statement

Pursuant to System Regulation 15.99.03, this SAP outlines the procedures for handling allegations of misconduct in research, scholarship, and creative work at Texas A&M University. The SAP details the responsibilities of the university's designated officer, processes for assessing an allegation of misconduct, the conduct of an inquiry in response to an allegation, the conduct of an investigation an allegation, and appeals of any decisions regarding misconduct.

Official Procedure/Responsibilities/Process

1. DUTIES OF THE DESIGNATED OFFICERⁱ

1.1 Preliminary Assessment

1.1.2 Upon receipt of a complaint alleging scientific misconduct, the designated officer shall conduct a preliminary assessment as provided in section 2.

1.2 Inquiry

1.2.1 While conducting an inquiry, the designated officer:

1.2.1.1 initiates the inquiry process.

1.2.1.2 notifies the research standards officer, appropriate institutional officials, the respondent, and if necessary, federal agencies, that an inquiry is underway.

1.2.1.3 sequesters research records.

1.2.1.4 appoints a three-person inquiry committee with the assistance of the research standards officer who will serve as the non-voting chairperson.

- 1.2.1.5 develops the charge to the research standards officer and the inquiry committee and provides advice on appropriate procedures.
- 1.2.1.6 determines whether a time extension will be allowed.
- 1.2.1.7 provides draft copies of the inquiry report to the respondent.
- 1.2.1.8 transmits the final inquiry report to the deciding official. The designated officer will notify the respondent and complainant of the results of the inquiry. Based on the recommendations in the final inquiry report, the deciding official, in consultation with the designated officer, will determine if an investigation is warranted.
- 1.2.1.9 The inquiry report shall remain confidential to the extent allowed by Texas law.

1.3 Investigation

1.3.1 While conducting an investigation, the designated officer:

- 1.3.1.1 initiates the investigation process if approved by the deciding official.
- 1.3.1.2 shall appoint a research standards officer who will be the non-voting chairperson.
- 1.3.1.3 develops a written charge to the research standards officer and the investigation committee that identifies the name of the respondent, defines misconduct in research, scholarship, or creative work, and describes the allegations and related issues. The charge shall state that the committee is to evaluate the evidence and testimony of the respondent, complainant, and any key witnesses to determine whether, based on a preponderance of the evidence, misconduct in research, scholarship, or creative work occurred, and if so, to what extent, who was responsible, and its seriousness.
- 1.3.1.4 convenes an initial meeting with the research standards officer, the investigation committee, and a representative of the Office of General Counsel, and provides them with advice on appropriate procedures.
- 1.3.1.5 determines whether a time extension will be allowed.

- 1.3.1.6 provides draft copies of the investigation report to the respondent.
- 1.3.1.7 transmits the final investigation report to the deciding official.
- 1.3.1.8 shall accept the investigation committee report; however, the deciding official may modify or reverse the recommendations of the investigation committee, and must state the reasons for the modification or reversal in a written report to the designated officer, the investigation committee, the complainant, and the respondent. The deciding official's report shall be transmitted with the report of the investigation committee to the President if the action is appealed.
- 1.3.1.9 notifies the complainant and the respondent of the institution's findings and actions.

1.4 Cleared Respondents

- 1.4.1 If an investigation is not warranted, the respondent may request, and the designated officer may recommend to the deciding officer, that any reasonable, practical, and appropriate efforts to restore the reputation of persons alleged to have engaged in research misconduct, but against whom no findings are found of research misconduct, is made. Paragraph 7 of the System Regulation 15.99.03.
- 1.4.2 If the conclusion of an investigation is that the respondent did not commit misconduct in research, scholarship, and creative work, the university will develop a reasonable plan to restore the respondent's reputation and research capabilities.

2. CONDUCTING A PRELIMINARY ASSESSMENT OF AN ALLEGATION OF MISCONDUCTⁱⁱ

2.1 Initiating the Preliminary Assessment

Upon receiving an allegation of misconduct in research, scholarship, or creative work, the designated officer will have 15 working days to assess the severity and extent of the allegations. This time limit may be extended for good cause by the designated officer with approval from the deciding official; the extension must be documented in the record. The designated officer may request a research standards officer and any other appropriate resource person to assist in the preliminary assessment. Every effort should be made to minimize the number of participants at this stage of the process.

2.1.1 Assessing the Complaint

The designated officer must assess the complaint to determine: (1) if the issues are appropriate for consideration through the process described in 15.99.03.M1; (2) whether the allegation is sufficiently credible and specific to warrant an inquiry; and (3) if there is federal funding involved. If federal funding is involved, the designated officer will assess whether the complaint falls under the agency's definition of misconduct.

2.1.2 Possible Findings of the Preliminary Assessment

2.1.2.1 If the issue does not fall within the definition of scientific misconduct or if the allegation is not sufficiently specific or credible, then there is no need for an inquiry. A general allegation that a researcher's or creative artist's work should be subjected to general examination for possible misconduct is not sufficiently credible or specific to initiate an inquiry.

2.1.2.2 If the allegation is the result of a misunderstanding or broken collaboration, then mediation at the level of the research unit, department, or college may be an appropriate response. If mediation is appropriate, a qualified third-party mediator will be made available.

2.1.2.3 If the allegation involves potential violations of federal or state law, system policies, or university rules other than those involving misconduct in research, scholarship, or creative work, then the designated officer shall inform the appropriate university official and/or law enforcement.

2.1.2.4 If the alleged misconduct involves an employee of another system member, then the designated officer shall inform the appropriate official in that unit.

2.1.2.5 If the allegation falls within the definition of misconduct in research, scholarship, or creative work and the allegations are sufficiently credible and specific to warrant an inquiry, then the designated officer will follow the procedures outlined in System Regulation 15.99.03, University Rule 15.99.03.M1 and herein and proceed to an inquiry.

3. CONDUCTING AN INQUIRYⁱⁱⁱ

3.1 Initiation of an Inquiry

If the designated officer determines that the allegation is sufficiently credible and specific so that potential evidence of research misconduct may be identified and it meets the definition of misconduct, he/she will inform the deciding official and initiate the inquiry process within 15 working days of receiving the complaint. This time limit may be extended by the designated officer for good cause; the extension must be documented in the record. Conduct of the inquiry shall be consistent with System Regulation 15.99.03 and University Rule 15.99.03.M1.

3.1.1 Purpose of an Inquiry

The purpose of an inquiry is to conduct an initial review of the evidence to determine whether to conduct an investigation. It does not require a full review of all the evidence related to the allegation. An inquiry's purpose is to decide if an allegation warrants an investigation. An investigation is warranted if there is a reasonable basis for concluding that the allegation falls within the definition of research misconduct and preliminary information gathering and preliminary fact-finding from the inquiry indicates that the allegation may have substance.

3.1.2 Sequestering of Relevant Records

The designated officer should, on or before the date that the respondent is notified or the inquiry begins, whichever is earlier, promptly take all reasonable and practical steps to obtain custody of all research records and evidence needed to conduct the research misconduct proceeding, inventory the records and evidence, and sequester them in a secure manner, except that where the research records or evidence encompass scientific instruments shared by a number of users, custody may be limited to copies of data or evidence on such instruments, so long as those copies are substantially equivalent to the evidentiary value of the instruments.

3.1.3 Interim Protective Actions

At any time during a research misconduct proceeding, the designated officer shall take appropriate interim actions to protect public health, federal funds and equipment, and the integrity of the federally supported research process. The necessary actions will vary according to the circumstances of each case, but examples of actions that may be necessary include delaying the publication of research results, providing for closer supervision of one or more researchers, requiring approvals for actions relating to the research that did not previously require approval, auditing pertinent records, or taking steps to contact other institutions that may be affected by an allegation of research misconduct.

3.2 Time Limit for Completing the Inquiry Process

The inquiry committee shall have 60 calendar days from the date of its original appointment to complete the inquiry process. If more time is required, an extension must be requested from and approved by the designated officer. The extension and the reason for the extension must be documented in the record and the inquiry report. The respondent must also be notified of the extension.

3.3 Notification of Initiation of an Inquiry to Respondent

The respondent shall be notified as soon as is practical and in any event no later than 5 working days as required by System Regulation 15.99.03. The notification shall: (1) identify the specific allegations; (2) define misconduct in research, scholarship, or creative work with respect to the allegations; (3) identify whether federal funding was involved; (4) list the names of the members of the inquiry committee (if appointed) and expert witness(es) (if any); (5) state the respondent's rights; (6) address the respondent's obligation as an employee of Texas A&M University to cooperate; and (7) describe Texas A&M's rule on protecting the complainants against retaliation and the need to maintain confidentiality. The designated officer shall notify each potential respondent that an inquiry will be initiated.

3.4 The Inquiry Committee

The designated officer should take reasonable steps to assure that appointed members of the inquiry committee do not have unresolved personal, professional, or financial conflicts of interest with the respondent, complainant, potential witnesses, or others involved in the matter. Any such conflict that a reasonable person would consider to demonstrate potential bias shall disqualify the individual from selection. The designated officer shall appoint the inquiry committee within ten working days from the initiation of the inquiry. This time limit may be extended for good cause by the designated officer with approval of the deciding official; the extension must be documented in the record. The designated officer shall insure that members of the inquiry committee are familiar with regulations and processes regarding scientific misconduct. The inquiry committee shall include three individuals employed by Texas A&M University and a non-voting research standards officer who do not have actual or potential conflicts of interest in the case and have necessary expertise to evaluate the evidence and issues related to the allegation, to interview the principals and key witnesses, and to conduct the inquiry. The designated officer shall notify the respondent of the proposed committee membership within five working days after the committee is appointed. This time limit may be extended for good cause by the designated officer with approval of the deciding official; the extension must be documented in the record.

3.5 Inquiry Process

The designated officer shall share with the Inquiry Committee in writing, material relevant to the inquiry, including notification of the initiation of an inquiry to the

respondent (see Section 3). The Inquiry Committee will normally interview the Complainant, the Respondent, and key witnesses and examine relevant research records and materials. The Inquiry Committee will evaluate the evidence and testimony obtained during the Inquiry, and following consultation with the Research Standards Officer, will determine whether there is sufficient evidence of possible research misconduct to recommend further Investigation. The scope of the Inquiry does not include deciding whether research misconduct occurred or conducting exhaustive interviews and analyses.

The purpose of an interview at the Inquiry stage is to allow each Respondent, Complainant (if he or she is identifiable), or witness to tell his or her side of the story. The Inquiry Committee should not speculate about what happened or might have happened. Information gathered by the Inquiry Committee shall remain confidential except as necessary for inclusion in the Inquiry report.

If the Respondent admits to the research misconduct:

- (1) The Respondent should be asked immediately to sign a statement attesting to the occurrence and extent of the research misconduct.
- (2) The admission may not be a sufficient basis for closing a case. Further investigation may be needed to determine the extent of the research misconduct or to explore additional issues.
- (3) If an admission is made, the Research Standards Officer will consult with the designated officer in determining whether there is a sufficient basis to close a case after the admission is fully documented and all appropriate procedural steps are taken. The inquiry committee shall evaluate the evidence and testimony obtained during the inquiry. After consultation with the designated officer, the research standards officer, and an attorney from the Office of General Counsel, the committee members shall recommend to the designated officer whether there is sufficient evidence of possible misconduct to recommend further investigation.

3.6 Inquiry Report

3.6.1 Contents of Inquiry Report

The written inquiry report must state:

- (1) the names and titles of the committee members;
- (2) the name and position of the respondent;

- (3) all allegations and the source and amount of support, for example, grant numbers, grant applications, contracts, allegations; and all relevant dates;
- (4) a summary of the inquiry process used;
- (5) a list of the research records and evidence reviewed, transcripts or recordings of any interviews, and copies of all relevant documents reviewed;
- (6) a description of the evidence in sufficient detail to demonstrate whether an investigation is warranted; and
- (7) the committee's recommendation as to whether an investigation is warranted or whether any other actions should be taken if an investigation is not warranted. The Office of General Counsel should review the report for legal sufficiency before finalizing and providing it to the designated officer. The final report, including the review by the Office of General Counsel, should be completed within 60 calendar days after the appointment of the committee.

3.6.2 Comments on the Draft Report by the Respondent

Within five working days of the respondent's receipt of the draft report, the respondent shall provide comments, if any, to the inquiry committee. This time limit may be extended for good cause by the designated officer with approval of the deciding official; the extension must be documented in the record. These comments will become part of the final report and record. Based on the comments by the respondent, the inquiry committee may revise the report as appropriate.

3.7 Final Decision by the Deciding Official

The deciding official, in consultation with the designated officer, shall determine whether findings from the inquiry provide sufficient evidence of possible misconduct to justify conducting an investigation within five working days of receiving the final report.

3.7.1 Decision to Investigate

If the deciding official concludes from the inquiry report that an investigation will be conducted, the designated officer will notify the President, the Office of General Counsel, and appropriate federal funding agencies (if involved) within the prescribed time in federal regulations, and forward a copy of the final inquiry report and a copy of the relevant rules,

policies and procedures.

3.7.2 Decision Not to Investigate

If an investigation is not warranted, the case can be closed. If the inquiry was begun at the request of a federal funding agency, or if a federal funding agency requests a copy of the final inquiry report, the designated officer will send a copy of the final inquiry report and the institutional decision to the federal agency.

If the committee recommends other actions, but no investigation, the deciding officer in consultation with the designated officer shall decide whether to accept the recommendation(s), and so inform the President, Office of General Counsel, and appropriate federal funding agencies of these actions.

The university must keep sufficiently detailed documentation of inquiries to permit a later assessment of the reasons why the institution decided not to conduct an investigation. The university must keep these records in a secure manner for at least 7 years after the termination of the inquiry, and upon request, provide them to other authorized organizations to the appropriate university and federal agency officials.

3.7.3 Restoration of the Respondent's Reputation and Research Capabilities

If an investigation is not warranted, the respondent may request, and the designated officer may recommend to the deciding officer, that any reasonable, practical, and appropriate efforts to restore the reputation of persons alleged to have engaged in research misconduct, but against whom no findings are found of research misconduct, is made.

4. CONDUCTING AN INVESTIGATION^{iv}

4.1 Initiation and Purpose of an Investigation

After reviewing findings of the inquiry committee, if the deciding official, in consultation with the designated officer, determines that an investigation is warranted, the investigation shall be initiated within the maximum time allowed by System Regulation 15.99.03 (30 calendar days). Conduct of the investigation shall be consistent with System Regulation 15.99.03 and University Rule 15.99.03.M1.

4.2 Time Limit for Completing the Investigation Process

The committee shall have the maximum time allowed by System Regulation 15.99.03 to complete the investigation process (180 calendar days). If more time is required and federal funding is involved, the university must request a time extension from the funding agency. If no funding agency is involved, the

designated officer may extend the time period by written notice delivered to the respondent.

4.3 Notification of Initiation of an Investigation of Respondent

The designated officer will notify the respondent of the initiation of an investigation within five working days after the deciding officer approves the initiation of an investigation. The notification shall include: (1) a copy of the inquiry report; (2) the specific allegations; (3) the sources of research funding; (4) the definition of misconduct; (5) the procedures to be followed in the investigation and (6) the documents required by System Regulation 15.99.03.

4.4 The Investigation Committee

4.4.1 Committee Membership

The designated officer shall appoint a research standards officer and a no less than three-member committee. All other procedures to be followed for appointing the investigation committee are the same procedures that apply during appointment of the inquiry committee. *See also* System Regulation 15.99.03 for further instructions on appointing investigation committee members.

4.4.2 Initial Meeting

The designated officer will convene an initial meeting with the research standards officer, the investigation committee, and a representative of the Office of General Counsel and provide them with advice on appropriate procedures. At the initial meeting, the committee shall develop an investigation plan. The committee shall complete the plan as soon as reasonably possible. The investigation plan will include: (1) an inventory of all previously secured evidence and testimony; (2) a determination of whether additional evidence should be secured; (3) who should be interviewed; (4) a proposed schedule of meetings, briefings from experts, and interviews; (5) anticipated analyses of evidence (scientific, forensic, or other); and (6) a plan for the investigation report.

4.4.3 Changes in the Scope or Respondents

During the investigation, if additional information becomes available that substantially changes the scope of the investigation or would suggest additional respondents, the committee shall notify the designated officer. The designated officer shall consult with the deciding officer regarding this notification and take appropriate actions consistent with system regulations and university rules.

4.5 Investigation Process

Consistent with System Regulation 15.99.03, the investigation will normally involve examination of all documentation, including, but not limited to: relevant research records; computer files; research proposals, manuscripts, publications, and presentations; and correspondence, memoranda, and notes of telephone calls.

Whenever possible, the investigation committee should take testimony from the complainant(s), the respondent(s), and other individuals who might have information regarding aspects of the allegations.

All members of the investigation committee shall be present for all testimony. The respondent should be permitted to attend meetings in which testimony is being given and to have present either legal counsel or an advocate of his or her choosing.

All testimony must be recorded. Testimony should be in depth and all significant witnesses should be heard by the investigative committee. Each witness should have the opportunity to respond to inconsistencies between his or her testimony and the evidence or other testimony, subject to the need to take reasonable steps to maintain the confidentiality of the testimony of the respondent or other witnesses.

If the respondent admits to the misconduct, he/she should be asked immediately to sign a statement attesting to the occurrence and extent of the misconduct, acknowledging that the statement was voluntary and stating that the respondent was advised of his/her right to seek the advice of counsel. The committee shall consult with a representative of the Office of General Counsel on the specific form and procedure for obtaining this statement. The admission may not be used as a basis for closing the investigation unless the committee has adequately determined the extent and significance of the misconduct and all procedural steps for completion of the investigation have been met. The committee may ask the designated officer or a representative of the Office of General Counsel to consult with federal funding agencies, when appropriate, to decide if an admission has adequately addressed all the relevant issues such that the investigation can be considered complete. The investigation shall not be closed unless the respondent has been appropriately notified and given an opportunity to comment on the investigative report. If the case is considered complete, it should be forwarded to the deciding official with recommendations for appropriate institutional action and then, if necessary, forwarded to any federal funding agency.

4.6 Investigation Report

4.6.1 Deliberations

Consistent with the standards set forth in System Regulation 15.99.03, the committee shall consider all relevant evidence to determine whether there is sufficient evidence of misconduct by a preponderance of the evidence. The committee shall consider whether the respondent has presented substantial evidence of honest error or differences in interpretations or judgments of data.

4.6.2 Contents of the Investigation Report

The report shall provide a detailed analysis of the evidence that either supports or does not support a finding of misconduct. The analysis shall be consistent with the definition of misconduct as stated in System Regulation 15.99.03, as well as the definition of misconduct that is part of any applicable federal regulation. The analysis shall demonstrate how a consideration of the evidence led to the report's findings. The report shall include sufficient background information to ensure full understanding of the issues.

4.6.2.1 This section shall describe the facts leading to the university's investigation, including: (1) a chronology of the research at issue; (2) the persons involved in the alleged misconduct; (3) the role of the complainant; (4) any associated grant applications or publications; and (5) any public health issues.

4.6.2.2 This section shall summarize: (1) the university's inquiry and investigation processes, including the composition of the committees; (2) the persons interviewed, noting any inconsistencies in between individuals and the credibility of each; (3) the evidence secured and reviewed; (4) the rules and procedures used; and (5) other factors that may have influenced the proceedings.

4.6.2.3 The report shall provide references to appropriate sources. All relevant dates, allegations and the source and basis for each allegation, relevant funding sources, names of experts used, and any additional misconduct issues that arose during the inquiry and/or investigation stages should be included. Copies of significant evidence shall be appended to the report.

4.6.2.4 The report shall also summarize each claim that the respondent raised in his/her defense against the misconduct allegations and cite the source of each claim. Any inconsistencies among the respondent's various claims shall be noted. The report shall not consider claims that do not address the allegations at issue.

4.6.3 Determinations of the Committee

The committee shall determine the type of misconduct the respondent committed. The report shall indicate the extent and seriousness of the misconduct, including its effect on previous research findings, research subjects, and the laboratory or project in which the misconduct occurred. If the committee determines that the respondent committed misconduct with respect to any issue, the report shall: (1) thoroughly document the commonly accepted practice of the relevant scientific community at the

time the misconduct occurred; (2) indicate the extent of the respondent's deviation; and (3) why the respondent's behavior is a serious deviation from that standard. If the committee concludes that honest error or difference of scientific opinion occurred with respect to any issue, the report shall describe the evidence supporting that finding.

4.6.4 Findings and Recommendations

The investigation report will concisely state the findings of the committee for each issue identified. The final investigation report shall make separate findings regarding whether or not each issue constitutes misconduct. The committee will recommend sanctions commensurate with the misconduct, level of intent, and whether it was an isolated event or part of a pattern.

Recommended sanctions and actions may include, but not be limited to:

- 4.6.4.1 withdrawal or correction of all pending or published abstracts and papers emanating from the research or creative work where the misconduct was found;
- 4.6.4.2 removal of the responsible person from the particular project
- 4.6.4.3 letter of reprimand to be placed in the individual's personnel file
- 4.6.4.4 special monitoring of future work
- 4.6.4.5 required training in compliance and ethics in research, scholarship, and creative work
- 4.6.4.6 reduction in pay
- 4.6.4.7 reduction in academic or employment rank
- 4.6.4.8 probation
- 4.6.4.9 loss of research equipment and/or space
- 4.6.4.10 termination of employment and/or expulsion from the university
- 4.6.4.11 restitution of funds

4.6.5 Transmitting the Draft Investigation Report

Once the committee has completed the investigation report, the draft will be transmitted to the designated officer. A copy will also be transmitted to the Office of General Counsel to review for legal sufficiency. The Office of General Counsel will be allowed the maximum time allowed by University Rule 15.99.03.M1 to review the document and transmit it back to the designated officer. After the Office of General Counsel's comments have been incorporated, the designated officer will transmit to the respondent a copy of the draft investigation report for comments and rebuttal to be included in the final report. The respondent will be allowed the maximum time prescribed by System Regulation 15.99.03 to review and comment on the draft report. These time limits may be extended for good cause by the designated officer with approval of the deciding official; the extension must be documented in the record.

4.6.6 Transmitting the Final Investigation Report

After all comments have been received and the necessary changes have been made to the draft report, the designated officer shall transmit the final report with attachments to the deciding official and to necessary federal funding agencies.

4.7 Adjudication by the Deciding Official

Consistent with System Regulation 15.99.03, the deciding official shall render a final decision on the committee's findings within 15 calendar days. The deciding official's decision, reasons, and sanctions will become the final report. The designated officer shall transmit the final report to the respondent within 10 working days of the designated officer receiving the final investigation report. This time limit may be extended for good cause and must be documented in the record.

4.7.1 The deciding official may exonerate the respondent and instruct the designated officer to develop plans to restore the respondent's reputation and research capabilities and to protect the good faith complainant against retaliation.

4.7.2 If the allegations of misconduct are substantiated, the deciding official will instruct that appropriate actions be taken.

5. Appeal and Review^v

5.1 Appeal

Any resulting sanctions or actions following a decision that the respondent engaged in scientific misconduct will be handled in a manner consistent with system policies and regulations and university rules.

5.2 Contesting a Termination Decision

If the sanction is termination, the respondent may appeal the decision in accordance with system policies, regulations and university rules and procedures. For cases in which the respondent is a faculty member, refer to System Policy 12.01 and Regulation 32.01.01 and University Rule 12.01.99.M2; for cases in which the respondent is a non-faculty employee, refer to System Regulation 32.01.02.

5.3 Appealing a Sanction Less than Termination

If the sanction is less than termination, the respondent may appeal all or any part of the deciding official's decision by filing a written appeal to the President of the Texas A&M University within ten working days of receiving the decision. This time limit may be extended by the designated officer for good cause and must be documented in the record. Issues that may be raised on appeal are: (1) new evidence is available to the investigative committee; or (2) the recommended sanction is not commensurate with the misconduct; or (3) the decision is not supported by the evidence; or (4) there exists a serious breach of the procedural process. Upon the President's decision, the respondent shall have exhausted all of his/her appeals.

5.3.1 President's Review

The President shall make the determination based on a preponderance of the evidence presented in the final investigative report, the actions and/or sanctions decided by the deciding official, and any comments or appeals received from the respondent. No live testimony or hearings will be conducted. The President may: (1) uphold all or any part of the findings and sanctions; or (2) uphold all or any part of the findings of the investigative committee and impose modified sanction(s) other than that decided by the deciding official; or (3) return the matter to the investigative committee for further consideration with instructions regarding the matters to be addressed. The President's decision shall be made within ten working days of receiving an appeal. This time limit may be extended by the President for good cause and must be documented in the record.

5.3.2 Notifications

The respondent will be notified in writing of the President's decision on the appeal by the designated officer. In addition, the deciding official in consultation with the designated officer, will determine whether law enforcement agencies, professional societies, professional licensing boards, editors of journals in which falsified reports may have been published, collaborators of the respondent in the work, or other relevant parties should be notified of the outcome of the proceedings. The designated officer is responsible for ensuring compliance with all notification requirements of federal or other sponsoring agencies.

Related Statutes, Policies, or Requirements

System regulation 15.99.03, Ethics in Research and Scholarship

<http://policies.tamus.edu/15-99-03.pdf>

University rule 15.99.03.M1, Ethics in Research, Scholarship, and Creative Work

<http://rules-saps.tamu.edu/PDFs/15.99.03.M1.pdf>

Contact Office

Division of Research

979-845-8585

**Combines the following SAPs:

15.99.03.M1.01: *Duties of the Designated Officer*

15.99.03.M1.02: *Conducting an Inquiry*

15.99.03.M1.03: *Conducting an Investigation*

15.99.03.M1.04: *Adjudication, Appeal and Review*

Adds new section:

Conducting a Preliminary Assessment of an Allegation of Misconduct

ⁱ Approved June 14, 1999

Next scheduled review: July 23, 2010

Supplements System Regulation 15.99.03 and University Rule 15.99.03.M1

ⁱⁱ Supplements System Regulation 15.99.03 and University Rule 15.99.03.M1

ⁱⁱⁱ Approved June 14, 1999

Next scheduled review: July 23, 2010

Supplements System Regulation 15.99.03 and University Rule 15.99.03.M1

^{iv} Approved June 14, 1999

Next scheduled review: July 23, 2010

Supplements System Regulation 15.99.03 and University Rule 15.99.03.M1

^v Approved June 14, 1999 Revised September 10, 2004

Next Scheduled Review: June 13, 2011

Supplements System Regulation 15.99.03 and University Rule 15.99.03.M1