



OFFICE OF RESEARCH-NSU

Policy and Procedure Governing Investigation of Research Misconduct (*recommended for approval at 86th Meeting of the Academic Council, 22 March 2021; approved by the NSU Board of Trustees at 122th Meeting, 11 May 2021*)

Preamble

North South University (NSU) faculty, staff, and students are accountable for the research integrity of all biomedical, behavioral, social science, engineering, and humanities research they conduct. In particular, all research investigators, whether performing in the role of principal investigator or co-investigator, shall act in compliance with NSU governing policies on “human subjects research” and “animal care and use in research.” All research falling within these two main categories of research are subject to review for scientific merit by the designated school Scientific Review Committee (SRC) and subsequently, where warranted, by the university’s Institutional Review Board/Ethics Review Committee (IRB/ERC) or the university’s Animal Care and Use Committee (IACUC). The Office of Research-NSU provides ready access online to all policies and procedures at its website (<http://www.northsouth.edu/research-office/>).

This policy shall apply to any person who, at the time of the alleged research misconduct, was employed by, was an agent of, or was affiliated by contract or agreement, with North South University. All investigations of scientific misconduct shall follow this policy when implementing investigative procedures for alleged research misconduct. The most current policy shall be posted at the website of the Office of Research-NSU for ready access and consultation by all concerned parties.

Any individual within or outside the university community may, without prejudice as to any untoward penalty, communicate an allegation of research misconduct to the designated *Institutional Official* (IO) [currently, the Vice Chancellor serves as IO] and/or to the Director, Office of Research-NSU, the designated investigative authority and Research Integrity Officer (RIO). It is the responsibility of university authority to investigate such allegations through appropriate inquiry and investigation, and then to dispose of any allegation according to procedure stipulated within this policy governing research misconduct.

Deciding Official (DO) means the institutional official who makes *final* determinations on allegations of research misconduct and issues any institutional administrative actions after (i) a formal investigation of research misconduct is concluded and (ii) a final report has been issued by an Ad Hoc Research Misconduct Investigation Committee (RMIC) according to procedures outlined below. Normally the Vice Chancellor, acting as Chief Academic Officer of the university, shall be the DO, subject to authorization from the NSU Board of Trustees.

The DO should have no direct prior involvement in the institution’s informal inquiry, formal investigation, or assessment of allegations of research misconduct. The Director, Office of Research-NSU (OR-NSU), shall serve as the institution’s Research Integrity



Officer (RIO) and be administratively responsible for assessing allegations of research misconduct according to procedures consistent with this policy.

Further, it is within the purview of the RIO to keep the DO and other NSU authorities apprised of the progress of the review of the allegation(s) of research misconduct. The DO being so apprised shall not be interpreted as the DO having direct prior involvement in either an informal inquiry or formal investigation such as might prejudice any administrative action that may be taken upon the conclusion of a formal investigation of allegations of research misconduct.

Consistent with the provision that the DO shall not have direct prior involvement in the assessment of allegations of research misconduct, the Chairperson and members of any Ad Hoc RMIC shall not discuss the substantive proceedings of any formal investigation with the DO or other NSU authority while the investigation is ongoing. The RMIC may, however, consult the Director, OR-NSU, in his/her capacity as RIO, for clarification and resolution of procedural matters related to interpretation and implementation of this policy during a formal investigation.

NSU follows an American model of higher education and aspires to become a research-intensive university consistent with that model. Accordingly, standards in research misconduct policy and procedures common to American institutions of higher education are adapted here. (Reference: Office of Research Integrity, "Sample Policy & Procedures for Responding to Research Misconduct Allegations," <https://ori.hhs.gov/sample-policy-procedures-responding-research-misconduct-allegations>, as accessed 17 August 2020. Hereafter, cited text is representative of U.S. Office of Research Integrity (ORI) terms in use within such recommended policy and procedure with some modification according to local context of research.)

Basic Definition of Research

'Research' means "a systematic experiment, study, evaluation, demonstration or survey designed to develop or contribute to general knowledge (basic research) or specific knowledge (applied research), e.g., relating broadly to public health by establishing, discovering, developing, elucidating or confirming information about, or the underlying mechanism relating to, biological causes, functions or effects, diseases, treatments, or related matters to be studied." The same criteria shall apply in the case of any and all behavioral research normally conducted in the social sciences and applied research in engineering, following discipline-specific research methods. The same definition applies in the case of research in humanities disciplines when allegations of research misconduct arise.

Responsibility to Report Misconduct

All institutional members of NSU, including faculty, staff, administrators, and graduate and undergraduate students will report observed, suspected, or apparent research misconduct to the RIO. If an individual is unsure whether a suspected incident falls within the definition of research misconduct as provided in this policy, s/he may contact the RIO at the Office of Research-NSU in person, by email, or by telephone, to



discuss the suspected research misconduct informally, which may include discussing it anonymously and/or hypothetically. If the circumstances described by the individual do not meet the definition of research misconduct but represent probability of academic or other misconduct, the RIO will refer the individual or allegation to other offices or officials with responsibility for resolving the problem.

At any time, an institutional member of NSU may have confidential discussions and consultations about concerns of possible misconduct with the RIO and will be counseled about appropriate procedures for reporting allegations.

Basic Definition of Research Misconduct

'Research misconduct' shall be understood to occur specifically when an investigator *violates*, whether through *negligence* or *deliberate intent*:

- (1) national scientific and/or ethical guidelines as established by Bangladesh governmental regulatory authority;
- (2) (2a) NSU human subjects research protection policy or (2b) NSU animal care and use policy; or
- (3) generally accepted standards of research integrity governing *bona fide* representation of an investigator's research accomplishments in research portfolio or web profile, (e.g., in an investigator's *curriculum vitae* or resume, in intramural and/or extramural research grant application documents, in applications for promotion in faculty rank, etc.); or,
- (4) any other policy that NSU may promulgate that governs the specific research in question.

Research misconduct, therefore, occurs *generally* when:

- a. carried out contrary to the public interest, including here public safety, public health, and public welfare as defined by applicable standards of professional ethics; as well as when,
- b. carried out contrary to NSU institutional interests to assure the public and the research community at large that NSU investigators are performing their professional duties consistent with national and international standards of responsible conduct of research.

In this sense, then, 'research misconduct' can involve specifically any one or a combination of the following actions undertaken during *proposing*, *performing*, *reviewing*, *reporting*, or *disseminating* research, research training, or activities related to research or research training:

1. Any breach of SRC-approved, IRB/ERC-approved, or IACUC-approved research protocol(s);
2. Misrepresentation of research investigator professional qualifications and/or professional experience;
3. Deliberate plagiarism; 'plagiarism' means "the appropriation of another person's ideas, processes, results, or words without giving appropriate credit;"
4. Misrepresentation of authorship: "Due credit" for authorship assumes the investigator has genuinely contributed to authorship according to standards of



- publication ethics in the given discipline of research. “Gifted” and “ghost” authorship, as well as false claims of authorship of any one or more of (i) scientific papers, (ii) published articles or conference proceedings, (iii) books, (iv) book chapters, etc., shall constitute misrepresentation of due credit for authorship.
5. Manipulation, falsification, or fabrication of research results and/or records produced in the course of research experiments or qualitative or quantitative studies, contrary to standards expected of research data safety and monitoring;
 - (a) ‘Fabrication’ means “making up data or results and recording or reporting them;”
 - (b) ‘Falsification’ means “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;”
 6. Deliberate mismanagement (fiscal impropriety) of institutionally supported (intramural) and/or externally sponsored (extramural) research funds that were disbursed in a research grant, contract, or inter-institutional cooperative/collaborative agreement. Fraudulent misuse of research funds is subject to referral for legal review and prosecution in an appropriate juridical venue.
 7. Research misconduct “does not include honest error or differences of opinion” such as are matters of reasonable disagreement about scientific facts and/or interpretation of those facts.

Research Misconduct Investigation Committee

When receiving allegations of research misconduct from a complainant (as defined below) or from the Institutional Official (IO), the RIO shall immediately assess the allegation to determine whether it is sufficiently credible and specific (relative to terms defined in this policy) such that potential evidence of research misconduct may be identified.

The period of the RIO’s assessment of an allegation should be brief, preferably concluded within seven days from the date the RIO receives the allegation. The RIO need not interview the complainant, respondent, or other witnesses, or gather data beyond any that may have been submitted with the allegation, except as the RIO deems necessary to determine whether the allegation is sufficiently credible and specific so that potential evidence of research misconduct may be identified.

If and when the RIO makes such a determination that the allegation is sufficiently credible and specific so that potential evidence of research misconduct may be identified, the RIO shall inform the DO in writing by formal memorandum accordingly. The RIO shall make a good faith effort to notify the respondent in writing (by official memorandum delivered to the respondent’s office and/or transmitted electronically by email to the respondent’s known email user id) of the allegation of research misconduct.

Depending on the seriousness of the alleged research misconduct, the DO may take temporary administrative action when deemed in the interest of NSU’s commitment to research integrity and/or in view of protection of the public interest against probable



risk, including here public safety, public health, and public welfare, as well as animal welfare in the case of live animal research projects. Such temporary administrative actions may include, e.g., suspending the individual alleged to have committed research misconduct from all current duties; authorizing the RIO to suspend current research project activity in which alleged research misconduct has occurred, including the RIO issuing a directive to the Director, Finance & Accounts, to suspend all grant funding disbursements when the alleged research misconduct occurs in funded research.

As appropriate to the case, the RIO shall, on or before the date on which the respondent is notified of the allegation, obtain custody of, inventory, and sequester, all research records and evidence needed to conduct the research misconduct proceeding.

If and when the RIO makes such a determination, the RIO shall constitute and appoint a Research Misconduct Investigation Committee (RMIC) on an ad hoc basis for the purpose of conducting a formal investigation into allegations of research misconduct. The RIO shall appoint the Chairperson and members of the RMIC and issue a formal written directive to initiate a formal investigation. In doing so, the RIO shall make a good faith effort to assure that members of the RMIC have no unresolved real or apparent personal, professional, or financial conflicts of interest with the respondent that may prejudice their service on the RMIC. Members of the RMIC should have relevant scientific or other pertinent expertise that enables the RMIC to evaluate the evidence and issues related to the allegation, to interview the complainant, respondents, and witnesses, and otherwise conduct the inquiry. If any member of the committee needs to be replaced for personal reasons or the RMIC requires additional expertise to assess allegations, the RIO may appoint additional members to the RMIC.

Charge to the RMIC and First Meeting of the RMIC

The RIO shall prepare a formal memorandum provided to members of the RMIC in advance of a first meeting, that:

- Sets forth the time frame for completion of the investigation (normally a maximum of 45 calendar days), although the time may be extended when circumstances warrant this (as supported by relevant documentation), as requested by the RMIC Chairperson;
- Describes the allegations and any related issues identified during the assessment of allegations;
- Reminds the RMIC of the standards that apply in the evaluation of potential evidence and in making a finding of research misconduct, consistent with this policy;
- Clarifies the procedure for the RMIC to issue its final report to the RIO and safeguard and secure all documents received and otherwise collected during formal investigative proceedings;
- Identifies administrative/clerical support staff to assist the RMIC with the investigation proceedings.



Complainant

The *complainant* is responsible for making allegations of research misconduct in good faith, i.e., s/he shall not do so on the basis of malicious motivation. The complainant may request and be granted anonymity during a research misconduct investigation; i.e., when granted anonymity the identity of the complainant shall not be disclosed to the respondent (as defined below) but shall be known by the IO, RIO (and thereby OR-NSU staff providing administrative support to the RMIC), and the RMIC. The complainant shall maintain confidentiality in all communications with the IO, the RIO (and thereby the staff of OR-NSU), and the RMIC, and s/he shall also cooperate fully and truthfully with the RMIC as it carries out the formal investigation, including when being interviewed by the RMIC. The RMIC must interview the complainant during an investigation, and the complainant shall thereafter be given the transcript or recording of any such interview(s) for correction. The complainant shall return any written corrective comments to the RMIC by the date designated by the RMIC Chairperson.

Respondent

The *respondent* is the individual alleged to have committed research misconduct. The respondent is responsible for maintaining confidentiality and cooperating with the conduct of the formal investigation.

The respondent is entitled to:

- A good faith effort from the RIO to notify the respondent in writing at the time of or before the beginning of a formal investigation, including in such notification a statement of the specific allegations of research misconduct (with copy of the NSU policy also provided for reference);
- Notification of any new allegations that arise during the RMIC proceedings (such notification shall be provided from the RIO upon transmittal of the same from the Chairperson of the RMIC to the RIO);
- An opportunity to be interviewed by the RMIC and to comment in writing on the specific allegations of research misconduct when interviewed by the RMIC; the respondent shall also have opportunity to correct the transcript of the interview and have this correction included as part of the formal record of investigation;
- Have the RMIC interview, during the investigation, any witness whom the respondent identifies to have information relevant to the investigation;
- To have independent legal counsel who may be present and advise the respondent during formal proceedings of the RMIC whenever the respondent is interviewed [such counsel may be present but shall not speak on behalf of, or otherwise represent, the respondent during said interview session(s)];
- Timely notification of the outcome of the formal investigation;
- Opportunity, at any time during the formal investigation, to admit that research misconduct occurred and that s/he committed the research misconduct. In the event of such admission, with the advice of the RIO, the Deciding Official may terminate the institution's formal investigation and proceed to take administrative action consistent with the DO's authority.
- To have his/her reputation protected through sustained confidentiality of all RMIC proceedings; and, further, the DO and the RIO in particular (and other



institutional officials as appropriate) shall make all reasonable and practical efforts to restore the reputation of persons alleged to have engaged in research misconduct but against whom no finding of research misconduct is made at the conclusion of a formal investigation.

Protection of Complainants, Witnesses, and Committee Members

Institutional members of NSU may not retaliate in any way against complainants, witnesses, RMIC committee members, or OR-NSU staff involved in official investigations. Institutional members should immediately report any alleged or apparent retaliation against complainants, witnesses, committee members, or OR-NSU staff to the RIO, who shall review the matter and, as necessary, make all reasonable and practical efforts to counter any potential or actual retaliation and protect and restore the position and reputation of the person against whom the retaliation is directed.

Other Definitions of Terms

Research record

'Research record' means "the record of data or results that embody the facts resulting from scientific inquiry, including but not limited to, research proposals, laboratory records, both physical and electronic, progress reports, abstracts, theses, oral presentations, internal reports, journal articles, and any documents and materials provided to NSU or an NSU institutional official by a respondent in the course of the research misconduct proceeding."

Investigation

'Investigation' means "the formal development of a factual record and the examination of that record leading to a decision not to make a finding of research misconduct or to a recommendation for a finding of research misconduct which may include a recommendation for other appropriate actions, including administrative actions." Any investigation must be a "thorough, competent, objective, and fair response to allegations of research misconduct."

Research misconduct proceeding

'Research misconduct proceeding' means "any actions related to alleged research misconduct taken under this policy, including but not limited to, allegation assessments, inquiries, investigations, oversight reviews, hearings, and administrative appeals."

Institution

'Institution' means, with reference to this policy, North South University, inclusive of biomedical, behavioral, and engineering research laboratories, research centers and institutes, and academic departments wherein or under whose administrative authority research occurs.



Evidentiary Standard

1. ***“Burden of Proof”***: Whenever an investigation for research misconduct is authorized, it is to be understood that the NSU Office of Research-NSU, as the designated investigating authority, has “the burden of proof for making a finding of research misconduct.” The RMIC functions to complete a formal investigation, as charged to this task by the RIO, that establishes whether research misconduct occurred or did not occur, the RMIC’s final report including therein appropriate finding that meets the burden of proof.
2. ***“Standard of Proof”***: An institutional finding of research misconduct must be established by:
 - a. a *preponderance* of the evidence; ‘preponderance of the evidence’ means “proof by information that, compared with that opposing it, leads to the conclusion that the fact at issue is more probably true than not;”
 - b. a manifest preponderance of evidence that a “significant departure from accepted practices of the relevant research community” has occurred (e.g., as represented by best practices concerning research methodology of a given discipline and/or as stipulated by the specific and/or general definition of research misconduct as given in this policy);
 - c. an intentional, knowing, reckless, or otherwise negligent engagement in misconduct as identified in the definition of research provided in this policy.
3. ***Status of Research Records***: “The destruction, absence of, or respondent’s failure to provide research records adequately documenting the questioned research is evidence of research misconduct” where NSU investigating authority establishes “by a preponderance of the evidence that the respondent intentionally, knowingly, or recklessly had research records and destroyed them, had the opportunity to maintain the records but did not do so, or maintained the records and failed to produce them in a timely manner and that the respondent’s conduct constitutes a significant departure from accepted practices of the relevant research community.”
4. ***Respondent Burden***:
 - a. “The respondent has the burden of going forward with and the burden of proving, by a preponderance of the evidence, any and all affirmative defenses raised.” ‘Affirmative defenses’ entail provision of evidentiary documentation and statements in writing or in interview that counter specific allegations of research misconduct. Statements that merely deny the validity of the allegations or that do not address the allegations squarely are not affirmative defenses and hence have no evidentiary weight to count in the determination of preponderance of evidence.
 - b. Further, “The respondent has the burden of going forward with and proving by a preponderance of the evidence any mitigating factors that are relevant to a decision to impose administrative actions following a research misconduct proceeding.” Any such declaration of mitigating factors shall have been provided to the RMIC in written comment and/or in interview so that this declaration is included in the final report.



- c. In determining whether NSU, as investigating authority, “has carried the burden of proof imposed” by this policy, “the finder of fact shall give due consideration to admissible, credible evidence of honest error or difference of opinion presented by the respondent.

Evidence

‘Evidence’ means “any document, tangible item, or testimony offered or obtained during a research misconduct proceeding that tends to prove or disprove the existence of an alleged fact” according to the standard of proof stipulated in this policy.

Rule of Interpretation

Consistent with the scope of research misconduct defined above, any interpretation of this policy must (1) assure that public safety, public health, and public welfare have been reasonably and responsibly taken into account, and (2) further the policies of the NSU Office of Research that govern responsible conduct of research.

Confidentiality

Consistent with university policy, practice, and applicable Bangladesh laws and regulations, NSU investigating authority shall assure that “disclosure of the identity of respondents and complainants in research misconduct proceedings is limited, to the extent possible, to those who need to know [in order to carry out the research misconduct proceedings], consistent with a thorough, competent, objective and fair research misconduct proceeding, and as allowed by law.”

Administrative action

‘Administrative action’ means any action taken by NSU investigating authority in response to a research misconduct proceeding consistent with the institution’s operative policy governing research misconduct investigation and/or other applicable policy, regulation, or procedure governing human subjects research, animal care and use, and/or grant management, contracts, and inter-institutional cooperative/collaborative agreements.

Charge Memorandum from the Deciding Official

‘Charge memorandum’ means “the written notice, as well as any amendments to the notice, that are sent to the respondent stating the findings of research misconduct” and any NSU investigative authority administrative actions.

Hearing

‘Hearing’ means that part of the research misconduct proceeding during which the RMIC interviews the complainant, respondent, and witnesses, prior to submittal of the committee’s final report to the RIO. As appropriate to a notification of the respondent of discovery and consideration of additional allegations of research misconduct, the



respondent may request additional interview for the purpose of supplementing any prior affirmative defense provided.

Maintenance and custody of research records and evidence

NSU, as the responsible legal entity for supported research, has a continuing obligation to ensure that it maintains adequate records for a research misconduct proceeding. The institution, through the RIO must—

- a. “Either before or when the institution notifies the respondent of the allegation, inquiry or investigation,
 - (1) promptly take all reasonable and practical steps to obtain custody of all the research records and evidence needed to conduct the research misconduct proceeding,
 - (2) inventory the records and evidence, and
 - (3) 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 the data or evidence on such instruments, so long as those copies are substantially equivalent to the evidentiary value of the instruments;
- b. Where appropriate, give the respondent copies of, or reasonable, supervised access to the research records, provided the respondent assents to sustaining requisite confidentiality of all such records for the duration of formal investigative proceedings and thereafter as appropriate to both the institutional interest and the respondent’s interest in restoration of professional reputation;
- c. Undertake all reasonable and practical efforts to take custody of additional research records or evidence that is discovered during the course of a research misconduct proceeding, except that where the research records or evidence encompass scientific instruments shared by a number of users, custody may be limited to copies of the data or evidence on such instruments, so long as those copies are substantially equivalent to the evidentiary value of the instruments; and
- d. Maintain the research records and evidence.

Procedures: Formal Investigation

Promptly after receiving an allegation of research misconduct, defined as a disclosure of possible research misconduct through any means of communication, the RIO, shall assess the allegation to determine if: (1) it meets the definition of research misconduct defined above, and (2) the allegation is sufficiently credible and specific so that potential evidence of research misconduct may be identified.

The RIO will make a written determination of whether a formal research misconduct investigation is warranted. If s/he determines that an investigation is warranted, the RIO shall constitute an Ad Hoc Research Misconduct Investigation Committee (RMIC) for the purpose of beginning the investigation within 10 calendar days of that determination.

The Chairperson of the RMIC shall assure best efforts to complete the investigation within 45 calendar days from the date on which it held its first orientation meeting with



the RIO. The Chairperson of the RMIC shall, together with appointed members of the committee, conduct the investigation, interview the complainant, respondent, and witnesses, review and evaluate all evidence provided by the complainant and documentation submitted by the respondent as part of affirmative defense countering the allegations, prepare the final report of findings, and submit the final report to the RIO. If it becomes apparent that the investigation cannot be completed the within the designated time frame, the Chairperson shall promptly request an extension in writing from the RIO, but shall otherwise work to assure completion of the investigation within the newly provided deadline.

In conducting all investigation, the RMIC shall:

- a. Use diligent efforts to ensure that the investigation is thorough and sufficiently documented and includes examination of all research records and evidence relevant to reaching a decision on the merits of the allegations;
- b. Interview each respondent, complainant, and any other available person who has been reasonably identified as having information regarding any relevant aspects of the investigation, including witnesses identified by the respondent, and record or transcribe each interview, provide the recording or transcript to the interviewee for correction, and include the recording or transcript in the record of investigation;
- c. Pursue diligently all significant issues and leads discovered that are determined relevant to the investigation, including any evidence of additional instances of possible research misconduct, and continue the investigation to completion.

The final investigation report shall:

1. Describe the nature of the allegations of research misconduct;
2. Describe and document any intramural and/or extramural grant support that funded the research in which misconduct is alleged to have occurred, including identification of grant numbers and listing of grant applications, contracts, and publications that have specified this grant support;
3. Describe the specific allegations of research misconduct considered in the investigation;
4. Identify the institutional policies and procedures under which the investigation was conducted;
5. Identify and summarize the research records and evidence reviewed, and identify any evidence taken into custody, but not reviewed. The report should also describe any relevant records and evidence not taken into custody and explain why.
6. Provide a finding as to whether research misconduct (A) *did occur* or (B) *did not occur*, for each separate allegation of research misconduct identified during the investigation. If misconduct was found, the RMIC shall:
 - a. identify it according to the definition of specific or general research misconduct as given in this policy and state whether the identified misconduct was (a.1) *intentional*, (a.2) *knowing*, and/or (a.3) in *reckless* disregard of relevant standards of research integrity;
 - b. summarize the facts and the analysis supporting the conclusion, considering the merits of any reasonable explanation provided by the respondent as well as any evidence that rebuts the respondent's explanations;



- c. identify any publications, based on the research for which a finding of misconduct has been decided, that need correction or retraction;
 - d. identify the person(s) responsible for the misconduct; and,
 - e. list any current support or known applications or proposals for support that the respondent(s) has pending with NSU, governmental, and/or international institutions or agencies.
7. At the conclusion of the formal investigation, the Chairperson of the RMIC shall provide to the RIO (through OR-NSU administrative/clerical support staff who assisted the RMIC), all relevant research records and records of the research misconduct proceedings, including summary results of all interviews, transcripts, or recordings of such interviews. All such documentation shall be archived in the OR-NSU offices with assurance of secured and protected confidentiality of all records archived.

Institutional Decision and Notification

The RIO will transmit the final report of the RMIC, along with any additional comments (to be provided in cover memorandum) that the RIO deems pertinent, to the Deciding Official (DO), i.e., the Vice Chancellor.

The DO will determine, in writing for the university record:

1. whether the DO accepts the investigation report and its findings;
2. what institutional administrative actions are to be taken in response to the accepted findings of research misconduct; otherwise, in the event of a finding that research misconduct did not occur, take appropriate measures to restore the reputation of the respondent;
3. notify the respondent that a final decision has been reached and inform the respondent of any administrative actions the DO has authorized in response to a finding of research misconduct or in response to a finding that research misconduct did not occur (the latter actions specific to restoration of the respondent's reputation and standing within the institution);
4. inform the RIO of the DO decision and administrative actions taken, including any directive to the RIO to assure that professional societies, professional licensing boards, editors of journals, co-authors and research collaborators, and extramural funding agencies are duly informed in the event of need for retraction of published research;

Institutional Administrative Actions

If the DO determines that research misconduct is substantiated by the findings of the RMIC as transmitted in the final report, s/he will, on the basis of authority delegated to the DO by the Board of Trustees through approval of this policy, decide on appropriate administrative actions to be taken, after consultation with the RIO. The DO may, as appropriate to a finding of research misconduct, consult the Chairperson of the NSU Board of Trustees in making any decision of any and all administrative actions taken.



The administrative actions normally may include:

- Withdrawal or correction of all pending or published abstracts and papers emanating from the research where research misconduct was found;
- Removal of the responsible person from the particular project;
- Issuance of letter of reprimand;
- Placement on probation, with special monitoring of future research work for the duration of the time of probation;
- Suspension from all research duties;
- Salary reduction;
- Initiation of steps leading to reduction in rank;
- Termination of employment;
- Restitution of funds to the grantor agency as appropriate; and,
- Other action appropriate to the research misconduct, as determined by the DO.

Appeal of Administrative Actions

The final report submitted by the Chairperson of the RMIC to the RIO shall be interpreted as having satisfied due process and having substantiated any and all research misconduct findings, once accepted by the DO.

There is no further institutional appeal once the DO issues a final determination of administrative action.