

**UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA, SAN FRANCISCO  
INTEGRITY OF RESEARCH PROCEDURES**

**A. OBJECTIVES AND GENERAL PROVISIONS**

A1. Objectives: In dealing with an Allegation<sup>1</sup> under these procedures, UCSF shall be guided by the following general objectives:

- A1.1 Institutional responsibility for self-regulation shall be preserved.
- A1.2 Appropriate and timely action shall be taken to investigate and address all Allegations.
- A1.3 Funding agency requirements for timely notification shall be followed.
- A1.4 These Procedures shall be administered in a manner that fairly protects: (i) the due process rights of Respondents; (ii) the interests of Complainants and those serving as witnesses in the investigation of Research Misconduct; and (iii) the public interest in preserving the integrity of Research.
- A1.5 Efforts will be made to prevent misjudgments caused by bias or Conflict of Interest.
- A1.6 Campus officials shall administer these Procedures in coordination with other applicable policies and procedures, including the University of California Policy on Reporting and Investigating Allegations of Suspected Improper Governmental Activities and Policy for Protection of Whistleblowers from Retaliation and Guidelines for Reviewing Retaliation Complaints.

A2. General Provisions: The following are generally applicable to Allegations, Inquiries, and Investigations under these Procedures:

- A2.1 Confidentiality. Throughout the process of responding to an Allegation, all persons involved, including the Research Integrity Officer (RIO), committee members, the Complainant, the Respondent, and witnesses, shall exercise great care to preserve the confidentiality of the proceedings to the extent consistent with state and federal laws and regulations, University policy, any contractual obligations, an effective response to the Allegation, and public health and safety. Those who conduct both Inquiries and Investigations are expected to be extremely circumspect. Only the Inquirer or the office of the RIO may contact potential witnesses. Further, interviews of witnesses outside of the University should occur only after consultation with the RIO to assure the necessity of such interviews and the development of an appropriate approach to maximize the confidentiality of the Inquiry or Investigation.
- A2.2 Sequestration of Records. The RIO shall take all reasonable and practical steps to obtain and/or secure Research Records necessary for an Assessment, Inquiry, or Investigation. Research Records belong to the University; all Research Records involved in a Research Misconduct proceeding must be surrendered to the RIO upon request. The RIO may engage Internal Audit Services or others to secure or take possession of potentially relevant evidence.
- A2.3 Risk of Loss or Abuse of Funds, Equipment, or Materials. If, in the judgment of the RIO, there appears to be a risk of loss or misuse of funds from circumstances relating to an Allegation, or a risk of destruction or abuse of equipment or materials purchased with those funds, the RIO shall instruct the Respondent's supervisor to take immediate interim administrative actions to protect those funds, equipment, or materials or, as necessary, shall take immediate administrative actions as the RIO. When, in the judgment of the RIO, misuse of funds, equipment or resources is likely to have occurred,

---

<sup>1</sup> Capitalized words used throughout these Procedures are defined in Appendix A, Definitions.

such information shall be reported to the campus [Locally Designated Official](#) or [Whistleblower Coordinator](#) for investigation.

A2.4 Rights and Roles of Complainant.

A2.4.1 Confidentiality of Complainant's Identity. The Complainant may request that his or her identity be kept confidential, and, if so, efforts shall be made to protect the identity of the Complainant, but confidentiality cannot be assured. For example, it may be necessary for the Complainant to testify before an Inquirer or an Investigation committee in the course of an Inquiry or Investigation, and his or her identity may be subject to disclosure under various state and federal laws.

A2.4.2 Disclosure of Allegations. Complainants are encouraged to raise Allegations through these Procedures rather than through public disclosure and are cautioned that public disclosure of an Allegation may render such Complainants vulnerable to legal action, such as violation of the Respondent's right of privacy under California law and University policy.

A2.4.3 Complainant as Witness. After making an Allegation, the Complainant's role is to serve as a witness if needed.

A2.4.4 Retaliation Against Complainants or Other Persons. UCSF employees who have made Allegations that are covered by the "University of California Policy on Reporting and Investigating Allegations of Suspected Improper Governmental Activities (Whistleblower Policy)," and who believe that they have been retaliated against for so doing, should report such Retaliation in accordance with the UC "Policy for Protection of Whistleblowers from Retaliation and Guidelines for Reviewing Retaliation Complaints." Persons not covered by the Protection of Whistleblowers Policy shall report claims of actual or threatened Retaliation to the RIO, who shall undertake diligent efforts to protect them from Retaliation. In addition, the RIO shall direct all participants in any aspect of an Inquiry or Investigation, including an Inquirer and members of an Investigation committee, the Respondent, and witnesses not to retaliate against the Complainant or other witnesses at any time after an Allegation has been made.

A2.5 Duty to Respond. The University is required to respond to an Allegation and to take them seriously. After receiving an Allegation, the University is legally obliged to undertake an Inquiry if the RIO determines that an Inquiry is warranted (Section B2).

A2.6 Respondent's Separation from University. The resignation or termination of employment, enrollment, or appointment of a Respondent shall not, in itself, result in the dismissal of a proceeding hereunder, although it may affect the imposition of discipline or other appropriate action.

A2.7 Delays. Delay in initiating or completing an Inquiry, Investigation, other process, or action within the time frames prescribed in these Procedures shall not be grounds for the dismissal of an Allegation.

A2.8 Retention of Records. At the closure of a case under these Procedures, a complete file of the case, including the Allegation, the reports from the Inquiry and/or Investigation, correspondence, and other records related to the case shall be maintained by the RIO in a secure manner. Essential evidence shall be kept for at least seven (7) years after the later of a final Inquiry report or a final Investigation report. Records shall be retained as required by federal policy if applicable. Otherwise, the RIO may use his or her discretion in determining what constitutes essential evidence. Examples of factors to be considered are whether Research Misconduct was found, the importance of the evidence to the finding of Research Misconduct, the uniqueness of the materials, and the extent to which the evidence is needed in connection with ongoing Research.

- A2.9 Legal Advice. Throughout the process of handling an Allegation, the RIO, the Inquirer, and Investigation committee shall consult with Campus or University Counsel, as needed, for advice and to ensure compliance with these Procedures. Complainants, Respondents, and witnesses may be accompanied by an advisor during any interview, but only for the purposes of observation and advice.
- A2.10 RIO Discretion. In the interest of fairness and consistent with the requirements of external funding agencies and other University policies, the RIO has the discretion to extend time frames based on a written showing of good cause, expand the scope of the Inquiry or Investigation, or take other action he or she deems appropriate in applying these Procedures.

## **B. ALLEGATIONS OF MISCONDUCT**

- B1. Reporting Suspected Misconduct. Allegations of Research Misconduct must be reported to the RIO. Under no circumstances should the Complainant pursue his/her own investigation into the Allegation.
- B2. Initial Assessment of Allegation. The RIO shall determine if the Allegation (a) involves Research Misconduct and within the purview of the Policy, (b) is covered by another University policy, (c) involves a research practice that does not constitute Research Misconduct, or (d) is groundless.
  - B2.1 Groundless Allegations. If the RIO believes that the Allegation is groundless or otherwise provides insufficient information or evidence to merit further review, he or she shall prepare and maintain a memorandum separate from the Respondent's personnel or academic file and shall inform the Complainant of the decision not to proceed. In such a case, the Respondent does not need to be informed of the Allegation.
  - B2.2 Dispute about Research Practices, including Authorship. If the Allegation is about a practice that does not fall within the definition of Research Misconduct, including authorship issues, then the Allegation shall be resolved under applicable policies, through mediation, or informally, at the discretion of the RIO.
  - B2.3 Allegations of Research Misconduct. If the RIO believes an Allegation involves Research Misconduct and provides sufficient information and/or evidence to merit further review, then he or she shall initiate an Inquiry. If the Complainant has not reported the Allegation in writing, then the RIO shall do so.
  - B2.4 Multiple Policies Involved. If an Allegation gives rise to investigative responsibilities under more than one University policy, the RIO shall consult with other appropriate administrative offices as necessary.

## **C. INQUIRY**

- C1. Initiating an Inquiry. Upon determining that an Inquiry is warranted, the RIO shall take the following actions:
  - C1.1 Appointment of Inquirer. Within fourteen (14) calendar days, the RIO shall appoint an Inquirer who shall be a faculty member or an administrator with appropriate practice and experience. The Inquirer shall disclose any possible conflicts. The RIO shall not appoint as Inquirer a faculty member or an administrator with a conflict of interest. The RIO shall provide the Inquirer with guidelines for carrying out the Inquiry.
  - C1.2 Identification of Funding Sources. The RIO shall identify all relevant research grants and funding agencies involved in the Research that is the subject of the Allegation.
  - C1.3 Notification of Interested Parties.
    - C1.3.1 Immediately after appointing an Inquirer, the RIO shall provide written notification of the nature of the Allegation and the appointment of the Inquirer to the Respondent. The RIO shall provide the Respondent with access to the Policy and these Procedures.

C1.3.2 Another institution shall be notified if the RIO has reason to believe that the alleged Research Misconduct involved that institution or if the Respondent has a joint appointment at the institution and notification is required by an inter-institutional agreement. The RIO shall inform the appropriate funding agencies, consistent with law, agency requirements, and contractual agreements, that an Inquiry is being undertaken. The RIO may also notify others with a need to know, at the RIO's discretion.

- C2. Time Limit. The entire Inquiry process, including the Inquirer's preparation and submittal of the report, the Respondent's submission of comments, the RIO's acceptance or rejection of the findings of the Inquirer, and the RIO's notification of the decision, shall normally be completed within sixty (60) calendar days following the appointment of the Inquirer. Any extension of this time limit requires approval of the RIO, must be documented in the final report, and should comply with the applicable requirements of external funding agencies.
- C3. Responsibilities of the Inquirer. The Inquirer shall take the following actions:
- C3.1 Preliminary Fact-Finding. Examine relevant Research Records and materials, and conduct sufficient interviews and preliminary fact-finding to determine whether there is Probable Cause to believe that an Allegation warrants an Investigation.
  - C3.2 Interviews. Interview the Complainant, Respondent, and other key witnesses with respect to the Allegation.
  - C3.3 Prepare Report. Prepare a report of the Inquirer's findings within 30 calendar days of the date of his or her appointment.
- C4. Report of the Inquirer. The written Inquiry report shall include:
- C4.1 the name and title of the Inquirer and experts, if any, consulted by the Inquirer
  - C4.2 the Allegation and individual(s) named
  - C4.3 the funding sources for the Research
  - C4.4 the procedures followed by the Inquirer to arrive at his or her findings
  - C4.5 how and from whom relevant information was obtained
  - C4.6 a list of the Research Records reviewed
  - C4.7 summaries of any interviews
  - C4.8 for each Allegation, a finding (a) that there is Probable Cause as to all or part of the Allegation that Research Misconduct may have occurred, or (b) that the Allegation involves questionable research practices that do not meet the definition of Research Misconduct, or (c) that the Allegation is without substance.
- C5. Finalizing the Report of the Inquirer.
- C5.1 RIO Review. The RIO shall review the Inquiry report within seven (7) calendar days of its receipt to ensure that: (i) the Inquirer has completed its charge; (ii) the report provides sufficient information to justify the Inquirer's findings; (iii) the report does not include information that is inappropriate; and (iv) the report is in proper form. If the report is inadequate in any of these respects, the RIO shall

## UCSF Integrity of Research Procedures

11/9/2009

ordinarily request the necessary modifications. If the Inquirer fails to make the necessary changes, then at his or her discretion, the RIO may accept the report as is or appoint a new Inquirer.

- C5.2 Revisions by Inquirer. If the report has been referred back to the Inquirer for modification or revision, the Inquirer shall submit a final, signed report, satisfactory to the RIO, within seven (7) calendar days of such request. If additional time is needed to revise the report or conduct further Inquiry, then the Inquirer shall request an extension of time from the RIO.
- C5.3 Determination by the RIO. Within seven (7) calendar days of receipt of the final report, the RIO shall determine whether Research Misconduct may have occurred and that an Investigation is warranted.
- C6. Notifications and Actions. Upon acceptance of the final Inquiry report, the RIO shall promptly notify all interested parties and take appropriate actions as follows:
- C6.1 Notification of Respondent. The RIO shall provide the Respondent with the Inquiry report and the determination as to whether Research Misconduct may have occurred. The Respondent may comment in writing within fifteen (15) calendar days and such response shall become part of the record of the Inquiry.
- C6.2 Notification of Interested Parties. At his or her discretion, the RIO may provide individuals notified of the Inquiry with a written summary of the Inquirer's findings and the RIO's determination in the case. Upon request and at the RIO's sole discretion, the Complainant and other witnesses may be provided with those portions of the report that address their role(s) and opinion(s) in the Inquiry.
- C6.3 Actions.
- C6.3.1 Finding that an Allegation Lacks Substance. If the RIO accepts an Inquirer's finding that the Allegation was without substance, he or she shall, in consultation with the Respondent and University or Campus Counsel as needed, make reasonable efforts to notify appropriate individuals and organizations of the outcome of the Inquiry for the purpose of restoring the Respondent's reputation, if it appears to have been damaged by the making of the Allegation. Any written responses to these efforts shall be placed in the record of the Inquiry.
- C6.3.2 Finding of Violations other than Research Misconduct. If the RIO accepts an Inquirer's finding that Research Misconduct probably did not occur, but that the Respondent may have violated commonly accepted Research standards or other University policies, the RIO may refer such possible violations in a separate summary memorandum to the appropriate administrative officer (who may be the RIO) and/or the Researcher's supervisor for discipline or other appropriate action. If appropriate, such information may be considered in the applicable performance review process.
- C6.3.3 Finding that Research Misconduct May Have Occurred. If the RIO accepts an Inquirer's finding that there is Probable Cause to believe that Research Misconduct may have occurred, the RIO shall decide whether the Inquiry can serve in place of an Investigation (Section C7) or whether to proceed with an Investigation (Section D).
- C7. When the Inquiry Report Can Serve in Place of an Investigation.
- C7.1. The RIO may decide that the Inquiry shall serve in place of a formal Investigation if all of the following conditions are satisfied:
- C7.1.1. Finding of Research Misconduct. The Inquiry has resulted in a finding, by a Preponderance of the Evidence, that Research Misconduct occurred.

C7.1.2. Thorough Inquiry. The Inquiry has been sufficiently broad and thorough that it is unlikely that an Investigation would uncover significant new information. For this to be the case, the Inquirer must have examined all relevant documentation, interviewed the Complainant, the Respondent, and other individuals with key information, and secured appropriate expertise to thoroughly evaluate the evidence.

C7.1.3. Concurrence of Counsel and External Agency. Campus or University Counsel and any appropriate external agency concur that the Inquiry may serve in place of a formal Investigation.

C7.2 Agency Notifications. If the RIO decides that the Inquiry may serve in place of the formal Investigation, then he or she shall comply with agency notification requirements and refer the matter for appropriate action (see Section D6).

## D. INVESTIGATION

D1. Initiating an Investigation. Upon determining that an Investigation is required, the RIO shall take the following actions:

D1.1 Appointment of Committee. Unless proceeding under Section C7 above, within thirty (30) calendar days of receiving the final Inquiry report and making his or her determination for action, the RIO shall appoint an Investigation committee consisting of three (3) or more faculty members with appropriate expertise.

D1.1.1 Membership. If feasible, at least one member of the committee should have expertise relevant to the area of the Research in question. Preferably, no member of the committee should be from the same immediate department, departmental division, or Organized Research Unit as the Respondent. Faculty from other research institutions may be asked to serve on the committee.

D1.1.2 Conflicts of Interest. Before appointing members to the committee, the RIO shall request that proposed members of the committee disclose any Conflicts of Interest and shall notify the Respondent of the proposed committee membership. If the Respondent submits a written objection within two (2) business days to any proposed member of the Investigation committee, and if the RIO agrees with the objection, that proposed member will not be selected. If the Respondent does not object within the two-day period, he or she will be deemed to have accepted the proposed committee membership.

D1.2 Guidelines. The RIO shall provide the Investigation committee with written instructions for carrying out the Investigation.

D1.3 Notification of Interested Parties. Immediately after appointing an Investigation committee, the RIO shall notify the Respondent in writing of the nature of the Allegation and the appointment of the Investigation committee. The RIO shall inform the appropriate funding agencies, consistent with law, agency requirements, and contractual agreements, that an Investigation is being undertaken. Affiliated institutions in which the Respondent has a joint appointment shall be notified if required by inter-institutional agreements. The RIO may also notify others with a need to know, at the RIO's discretion.

D2. Time Limit. The entire Investigation process shall normally be completed within one- hundred twenty (120) calendar days following the appointment of the Investigation committee. Any extension of this time limit requires approval of the RIO, must be documented in the final Investigation report, and should comply with the applicable requirements of external funding agencies. If UCSF is unable to complete the Investigation within the time period required by any applicable external agency, the RIO shall submit a written request to the agency requesting an extension in order to comply with its regulations; such a request must include an explanation for

## UCSF Integrity of Research Procedures

11/9/2009

the delay that includes an interim report on the progress to date and estimated dates of completion of the report and other necessary steps.

D3. Responsibilities of the Investigation Committee. The Investigation committee shall take the following actions as appropriate:

D3.1 Evidence. Examine relevant information and Research Records as needed to determine if Research Misconduct has occurred and who is responsible.

D3.2 Interviews. Interview the Complainant, the Respondent, and other witnesses with respect to the Allegation. The Investigation committee may, in its discretion, record, transcribe, and/or prepare summaries of these interviews.

D3.3 Respondent. Provide an opportunity for the Respondent to present additional information about the Allegation and the evidence developed by the committee.

D3.4 Expertise. Secure any necessary and appropriate expertise in consultation with the RIO.

D3.5 Prepare Report. The Investigation committee shall prepare a report of its findings within 75 calendar days of the date of its appointment.

D4. Report of the Investigation Committee. The Investigation report shall contain:

D4.1 a description of the nature of the Allegation of Research Misconduct

D4.2 a description and documentation of the PHS support, including, for example, any grant numbers, grant applications, contracts, and publications listing PHS support

D4.3 a description of the specific Allegation of Research Misconduct for consideration in the Investigation

D4.4 if not already provided to ORI with the Inquiry report, the UCSF policies and procedures under which the Investigation was conducted

D4.5 the identification and summary of the Research Records and evidence reviewed

D4.6 for each Allegation of Research Misconduct identified during the Investigation, a finding as to whether Research Misconduct did or did not occur, and if so—

D4.6.1 whether the Research Misconduct was Falsification, Fabrication, or Plagiarism, and if it was intentional, knowing, or in reckless disregard

D4.6.2 a summary of the facts and the analysis which support the conclusion and consideration of the merits of any reasonable explanation by the Respondent

D4.6.3 identification of the specific PHS support

D4.7 for each Allegation as to which the committee finds that Research Misconduct did not occur, the committee shall support its finding as described in Sections D4.6.2 and D4.6.3.

D4.8 for each Allegation as to which the committee finds that Research Misconduct did not occur, but also believes that the Allegation may involve a violation of commonly accepted Research standards or other University policies, the committee should provide a summary of the facts and the analysis which support the finding and consideration of the merits of any reasonable explanation by the Respondent.

D5. Finalizing the Report of the Investigation Committee.

- D5.1 RIO Review. RIO review shall follow the same process as that set forth in Section C5.1 above.
- D5.2 Revisions by Committee. If the report has been referred back to the Investigation committee for modification or revision, the committee shall submit a signed report, satisfactory to the RIO, within seven (7) calendar days of such request. If additional time is needed for revisions or further investigation, the committee may request an extension of time from the RIO prior to the expiration of the 7-day period. After revisions satisfactory to the RIO have been made, a signed report shall be submitted to the RIO.
- D5.3 Review and Response by Respondent. The RIO shall provide the Respondent with a copy of the Investigation report. The Respondent shall submit his or her written comments or requested corrections of any factual errors to the RIO within fourteen (14) calendar days of receipt of the report. Upon receipt, the RIO shall promptly forward the response to the Investigation committee, which may revise the report. The response shall become part of the record of the Investigation.
- D5.4 Revisions by Committee. If the committee revises the report after reviewing the comments of the Respondent, the committee shall submit to the RIO a final, signed report, satisfactory to the RIO, within seven (7) calendar days after the RIO has provided the committee a response from the Respondent. If the committee determines that no revisions are necessary, it shall notify the RIO in writing within the 7-day period. If additional time is needed to review the Respondent's response, conduct additional investigation, or correct any factual errors, the committee shall request an extension of time from the RIO prior to the expiration of the 7-day period including a written showing of good cause.
- D5.5 Determination by RIO. Within seven (7) calendar days of his or her receipt of the final report, the RIO shall determine whether a Preponderance of the Evidence in the Investigation committee report supports a finding of Research Misconduct.
- D6. Notifications and Actions. Upon acceptance of the final Investigation report, the RIO shall promptly notify all interested parties and take appropriate actions.
- D6.1 Notification of Respondent. The RIO shall provide the Respondent with a final copy of the Investigation report and the RIO's determination as to whether Research Misconduct has occurred.
- D6.2 Notification of Interested Parties. At his or her discretion, the RIO may notify those persons described in Section D1.3, above, as to the RIO's determination in the case.
- D6.3 Actions. Depending on the findings, the RIO shall take appropriate actions.
- D6.3.1 Finding that an Allegation is not Supported. If the RIO finds that an Allegation is not supported by a Preponderance of the Evidence, the RIO shall make diligent efforts to make known the outcome of the Investigation to appropriate individuals and organizations identified by the RIO, in consultation with the Respondent, with the intention of restoring the Respondent's reputation if affected by the Allegation. Written responses to the decision shall be placed in the record of the Investigation.
- D6.3.2 Finding of Violations other than Research Misconduct. If the RIO accepts the finding that Research Misconduct did not occur, but that the Respondent may have violated commonly accepted Research standards or other University policies, the RIO may refer such possible violations in a separate summary memorandum to the appropriate administrative officer (who may be the RIO) and/or the Researcher's supervisor for discipline or other appropriate action. If appropriate, such information may be considered in the applicable performance review process.



- D6.3.3 Finding of Research Misconduct. If the RIO finds that Research Misconduct has occurred, then he or she shall refer this matter for appropriate action and, in consultation with Campus or University Counsel, shall take any necessary corrective steps, including correction of the published record.
- D7. Submission of Final Report. Within seven (7) calendar days after the RIO's determination as to whether Research Misconduct has occurred, the RIO shall provide a copy of the final report to the appropriate funding agency and to affiliated institutions, in compliance with funding agency regulations or contractual agreements. The final report shall include the actual text or an accurate summary of the views of any Respondent found to have engaged in Research Misconduct, as well as:
- D7.1 a copy of the report with all attachments
  - D7.2 a statement as to whether UCSF found Research Misconduct, and if so, who committed the misconduct
  - D7.3 a statement as to whether UCSF accepts the Investigation's findings
  - D7.4 a description of any pending or completed administrative actions against the Respondent
- D8. No Right of Appeal. Neither the findings of an Investigation Committee, nor the RIO's determination regarding Research Misconduct, shall be subject to further appeal.

#### **E. DISCIPLINE**

If Research Misconduct has been found, the RIO shall refer the matter to the appropriate University official for discipline or other appropriate action.

## Appendix A Definitions

Singular words will be interpreted or written as plural and plural words interpreted as singular where applicable and where the full context of the provision so indicates.

**Allegation.** An Allegation is any oral or written statement or other evidence of one or more apparent instances of Research Misconduct.

**Complainant.** A Complainant is a person who makes an Allegation.

**Conflict of Interest.** A Conflict of Interest exists when a relationship between a decision-maker and the Complainant, the Respondent, or the Research that is the subject of an Allegation creates the potential for compromised judgment or decision-making.

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

**Falsification.** Falsification is 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.

**Inquirer.** The faculty member or administrator assigned by the RIO to conduct an Inquiry.

**Inquiry.** An Inquiry is an informal process for gathering information and initial fact-finding to determine, based upon Probable Cause, whether an Allegation warrants an Investigation.

**Investigation.** An Investigation is the formal examination and evaluation of all relevant facts to determine, based upon a Preponderance of the Evidence, whether Research Misconduct has occurred, and, if so, its extent and consequences and the responsible person or persons.

**Plagiarism.** Plagiarism is the appropriation of another person's words, ideas or research results without acknowledgement, and passing them off as one's own.

**Policy.** The Policy is the University of California, San Francisco Campus Administrative Policy 100-29 "Integrity of Research Policy".

**Preponderance of the Evidence.** There is a preponderance of the evidence when the greater weight of credible evidence shows that it is more likely than not that a Respondent committed the alleged act or omission.

**Probable Cause.** Probable cause is a reasonable belief based on a standard of proof such that a person of ordinary caution or prudence would be led to believe and conscientiously entertain a strong suspicion of such violation.

**Research.** Research means a systematic investigation, including development, testing, evaluation, or publication, to develop or contribute to generalizable knowledge.

**Researcher.** A Researcher is any person who is engaged in the design, conduct, or reporting of Research.

**Research Integrity Officer (RIO).** The RIO is the person who is responsible for assessing an Allegation, determining when such Allegation warrants an Inquiry and/or an Investigation, overseeing Inquiries and Investigations, and reporting on Research Misconduct proceedings to appropriate funding agencies or others.

**Research Misconduct.** Research Misconduct is Fabrication, Falsification, or Plagiarism in proposing, performing, or reviewing Research, or in reporting Research results. Research Misconduct does not include honest error or differences of opinion.

## UCSF Integrity of Research Procedures

11/9/2009

**Research Records.** Research Records are the records of data or results that embody the facts resulting from the scientific inquiry, and include, but are not limited to, Research proposals, laboratory records, both physical and electronic, progress reports, abstracts, theses, oral presentations, internal reports, and journal articles.

**Respondent.** A Respondent is a person against whom an Allegation is made.

**Retaliation.** Retaliation is any action taken by UCSF or its employees that adversely affects the institutional status of a person who is employed by or affiliated with UCSF, including Researchers, clinicians, technicians, fellows, students, and independent contractors, which action is taken as a direct or indirect result of such person's making of an Allegation or cooperating in an Inquiry or Investigation, provided such person's conduct was not in Bad Faith. An action is in Bad Faith if it is made with reckless disregard for or willful ignorance of facts that would disprove the Allegation or if it is made falsely with malicious intent to harm the Respondent.

**RIO.** See "Research Integrity Officer."