APPENDIX B

PROCEDURES AND PRACTICES

1. Maintain and store raw data based on research conclusions in a safe environment. The raw data are the best protection against fabricated or falsified research claims. Researchers are encouraged to consider backup systems for raw data.
2. Preview research proposals and manuscripts with colleagues of equal or greater experience. This may improve the technical/scientific quality of the proposal or manuscript while providing for corroboration of research ideas and timing.
3. Present research findings at departmental or other faculty meetings. This also provides for more open discourse among colleagues for the mutual protection of individual researchers, leading to an enhanced climate of integrity and objectivity.
4. Adhere to established standards of ethics regarding authorship of publications. All authors named in a collaborative study accept full responsibility for the work published or at least for that portion of the research for which they were responsible. Researchers should be familiar with established guidelines and adhere to requirements set by individual publishers.
5. Consider holding staff meetings for the purposes described in paragraphs 2 and 3 above. Such a forum would help enlist the department's assistance in solving administrative and other problems involving research projects. Department heads might request a file copy of each research manuscript submitted for publication.
6. Encourage the incorporation of formal course work, for example, seminars on bioethics, into the curriculum, making this subject an integral part of the research and educational experience.

INVESTIGATION REPORT CHECKLIST[1]

A. **Summary**: Summary of the inquiry report and background information

B. **Relevant Information:** Name, position, and contact information of respondent(s) and complainant(s) and contact information for respondent's attorney, if applicable

C. **The Allegation:** Allegations received and examined by the institution, including the complainant's comments and the date the institution received the allegations.

   1. Description of the allegation(s) of research misconduct – each allegation should be framed with the following:

      a. Respondent's name, if known

      b. Where the falsified/fabricated/plagiarized (f/f/p) data/information were included paper, grant application, etc.)

      c. Which specific figure, text, or data were falsified/fabricated/plagiarized

[1] This Investigation Report Checklist was composed using the Office of Research Integrity's Investigation Report Checklist. https://ori.hhs.gov/sites/default/files/2020-02/Investigation%20Report%20Checklist%2002-21-2020.pdf

d. What the alleged f/f/p was, and what the actual experimental results were if known.

2. Any additional research misconduct allegation(s) that arose during the investigation, including:
    a. Other papers or manuscripts submitted but have yet to be accepted for publication.
    b. Other PHS grant applications submitted for funding or awarded.
    c. Progress reports, presentations, posters, or other research records
3. Any additional respondents were identified during the investigation.

D. **PHS Support/ORI Jurisdiction**
1. Grant, grant application, or contract number(s), designated Principal Investigator(s) (PI[s]), and date(s) of application submission or award (with project dates).
2. List of paper(s), abstract(s), poster(s), or presentation(s) affected, and the PHS support for each.
3. List of any grants or contracts that were withdrawn or publications that were corrected or retracted.
4. If the alleged research misconduct occurred more than six years before the date the institution received the initial allegation of research misconduct, identification of the respondent's subsequent use, if any, that meets the requirements of 42 C.F.R. § 93.105(b)(1).

E. **Composition of the Investigation Committee** (names, degrees, departmental affiliation, and expertise) and the charge to the committee

F. **Notice to the Respondent** of the investigation and of any new allegations that arose during the investigation.
1. Respondent's response(s) to the notice(s)
2. If relevant, an admission statement from the respondent

G. **Attachments/Exhibits of Evidence** and other relevant documents sequestered during the investigation.
1. Annotated inventory of sequestered records/evidence and chain of custody document(s).
2. Description of how sequestration was conducted.
3. Identification of any sequestered records/evidence that were not reviewed by the investigation committee, if applicable

H. **Transcripts or Recordings** of interviews of the respondent(s), complainant(s), and witness(es) with their names, degrees, and departmental affiliation

I. **Institutional Policies and Procedures**

J. **Timeline, Process, and Procedural History**

K. **Investigation Committee's Analysis**
1. Assessment of all relevant information
2. Findings and conclusions for each allegation
3. For each finding of research misconduct (§ 93.313(f)):

a. Identify whether the research misconduct was falsification, fabrication, or plagiarism and if it was intentional, knowing, or in reckless disregard;
b. Summarize the facts and the analysis that support the conclusion and consider the merits of any reasonable explanation by the respondent;
c. Identify the specific PHS support;
d. Identify whether any publications need correction or retraction;
e. Identify the person(s) responsible for the misconduct; and
f. List any current support or known applications or proposals for support that the respondent has pending with non-PHS Federal Agencies

4. Conclusion or recommended findings and institutional actions

L. **Description** of any factors that may have affected the investigation.

M. **Respondent's** (and, if applicable, the **Complainant's**) response to the draft investigation report.

1. Investigation committee's response to the comments.

N. **Written Decision** from the responsible institutional official with institutional findings (or no findings) of research misconduct and administrative actions pending or completed.

14. **Notice to the Respondent** (and, if applicable, the **Complainant**) of the institutional decision.