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RM in the News...

Harvard and the Brigham call for more than 30 retractions of cardiac stem cell research

By IVAN ORANSKY @ivancransky and ADAM MARCUS @armarcus / OCTOBER 14, 2018

Cornell researcher who studied what we eat and why will step down after six studies are retracted

Higher Education

Duke settles research misconduct case, agrees to pay U.S. government $112.5 million

We need more investigations into research misconduct

When a scientist has papers retracted for scientific misconduct, collaborators can suffer career damage.
UCR in the news…

What a report into scientific misconduct reveals: The case of Frank Sauer

BRANIA

On Second Thought: An anti-German plot?

Oct. 3, 2011, was the beginning of the end for Frank Sauer’s tenure at

Investigation sheds light on biochemist's misconduct

“An eye for an eye, a tooth for a tooth. I have lost my job, you yours.”
Other forces...

- ‘Clare Frances’

- *Retraction Watch* blog

- Hi-tech war on ‘fraud’ (e.g., StatsCheck)

- More scrutiny of research (e.g., newspapers, PeerPub)

- Broader trust in science & the academe
RM Definitions - FFP

- **Falsification**
  - Manipulating research materials, equipment, or processes, or changing or omitting data or results such that the research is not accurately represented in the research record

- **Fabrication**
  - Making up data or results and recording or reporting them

- **Plagiarism**
  - Appropriating another person’s ideas, processes, results, or words without giving appropriate credit

- Does not include honest error or difference of opinion

[UCR Policy 529 - 900](#)
**Authorship disputes** (grant disputes)

- Data management
- Stealing data
- Rigour in research
- ‘Toxic culture’ / Poor or inadequate supervision
- IRB/IACUC/IBC/disclosure non-compliance
- Title IX violations
- HR issues
- Etc.
Key Players

- **RIO / ARIO** – Research Integrity Office / Assistant Research Integrity Officer

- **Respondent (R)**: A person who is the subject of an allegation

- **Complainant (C)**: A person who makes an allegation

- **Witness (W)**: Person who is pertinent to the RM case
RM Allegation: RIO Review Process

If not RM, it could still be Detrimental Research Practices (DRPs) – DRPs stray from the norms and appropriate practices of science.

- Allegation Review (assessment)
- Inquiry
- Investigation
Possible Paths

a. Allegation → Assessment → Case Closed

b. Allegation → Assessment → Inquiry → Case Closed

c. Allegation → Assessment → Inquiry → Investigation
   - No RM Finding
   - RM Finding
What you must NOT do?

- Do not investigate FFP yourself
- Do not intervene and try to resolve the issue (i.e., have the parties ‘talk it out’)
- Do not promise confidentiality
- Please do not share information with anyone else who does not have a legitimate need to know. While you must report it to RED’s ORI, it is critical to maintain confidentiality.
**Responsible Conduct of Research (RCR) training requirements - UCR**

Strongly encouraged for everyone at UCR but required for the individuals on following grants

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Federal Funder</th>
<th>Minimal Requirement for RCR</th>
<th>Target Audience (who must do the training)</th>
<th>CITI RCR Training Qualifies</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>NSF</strong></td>
<td>Online or face-to-face training</td>
<td>Undergraduates, Graduate students, Postdoctoral researchers</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>NIFA</strong></td>
<td>Online or face-to-face training</td>
<td>Faculty, Program Directors, Undergraduate students, Postdoctoral researchers, any staff</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>NIH</strong></td>
<td>Face-to-face training/interaction</td>
<td>Trainees, Fellows, Scholars, Participants</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Education & resources

- Website on RM – ORI
- Resources page – ORI
- Online RCR training on CITI – ORI
- REEP Program at UCR – Grad Division
- FAQ’s on RM – ORI
- Ombuds Office – Confidential resource

- Whistleblower complaint line – EthicsPoint
B. The Academic Senate shall:

1. Recognize that, in order for the University to fulfill obligations imposed by external funding agencies, there must be coordination among Administrative, Senate and legal standards applicable to Research Misconduct Proceedings.

2. Encourage participation by faculty on Inquiry and Investigation Committees. (emphasis mine)

Part II, section B:
Policy and procedure for responding to allegations of Research Misconduct - 529 - 900
VIII. Post-Investigations Proceedings

B. Investigation concludes Research Misconduct occurred.

Respondent is a member of the Academic Senate. If, in the case of a faculty member, the Vice Chancellor for Research together with the Executive Vice Chancellor intend to file charges pursuant to the imposition of disciplinary sanctions, the Vice Chancellor for Research shall prepare and sign an Academic Complaint form and forward it to the Chancellor in accordance with the provisions of the Bylaws of the Riverside Division of the Academic Senate, Appendix 5, Section 5.3, “Rules of Procedures for Implementation of Policies on Faculty Conduct and the Administration of Discipline at UCR.”
Questions? Comments? Concerns?

AVC, RI – Dario Kuzmanović
UCR ARIO

951- 827 - 4818
Dario@ucr.edu
http://research.ucr.edu/ori/RM

Policy and procedure for responding to allegations of Research Misconduct - 529 - 900