It is the responsibility of all faculty members to participate in the commencement involving their programs.

3.25 SCHOLARLY AND PROFESSIONAL ORGANIZATIONS

There are active chapters of numerous scholarly and professional organizations at the University. Information on current activity can be obtained from the offices of the deans.

3.26 CANDIDACY FOR POLITICAL OFFICE

Any employee of the University who becomes a candidate in any primary or general election for any county, state or federal office shall, prior to announcing candidacy for any said offices, offer his/her resignation to the Board of Regents, without reservation (See Section 3.4.2 (d)).

In making the announcement of the adoption of the resolution, the Board of Regents stated: “In adopting this resolution, the Board of Regents does not want to be understood as offering discouragement to faculty members or employees from becoming candidates for public office. As an American citizen, an employee may regard it his or her duty to become a candidate.”

(Regents, 9-14-43, 1-27-04)

3.27 PROFESSIONAL PRACTICE PLANS

All colleges on the Health Sciences Center campus have Professional Practice Plans in effect. Faculty are obligated to comply with the Plan of their college.

Copies of Professional Practice Plans are included for each college in Appendix M.

Each college plan stipulates procedures and processes related to time restrictions, deposit and disbursement requirements and restrictions, governance structure, etc.

3.28 ETHICS IN RESEARCH POLICY

(a) Introduction

Research and other scholarly activity at The University of Oklahoma must be above reproach. Each member of the University community has the responsibility to ensure the integrity and ethical standards in any activity with which he or she is associated directly, or any activity of which there is sufficient knowledge to determine its appropriateness. Misconduct in the conduct of research undermines the scholarly enterprise and erodes the public trust in the University community to conduct research and communicate results using the highest standards and ethical practices. The University of Oklahoma is responsible both for promoting scholarly practices that prevent misconduct and for developing policies and procedures for dealing with allegations or other evidence of scholarly or research misconduct.

This policy establishes uniform policies and procedures for investigating and reporting instances of alleged or apparent misconduct involving research, including, but not limited to, research or research training, applications for support of research or research training, or related research
activities that are supported with funds made available under the Public Health Service Act. The policies and procedures outlined below apply to faculty, staff and students. They are not intended to address all scholarly issues of an ethical nature. For example, discrimination and affirmative action issues are covered by other institutional policies.

(b) Definition of Scholarly Misconduct

Scholarly misconduct involves any form of behavior which entails an act of deception whereby one's work or the work of others is misrepresented. Other terms, such as research fraud, are here subsumed within the term "scholarly misconduct" as defined below. The term scholarly misconduct will be used to encompass scientific as well as other types of scholarly misconduct. Scholarly misconduct is distinguished from honest errors and ambiguities of interpretation that are inherent in the scholarly process. Further, scholarly misconduct involves significant and intentional breaches of integrity which may take numerous forms such as, but not limited to, those outlined below:

(b)(1) Falsification of data ranging from fabrication to deceptive selected reporting of findings and omission of conflicting data.

(b)(2) Plagiarism and other improper assignment of credit, such as excluding others or claiming the work of others as one's own; presentation of the same material as original in more than one publication; inclusion of individuals as authors who have not made a definite contribution to the work published; and submission of multi-authored publications without the concurrence of all authors.

(b)(3) Improper use of information gained by privileged access, such as through service on peer review panels, editorial boards or policy boards of research funding organizations.

(b)(4) Serious deviation from the scientific method accepted in proposing or carrying out research, deliberate manipulations or improper reporting of results.

(b)(5) Material failure to comply with federal, state or institutional rules governing research: Including, but not limited to, serious or substantial violations involving the use of funds, care of animals, protection of human subjects, or use of investigational drugs, recombinant products, new devices, or radioactive, biological and/or chemical materials.

(b)(6) Inappropriate behavior in relation to misconduct: Including inappropriate accusations of misconduct; failure to report known or suspected misconduct; withholding or destruction of information relevant to a claim of misconduct; and retaliation against persons involved in the allegation or investigation of misconduct.

(c) Process for Handling Allegations of Scholarly Misconduct (also see page 3-67)

(c)(1) Initiation of an allegation of misconduct. Initial allegations or evidence may be reported to any faculty member or administrator, who must then report the allegations to the Senior Vice President and Provost and to the Vice President for Research. If the person to whom the report would normally be given is involved in some way in the misconduct, the next higher academic officer should be informed. The Provost or Vice President for Research shall take interim administrative actions, as appropriate, to protect Federal funds and
insure that the purposes of the Federal financial assistance are carried out during the inquiry and investigation stages.

The Provost or Vice President for Research shall informally review any allegations of scholarly misconduct, confer with the dean of the college in which the allegation is alleged to have occurred and Legal Counsel and determine whether the allegation warrants initiation of the inquiry process according to the policies and procedures for scholarly misconduct or whether other University policies or procedures should take precedence. The Provost or Vice President for Research will counsel the individual(s) making the allegation, as to the policies and procedures to be used. If the reporting individual chooses not to make a formal allegation but the Provost or Vice President for Research believes an inquiry is warranted, an inquiry shall be initiated. The institution will pursue an allegation of misconduct to its conclusion, even if the person against whom the allegation is made (hereinafter referred to as the “Respondent”) leaves or has left the institution before the case is resolved.

(c)(2) Inquiry

(a) The first step of the review process is an inquiry which has as its purpose fact finding in an expeditious manner to help determine if an allegation is deserving of further formal investigation, and if formal investigation is not warranted, to make recommendations concerning the disposition of the case.

(b) An Inquiry Committee composed of no fewer than three tenured faculty with no real or apparent conflict of interest, with no appointment in the department of either the individual(s) making the allegation or the Respondent, with appropriate expertise for evaluating information relevant to the cases shall be appointed by the Provost or Vice President for Research within fifteen days after receipt of an allegation.

(c) The Provost or Vice President for Research shall notify the Respondent, in writing, of the allegations and the procedures which will be used to examine the allegations. The Respondent will be informed of the proposed membership of the Inquiry Committee to identify in advance any bias or conflict of interest.

(d) Where the individual(s) making the allegation seeks anonymity, the Inquiry Committee shall operate in such a way as to maintain the anonymity to the degree compatible with accomplishing the fact-finding purpose of the inquiry. Such anonymity cannot, however, be assured. Further, this anonymity may be neither desirable nor appropriate where individual(s) testimony is important to the substantiation of the allegations.

(e) Information, expert opinions, records, and other pertinent data may be requested by the Inquiry Committee. All involved individuals are obligated to cooperate with this committee by supplying such requested documents and information. Uncooperative behavior may result in immediate implementation of a formal investigation or institutional sanctions.

(f) All material will be considered confidential and shared only with those with a need to know. The Provost or Vice President for Research and the members of the Inquiry Committee are responsible for the security of relevant documents.
(g) In order to gather evidence, whenever possible, the Inquiry Committee will conduct interviews of all individuals possessing relevant information but in particular the Respondent and the individual(s) making the allegation.

(h) All individuals may have the assistance of personal legal counsel at their expense at both the inquiry and investigative stages; however, principals are expected to speak for themselves at the interviews.

(i) The review by the Inquiry Committee should be completed and a written report filed within sixty days of written notification to the Respondent that an Inquiry Committee is being named. The written report shall contain what evidence was reviewed, summarize relevant interviews and include the conclusions of the Inquiry Committee. If this deadline cannot be met, a request for extension and a report of reasons and progress to date, together with the anticipated time frame, should be filed with the Provost and the Vice President for Research and all individuals with a need to know should be informed.

(j) The written report of the Inquiry Committee will be conveyed to the Provost or the Vice President for Research, who shall give a copy of the written report of inquiry to the Respondent. The Respondent shall be given the opportunity (ten working days) to comment in writing upon the findings and recommendations of the Inquiry Committee. These comments may be made part of the record.

(k) If, after reviewing the outcome of the inquiry, the Vice President for Research, in consultation with the Provost determines the need for a formal investigation, the Provost or Vice President for Research will initiate that action within fifteen days by appointment of a Committee of Investigation, and by immediately notifying, among others with a need to know, the Director of the Office of Research Integrity, if appropriate, and the funding source, if any, that an investigation is being undertaken. This notification is expected to occur within twenty-four hours of the determination of the need for a formal investigation. Under certain circumstances, the institution may be expected to notify the sponsoring agency or funding source at a point prior to the initiation of an investigation. Factors used in determining the timing of such notification include the seriousness of the possible misconduct, the presence of an immediate health hazard, consideration of the interests of the funding agency, the scientific community, the public, and the individual who is the subject of the inquiry or investigation and his/her associates.

(l) If, after reviewing the outcome of an inquiry, the Provost or Vice President for Research determines that a formal investigation is unwarranted, or if the inquiry is terminated for any reason, the Provost or Vice President for Research shall notify all involved individuals and make diligent efforts to restore the reputations of persons alleged to have engaged in misconduct when allegations are not confirmed, shall also undertake diligent efforts to protect the positions and reputations of those persons who, in good faith, have made allegations of scientific misconduct and shall send a report to the Office of Research Integrity stating the intent to terminate the procedure without an investigation and including a description of the reason for such termination. If the Inquiry Committee finds the allegations not to have been brought in good faith, sanctions may be recommended against the individual(s) making the allegation.
(m) Records of the inquiry are confidential to the maximum extent possible and are to be passed on to Committee of Investigation only if a formal review is initiated. The records of inquiry shall contain sufficiently detailed documentation of the inquiry to permit a later assessment of the reasons for determining that an investigation was not warranted, if necessary. If a formal review is not initiated, the records shall be kept by the Provost or Vice President for Research for at least three years after completion of the inquiry and shall, upon request, be provided to authorized Department of Health and Human Services personnel.

(c)(3) Investigation

(a) The Provost or Vice President for Research shall appoint a Committee of Investigation of no fewer than three senior faculty who are without conflict of interest, hold no appointment in the departments of either the individuals making the allegation or Respondent, and have appropriate expertise for evaluating the information relevant to the case. Preferably, at least one member should not be associated with the institution.

(b) The Provost or Vice President for Research shall notify the Respondent, in writing, that there will be an investigation and of the procedures to be used during the investigation. The Respondent will be informed of the proposed membership of the Committee of Investigation to identify any bias or conflict of interest.

(c) The purpose of the Committee of Investigation is to explore further the allegation and to determine whether serious scholarly misconduct has been committed, and, if so, the extent of the misconduct. The investigation normally will include examination of all documentation, including but not necessarily limited to relevant research data and proposals, publications, correspondence and memoranda of telephone calls. Interviews should be conducted of all individuals involved including the Respondent and the individuals making the allegation, as well as other individuals who might have information regarding key aspects of the allegations. Respondent shall be given the opportunity to address the allegations and evidence at the interviews. Complete summaries of these interviews should be prepared, provided to the interviewed party for comment or revision and included in the investigatory file. The Committee of Investigation may request the involvement of outside experts. The investigation must be sufficiently thorough to permit the Committee of Investigation to reach a firm conclusion about the validity of the allegations and the scope of the wrongdoing or to be sure that further investigation will be unlikely to alter an inconclusive result. In the course of an investigation, additional information may emerge that may justify broadening the scope of the investigation beyond the initial allegation. Should this occur the Respondent is to be informed, in writing, of any significant new directions in the investigation. In addition to making a judgment on the veracity of the charges, the Committee of Investigation may recommend to the Provost or Vice President for Research appropriate sanctions.

(d) Interim administrative action prior to conclusion of either the inquiry or the investigation may be indicated as the institution is responsible for protecting the health and safety of research subjects, patients, students, staff, and Federal funds as well as the public interest. Such action may range from restriction on some activities to full suspension of
the Respondent. Notification of external sponsors and the Office of Research Integrity, if appropriate, should be initiated by the Provost.

(e) All individuals involved in the investigation are obligated to operate in timely fashion by producing any additional data requested for the investigation. Copies of all materials obtained by the Committee of Investigation shall be provided to the Respondent and to other concerned individuals as judged appropriate by the Committee of Investigation.

(f) The proceedings of the Committee of Investigation are confidential and will be closed. A tape recording of proceedings may be made.

(g) After the investigation has been completed, the Committee of Investigation shall deliberate, and prepare its findings and recommendations.

(h) All significant developments during the formal investigation as well as the interim and final findings and recommendations of the Committee of Investigation will be reported by the Provost or Vice President for Research, among others, to the research sponsor and the Office of Research Integrity, if appropriate.

(i) Every effort should be made to complete the investigation within 120 days; however, it is acknowledged that some cases may render this deadline difficult to meet. In such cases, the Committee of Investigation shall compile a progress report, identify reasons for the delay and request an extension from the Provost or Vice President for Research. The Provost or Vice President for Research shall convey to the funding or other relevant agency such information as may be required by it, at intervals as required by the agency.

(j) Upon completion of the investigation the Committee of Investigation shall submit to the Provost and Vice President for Research a full report which details the Committee of Investigation's findings, recommendations and the documentation to substantiate the investigation's findings. This report shall be sent to the Respondent by the Provost or Vice President for Research. The Respondent shall be given twenty working days to comment in writing on the allegations, evidence findings and recommendations of the Committee of Investigation. The Provost shall then make the decision regarding application of sanctions based on all the information received and shall so inform the Respondent in writing of the sanctions and the appeal process. If the sanctions involve the recommendation for termination of employment, the academic termination procedures of the University will be invoked.

(k) When appropriate, the Provost will submit the final report of the investigation to the Director of the Office of Research Integrity and the funding agency. In cases involving a recommendation for severe sanctions, the notification will state "these sanctions are being recommended and, following University policy, appropriate procedures to appeal the case will be initiated." On occasion they may require a request for an extension. At the conclusion of the University process, the final report will be submitted. The final report must describe the policies and procedures under which the investigation was conducted, how and from whom information was obtained relevant to the investigation, the findings and the basis for the findings and include the actual text or accurate summary of the views of any individual(s) found to have engaged in misconduct, as well as a description of any sanctions taken by the University.
(l) If the formal investigation is terminated for any reasons without completing all the requirements for an investigation, the Provost shall send a report to the Office of Research Integrity stating the intent to terminate the investigation, including a description of the reasons for such termination.

(c)(4) Resolution

(a) Finding of absence of scholarly misconduct. All research sponsors and others initially informed of the investigation shall be informed in writing that allegations of misconduct were not supported. If the allegations are deemed to have not been made in good faith, appropriate disciplinary action should be taken against the individuals making the allegation. If the allegations, however incorrect, are deemed to have been made in good faith, no disciplinary measures are indicated and an effort should be made to prevent retaliatory actions. In publicizing the findings of no misconduct, the institution should be guided by whether public announcements will be harmful or beneficial in restoring any reputations that may have been lost. Usually, such decisions should rest with the person who was wrongfully accused. Diligent efforts, as appropriate, should be undertaken to restore the reputations of persons alleged to have engaged in misconduct when allegations are not confirmed and to protect the positions and reputations of those persons who, in good faith, make allegations.

(b) Findings of scholarly misconduct. The Provost is responsible for notification of all federal agencies, sponsors, or other entities initially informed of the investigation of the finding of scholarly misconduct. The institution should take action appropriate for the seriousness of the misconduct, including but not limited to the following:

1. **Notification:** Consideration should be given to formal notification of the following, among other appropriate entities:
   - Sponsoring agencies, funding sources
   - Co-authors, co-investigators, collaborators
   - Department, School, or Institution
   - Editors in journals in which fraudulent research was published
   - Editors of other journals or publications, other institutions, other sponsoring agencies, and funding sources with which the individual has been affiliated
   - State professional licensing boards
   - Notification of professional societies

2. **Institutional Disciplinary Action** including, but not limited to the following:
   - Removal from particular project
   - Special monitoring of future work
   - Letter of reprimand
   - Probation for a specified period with conditions specified
   - Suspension of rights and responsibilities for a specified period, with or without salary
   - Termination of employment
(c) Appeal

Individuals may appeal the judgment of the Committee of Investigation and/or the sanction. A written statement of the grounds for the appeal must be submitted to the President within thirty days of written notification of the results of the investigation. Grounds for appeal include, but are not limited to, new previously unconsidered evidence which was not available earlier, sanctions not in keeping with the findings, conflict of interest not previously known among those involved in the investigation, or other lapses in due processes. Upon receipt of a written appeal, the President will evaluate the evidence and make a determination. At the President's discretion, the investigation may be reopened. The President's decision will be binding on all parties and will be conveyed to all involved in a timely fashion. In case of termination of employment, the decision may be appealed according to University regulations.

(Regents, 6-25-97, 6-25-08)
This is intended to serve only as an outline of the procedures detailed in the Ethics in Research Policy in Section 3.28.