

	Research Misconduct
Policy Number	1200@21
Effective Date	May23, 2017
Administrative Division	Division of Research and Federal Relatio
Unit	Researc@ompliance
Revised Date	Click here to enter text.

## 1.0 Policy Statement

Jackson State University holds that misconduct in research, creative, and other scholarly activities is expressly prohibited at the University, and that all such allegations will be investigated carefully and methodically, and resolved expeditiously, while maintaining standards of confidentiality for all involved. Research misconduct is considered a serious breach of the public trust, scholarly conduct, values, and ethics. Such misconduct shall be subject to appropriate disciplinary action.

## 2.0 Purpose

The pX U S R V H R I W K L V S R O L F \ L V W R R X Wadhle to the legical strong of th

A person who, at the time of the alleged research misconduct, was employed by, was an agent of, or was affiliatecology act or agreement with this institution

Any research proposed, performed, reviewed, or reported, or any research record generated from that research, regardless of whether an application or proposal for funds resulted in a grant, contract, cooperative agreement, or other form of support.

The principles outlined in this policy may be used as a framework for conducting inquiries and investigat of allegations of misconduct for research, whether funded or not.

## 3.0 Definitions

- 3.1 Allegations written or oral statement or other indication of possible scientific misconduct made to an institutional official.
- 3.2 Good Faith Allegatiens

## 4.0 Additional formation

- 4.1 Findings of misconduct require that the allegation(s) be proven by a preponderance of evidence indicating a significant departure from accepted practices of the relevant research community an that the misconduct committed was intentioinal, akmd/wr reckless
- Anyone who has reason to suspect research misconduct, or observes anyone engaged in Research Misconduct, has the responsibility and right to report such through an oral or written statement to their department/unit head, Department/unit Researchtegrit@fficer or through the useEthicspoint
- 4.3 If the complainaistunsure whether a suspectation can be defined essearch misconduct, he or she may meet with or contact descriptoffice to discuss the suspected research misconduct informally, which may include discussing it anonymously and/or hypothetically.
- 4.4 The identity of the respondent and the complainants should be limited to those who need to know in order to conduct an objection deair assessment of the allegation.
- 4.5 If the assessment of the allegation meets the definition of research misconduct and sufficient, credible and specific evidence is identified, an inquiry can be initiated.
- 4.6 The respondent will be provided witten swrittmary of the allegations, a copy of this policy and a procedure guideline regaption during addressing research misconduct. The name of the complainant will not be revealed to the respondent during the inquiry process.
- 4.7 The University nust, oner before the date on which the respondent is notified or the inquiry begins (whichever is early promptly take all reasonable and practical steps to obtain custody of all the research records and evidence needed to conduct the research mised inductive outcomes the records and evidence, and ester them in a secure matrices pt 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 instruments, so long as those copies are substantially equivalent to the evidentiary value of the instruments.
- 4.8 The inquiry process will be conducted and completed by an appointed committee within 60 10 a

4.10 Retaliation in any way against complainants, witness