

UC Davis Policy and Procedure Manual

Chapter 220, Research--General

Section 05, Integrity in Research

Date: 4/9/07, reissued 2/3/15

Supersedes: 12/23/03, renumbered 4/14/05

Responsible Department: Office of Research

Source Document: [42 CFR Parts 50 and 93](#); [University Policy on Integrity in Research](#)

[Exhibit A, Procedure for Conducting the Inquiry](#)

[Exhibit B, Procedure for Conducting the Investigation](#)

I. Purpose and Scope

- A. This policy sets forth the principles and methods for assessing allegations of research misconduct, conducting inquiries and investigations related to possible research misconduct, and reporting the results to cognizant federal sponsors. This policy is intended to comply with federal law regarding research misconduct involving federally funded research ([Federal Register Volume 65, Number 235 Page 76260-76264](#)) and ([42 CFR Part 93](#)).
- B. This policy applies to all research conducted at UC Davis, regardless of funding source. With regard to research conducted with federal funds, the procedures for handling allegations of fabrication, falsification or plagiarism, as defined in this policy, are mandated by federal regulations. The procedure for handling allegations involving non-federally funded research or allegations involving areas of misconduct other than fabrication, falsification or plagiarism may or may not follow these procedures. In these cases, the Locally Designated Official (LDO) in consultation with the Research Integrity Officer (RIO) will determine what procedure applies in accordance with other UC Davis policies and procedures.
- C. This policy applies to all individuals engaged in research, including any person paid by, under the control of, or affiliated with UC Davis, such as scientists, trainees, technicians and other staff members, students, fellows, guest researchers or collaborators. This policy also applies to those individuals who were engaged in the research that is the subject of an allegation of research misconduct, but who are no longer affiliated with UC Davis at the time an allegation is reported.

II. Definitions

- A. Allegation--a report of possible research misconduct through any means of communication to the RIO and/or the LDO.
- B. Campus Counsel--the UC Davis legal counsel who is responsible for advising the RIO, the inquiry and investigation committees and the Deciding Official on relevant legal issues. Campus Counsel does not represent the Respondent, the Reporter or any other person participating during the assessment, inquiry, investigation or any follow-up action, except the officials responsible for managing or conducting the research misconduct process as part of their official duties.
- C. Cognizant Federal Sponsor or Federal sponsor--the federal sponsoring agency of the research project, for example, PHS, NIH, NSF, DOE, NASA, DOD and FDA.
- D. Conflict of interest--the real or apparent interference of one person's interests with the interests of another, where potential bias may occur due to prior or existing personal, professional or economic relationships.
- E. Deciding official--the Vice Chancellor--Research at UC Davis. The Deciding Official will not be the same individual as the RIO and should have no direct prior involvement in the preliminary assessment, inquiry or investigation.
- F. Discipline--can include written censure, reduction in salary, suspension, demotion, denial or

curtailment of emeritus status and/or dismissal. For student discipline, can include probation, delay of graduation, or revocation of degree. A finding of research misconduct under this policy does not constitute discipline.

- G. Employee--any person paid by, under the control of, or affiliated with the University of California. For the purpose of this policy, "employee" also includes independent contractors and guest researchers.
- H. Good faith allegation--an allegation made with the honest belief that research misconduct may have occurred.
- I. Immediate health hazard--a condition that exists or has the potential to exist which should be abated or corrected immediately to prevent imminent or ongoing danger of serious damage to human or animal health or the environment.
- J. Inquiry--preliminary information-gathering and initial fact-finding to determine whether an allegation or apparent instance of research misconduct warrants an investigation.
- K. Investigation--the formal examination and evaluation of all relevant facts to determine if research misconduct has occurred and, if so, to determine the responsible person and the seriousness of the misconduct.
- L. Locally Designated Official (LDO)--the Assistant Executive Vice Chancellor who is the individual designated by the Chancellor to receive allegations of suspected improper governmental activity (IGA) under the UC whistleblower policies and the California Whistleblower Protection Act.
- M. Office of Research Integrity (ORI)--the Federal agency responsible for overseeing and investigating research integrity and misconduct issues as they relate to federally funded research.
- N. Official--the LDO, RIO or Deciding Official.
- O. Remedial action--actions necessary to protect research funds. These actions are not disciplinary but are intended to ensure the appropriate expenditure of research funds and to protect the integrity of the research.
- P. Reporter--anyone who makes an allegation of research misconduct.
- Q. Research--a systematic experiment, study, evaluation, demonstration or survey designed to develop or contribute to general knowledge (basic research) or specific knowledge (applied research).
- R. Research Integrity Officer (RIO)--the Associate Vice Chancellor for Research Administration or the person delegated this responsibility.
- S. Research misconduct--fabrication, falsification or plagiarism in proposing, performing or reviewing research or in reporting research results. It does not include honest error, differences of opinion, or authorship disputes.
 - 1. Fabrication--making up data or results and recording or reporting them.
 - 2. 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.
 - 3. Plagiarism--the appropriation of another person's ideas, processes, results or words without giving appropriate credit.
- T. Research record--the physical and/or electronic record of data or results that embody the facts resulting from scientific inquiry, including but not limited to, research proposals, laboratory records, progress reports, abstracts, theses, oral presentations, internal reports, journal articles

and any documents and materials provided to the United States Department of Health and Human Services (DHHS) or a University official by a Respondent in the course of a research misconduct proceeding.

- U. Respondent--the person(s) against whom an allegation of research misconduct is directed or the subject(s) of a preliminary assessment, inquiry or investigation.

III. Policy

- A. Quality research requires adherence to the highest standards of integrity in proposing, conducting, and reporting research.
- B. When allegations of research misconduct are reported, the University will conduct a prompt, fair, objective, competent and thorough investigation of those allegations.

IV. Requirements

- A. Time limits
 - 1. Federal law imposes specific time limits upon many of the steps described below including:
 - a. Complete inquiry process within 60 days of the first meeting of the inquiry committee unless a delay is clearly warranted.
 - b. Initiate investigation within 30 days of completion of inquiry if investigation is indicated.
 - c. Submit investigation report to the federal sponsor within 120 days of initiation of investigation.
 - 2. This policy applies only to research misconduct occurring within six years preceding the date an allegation of research misconduct is received. The exceptions to the six-year statute of limitations are as follows:
 - a. If, for the potential benefit of the Respondent, the Respondent continues or renews any incident of alleged research misconduct that occurred before the six year limitations period through the citation, republication or other use of the research record that is alleged to have been fabricated, falsified or plagiarized.
 - b. The alleged misconduct, if it occurred, would possibly have a substantial adverse effect on the health or safety of the public.

- B. Evidentiary standards

The following evidentiary standards apply to allegations of research misconduct:

- 1. UC Davis has the burden of proving research misconduct.
- 2. Standard of proof
 - a. A finding of research misconduct must be established by a preponderance of the evidence, which means that the evidence demonstrates that it is more likely than not that the Respondent committed research misconduct as defined in this policy.
 - b. A finding of research misconduct requires:
 - 1) A significant departure from accepted practices of the relevant research community; and
 - 2) the misconduct is committed intentionally, knowingly or recklessly.
 - c. The destruction, absence of, or Respondent's failure to provide research records documenting the questioned research may be considered evidence of research

misconduct where the preponderance of the evidence establishes the Respondent intentionally, knowingly or recklessly had research records and destroyed them, had the opportunity to maintain the records but failed to do so, or maintained the records and failed to produce them in a timely manner and that the Respondent's conduct constitutes a significant departure from accepted practices of the relevant research community.

- d. For purposes of this policy, misconduct is committed recklessly when an individual makes a false, fabricated or plagiarized representation with callous disregard as to whether or not it is true or requires attribution to another. Such callous disregard can be demonstrated by evidence that shows the representation is:
 - 1) In fact false, misleading, or plagiarized; and
 - 2) The individual had a high degree of awareness of the probable falsity or misleading nature or source of the representation or in fact entertained serious doubts as to the truth of the representation. This subjective awareness of the falsity or misleading nature of a representation can be inferred from evidence indicating that there were obvious reasons to doubt the accuracy of the representation and the individual did not act reasonably in dispelling those doubts.

V. Rights and Responsibilities

A. General

1. Duty to report misconduct

- a. All employees or individuals associated with UC Davis should report, either in writing or orally, observed, suspected or apparent misconduct in research to the LDO or the RIO. If an individual is unsure whether a suspected incident falls within the definition of research misconduct, he or she may discuss the suspected misconduct with the LDO or RIO informally.
- b. At any time, an employee or individual may have confidential discussions and consultations about concerns of possible research misconduct with the RIO and will be counseled about appropriate procedures for reporting allegations.
- c. At any time, an employee or individual may make a confidential telephone call to the Research Compliance Hotline (877-384-4272).
- d. If the RIO receives any allegations of misconduct that do not meet the definition of research misconduct, the RIO will refer the reporting individual or the allegation to the appropriate office or administrator for further handling. When a report of research misconduct also contains allegations of other misconduct that does not meet the definition of research misconduct, the allegations will be severed and handled separately.
- e. The RIO will notify the LDO if the allegation meets the conditions specified in section III.B.3 of the [UC Whistleblower Policy](#).

2. Duty to cooperate

Employees shall cooperate with the LDO and/or RIO or other individuals delegated responsibility in the review of research misconduct allegations and the conduct of preliminary assessments, inquiries and investigations. Employees shall provide relevant evidence to the RIO or other officials responsible for reviewing an allegation of research misconduct.

3. Protection from retaliation

Employees who receive or learn of an allegation of research misconduct will treat the Reporter who makes a good faith allegation of research misconduct and others involved in the preliminary assessment, inquiry or investigation of research misconduct who act in good faith with fairness and respect. The RIO will take reasonable steps to protect the position and reputation of such individuals and protect them against retaliation. Employees shall immediately report any alleged or apparent retaliation to the RIO, who will review instances of alleged retaliation for appropriate action.

4. Confidentiality

- a. The RIO will take all reasonable steps to protect the confidentiality of the preliminary assessment, inquiry and investigation process and to protect the identities of those who participate in these processes. If a Reporter requests anonymity, an effort will be made to honor the request during the preliminary assessment or inquiry to the greatest extent possible and in compliance with applicable policies, regulations and federal, state and local laws. The Reporter will be advised that if the matter is referred to an investigation committee and the Reporter's testimony is required, anonymity may no longer be guaranteed.
- b. Employees who make, receive or learn of an allegation of research misconduct will protect, to the greatest extent possible, the confidentiality of information regarding the Reporter, the Respondent and other affected individuals. The RIO may establish reasonable conditions to ensure the confidentiality of such information.

5. Restoration of reputation

If neither UC Davis nor the Federal Sponsor finds research misconduct, and if requested by the Respondent, the University will work with the Respondent to develop a plan to undertake reasonable and practical efforts to protect or restore the Respondent's reputation. Similar efforts will be employed when requested and when necessary to protect or restore the reputation of a Reporter, witness and/or committee member.

B. Research Integrity Officer (RIO)

1. In addition to the rights and responsibilities set forth above, the RIO is responsible for:
 - a. Implementation of the procedures set forth in this policy and for ensuring that any preliminary assessment, inquiry or investigation is conducted in a fair, timely, objective, thorough and competent manner.
 - b. With the Vice Provost--Academic Personnel, appointing the inquiry and investigation committees as provided by Exhibits A and B and ensuring that necessary and appropriate expertise is secured to carry out a thorough and authoritative evaluation of the relevant evidence in an inquiry or investigation.
 - c. Providing the Respondent with written notification regarding the inquiry within seven days of the decision to conduct an inquiry.
 - d. Taking reasonable precautions to ensure that the individual(s) who conduct(s) the inquiry or investigation is/are unbiased and free of any conflict of interest.
 - e. Assisting the inquiry and investigation committees and other involved personnel in complying with these procedures and with applicable standards imposed by government or external funding sources.
 - f. Serving as the recorder of the record during research misconduct proceedings, maintaining files of all relevant documents and evidence, and maintaining the confidentiality and the security of the files.
 - g. Reviewing the preliminary assessment, inquiry and investigation reports and

delivering the reports to the Deciding Official.

- h. Reporting any allegation not made in good faith to the Deciding Official for appropriate action.
- i. Communicating with Federal and non-Federal Sponsors as required by federal law and this policy.

- 2. The RIO is not a voting member of the inquiry or investigation committees.
- 3. The RIO's role may be delegated.

C. Reporter

- 1. In addition to the rights and responsibilities set forth above, the Reporter is responsible for making allegations in good faith.
- 2. The Reporter is entitled to testify before the inquiry and investigation committees, to review portions of the inquiry and investigation reports pertinent to his/her allegations or testimony, to receive information about the results of the inquiry and investigation, and to be protected from retaliation. Also, if the RIO has determined that the Reporter may be able to provide pertinent information on any portions of the draft report, these portions will be given to the Reporter for comment. The reports may be redacted as deemed necessary to protect confidentiality and to prevent the Reporter from accessing information not pertinent to his/her participation in the review of the allegation.
- 3. If the Reporter is a person charged with oversight of some aspect of the research integrity process, he or she should not participate in the inquiry or investigation of the issue other than to provide relevant information to the RIO and inquiry or investigation committees. In the event that the Reporter who is charged with oversight responsibilities has pertinent work products or information predating the allegation, that material may be reviewed by the individuals and/or committees charged with reviewing the allegation.

D. Respondent

In addition to the rights and responsibilities set forth above, the Respondent is entitled to:

- 1. Receive written notification regarding the opening of an inquiry or investigation and the final determinations and resulting actions.
- 2. The opportunity to be interviewed by and present evidence to the inquiry and investigation committees.
- 3. The opportunity to receive information about the results of an inquiry or investigation, to review the draft inquiry and investigation reports, and to provide written comments regarding the reports.
- 4. Retain and consult with legal counsel or a non-lawyer personal adviser (who is not a principal or witness in the case) to seek advice and bring the counsel or personal adviser to represent him/her during interviews or meetings regarding the allegation.

E. Deciding Official

- 1. In addition to the rights and responsibilities set forth above, the Deciding Official is responsible for:
 - a. Receiving the inquiry report and any written comments made by the Respondent and/or the Reporter to the draft report, consulting with the RIO or other appropriate individuals, and determining whether to conduct an investigation.
 - b. Receiving the investigation report and any written comments made by the Respondent and/or the Reporter on the draft report, consulting with the RIO or other

appropriate individuals, and determining whether research misconduct occurred.

- c. Notifying the Respondent of the finding(s) of an investigation.
2. If the Deciding Official determines that the alleged misconduct is substantiated by the findings, he or she may take any remedial actions which are deemed necessary to protect research funding and integrity. These remedial actions may include:
 - a. Notifying publishers of the findings so that publishers may withdraw or correct all pending or published abstracts and papers emanating from the research where research misconduct was found.
 - b. Coordinating with department chairs to redirect University funds by removing the Respondent from the particular project, and to institute mechanisms for special monitoring of future work.
3. If research misconduct is found, the Deciding Official will inform the Chancellor who will then notify the appropriate office responsible for discipline or administrative action pursuant to the appropriate policies and procedures.

VI. Procedures

A. Preliminary assessment of allegations

1. Allegation assessment

Upon receiving an allegation of research misconduct, the RIO will assess the allegation to determine whether there is sufficient evidence to warrant an inquiry, whether federal support or federal applications for funding are involved, and whether the allegation falls under the definition of research misconduct. The RIO may consult with others whom the RIO determines have the appropriate technical expertise. Before proceeding to an inquiry, the RIO will consult with scientific peers who have the appropriate technical expertise to determine whether or not the allegation falls under the definition of research misconduct.

2. Sufficient evidence to proceed

There is not always sufficient evidence or information to permit further inquiry into an allegation. For example, an allegation that a scientist's work should be subjected to general examination for possible research misconduct is not sufficiently substantial or specific to initiate an inquiry. In case of such a vague allegation, an effort should be made to obtain more information before initiating an inquiry. This information may be sought from any reasonable source, including the Reporter, if known.

3. Referral of other issues

Regardless of whether it is determined that a research misconduct inquiry is warranted, if the allegation involves federal support and concerns possible failure to protect human or animal subjects, financial malfeasance or criminal activity, the allegation should be referred to the appropriate Federal Sponsor.

B. Conducting the Inquiry--See [Exhibit A](#)

C. Conducting the Investigation--See [Exhibit B](#)

D. Additional allegations received during the inquiry or investigation

When allegations of research misconduct are received during the inquiry or investigation that were not previously evaluated during the preliminary assessment, the RIO will determine whether those allegations should be reviewed as part of the inquiry or investigation, or whether a separate preliminary assessment must be conducted.

E. Leave

When the Respondent is an academic appointee, the Chancellor may impose an involuntary or administrative leave with pay on the Respondent, pending the completion of the inquiry and/or investigation pursuant to this policy, and/or applicable disciplinary procedures, if such action is appropriate according to the applicable academic personnel or administrative policies. The Chancellor shall immediately give the Respondent written notice of the interim leave, specifying the rule or rules allegedly violated.

F. Termination of employment or resignation prior to completing inquiry or investigation

The termination of the Respondent's employment, by resignation or otherwise, before or after an allegation of possible research misconduct has been reported, will not preclude or terminate the research misconduct procedures. If the Respondent, without admitting to the research misconduct, elects to resign his/her position prior to the initiation of an inquiry but after an allegation has been reported, or during an inquiry or investigation, the inquiry or investigation will proceed. If the Respondent refuses to participate in the process after resignation, the committee will use its best efforts to reach a conclusion concerning the allegations, noting in its report the Respondent's failure to cooperate and its effect on the committee's review of all the evidence.

G. Reporting to ORI and the Cognizant Federal Sponsor

1. Decision not to conduct investigation

- a. If, after an inquiry, the Deciding Official determines that an investigation is not warranted, ORI and the Federal Sponsor will generally not receive notification. However, the RIO will provide ORI and/or the Federal Sponsor with a copy of the inquiry report where ORI or the Federal Sponsor requested the inquiry or otherwise requests a copy of the report.
- b. If ORI or a Federal Sponsor that has been informed of a decision not to proceed with an investigation is performing an oversight review of the determination not to proceed to an investigation, the RIO, if so requested, will provide ORI or the Federal Sponsor with the report and the inquiry file including, but not limited to, secured evidence, analyses and transcripts of interviews. The RIO will keep all records secure until ORI or the Federal Sponsor makes its final decision on its oversight of the inquiry.

2. Decision to conduct investigation

- a. If the Deciding Official decides to initiate an investigation, the RIO will provide ORI and/or the Director of the Cognizant Federal Sponsor with written notification on or before the date the investigation begins. At a minimum, the notification will include the name of the person(s) against whom the allegations have been made, the general nature of the allegation as it relates to the definition of research misconduct and the Federal Sponsor applications or grant number(s) involved. The RIO will also provide ORI and/or the Cognizant Federal Sponsor with a copy of the inquiry report and the policies and procedures for conducting an investigation. ORI and/or the Cognizant Federal Sponsor will be notified of the final outcome of the investigation and will be provided with a copy of the investigation report. Any significant variations from the provisions of this policy will be explained in any reports submitted to ORI and/or the Federal Sponsor.
- b. Before terminating an investigation for any reason without completing all relevant requirements of this policy, the RIO will submit a report of the planned termination to ORI and/or the Federal Sponsor, including a description of the reasons for the proposed termination. ORI and/or the Federal Sponsor will review the information provided and advise whether a further investigation should be undertaken.
- c. When an admission of research misconduct is made, the RIO will contact ORI

and/or the Federal Sponsor for consultation and advice. Normally, the individual making the admission will be asked to sign a statement attesting to the occurrence and extent of research misconduct. When the case involves federal funds, an admission of research misconduct is not an acceptable basis for closing a case or failing to undertake an investigation without prior approval from ORI and/or the Federal Sponsor.

- d. If the investigation cannot be completed in 120 days, the RIO will submit to ORI and/or the Federal Sponsor a written request for an extension that explains the delay, reports on the progress to date, estimates the date of completion of the report, and describes other necessary steps to be taken. If the request is granted, the RIO will file periodic progress reports as requested by ORI and/or the Federal Sponsor.
 - e. The RIO will report to ORI and/or the Federal Sponsor(s) as required by regulation and keep them apprised of any developments during the course of the investigation that may affect current or potential funding for the individual(s) under investigation or that ORI and/or the Federal Sponsor needs to know to ensure appropriate use of federal funds and otherwise protect the public interest.
3. The RIO will notify ORI and/or the Federal Sponsor at any stage of this process if:
- a. there is an immediate health hazard involved;
 - b. there is an immediate need to protect Federal funds or equipment;
 - c. there is an immediate need to protect the interests of the person(s) making the allegations or of the individual(s) who is (are) the subject of the allegations as well as his/her co-investigators and associates, if any;
 - d. it is probable that the alleged incident is going to be reported publicly;
 - e. the allegation involves a public health sensitive issue, e.g., a clinical trial;
 - f. there is a reasonable indication of a possible Federal criminal and civil violation. In this instance, ORI and/or the Federal Sponsor must be informed within 24 hours of obtaining that information.

H. Notifying Non-Federal Sponsors

Non-Federal Sponsors will be informed of inquiries, investigations and outcomes of research misconduct proceedings based on contractual obligations. The Deciding Official, after consulting appropriate University officials and Chair of the Academic Senate, may inform non-federal sponsors even if notification is not contractually required.

I. Institutional review and decision

1. Acceptance of investigation report

The Deciding Official will make the final determination whether to accept the investigation report and its findings based on a preponderance of the evidence. If the Deciding Official's determination varies from that of the investigation committee, the Deciding Official will explain in detail the basis for rendering a decision different from that of the investigation committee in a letter transmitting the report to the Federal Sponsor. The Deciding Official's explanation will be consistent with the definition of research misconduct, these policies and procedures, and the evidence reviewed and analyzed by the investigation committee.

2. Request for further fact finding

The Deciding Official may also return the report to the investigation committee with a

request for further fact-finding or analysis. The Deciding Official's determination together with any revised report prepared by the investigation committee constitutes the final investigation report for purposes of the Federal Sponsor's review.

3. Notification of final determination

In addition to notifying those persons entitled to notification under this policy, the Deciding Official will determine whether law enforcement agencies, professional societies, professional licensing boards, editors of journals in which falsified reports may have been published, collaborators of the Respondent in the work, or other relevant parties should be notified of the outcome of the case.

J. Administration of discipline

1. Academic Senate Bylaws, Davis Division of the Academic Senate Bylaws, the University Policy on Faculty Conduct and the Administration of Discipline and University Policies Applying to Campus Activities, Organizations and Students, Section 100.00, Student Conduct and Discipline, set forth expectations for high standards of ethical behavior for faculty and students, respectively, and provide procedures for administration of discipline. Other relevant procedures for administration of discipline should be adhered to based on the Respondent's employment status. No discipline may be imposed other than as provided in applicable policies and procedures regarding disciplinary actions. Specifically, if Respondent is:

- a. An academic appointee, the matter will be referred to the Vice Provost--Academic Personnel for review under applicable personnel policies;
- b. A student, the matter will be referred to the Director--Student Judicial Affairs for review under applicable student policies;
- c. A staff member, the matter will be referred to the respective department chair and Human Resources for review under applicable staff policies.

2. Appeals

The determination of the Deciding Official with respect to research misconduct shall be binding. The appeal of any disciplinary determination shall be handled in accordance with the applicable academic or staff personnel policy or collective bargaining agreement.

K. Record retention

After completion of a case and all ensuing related actions, the RIO will prepare a complete file, including the records of any inquiry or investigation and copies of all documents and other materials furnished to the RIO or inquiry or investigation committees. The RIO will keep the file for at least seven years after completion of the case to permit later assessment of the case. The Federal Sponsor will be given access to the records upon request.

VII. References

A. UC Office of the President:

1. Guidelines on University-Industry Relations, 5/17/89, revised 2/16/96 (<http://www.ucop.edu/ucophome/coordrev/policy/5-17-89.html>).
2. University Policy on Integrity in Research, 6/19/90 (<http://www.ucop.edu/ucophome/coordrev/policy/6-19-90.html>).
3. UC Policy on Disclosure of Financial Interests and Management of Conflicts of Interest Related to Sponsored Projects, 10/1/95, revised 10/5/97 (<http://www.ucop.edu/research/disclosure.html>).

4. UC Policies Applying to Campus Activities, Organizations, and Students, Section 100.00, Policy on Student Conduct and Discipline, and Section 110.00, Policy on Student Grievance Procedures, 10/19/06 (<http://www.ucop.edu/ucophome/coordrev/ucpolicies/aos/toc.html>).
 5. UC Policy on Reporting and Investigating Allegations of Suspected Improper Governmental Activities (Whistleblower Policy) (<http://www.ucop.edu/ucophome/coordrev/policy/10-04-02whistle.pdf>) and Policy for Protection of Whistleblowers from Retaliation and Guidelines for Reviewing Retaliation Complaints (Whistleblower Protection Policy) (<http://www.ucop.edu/ucophome/coordrev/policy/10-04-02retaliation.pdf>).
- B. Academic Personnel Manual:
1. [Section APM-010, Academic Freedom.](#)
 2. [Section APM-015, Faculty Code of Conduct \(Code of Professional Rights, Responsibilities, and Conduct of University Faculty, and University Disciplinary Procedures\);](#) and [Section UCD-015, Procedures for Faculty Misconduct Allegations.](#)
 3. [Section APM-016, University Policy on Faculty Conduct and the Administration of Discipline;](#) and [Section UCD-016, Procedures for Faculty Discipline.](#)
 4. [Section APM-020, Special Services to Individuals and Organizations.](#)
 5. [Section APM-025](#) and [Section UCD-025, Conflict of Commitment and Outside Activities of Faculty Members.](#)
 6. [Section APM-140](#) and [Section UCD-140, Non-Senate Academic Appointees/Grievances.](#)
 7. [Section APM-150, Non-Senate Academic Appointees/Corrective Action and Dismissal.](#)
 8. [Section APM-210-1, Appendix A, Statement on Professional Ethics.](#)
- C. [Academic Senate Bylaw 335, Privilege and Tenure: Divisional Committees--Grievance Cases \(May 23, 2001\),](#) and [Davis Division Bylaw 87, Privilege and Tenure.](#)
- D. Personnel Policies for Staff Members:
1. [UC Policy 62](#) and [UCD Procedure 62, Corrective Action--Professional and Support Staff.](#)
 2. [UC Policy 63](#) and [UCD Procedure 63, Investigatory Leave.](#)
 3. [UC Policy 64](#) and [UCD Procedure 64, Termination of Career Employees--Professional and Support Staff.](#)
 4. [UC Policy 65](#) and [UCD Procedure 65, Termination of Career Employees--Managers and Senior Professionals, Salary Grades I through VII.](#)
 5. [UC Policy 67, Termination of Career Employees--Managers and Senior Professionals, Salary Grades VIII and IX.](#)
 6. [UC Policy 70](#) and [UCD Procedure 70, Complaint Resolution.](#)
 7. [UC Policy 71, Resolution of Concerns--Managers and Senior Professionals, Salary Grades VIII and IX.](#)
 8. [UC Appendix II, Personnel Policies for Senior Managers.](#)
- E. UC/union collective bargaining agreements (<http://www.hr.ucdavis.edu/Elr/Contracts>).
- F. [UC Davis Administration of Student Discipline.](#)
- G. UC Davis Policy & Procedure Manual:

1. [Section 250-03, Use of Copyrighted Materials in General.](#)
 2. [Section 290-30, Use and Care of Animals in Teaching and Research.](#)
 3. [Section 310-24, Electronic Communications: Privacy and Access.](#)
 4. [Section 380-16, Conflict of Interest.](#)
 5. [Section 380-17, Improper Governmental Activities.](#)
- H. [California Whistleblower Protection Act \(Cal. Gov't Code Section 8547-8547.12\).](#)
- I. Federal Policies on Research Misconduct.
1. [Public Health Service Policies on Research Misconduct; Final Rule, Federal Register, Vol. 70, No. 94, May 17, 2005, 42 CFR Parts 50 and 93.](#)
 2. [Office of Science and Technology Policy \(OSTP\) Federal Research Misconduct Policy: Federal Register, Vol. 65, No.235, December 6, 2000, Pages 76260-76264.](#)

The following federal departments and agencies have enacted policies or regulations to implement the Federal Research Misconduct Policy

- a. [Department of Health and Human Services - ORI](#) [PDF]
- b. [Department of Energy](#) [PDF]
- c. [Department of Labor](#)
- d. [Department of Transportation](#) [PDF]
- e. [Department of Veteran Affairs](#) [PDF]
- f. [Environmental Protection Agency](#) [PDF]
- g. [National Aeronautics Space Administration](#)
- h. [National Endowment for the Humanities](#)
- i. [National Science Foundation](#)