

UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA DAVIS  
INTERIM RESEARCH MISCONDUCT POLICY

December 31, 2025  
Office of Research  
Page 1

---

## I. Purpose and Scope

- A. This section outlines the policy, procedures, and responsibilities for reviewing allegations of research misconduct, conducting inquiries and investigations related to possible research misconduct, and reporting findings to cognizant Federal sponsors. It aligns with Federal research misconduct regulations, including [42 CFR Part 93](#) and [45 CFR Part 689](#).
- B. This section applies to all research conducted at UC Davis, regardless of funding source.
1. For Federal funded research, the procedures for handling allegations of fabrication, falsification or plagiarism, are required by Federal law.
  2. For non-Federally funded research or other types of misconduct procedures may differ. The Research Integrity Officer [RIO or Executive Associate Vice Chancellor for Research] in consultation with the Locally Designated Official [LDO or Chief Compliance Officer] as/if appropriate and the will determine what procedure applies.
  3. This section applies to all individuals engaged in research, including:
  4. Any individual paid by, under the control of, or affiliated with the University of California, Davis (UC Davis), i.e., scientists, trainees, technicians and other staff members, students, fellows, guest researchers, or collaborators.
  5. Former affiliates involved in the research in question.
  6. This policy does not apply to activities undertaken in fulfillment of course requirements unless there is an expectation of publication or dissemination of the results of such research outside of UC Davis.

## II. Definitions

For the definitions of Fabrication, Plagiarism, Research Misconduct, and Research, refer to the UC Policy on Responding to Allegations of Research Misconduct (effective December 31, 2025). Where a sponsor adopts a definition that differs from the Federal Policy, UC will use the sponsor's definition for responding to allegations of Research Misconduct for research funded by that sponsor, in effect at the time of the alleged Research Misconduct.

The following terms are defined for purposes of this UC Davis policy and its implementing procedures:

- A. Allegation: a disclosure of possible research misconduct through any means of communication to the RIO or the LDO.
- B. Cognizant Federal Sponsor or Federal sponsor: the federal sponsoring agency of the research project (e.g., PHS, NIH, NSF, DOE, NASA, DOD, and FDA).
- C. 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.
- D. Deciding Official (DO) - the UC Davis official responsible for making final determinations of Research Misconduct findings [Vice Chancellor for Research]. The same individual cannot serve as both the Deciding Official and Research Integrity Officer.
- E. Discipline: can include written censure, reduction in salary, suspension, demotion, denial, or curtailment of emeritus status or dismissal. For student discipline, it can include probation, delay of graduation, or revocation

# UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA DAVIS INTERIM RESEARCH MISCONDUCT POLICY

December 31, 2025  
Office of Research  
Page 2

---

of degree. A finding of research misconduct under this policy does not constitute discipline; discipline is administered separately under applicable rules.

F. 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.

1. Good faith allegation: an allegation made with the honest belief that research misconduct may have occurred.
2. 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.
3. Inquiry: preliminary information-gathering and initial fact-finding to determine whether an allegation or apparent instance of research misconduct warrants an investigation.
4. 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.
5. Locally Designated Official (LDO): the UC Davis official designated by the Chancellor to receive and act on allegations of Research Misconduct, consistent with the Chancellor’s responsibilities under the UC Policy.
6. 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.
7. 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.
8. Reporter: any person who makes an allegation of Research Misconduct.
9. Research Integrity Officer (RIO): the UC Davis official responsible for compliance and implementation of this policy, including establishing procedures and documentation.
10. Research Record: the physical 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.
11. 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. The University is committed to the highest standards of research integrity and requires compliance with applicable regulations.
- B. All reported research misconduct allegations are reviewed promptly, fairly, and objectively.

UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA DAVIS  
INTERIM RESEARCH MISCONDUCT POLICY

December 31, 2025  
Office of Research  
Page 3

---

#### IV. Requirements

##### A. Time Limits (Federal Requirements)

1. Inquiry process within 90 days of initiation of the inquiry (unless a delay is clearly warranted).
2. Initiate investigation started within 30 days of completion of inquiry if investigation is indicated
3. Submit investigation report to the Federal sponsor within 180 days of initiation of investigation. This policy applies only to research misconduct occurring within 6 years preceding the date an allegation of research misconduct is received. The exceptions to the 6-year statute of limitations are as follows:

a. Subsequent use exception. The respondent continues or renews any incident of alleged research misconduct that occurred before the six-year limitation through the use of, republication of, or citation to the portion(s) of the research record (e.g., processed data, journal articles, funding proposals, data repositories) alleged to have been fabricated, falsified, or plagiarized, for the potential benefit of the respondent.

4. 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. A respondent's destruction of research records documenting the questioned research is evidence of research misconduct where UC Davis establishes by a preponderance of the evidence that the respondent intentionally or knowingly destroyed records after being informed of the research misconduct allegations.
  - d. A respondent's failure to provide research records documenting the questioned research is evidence of research misconduct where the respondent claims to possess the records but refuses to provide them upon request. For purposes of this policy, to act recklessly means to propose, perform, or review research, or report research results, with indifference to a known risk of fabrication, falsification, or plagiarism.
  - e. The respondent has the burden of going forward with and proving, by a preponderance of the evidence, any mitigating factors relevant to a decision to impose administrative actions after a research misconduct proceeding.

UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA DAVIS  
INTERIM RESEARCH MISCONDUCT POLICY

December 31, 2025  
Office of Research  
Page 4

---

## V. Rights and Responsibilities

### A. General

#### 1. Duty to report misconduct

a. All employees or individuals associated with UC Davis should either report, 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, the individual 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 the Reporting to the LDO section of the [UC Whistleblower Policy](#).

#### 2. Duty to cooperate

Employees must cooperate with the LDO, RIO or other individuals delegated responsibility in the review of research misconduct allegations and the conduct of preliminary assessments, inquiries, and investigations. Employees must 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 must 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.

UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA DAVIS  
INTERIM RESEARCH MISCONDUCT POLICY

December 31, 2025  
Office of Research  
Page 5

---

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, or committee member.

C. Principal Investigator and the research team

Principal Investigators are responsible for fostering a research environment that supports integrity in research and compliance with applicable policies and regulations. Principal Investigators and members of the research team must:

1. Follow all applicable institutional and applicable Federal policies, requirements, and regulations regarding Research Misconduct.

1. Comply with this policy and its implementing procedures, and with any extramural contract and grant terms and conditions supporting their research.

2. Report observed, suspected, or apparent Research Misconduct to the RIO or LDO in accordance with Section V.A of this policy.

Principal Investigators bear particular responsibility for ensuring that members of their research team are aware of and comply with this policy.

D. Research Integrity Officer (RIO)

In addition to the rights and responsibilities set forth above, the RIO is responsible for:

1. 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.

2. In consultation with Academic Affairs, the Compliance Office, and the Faculty Senate; appointing the inquiry and investigation committees as provided by Exhibits A and B and ensuring that necessary and appropriate expertise is secured to conduct a thorough and authoritative evaluation of the relevant evidence in an inquiry or investigation.

3. Providing the Respondent with written notification regarding the inquiry within seven days of the decision to conduct an inquiry.

4. 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.

5. 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.

6. 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.

7. Reviewing the preliminary assessment, inquiry, and investigation reports and delivering the reports to the Deciding Official.

8. Reporting any allegation not made in good faith to the Deciding Official for appropriate action.

UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA DAVIS  
INTERIM RESEARCH MISCONDUCT POLICY

December 31, 2025  
Office of Research  
Page 6

---

9. Communicating with Federal and non-Federal Sponsors as required by Federal law and this policy.

10. The RIO is not a voting member of the inquiry or investigation committees.

11. The RIO's role may be delegated.

E. Locally Designated Official (LDO)

The Chancellor has designated the Chief Compliance Officer to receive allegations of suspected improper governmental activity (IGA) under the UC whistleblower policies and the California Whistleblower Protection Act.

F. Reporter

A Reporter can be anyone who makes an allegation of research misconduct.

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 the Reporter's allegations or testimony, to receive information about the results of the inquiry and investigation, and to be protected from retaliation. In addition, 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 the Reporter's 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, the Reporter 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 or committees charged with reviewing the allegation.

G. Respondent

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

UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA DAVIS  
INTERIM RESEARCH MISCONDUCT POLICY

December 31, 2025  
Office of Research  
Page 7

---

#### H. Deciding Official

The Chancellor has designated the Vice Chancellor for Research to serve as the Deciding Official and must not have direct prior involvement in the preliminary assessment, inquiry, or investigation.

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 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 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, the Deciding Official 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.

c. 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.

#### I. Campus Counsel

The UC Davis legal counsel responsible for advising the RIO, the inquiry and investigation committees and the Deciding Official on relevant legal issues.

Is not responsible for representing 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.

### VI. Procedures

#### A. Preliminary assessment of allegations

##### 1. Allegation assessment

Upon receiving an allegation of research misconduct, the RIO assesses 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 consults with scientific peers who have the appropriate technical expertise to determine whether the allegation falls under the definition of research misconduct.

UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA DAVIS  
INTERIM RESEARCH MISCONDUCT POLICY

December 31, 2025  
Office of Research  
Page 8

---

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.

A. Conducting the Inquiry: See Exhibit A.

B. Conducting the Investigation: See Exhibit B.

C. 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 determines whether those allegations should be reviewed as part of the inquiry or investigation, or whether a separate preliminary assessment must be conducted.

D. 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 or investigation pursuant to this policy, or applicable disciplinary procedures, if such action is appropriate according to the applicable academic personnel or administrative policies. The Chancellor must immediately give the Respondent written notice of the interim leave, specifying the rule or rules allegedly violated.

E. 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 their 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.

F. 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 requested,

UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA DAVIS  
INTERIM RESEARCH MISCONDUCT POLICY

December 31, 2025  
Office of Research  
Page 9

---

provides 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 keeps 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 provides ORI and 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 also provides ORI and the Cognizant Federal Sponsor with a copy of the inquiry report and the policies and procedures for conducting an investigation. ORI and 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 the Federal Sponsor.

b. Before terminating an investigation for any reason without completing all relevant requirements of this policy, the RIO submits a report of the planned termination to ORI and the Federal Sponsor, including a description of the reasons for the proposed termination. ORI and the Federal Sponsor reviews the information provided and advises whether a further investigation should be undertaken.

c. When an admission of research misconduct is made, the RIO contacts ORI and 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 the Federal Sponsor.

d. If the investigation cannot be completed in 180 days, the RIO submits to ORI and 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 files periodic progress reports as requested by ORI and the Federal Sponsor.

e. The RIO reports to ORI and 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 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 the Federal Sponsor at any stage of this process if:

a. Health or safety of the public is at risk, including an immediate need to protect human or animal subjects.

b. HHS resources or interests are threatened.

c. Research activities should be suspended.

d. There is reasonable indication of possible violations of civil or criminal law.

e. Federal action is required to protect the interests of those involved in the research misconduct proceeding.

f. HHS may need to take appropriate steps to safeguard evidence and protect the rights of those involved.

G. Notifying Non-Federal Sponsors

Non-Federal Sponsors will be informed of inquiries, investigations, and outcomes of research misconduct

UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA DAVIS  
INTERIM RESEARCH MISCONDUCT POLICY

December 31, 2025  
Office of Research  
Page 10

---

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.

H. Institutional review and decision

1. Acceptance of investigation report

The Deciding Official makes 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 explains 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 determines 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.

I. 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 Affairs for review under applicable personnel policies;
- b. A student, the matter will be referred to the Director, Office of Student Support and 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 is binding. The appeal of any disciplinary determination will be handled in accordance with the applicable academic or staff personnel policy or collective bargaining agreement.

UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA DAVIS  
INTERIM RESEARCH MISCONDUCT POLICY

December 31, 2025  
Office of Research  
Page 11

---

J. Record retention

After completion of a case and all ensuing related actions, the RIO prepares 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 keeps the file for at least 7 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. Further Information**

A. Additional information is available from the Research Integrity Office at UC Davis ([Research Misconduct - Office of Research](#)).

B. Confidential reports of report misconduct can be made by contacting the Research Compliance Hotline at 877-384-4272.

**VIII. References and Related Policies**

A. UC Office of the President:

[University Policy on Responding to Allegations of Research Misconduct](#)

1. [UC Policy on Disclosure of Financial Interests and Management of Conflicts of Interest Related to Sponsored Projects](#).

2. Policies Applying to Campus Activities, Organizations, and Students:

a. [Section 100.00, Policy on Student Conduct and Discipline](#).

b. [Section 110.00, Policy on Student Grievance Procedures](#).

3. [Whistleblower Policy](#).

4. [Whistleblower Protection Policy](#).

B. [Academic Personnel Manual](#):

1. [Section 010, Academic Freedom](#).

2. [Section 015, Faculty Code of Conduct](#); and UCD-015, Procedures for Faculty Misconduct Allegations.

3. [Section 016, University Policy on Faculty Conduct and the Administration of Discipline](#); and [UCD-016, Procedures for Faculty Discipline](#).

4. [Section 020, Special Services to Individuals and Organizations](#).

5. [Section 025](#) and [UCD-025, Conflict of Commitment and Outside Activities of Faculty Members](#).

6. [Section 140](#) and [UCD-140, Non-Senate Academic Appointees/Grievances](#).

7. [Section 150, Non-Senate Academic Appointees/Corrective Action and Dismissal](#).

C. [Academic Senate Bylaw 335, Privilege and Tenure: Divisional Committees: Grievance Cases](#), and [Davis Division Bylaw 87, Privilege and Tenure](#).

UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA DAVIS  
INTERIM RESEARCH MISCONDUCT POLICY

December 31, 2025  
Office of Research  
Page 12

---

D. Personnel Policies for Staff Members:

1. [Policy 62 and UCD Procedure 62, Corrective Action.](#)
  2. [Policy 63 and UCD Procedure 63, Investigatory Leave.](#)
  3. [Policy 64 and UCD Procedure 64, Termination and Job Abandonment.](#)
  4. [Policy 70 and UCD Procedure 70, Complaint Resolution.](#)
  5. [Personnel Policies for Senior Management Group.](#)
- E. [UC/union collective bargaining agreements.](#)
- F. [UC Davis Administration of Student Discipline.](#)

G. UC Davis Policy & Procedure Manual:

1. [Section 290-30, Care and Use of Animals in Teaching and Research.](#)
  2. [Section 310-24, Electronic Communications: Privacy and Access.](#)
  3. [Section 230-05, Conflict of Interest.](#)
  4. [Section 400-05, Fraud Risk Management.](#)
- H. [California Whistleblower Protection Act \(Cal. Gov't Code Section 8547-8547.12\).](#)

I. Federal Policies on Research Misconduct.

1. [Public Health and Human Services Policies on Research Misconduct.](#)
2. [Office of Science and Technology Policy \(OSTP\) Federal Research Misconduct Policy.](#)
3. The following Federal departments and agencies have enacted policies or regulations to implement the Federal Research Misconduct Policy:
  - a. [Department of Energy.](#)
  - b. [Department of Labor.](#)
  - c. [Department of Transportation.](#)
  - d. [Department of Veteran Affairs.](#)
  - e. [Environmental Protection Agency.](#)
  - f. [National Aeronautics Space Administration.](#)
  - g. [National Endowment for the Humanities.](#)
  - h. [National Science Foundation.](#)