THE UNIVERSITY OF TENNESSEE

System-wide Policy: RE0001 - Policy and Procedures on Responsible Conduct in Research and Scholarly Activities	
Version: 2	**Effective Date: 01/01/2026**

SECTION 1. Policy Statement

The University of Tennessee System (UT) is committed to upholding the highest standards of scientific rigor in research. Further, UT is committed to fostering an environment that promotes research integrity and the responsible conduct of research, discourages research misconduct, and deals promptly with allegations or evidence of possible research misconduct. Research misconduct is contrary to the interests of UT and its campuses and institutes, the health and safety of the public, the integrity of research, and the conservation of public funds.

UT's goals under this policy are to (1) conduct fair, thorough, competent and objective proceedings to determine the truthfulness and accuracy of allegations of research misconduct, (2) impose fair and reasonable disciplinary sanctions on any person who is found to have committed research misconduct and who is subject to discipline, and (3) comply with laws and regulations applicable to research misconduct and research misconduct proceedings, including but not limited to regulations promulgated by federal agencies that sponsor research.

SECTION 2. Reason for the Policy

This policy confirms UT's commitment to foster an environment that preserves the integrity of the research record and promotes truth, objectivity, fairness and honesty in the conduct of all research at UT. This policy is designed to comply with applicable federal laws and regulations requiring UT to establish and implement policies and procedures to address allegations of research misconduct in connection with the research enterprise.

SECTION 3. Scope and Application

This policy applies to allegations of research misconduct brought forward against a person who, at the time of the alleged misconduct, was engaged in proposing, performing, reviewing, or reporting research, regardless of the source of funding for the activity at UT.

3.1 Research to which this policy applies

Research misconduct involves Falsification, Fabrication, or Plagiarism in any portion of the research record which is broadly defined under federal regulations and this policy. Research record means the record of data or results that embody the facts resulting from scientific inquiry. Data or results may be in physical or electronic form. Research data or results need not be published formally to be covered by this policy. Examples include, but are not limited to:

- Manuscripts, master's theses, PhD dissertations (and the data therein), whether formally published or not, when presented as a completed analysis or set of data;
- Data provided to a mentor or lab chief as representing the results of experiments;
- Reports to federal agencies or other funding sponsors (progress reports, renewal applications, extensions requests, etc.);
- Preliminary data included as part of a funding proposal;
- Funding proposals withdrawn prior to consideration, denied without peer review, or

unfunded;

- Research data or results referenced in funding applications, proposals, or reports;
- Abstracts, posters, oral presentations, or preliminary reports presented at conferences;
- Data reported to central databases, such as multi-center clinical trials or epidemiological research; and
- Statements contained in patent applications.
- Unfunded scholarly and creative works, including but not limited to books, poems, scripts, various art and performance works.

3.2 Application to institutional members and others engaged in research

This policy applies to all UT institutional members, external collaborators, guest researchers or affiliates, who at the time of the alleged research misconduct is or was engaged in proposing, performing, reviewing, or reporting research regardless of the source of funding, if funded, pay status of the individual, or location of the research effort. The work need not been conducted at a UT campus or facility to be covered by this policy.

3.2.1 Students

This policy applies to any currently enrolled UT student whose conduct is the subject of any allegation of research misconduct, whether the questioned research was conducted at UT or at some other institution or entity. Likewise, it applies to any previously enrolled UT student who conduct is the subject of an allegation of research misconduct when the questioned research was conducted at UT, or when the former student remains otherwise affiliated with UT. This policy is not intended to govern UT's response to alleged breaches of academic integrity related to student work for which the academic credit may be received except to the extent the alleged misconduct was part of the research record for an externally funded project. UT may designate an academic administrator to provide guidance to a student respondent regarding academic issues that may arise related to the research misconduct proceeding (e.g., if the work in question is a thesis or dissertation).

3.2.2 Principal Investigators (PIs)

Individuals in collaborative research (including scholarship) bear joint responsibility (sometimes to varying degrees) for ensuring the integrity of research performed or published under their names. PIs bear primary responsibility for ensuring the integrity of collaborative research performed under their supervision. Investigators, department heads, and center directors are expected to make periodic and reasonable inquiries concerning the integrity of the research activities conducted under their supervision. Intentional, Knowing or Reckless failure to comply with the responsibilities of a PI in connection with an act of fabrication, falsification, or plagiarism committed by a person under the PIs direction or control can constitute research misconduct.

3.2.3 External collaborators, guests, and affiliates

This policy applies to non-employee and non-student external collaborators to the extent required by federal regulations or funding agreements, and to the extent a written

agreement exists linking the work of the collaborator to UT or its faculty, staff and students. In the case of an external collaborator accused of research misconduct who is neither a UT employee or student, the campus/institute Research Integrity Officer (RIO) may refer the allegation to the collaborator's employer, affiliated institution, or to oversight officials, in lieu of conducting a research misconduct proceeding at the appropriate campus or institute. UT will cooperate with any such proceeding at another institution consistent with funding agreements and applicable law.

3.2.4 Unavailable respondent

The unavailability of a respondent for any reason, including voluntary or involuntary separation from UT, should not delay the initiation or continuation of a research misconduct proceeding. In exceptional cases (for example, grave illness of the respondent or among the respondent's immediate family), the Chancellor may modify the application of this policy upon advice of the RIO, Chief Research Officer (CRO), and University Counsel.

3.3 Exclusions

Allegations of misconduct occurring outside of the research setting are excluded from this policy, as are allegations of research misconduct that are not Fabrication, Falsification, or Plagiarism as defined in this policy. Allegations determined by the campus RIO to fall outside of the scope of the policy may be addressed by other UT policies.

3.4 Limited application after Six (6) years

A research misconduct proceeding generally will not be initiated if the allegations involve conduct occurring more than six (6) years prior to UT's receipt of the allegation. Any exception to this 6-year limitation must be approved in advance by the campus CRO, with advice from the RIO and university counsel. Exceptions may include, but are not limited to:

- Referral of an allegation of research misconduct to UT from a federal funding agency beyond the 6-year period;
- If the respondent continues or renews any incident of alleged research misconduct that occurred before the 6-year period through the use of, republication of, or citation to the portion(s) of the research record alleged to have been fabricated, falsified, or plagiarized, for the potential benefit of the respondent (subsequent use of exception). For alleged research misconduct that appears subject to this subsequent use exception, but UT determines it is not subject to the exception, the institution will document its determination that the subsequent use exception does not apply and will retain this documentation for the later of 7 years after completion of the institutional proceedings or the completion of any federal agency hearing, or any state law records retention requirements.
- Continued or renewed conduct involving the questioned research through the citation, re-publication, or other use of the research record at issue;
- Alleged research misconduct that could have a substantial adverse effect on public health or safety;
- Application of this policy is required by law or is otherwise in the best interest of UT; or
- Application of a different limitation period (or no limitation period) imposed by a contract or

funding entity.

SECTION 4. Procedures

UT will address all such allegations of research misconduct under this policy and its supporting **Procedures for Addressing Allegations of Research Misconduct**.

Retaliation against Complainants, Respondents, witnesses, committee members, or anyone else involved in Research Misconduct proceedings is prohibited.

SECTION 5. Responsibilities

5.1 Institution

5.1.1 UTs General Responsibilities

- To the extent possible, UT will limit disclosure of the identity of respondents, complainants, and witnesses while conducting the research misconduct proceedings to those who need to know, inform all institutional members about these policies and procedures, and make these policies and procedures publicly available. This limitation on disclosure no longer applies once the institution has made a final determination of research misconduct findings.
- UT will respond to each allegation of research misconduct in a thorough, competent, objective, and fair manner.
- UT will take all reasonable and practical steps to ensure the cooperation of respondents and other institutional members with research misconduct proceedings, including, but not limited to, their providing information, research records, and other evidence.
- UT will cooperate with any federal, state, or local agency or entity as required by federal law during any research misconduct proceeding or compliance review, including addressing deficiencies or additional allegations in the institutional record if directed to and to assist in administering and enforcing any administrative actions imposed on institutional members. The institution may also take steps to manage published data or acknowledge that data may be unreliable.

5.1.2 UTs Responsibilities During and After a Research Misconduct Proceeding

- Except as may otherwise be prescribed by applicable law, UT will maintain confidentiality for any records or evidence from which research subjects might be identified and will limit disclosure to those who need to know to carry out a research misconduct proceeding. Before or at the time of notifying the respondent of the allegation(s) and whenever additional items become known or relevant, UT will promptly take all reasonable and practical steps to obtain all research records and other evidence and sequester them securely.
- UT will ensure that the institutional record contains all required elements, i.e.,

research records that were compiled and considered during the proceedings, assessment documentation, and inquiry and/or investigation reports.

- Upon completion of the inquiry, UT will provide any required agency or entity as required by law with the complete inquiry report and add it to the institutional record.
- The institution will maintain the institutional record and all sequestered research records and other evidence in a secure manner for the required period as stated in federal regulations following the completion of the institutional and/or other proceeding.
- UT will provide information related to the alleged research misconduct and proceedings to any required federal agency or entity as required by law upon request and transfer custody or provide copies of the institutional record or any component of it and any sequestered evidence, regardless of whether the evidence is included in the institutional record.
- Additionally, UT will promptly notify the federal agency or entity of any special circumstances that may arise.
- Disclosure of the identity of respondents, complainants, and witnesses while conducting research misconduct proceedings is limited to those who need to know, which UT will determine consistently with a thorough, competent, objective, and fair research misconduct proceeding, and as allowed by law. Those who need to know may include institutional review boards, journals, editors, publishers, co-authors, and collaborating institutions.

5.1.3 UTs Responsibilities to the Complainant(s)

- UT will provide confidentiality consistent with all applicable federal regulations for all complainants in research misconduct proceedings.
- UT will take precautions to ensure that individuals responsible for carrying out any part of the research misconduct proceeding do not have potential, perceived, or actual personal, professional, or financial conflicts of interest with the complainant(s).
- UT will take all reasonable and practical steps to protect the positions and reputations of complainants and to protect these individuals from retaliation by respondents and/or other institutional members.
- If UT chooses to notify one complainant of the inquiry results in a case, all complainants will be notified by the institution, to the extent possible.

5.1.4 UTs Responsibilities to the Respondent(s)

- As with complainants, UT will provide confidentiality consistent with federal regulations to all respondents in research misconduct proceedings.
- UT will make a good-faith effort to notify the respondent(s) in writing of the allegations being made against them.
- UT will take precautions to ensure that individuals responsible for carrying out any part of the research misconduct proceeding do not have unresolved personal,

professional, or financial conflicts of interest with the respondent.

- UT is responsible for giving the respondent(s) copies of or supervised access to the sequestered research records.
- UT will notify the respondent whether the inquiry found that an investigation is warranted, provide the respondent with an opportunity to review and comment on the inquiry report, and attach their comments to the inquiry report. If an investigation is commenced, the respondent will be notified and given written notice of any additional allegations raised against them not previously addressed by the inquiry report and allow the respondent(s) an opportunity to review the witness transcripts.
- UT will give the respondent(s) an opportunity to read and comment on the draft investigation report and any information or allegations added to the institutional record.
- UT will give due consideration to admissible, credible evidence of honest error or difference of opinion presented by the respondent.
- UT will bear the burden of proof, by a preponderance of the evidence, for making a finding of research misconduct.
- UT will make all reasonable, practical efforts, if requested and, as appropriate, to protect or restore the reputation of respondents against whom no finding of research misconduct is made.

5.1.5 UT Responsibilities to Committee Members

- UT will ensure that a committee, consortium, or person acting on the institution's behalf conducts research misconduct proceedings in compliance with federal regulations.
- UT will take all reasonable and practical steps to protect the positions and reputations of good-faith committee members and to protect these individuals from retaliation.

5.1.6 UTs Responsibilities to the Witness[es]

- UT will provide confidentiality consistent with federal regulations for all witnesses.
- UT will take precautions to ensure that individuals responsible for carrying out any part of the proceedings do not have unresolved personal, professional, or financial conflicts of interest with the witnesses.
- UT will take all reasonable and practical steps to protect the positions and reputations of witnesses and to protect these individuals from retaliation.

5.2 UT faculty, staff, student, external collaborator, visitor and guest researcher responsibilities:

- Report in good faith alleged research misconduct to the appropriate RIO.
- Forward to the RIO any information received from any person that might constitute research misconduct or an admission of conduct constituting research misconduct.
- Cooperate with the RIO and other UT officials in connection with research misconduct proceedings, which includes providing evidence and information relevant to an allegation of

research misconduct.
- Adhere to the confidentiality requirements and the prohibition on retaliation stated in this policy

5.3 Complainants Responsibilities
- Report research misconduct in good faith, having a reasonable belief in the truth of one's allegation or testimony, based on the information known to the complainant at the time.
- Report the misconduct using any means of communication to the attention of the UT campuses or institute.

5.4 Respondents Responsibilities
- Participate in all levels of research misconduct proceedings and adhere to the stated time frames as outlined in the procedures.

5.5 Institutional Deciding Official (IDO) Responsibilities
- Appoint or otherwise name/hire an individual to serve as RIO.
- Make the final determination of research misconduct findings. As such, the IDO cannot serve as the RIO.
- The IDO documents their determination in a written decision that includes whether research misconduct occurred, and if so, what kind and who committed it, and a description of any sanctions, required corrective actions, or other required relation actions that have been or will be taken. The IDOs decision becomes part of the institutional record.

5.6 Research Integrity Officer (RIO) Responsibilities
- Administer this policy and oversee coordination of the Procedures (both system level and campus level).
- The RIO cannot serve as both the IDO and RIO.
- Maintain compliance laws and regulations applicable to research misconduct proceedings, including but not limited to providing notices and maintaining and retaining records in accordance with the requirements of research sponsors.
- Select members to serve on committees, as needed. These members may be chosen from a standing committee for research integrity matters or ad hoc as needed.
- Receive reports of research misconduct and information suggestive of an instance of research misconduct; assess whether the inquiry criteria have been satisfied and, if so, prepare an allegation based on the report or available information.
- UT campuses and institutes may choose to have the RIO or other designated official conduct an inquiry in lieu of a committee, and if needed, this individual may utilize one or more subject matter experts to assist them in the inquiry.
- Training members of committees (e.g., inquiry, investigation, and appeals) concerning their duties under this policy.
- Regularly brief the Involved Dean, Faculty Chairperson, Chancellor, and others with a need to know as applicable, and the IDO on matters administered under this Policy.

5.7 Dean Responsibilities

- Provide consultation to the IDO and RIO on appointments to the Standing Committee on Research Integrity as well as Investigation and Appeals committees, as needed.

5.8 Committee and Consortium Members Responsibilities

- Committee members (and consortium members where applicable) are experts who act in good faith to cooperate with the research misconduct proceedings by impartially carrying out their assigned duties for the purpose of helping UT meet its responsibilities under federal regulations and laws. Committee and consortium members will have relevant scientific expertise and be free of real or perceived conflicts of interest with any of the parties involved.
- Committee or consortium members or anyone acting on behalf of UT will conduct research misconduct proceedings consistent with all federal regulations applicable. They will determine whether an investigation is warranted, documenting the decision in an inquiry report.
    - During an investigation, committee or consortium members participate in recorded interviews of each respondent, complainant, and any other available person who has been reasonably identified as having information regarding any relevant aspects of the investigation, including witnesses identified by the respondent(s).
    - They will also determine whether the respondent(s) engaged in research misconduct and document the decision in the investigation report.
    - They consider respondent and/or complainant comments on the inquiry/investigation report(s) and document that consideration in the investigation report.[i]
- An investigation into multiple respondents may convene with the same investigation committee or consortium members or anyone acting on behalf of UT, but there will be separate investigation reports and separate research misconduct determinations for each respondent.
- Committee or consortium members may serve for more than one investigation, in cases with multiple respondents.
- Committee members may also serve on both the inquiry (if convened) and the investigation committees.

5.8.1 Inquiry Committee, if convened

- Review allegations of research misconduct as presented by the RIO and determine whether the Investigative Criteria has been satisfied.
- Prepare a draft determination for review and comment by the RIO; revise as needed.
- Allow the respondent to comment on a finalized draft determination; revise as needed.
- Submit a final written determination to the RIO.

5.8.2 Investigation Committee

- Review allegations of research misconduct determined to have met the

Investigation Criteria by an inquiry committee and determine for each allegation whether it is more likely than not that the respondent engaged in research misconduct.

- Prepare a draft investigation report for review and comment by the RIO; revise as needed.
- Allow the respondent to comment on a finalized draft investigation report; revise as needed.
- Submit a final investigation report to the RIO for delivery to the appropriate parties.

5.8.3 Appeals Committee

- Review an appealed finding of research misconduct.
- Prepare a draft determination for review and comment by the RIO.
- Submit a final written determination to the RIO for delivery to the appropriate parties as described in the Procedures (both system and campus).

5.9 Witnesses Responsibilities

- Witnesses are people with whom UT has reasonably identified as having information regarding any relevant aspects of the investigation.
- Witnesses provide information for review during research misconduct proceedings.
- Witnesses will cooperate with the research misconduct proceedings in good faith and have a reasonable belief in the truth of their testimony, based on the information known to them at the time.

5.10 Chancellor Responsibilities

- Upon receipt of a research misconduct finding and/or timely appeal of disciplinary sanctions from a respondent, review and decide whether to affirm, modify, or overturn the sanctions.

SECTION 6. Definitions

Allegation. This term is a disclosure of possible research misconduct through any means of communication and brought directly to the attention of an institutional or HHS official.

Assessment. Assessment means a consideration of whether an allegation of research misconduct appears to fall within the definition of research misconduct; appears to involve PHS-supported biomedical or behavioral research, biomedical or behavioral research training, or activities related to that research or research training; and is sufficiently credible and specific so that potential evidence of research misconduct may be identified. The assessment only involves the review of readily accessible information relevant to the allegation.

Chief Research Officer. The senior administrator at a UT campus or institute who is responsible for the research programs of that campus or institute.

Complainant. Complainant means an individual who in good faith makes an allegation of research misconduct.

Evidence. Evidence means anything offered or obtained during a research misconduct proceeding that tends to prove or disprove the existence of an alleged fact. Evidence includes documents, whether in hard copy or electronic form, information, tangible items, and testimony.

Fabrication. Fabrication means making up data or results and recording or reporting them.

Faculty Chairperson. The chairperson of the Faculty Senate/ Faculty Affairs Committee of the Faculty Senate.

Falsification. Falsification means 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.

Good faith. (a) Good faith as applied to a complainant or witness means having a reasonable belief in the truth of one's allegation or testimony, based on the information known to the complainant or witness at the time. An allegation or cooperation with a research misconduct proceeding is not in good faith if made with knowledge of or reckless disregard for information that would negate the allegation or testimony. (b) Good faith as applied to an institutional or committee member means cooperating with the research misconduct proceeding by impartially carrying out the duties assigned for the purpose of helping an institution meet its responsibilities under 42 CFR Part 93. An institutional or committee member does not act in good faith if their acts or omissions during the research misconduct proceedings are dishonest or influenced by personal, professional, or financial conflicts of interest with those involved in the research misconduct proceeding.

Honest Error. An exception to the definition of Research Misconduct or an affirmative defense to an Allegation of Research Misconduct in which a Respondent asserts that the questioned conduct resulted from an unintended error rather than Intentional, Knowing, or Reckless distortion of the Research Records. The Respondent carries the burden of establishing Honest Error (or other affirmative defense such as difference of opinion) that more likely than not explains the Fabrication, Falsification, or Plagiarism.

Inquiry. Inquiry means preliminary information gathering and preliminary fact-finding that meets the criteria and follows the procedures of § 93.307 through § 93.309.

Inquiry Committee. A committee of three (3) members, if convened, appointed by the RIO, with guidance from the RIO, from the membership of the Standing Committee on Research Integrity to review allegations of Research Misconduct that the RIO has determined satisfies the Inquiry Criteria. The committee determines if the Investigation Criteria has been satisfied for any of the allegations provided to them.

Institutional Deciding Official. Institutional Deciding Official means the institutional official, at a UT campus or institute, who makes final determinations on allegations of research misconduct and any institutional

actions. The same individual cannot serve as the Institutional Deciding Official and the Research Integrity Officer.

Institutional Member. Institutional member (members) means an individual (or individuals) who is (are) employed by, is an agent of, or is affiliated by contract or agreement with an institution. Institutional members may include, but are not limited to, officials, tenured and untenured faculty, teaching and support staff, researchers, research coordinators, technicians, postdoctoral and other fellows, students, volunteers, subject matter experts, consultants, or attorneys, or employees or agents of contractors, subcontractors, or sub-awardees.

Institutional Record. The institutional record comprises: (a) The records that the institution compiled or generated during the research misconduct proceeding, except records the institution did not consider or rely on. These records include but are not limited to (1) documentation of the assessment as required by § 93.306(c); (2) if an inquiry is conducted, the inquiry report and all records (other than drafts of the report) considered or relied on during the inquiry, including, but not limited to, research records and the transcripts of any transcribed interviews conducted during the inquiry, information the respondent provided to the institution, and the documentation of any decision not to investigate as required by § 93.309(c); (3) if an investigation is conducted, the investigation report and all records (other than drafts of the report) considered or relied on during the investigation, including, but not limited to, research records, the transcripts of each interview conducted pursuant to § 93.310(g), and information the respondent provided to the institution; (4) decision(s) by the Institutional Deciding Official, such as the written decision from the Institutional Deciding Official under § 93.314; (5) the complete record of any institutional appeal consistent with § 93.315; (b) a single index listing all the research records and evidence that the institution compiled during the research misconduct proceeding, except records the institution did not consider or rely on; and (c) a general description of the records that were sequestered but not considered or relied on.

Intentionally. To act intentionally means to act with the aim of carrying out the act.

Investigation. Investigation means the formal development of a factual record and the examination of that record that meets the criteria and follows the procedures of §§ 93.310 through 93.317.

Investigation Committee. A committee of at least three (3) members appointed by the IDO, with guidance from the RIO and in consultation with the Involved Dean, to review allegations of Research Misconduct that an Inquiry Committee has determined satisfy the Investigation Criteria. The committee determines whether an identified Respondent has committed Research Misconduct with respect to each such allegation.

Investigation Criteria. The following two criteria, which must both be answered in the affirmative by an Inquiry Committee for an investigation to commence:

1. Taking the alleged facts as true, does the allegation describe conduct that may fall within this policy's definition of Research Misconduct?
2. Does there exist evidence that has been or could be readily obtained, which would help show whether Research Misconduct (as defined in this policy) has occurred?

Involved Dean. The UT Dean whose school, college or program is most directly involved with the research that is the subject of a particular allegation of research misconduct.

Knowingly. To act knowingly means to act with awareness of the act.

Plagiarism. Plagiarism means the appropriation of another person's ideas, processes, results, or words, without giving appropriate credit. (a) Plagiarism includes the unattributed verbatim or nearly verbatim copying of sentences and paragraphs from another's work that materially misleads the reader regarding the contributions of the author. It does not include the limited use of identical or nearly identical phrases that describe a commonly used methodology. (b) Plagiarism does not include self-plagiarism or authorship or credit disputes, including disputes among former collaborators who participated jointly in the development or conduct of a research project. Self-plagiarism and authorship disputes do not meet the definition of research misconduct.

Preponderance of the Evidence. Preponderance of the evidence means proof by evidence that, compared with evidence opposing it, leads to the conclusion that the fact at issue is more likely true than not.

Recklessly. 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.

Research Integrity Officer. The Research Integrity Officer (RIO) refers to the institutional official responsible for administering the institution's written policies and procedures for addressing allegations of research misconduct in compliance with 42 CFR Part 93.

Research Misconduct. Research misconduct means fabrication, falsification, or plagiarism in proposing, performing, or reviewing research, or reporting research results. Research misconduct does not include honest error or differences of opinion.

Research Misconduct Proceeding. Research misconduct proceeding means any actions related to alleged research misconduct taken under 42 CFR Part 93, including allegation assessments, inquiries, investigations, ORI oversight reviews, and appeals under subpart E of 42 CFR Part 93.

Research record. Research record means the record of data or results that embody the facts resulting from scientific inquiry. Data or results may be in physical or electronic form. Examples of items, materials, or information that may be considered part of the research record include, but are not limited to, research proposals, raw data, processed data, clinical research records, laboratory records, study records, laboratory notebooks, progress reports, manuscripts, abstracts, theses, records of oral presentations, online content, lab meeting reports, and journal articles.

Respondent. Respondent means the individual against whom an allegation of research misconduct is directed or who is the subject of a research misconduct proceeding.

Retaliation. Retaliation means an adverse action taken against a complainant, witness, or committee member by an institution or one of its members in response to (a) a good faith allegation of research misconduct or (b) good faith cooperation with a research misconduct proceeding.

University Counsel. Any attorney on the staff at UTs Office of General Counsel who advises the RIO, the Inquiry and Investigation Committees, the Institutional Deciding Official (IDO) and other administrators with respect to legal issues arising withing the scope of administrators' University responsibilities. University Counsel does not represent the Respondent, the Complainant, or any individual person participating in a Research Misconduct Proceeding.

SECTION 6. Penalties/Disciplinary Action for Non-Compliance

Noncompliance with or violations of this Policy may result in internal disciplinary actions pursuant to University By-Laws, general rules of conduct for University employees, HR-0525 (Disciplinary Action), the University Student Conduct Code, governing faculty handbook guidance, and any other relevant University policies. Additionally, violations of this Policy could result in external disciplinary action, penalties, or sanctions by sponsors of federal research or related federal agencies.

SECTION 7. Responsible Official & Additional Contacts

Responsible Official and Contacts may have responsibilities that include monitoring compliance with the policy, accuracy of policy subject matter, organizing policy training, and updating the policy.

Include:
Subject, Name of Contact, Phone, Email address

UT System

Subject Matter	Office Name	Telephone Number (xxx) xxx-xxxx	Email/Web Address
Policy Clarification and Interpretation	Associate Vice President for Research	(865)974-0207	Kari@tennessee.edu
Policy Training	Associate Vice President for Research	(865)974-0207	Kari@tennessee.edu

Knoxville

Subject Matter	Office Name	Telephone Number (xxx) xxx-xxxx	Email/Web Address
Policy Clarification and Interpretation	Research Integrity Officer Deciding Official and Vice Chancellor of Research	(865) 974-4254 (865) 974-8701	Joemiles@utk.edu Dcrawf19@utk.edu

Policy Training	Director of Research Integrity	(865) 974-3526	Researchintegrity@utk.edu

Health Sciences Center

Subject Matter	Office Name	Telephone Number (xxx) xxx-xxxx	Email/Web Address
Policy Clarification and Interpretation	Office of Research Integrity—Mark Miller	(901) 448-6752	Mamiller@uthsc.edu
Policy Training	Office of Research Integrity—Mark Miller	(901) 448-6752	Mamiller@uthsc.edu

Chattanooga

Subject Matter	Office Name	Telephone Number (xxx) xxx-xxxx	Email/Web Address
Policy Clarification and Interpretation	Office of Research Integrity	(423) 425-4443	Ori@utc.edu
Policy Training	Office of Research Integrity	(423) 425-4443	Ori@utc.edu https://www.utc.edu/research/research-integrity

Martin

Subject Matter	Office Name	Telephone Number (xxx) xxx-xxxx	Email/Web Address
Policy Clarification and Interpretation	Office of Research and Sponsored Programs	(731) 881-7015	orsp@utm.edu
Policy Training	Office of Research and Sponsored Programs	(731) 881-7015	orsp@utm.edu

Southern

Subject Matter	Office Name	Telephone Number (xxx) xxx-xxxx	Email/Web Address
Policy Clarification and Interpretation	Academic Affairs	(931)424-0460	Cmattingly@utsouthern.edu
Policy Training	Academic Affairs	(931)424-0460	Cmattingly@utsouthern.edu

SECTION 8. Policy History
Revision 1: XX/XX/XXXX

SECTION 9. Related Policies/Guidance Documents

42 CFR Part 93