

3-8-102(1) **Definitions.** For purposes of this policy, the following terms are as stated below.

(a) Academic Researcher. Any person (paid or non-paid) affiliated with the University conducting or collaborating in University Sponsored Research.

(b) Complainant. Any individual or entity who makes an allegation of misconduct under this policy.

(c) Conflict of Interest. Any pecu[(STj -0.004 Ts)-6 (nlic)-7 e (tit)-teres74 Ts 5 (u)-9.10 Tw 6.

shall inform all parties at each stage about the expectation of confidentiality regarding all aspects of the proceedings.

3-8-1-2(4) Allegations . Allegations of RSCWMisconduct shall be received and reviewed as follows:

- (i) Allegations of RSCW Misconduct will be reported to the RIO by any individual with knowledge of observed, suspected, or apparent violations of this policy. These allegations shall be filed with the Office of the RIO in writing and shall be signed by the Complainant(s) who has/have made the allegations. Signatures shall not be required if the Complainant requests anonymity and the RIO determines that anonymity will affect materially the University's compliance with its responsibilities under this policy and/or as required by law.
- (ii) If the RIO suspects RSCWMisconduct they shall file allegations of RSCW misconduct.
- (iii) Upon receiving an allegation of misconduct, the RIO will assess the allegation to determine whether it is sufficiently credible and specific so that potential evidence of misconduct may be identified and if these criteria are met, an inquiry must be conducted.
- (iv) If the RIO determines that these criteria are not met, they shall inform the Complainant(s), the Respondent(s), and the DO that an inquiry will not be initiated.

3-8-102(5) Inquiry . An inquiry regarding an allegation of RSCWMisconduct shall be initiated as follows:

- (a) Upon the determination by the RIO that the allegations are sufficiently credible and specific, an inquiry shall be conducted by the RIO or the RIO's designee.
- (b) The purpose of the inquiry shall be to determine whether there is sufficient evidence that supports the reasonable conclusion that a violation(s) of this policy has/have occurred.
- (c) At the time an inquiry is initiated, the RIO must notify in writing the

Complainant(s), Respondent(s), if known, who is/are alleged to have violated this policy and each Respondent's department chair/school director/program area coordinator and dean, and the DO that an inquiry has been

described in the preceding sentence.

- (d) The RIO or their designee ~~may not be~~ ^{is not} reasonable to obtain information in the care, custody or control of the University not privileged as a matter of law that is needed to conduct the inquiry. The

the Respondent(s) and determine whether an investigation is warranted. Any finding that an investigation is warranted must be made in writing by the DO to the RIO and the Complainant(s) and Respondent(s).

- (i) The outcome of the inquiry, the DO's written decision, and a copy of the written inquiry report shall be sent "Confidential" to the last known email address of the Respondent(s).

(b) Upon the appointment of the IC, the RIO shall notify in writing the Complainant(s) and Respondent(s) of the allegations to be investigated.

(c) No later than thirty (30) calendar days after the DO's determination that an investigation is warranted, the IC shall

RSCW Misconduct; and

(A) identify the Respondent(s) responsible for the RSCW Misconduct;

(B) identify whether the RSCW Misconduct was fabrication, or plagiarism;

(C) describe and document the external support, including, e.g., any grant numbers, grant applications, contracts, and publication listing external support; and/or

(D) identify any publications and/or other RSCW dissemination that the IC has concluded need correction or retraction.

(k) The initial report... (B) identify whether the RSCW Misconduct was fabrication, or plagiarism;

funding sources supporting the Academic Researcher's
University Sponsored Research.

3-8-102(7) Discipline. Any University policy to the contrary notwithstanding, violation of the policy shall be cause for discipline consistent with University policies, regulations, procedures, or applicable law. Such discipline may include:

(a) sanctions of written and/or oral reprimand;

(b) prohibition (either temporary or permanent) from involvement in any University Sponsored Research;

from involvement in any University Sponsored Research;

department/school/program area. Specific FTE and dollar guidelines from the Vice President will be included by the dean in the dean's guidelines to a department/school/program area.

- (VI) FTE and dollar allocations from the dean may be for the fiscal year or for any portion of the fiscal year (e.g. summer only).
- (VII) FTE and dollars allocated to departments/schools/program areas may not exceed the FTE and dollars allocated to the dean by the Vice President. The dean may, however, establish a contingency pool of FTE and/or dollars.
- (VIII) Without approval of the Vice President, and the dean, a department/school/program area may not "lock in" its allocated FTE by assigning all FTE to tenure track and multiple year positions, even when the positions are within the 80% tenured plan of the department/school/program area and college.
- (IX) FTE assigned to positions which become vacant during the year may be reassigned, at the discretion of the dean, within discretion.

departmental/school/program area levels do not guarantee

while they are employed by the University. An honorary degree shall

any UNC employee. A nomination shall be submitted to the Chief Academic Officer (CAO) at least one semester prior to the semester of conferral.

(ii) Materials. A nomination shall include a letter that describes how the nominee meets the honorary degree criteria, including the type of degree to be awarded.

(iii) Termination of Process. If the CAO, FSEC, or the President does not recommend approval of a nominee, the nomination process for that nominee ends.

(e) Review Process . All conversations and materials relating to nominee reviews and recommendations are confidential.

(i) Evaluation Materials. The evaluation materials for each nominee shall include the letter of nomination and the Honorary Degree Candidate Evaluation Form completed by the reviewers at each step in the review process. These materials shall be forwarded throughout the process.

(ii) Chief Academic Officer Review. A nomination is reviewed first by the CAO, who shall make a recommendation on each nominee including a determination of the type of degree to be conferred. If the CAO recommends approval of the nomination, such recommendation and the evaluation materials shall be forwarded to the FSEC for consideration.

(iii) Faculty Senate Executive Committee Review. If the CAO recommends approval of the nominee, the nomination is then reviewed by the FSEC in executive session. If the FSEC recommends the nomination for approval, such recommendation and evaluation materials shall be forwarded to the President for consideration.

(iv) President's Review. If the FSEC recommends approval of the nomination, the nomination is then reviewed by the President. The President shall review the evaluation materials, and if the President determines the nominee fulfills the honorary degree criteria in 3 -8-104(c), the President shall first contact the nominee to inquire if they are interested in receiving an honorary degree. If they wish to be so recognized, the President shall forward the

