

**RESOLUTION APPROVING UNIVERSITY POLICIES ON HUMAN RESEARCH  
PROTECTION PROGRAM,  
PROPOSAL REVIEW AND SUBMISSION, AND RESEARCH MISCONDUCT**

---

**PURPOSE:** To approve University policies governing the Human Research Protection Program, Proposal Review and Submission, and Research Misconduct.

---

**WHEREAS,** the University of the Virgin Islands (“University”) is committed to maintaining the highest standards of integrity, accountability, and compliance in all academic, administrative, and research activities; and

**WHEREAS,** the University maintains policies and procedures to ensure that research conducted under the auspices of the University is performed in accordance with applicable federal and local law, federal regulations, sponsor requirements, and institutional standards; and

**WHEREAS,** the University has developed institutional policies governing (i) the protection of human subjects involved in research through the Human Research Protection Program administered through the Institutional Review Board, (ii) the review and submission of sponsored program proposals through the Office of Sponsored Programs, and (iii) the reporting; review and disposition of allegations of research misconduct; and

**WHEREAS,** the Human Research Protection Program Policy establishes ethical and regulatory requirements for the conduct and oversight of human subjects research conducted at or by the University; and

**WHEREAS,** the Proposal Review and Submission Policy establishes procedures and responsibilities for the review and institutional submission of sponsored program proposals to ensure compliance with sponsor guidelines and applicable regulations; and

**WHEREAS,** the Administrative Policy for Research Misconduct establishes procedures for reporting, reviewing, and addressing research misconduct in order to promote responsible conduct of research and compliance with applicable federal and local law, federal regulations and institutional standards; and

**WHEREAS,** on February 9, 2026, the Academic, Research, and Student Affairs Committee reviewed the proposed policies and recommended their approval by the Board of Trustees;

**NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED BY THE BOARD OF TRUSTEES OF THE  
UNIVERSITY OF THE VIRGIN ISLANDS AS FOLLOWS:**

A. The Board of Trustees hereby approves the following University policies:

1. Human Research Protection Program Policy;
2. Proposal Review and Submission Policy;
3. Administrative Policy for Research Misconduct.

B. The President of the University is authorized to take such actions as are necessary and appropriate to implement and administer these policies in accordance with applicable laws, regulations, and University procedures.

C. This resolution shall become effective March 7, 2026.

### CERTIFICATION

The undersigned does hereby certify that the foregoing is a true and exact copy of a resolution of the Board of Trustees of the University of the Virgin Islands adopted at its meeting on Saturday, March 7, 2026, as recorded in the minutes of said meeting.



---

Secretary of the Board

03/18/2026

---

Date

# University of the Virgin Islands

## Human Research Protection Program Policy



<b>Policy Title:</b> Human Research Protection Program Policy	<b>Policy Number:</b>	
	<b>Office of Accountability:</b> Office of Sponsored Programs	
<b>Board Approval Date:</b>	<b>Policy Effective Date:</b>	<b>Policy Revision Date:</b>

**SCOPE**

The UVI IRB (Institutional Review Board) is an administrative body established to protect the rights and welfare of Human Subjects recruited to participate in Research activities conducted under the auspices of UVI. All human subject’s research conducted at UVI is guided by the principles as set forth in the report of the National Commission for the Protection of Human Subjects of Biomedical and Behavioral Research entitled “Ethical Principles and Guidelines for the Protection of Human Subject of Research (Belmont Report)” and the Common Rule. The purpose of this document is to describe UVI’s ethical and regulatory requirements for the conduct and oversight of human subject’s research (whether funded or not funded).

**POLICY STATEMENT**

**Institutional Authority & Commitment**

UVI commits to institutional resources and infrastructure to the protection of Human Subjects. In so doing, the IRB has the authority to suspend or terminate research according to federal regulations.

All research conducted by the university’s faculty members, staff members, and students that meets the federal definition of human subjects research must be reviewed and approved by the UVI IRB, or its designated reviewing authority, prior to any research engagement with human participants.

**POLICY OBJECTIVES**

- To safeguard and promote dignity and well-being of participants in research conducted at or by UVI by assuring their rights, safety and welfare are protected.
- To provide timely and high-quality review and monitoring of human subjects research.
- To facilitate excellence in human subjects research by providing accurate guidance and education to UVI investigators, IRB members, and research officials.
- To ensure compliance with all regulatory and ethical obligations involved in Human Subjects Research conducted at or by UVI.

**DEFINITIONS**

Human Subject

A living individual about whom an investigator conducting research obtains 1) data through intervention or interaction with the individual, and uses, studies or analyzes the information or biospecimens or 2) obtains, uses, studies, analyzes or generates identifiable private information or identifiable biospecimens. Human Subject under U.S. Food and Drug Administration research means an

individual who is or becomes a participant in research, either as a recipient of the test article (medical device or drug) or as a control. A human subject includes an individual on whose specimen an investigational medical device is used. When medical device research involves in vitro diagnostics and unidentified tissue specimens, the U.S. Food and Drug Administration defines the unidentified tissue specimens as human subjects.

### Human Subjects Research

A systematic investigation about living individuals where information is obtained through intervention or interaction including research, development, testing, and evaluation designed to develop or contribute to generalizable knowledge.

### Federal Wide Assurance (FWA)

An FWA is the documentation of an institution's commitment to comply with Federal regulations and maintain policies and procedures for the protection of human subjects.

### Intervention

Physical procedures by which information or biospecimens are gathered (for example, venipuncture) and manipulations of the subject or the subject's environment that are performed for research purposes.

### Interaction

Communication or interpersonal contact between investigator and subject.

### Institutional Review Board (IRB)

The IRB is a committee used in research that has been formally designated to approve, monitor, and review biomedical, behavioral or other research involving human subjects.

### Institutional Official (IO)

The Institutional Official is delegated the legal authority to represent UVI and all components listed on the UVI FWA on matters related to human research.

### Principal Investigator (PI)

For the purposes of Institutional Review Board activities and this document, the principal investigator is the faculty member, post-doctoral associate, graduate student, medical student, or other suitably trained individual responsible for the conduct of a particular research project. Any given project may have additional co- or sub-investigators. Undergraduate students may not act as the principal investigator; the faculty supervisor must serve as the principal investigator and the undergraduate student is listed as a co-investigator.

### Private Information

Information about behavior that occurs in a context in which an individual can reasonably expect that no observation or recording is taking place, and information that has been provided for specific purposes by an individual and that the individual can reasonably expect will not be made public.

### Identifiable Private Information

Private Information for which the identity of the subject is or may readily be ascertained by the investigator or associated with the information.

### Identifiable Biospecimen

A biospecimen for which the identity of the subject is or may readily be ascertained by the investigator or associated with the biospecimen.

### Human Research Protections Administration (HRPA)

The HRPAs consisting of the Institutional Official, Office of Sponsored Programs, and the Institutional Review Board Committee provides leadership in protection of the rights, welfare, and wellbeing of human subjects involved in research.

### Protocol

A document that outlines the proposed research, including a research design that clearly states the objectives, background, methodology, and significance of the study.

### U.S. Food and Drug Administration (FDA)

The FDA is responsible for protecting the public health by assuring the safety, efficacy, and security of human and veterinary drugs, biological products, medical devices, our nation's food supply, cosmetics, and products that emit radiation. They also provide accurate, science-based health information to the public.

### Governance Structure

The IRB is independent of the university and supported by the compliance function within the Office of Sponsored Projects. The Institutional Official is responsible for promoting an overall positive environment for human subjects' research at UVI and reports to the President.

## **ROLES AND RESPONSIBILITIES**

### **1. Principal Investigator**

- a) Submit fully detailed research plans.
- b) Ensure that no human subject be recruited or enlisted without prior informed consent.
- c) Take all necessary safeguards to minimize risks and to protect the interests of vulnerable populations.
- d) Maintain the confidentiality of human subject data.
- e) Promptly report, in writing and verbally to IRB Chairperson, IRB Coordinator, and OSP Director any injuries or other unanticipated problems.
- f) Assure the adequate training of personnel including Human Subjects Training and Adverse Event procedures.
- g) Adhere to high ethical standards; and
- h) Read, electronically sign, and comply with the affirmations and certifications on the applicable IRB Application Form.

2. **Undergraduate Student Investigators** can serve as a Co-Investigator on human research protocol, but there must be a Faculty Member serving as the main Faculty Advisor/Principal Investigator of the project. The IRB cannot give retroactive approval to any project.
3. **Graduate Student Investigators** can serve as a Principal Investigator on human research protocol; however the Faculty Advisor and/or Dissertation Chair must be listed and approve the IRB application. Data that is obtained without IRB approval may be deemed unusable for a Master's Thesis or PhD Dissertation. The IRB cannot give retroactive approval to any project.
4. **Faculty Advisors** are responsible for providing students with:
  - a. Timely information and guidance regarding proposal preparation, conduct and responsibilities; and
  - b. Information to foster responsible research conduct and compliance.

In order to adhere to proper timelines in the preparation and conduct of research, it is imperative that faculty advisors:

- i. Complete the Human Subject training required by UVI and federal regulations.
- ii. Remain up to date with IRB procedures and policies as well as those of the Graduate School;

It is important to note that delinquency in the submission of requested information and forms or approvals by a particular faculty advisor and his/her students may delay the review of IRB proposals; and

Faculty Advisors are required to have the necessary expertise to advise and supervise students performing human subject research.

5. **Office of Sponsored Programs shall:**
  - a. Establish a formal process to monitor, evaluate and continually improve the protection of human research participants.
  - b. Educate investigators and research staff about their ethical responsibility to protect research participants.
  - c. When appropriate, intervene in research and/or respond directly to concerns of research participants.
  - d. Ensure that the research review process is independent and free of undue influence.
  - e. Maintain records of compliance actions as per the federal requirement.
  - f. Notify the investigators of all UVI IRB final protocol decisions and any ensuing stipulation as required; and
  - g. Report to the University President and the Institutional Review Board any deficiencies in research projects as a result of failures to adhere to the provisions in this Policy.

## 6. Institutional Review Board

- a. Review and approve, require modification, disapprove, or table any research activity, including proposed changes in previously approved Human Subject Research.
- b. Require that information given to subjects as part of the informed consent is in accordance with CFR 46.116 and documentation of informed consent in accordance with CFR 46.117, unless a waiver is issued.
- c. Make determinations of eligibility for exempt, expedited and limited review procedures. Expedited review and limited review of research activities is not permitted where full board review is required.
- d. Require progress reports from investigators, including continuing review at intervals appropriate to the degree of risk, but not less than once per year.
- e. Suspend or terminate approval of research not being conducted in accordance with applicable federal regulations and/or IRB requirements, or that has been associated with unexpected serious harm to subjects.
- f. Place restrictions on studies and/or ensure certification that Principal Investigators are qualified to conduct research.
- g. Actively recruit and assure a sufficient number of alternates and categories required for membership.
- h. Provide reports to the Vice President for Research or University President regarding any suspension, termination or restrictions occurring as a result of violations of this Policy.

#### **7. Institutional Official**

- a. Oversee compliance with all applicable federal regulations and guidance, state law and institutional policies;
- b. Signatory authority for the Federal Wide Assurance submitted by UVI to HRP;A;
- c. Serve as a knowledgeable point of contact for HRP;A, FDA and other governmental and nongovernmental agencies regarding human research protections;
- d. Ensure effective institution-wide communication and guidance on human subject protection issues;
- e. Oversee processes to ensure that investigators fulfill their responsibilities under applicable regulations;
- f. May accept external IRB committee with evidence of approval from that external IRB after consultation with the IRB Chair
- g. Investigate allegations of potential undue influence and take corrective actions as appropriate;
- h. Facilitate participation by the research community in human subjects protection educational activities;
- i. Designate one or more IRBs that will review research covered by the UVI FWA;
- j. Arrange for sufficient resources, space, and staff to support the IRB's review and record keeping duties;
- k. Appoint/remove, with or without cause, either directly or through a designee, the IRB Chairperson and IRB committee members; and
- l. Conduct an annual review of the Human Research Protection Program.

#### Complaints or Questions

Any concerns or complaints regarding IRB processes may be addressed to the Director of Compliance, the IRB Chair or the IO, and held in confidence.

#### **RELATED INFORMATION**

21 Code of Federal Regulations (CFR), Part 50, Protection of Human Subjects

21 Code of Federal Regulations (CFR), Part 56, Institutional Review Boards

21 Code of Federal Regulations (CFR), Part 312, Investigational New Drug Application

21 Code of Federal Regulations (CFR), Part 314, Application for FDA Approval to Market a New Drug

21 Code of Federal Regulations (CFR), Part 600, Biological Products

45 CFR Part 46 <http://www.hhs.gov/ohrp/humansubjects/guidance/45cfr46.html>

#### **RELATED DOCUMENTS**

University of Virgin Islands IRB Federal-Wide Assurance and IRB Registration

# University of the Virgin Islands

## Proposal Review and Submission Policy



<b>Policy Title:</b> Proposal Review and Submission Policy	<b>Policy Number:</b>	
	<b>Office of Accountability:</b> Office of Sponsored Programs	
<b>Board Approval Date:</b>	<b>Policy Effective Date:</b>	<b>Policy Revision Date:</b>

## SCOPE

As an applicant organization, the University of the Virgin Islands (UVI) has an institutional responsibility to verify the eligibility of all sponsored program proposals submitted to a Sponsor on behalf of UVI. The institution is also responsible for reviewing the proposal for accuracy, validity, and conformity with all Federal, State, UVI and sponsor policies and guidelines. This responsibility is shared with the Principal Investigator (PI), the PI's Chair or Director and Dean, and the Office of Sponsored Programs (OSP).

## POLICY STATEMENT

UVI requires employees to submit all proposals for Sponsored Projects funding through the appropriate university routing process. Proposals may not be submitted by individuals on behalf of UVI; all proposals must be submitted by the OSP. If a proposal is submitted without the OSP approval, this may result in UVI not being able to accept the award or delays in the award to address any compliance issues or necessary revisions. This policy acknowledges exceptions in the case where the Sponsor requires a submission from an individual rather than the institution.

## POLICY OBJECTIVES

- To provide timely and high-quality review, approval, and submission of sponsored program proposals.
- To ensure compliance with all UVI, Territory, and Federal regulations and Sponsor guidelines.

## DEFINITIONS

### Principal Investigator (PI) Project Director (PD)

The PI or Project Director is the individual designated by UVI and the person responsible for overall scientific and technical direction, and conduct of a sponsored project, including filing reports. The PI works with UVI sponsored programs, finance and accounting to share responsibility for administrative, fiscal, and expenditures, including reporting. The PI may delegate certain components of the proposal to the PI's research team or departmental administrators, but the PI retains ultimate responsibility and accountability for all portions of the award.

### Office of Sponsored Programs (OSP)

The OSP is the office responsible for review and submission of sponsored project proposals on behalf of UVI. The Director of the OSP is the University's Authorized Organization Representative (AOR) for submitting proposals on behalf of the PI/PD.

### Sponsored Project

A sponsored project is any externally funded research, training, evaluative testing, education or service grant or contract, that carries the expectation of deliverables or expected outcomes. Sponsored projects are directed by the UVI PI/PD as part of their university work. Sponsored projects may be contrasted with fellowships or awards designed for individuals, that may not have the institution as fiduciary. Gifts, also by

contrast, do not carry specific time delineated deliverables. Faculty or staff with questions should contact the director of OSP.

## **ROLES AND RESPONSIBILITIES**

### **1. Principal Investigator/Project Director**

- a. Complete the Notice of Intent form and ensure the proposal is complete, accurate, and meets all programmatic, administrative and compliance requirements.
- b. Allow delegated and OSP access to the proposal in the Sponsor electronic system/portal, if applicable.
- c. Review accuracy of budget, ensuring costs are allowable, reasonable, allocable.
- d. Ensure the final/submission ready proposal is properly routed to the OSP for review and approval no later than three 3 business days prior to the Sponsor's/Prime Recipient's published and/or written proposal deadline. Note, for more complex proposals, more time will be needed for review by OSP. OSP will advise during those scenarios.

### **2. Department Chair and/or Director**

- a. Promote faculty and staff awareness of this policy.
- b. Review and approve proposals considering the following:
  - i. Consistency with specific departmental policies and procedures as well as various institutional requirements;
  - ii. Accuracy of budget and ensuring costs are allowable, reasonable and allocable to the project;
  - iii. Personnel listed are available and qualified to participate and appointment information is accurate;
  - iv. Access to sufficient facilities, equipment and other resources;
  - v. Concur with any Facilities & Administrative (F&A) cost waiver request;
  - vi. Agree to cost share commitments provided by the Department/Unit.

### **3. College Dean**

- a. Promote faculty and staff awareness of this policy.
- b. Understand and agree with proposals considering the following:
  - i. The department has addressed all department-level concerns;
  - ii. The budgeted costs are fully and appropriately documented;
  - iii. The project aligns with college objectives.
  - iv. Concur with any Facilities & Administrative (F&A) cost waiver request;
  - v. Agree to cost share commitments provided by the College/School.

### **4. Office of Sponsored Programs (OSP)**

- a. Reviews all final/submission ready, sponsored project proposals prior to submission. Note, for more complex proposals, more time may be needed for review.
- b. Assess whether the proposal is complete and conforms with sponsor requirements, UVI requirements, and Federal/State regulations, or Private/Foundation Policies including, but not limited to the following:
  - The application has been completed in accordance with Sponsor guidelines.
  - Budget calculations are accurate and includes appropriate costs including facilities and administrative (F&A) costs.
  - Mandatory cost-share requirements are met and approvals are on file.
  - All proposed subrecipients satisfy OSP's documentation requirements.
  - When UVI is Secondary/Collaborator, ensure the Institution has satisfied the Prime Recipient's documentation requirements.
  - All required approvals have been documented.
  - Any concerns identified in the review have been documented and the Principal Investigator and department research administrator have been instructed to address the concerns prior to (re-)submission of proposal, or at the time of award.
- c. Identify areas needing clarification or changes outside the scope of the above criteria.

- d. Obtain any additional approvals necessitated by the scope of work or Sponsor guidelines.
- e. Refer any conflicts related to submission to the Vice President for Research and Economic Development unless delegated to AOR.
- f. Approve and submit the proposal after the OSP confirms the proposal meets the requirements of UVI, Sponsor and applicable rules and regulations.

## **PROCEDURES**

- a. All sponsored program proposal review and submissions will be carried out in compliance with the UVI proposal standard operating procedures.
- b. Principal Investigators interested in engaging in sponsored project activity must contact the OSP in order to initiate or pursue those activities.
- c. Principal Investigators must become reasonably familiar with sponsored projects regulations applicable to awards and associated compliance regulations.
- d. All proposals are reviewed by the department, school or college, OSP, and other units as needed before they are signed by an authorized institutional official/AOR and sent to a sponsor. This review assures conformity to UVI and agency policies and ensures that necessary components of the proposal have been incorporated. Failure to conform to sponsor requirements may result in the proposal being deemed ineligible.
- e. The OSP will submit all proposals for sponsored projects on behalf of UVI. This policy acknowledges exceptions in the case where the sponsor requires a submission from an individual rather than from the institution. Any exceptions other than indicated by this policy must be approved in advance and in writing through OSP by the Vice President for Research and Economic Development or designee, at minimum, three (3) business prior to submission.
- f. OSP reserves the right to withdraw a proposal that is deemed unresponsive or technically incomplete or is submitted without a full review if it is determined at a later date that there were errors or omissions significant enough to justify the withdrawal.
- g. When a proposal is submitted to the sponsor with an incorrect F&A rate or undocumented cost-share commitment, if funded, OSP will request corrections to the awarded budget prior to accepting the award.

## **RELATED INFORMATION**

This policy is related to sponsored projects as defined above and excludes gifts to UVI unrelated to sponsored projects. Gifts unrelated to sponsored projects are governed by UVI Gift Policy.

## **RELATED DOCUMENTS**

Proposal Review and Submission Standard Operating Procedure

Gift Acceptance Policy

Conflict of Interest Policy

2 CFR part 200 "Uniform Administrative Requirements, Costs Principles, and Audit Requirements of Federal Awards

# University of the Virgin Islands

## Administrative Policy for Allegations of Research Misconduct



<b>Policy Title:</b> Allegations of Research Misconduct	<b>Policy Number:</b>	
	<b>Office of Accountability:</b> Office of the Vice President for Research and Economic Development, Office of the Provost	
<b>Board Approval Date:</b>	<b>Policy Effective Date:</b>	<b>Policy Revision Date:</b>

**SCOPE**

The University of the Virgin Islands has an institutional responsibility to ensure that research performed under its purview is conducted in a manner consistent with the highest standards of professional integrity. This Policy applies to all members or affiliates of the University community engaged in both sponsored and non-sponsored research. This Policy is also intended to comply with the requirements of applicable regulatory agencies and sponsors of research.

**POLICY STATEMENT**

University members and affiliates will not fabricate, falsify, or plagiarize in proposing, performing, or reviewing research, or in reporting research results. The University and its members and affiliates engaged in research activity will fully comply with federal agency regulations and University policies and procedures in conducting research and will report allegations of research misconduct for review.

**POLICY OBJECTIVES**

- To foster an environment that promotes the responsible conduct of, and training in, research and scholarly activities, and to discourage Research Misconduct.
- To ensure compliance with all University, Territory, Federal regulations and Sponsor guidelines.

**DEFINITIONS**

Allegation: Any written or oral statement.

Complainant: A person who makes an allegation of research misconduct.

Component Head: A Component Head means the person charged with the responsibility of supervising or directing a unit within the University. The Component Head may be, for example, the supervisor of a group, director of a division, a department chair, a dean or a vice president.

Good Faith Allegation: An allegation made with the honest belief that research misconduct may have occurred. An allegation is not in good faith if it is made with reckless disregard for or willful ignorance of facts that would disprove the allegation.

Inquiry: The initial fact-finding to determine whether an allegation or apparent instance of research misconduct warrants an investigation.

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.

Respondent: The person against whom an allegation of research misconduct is directed or the person whose actions are the subject of the inquiry or investigation. There can be more than one respondent in an inquiry or investigation.

Research: A systematic experiment, study, evaluation, demonstration, or survey designed to develop or contribute to general knowledge or specific knowledge in all fields by establishing, discovering, developing, elucidating, or confirming.

### Research Misconduct

A behavior that fails to respect the intellectual contributions or property of others that intentionally impedes the progress of research, that risks corrupting the research record, or that compromises the integrity of research practices. Research misconduct does not include unintentional error or honest differences in interpretation or judgments of data. Examples of research misconduct include, but are not limited to the following:

- Fabrication of data: making up data or results and recording or reporting them.
- Falsification of data: 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.
- Misrepresentation: reckless disregard for the truth by stating or presenting a material or significant falsehood; or omitting a fact so that what is stated or presented as a whole states or presents a material or significant falsehood.
- Plagiarism: representing of another's work as one's own; the appropriation of another person's ideas, processes, results, or words without giving appropriate credit. This includes self-plagiarism, which is the reuse of one's own work in multiple publications without proper citation of the original work.
- Misappropriating other's ideas: the unauthorized use of privileged information (such as violation of confidentiality in peer review), however obtained.
- Interference: intentionally and without authorization taking or sequestering or materially damaging any research-related property of another used or produced in the conduct of research.
- Material failure to comply with established requirements that relate to the conduct of research (e.g., for the protection of researchers, human subjects, animal subjects, or the public).
- Misappropriating research funds, including but not limited to the diversion of external funds to purposes not appropriately related to the funded research project.

Research Record: Any data, document, computer file, or any other written or non-written account or object that reasonably may be expected to provide evidence or information regarding the proposed, conducted, or reported research that constitutes the subject of an allegation of research misconduct. A research record includes, but is not limited to, grant or contract applications, whether sponsored or non-sponsored; grant or contract progress and other reports; laboratory

notebooks; notes; correspondence; videos, photographs; slides; biological materials; computer files and printouts; manuscripts and publications; equipment use logs, laboratory procurement records; animal facility records; human and animal subject protocols; and consent forms.

**Retaliation:** Any action that adversely affects the employment or other institutional status of an individual that is taken by an institution or an employee because the individual has made a good faith allegation of research misconduct or of inadequate institutional response thereto or has cooperated in good faith with an investigation of such allegation.

## **PROCEDURES**

Allegations of research misconduct shall be reported by the complainant to any University official. The research misconduct will be brought to the Component Head of the Respondent by the University official and will be processed in accordance with the procedures outlined in this research misconduct policy and associated standard operating procedures. The Component Head will review the allegation documents and will seek all available evidence at this initial point in reporting, acknowledging that additional evidence may be sought. Within 30 business days of receipt, and if determined the allegation warrants an inquiry, notify the Vice President for Research and Economic Development (VPRED) or designee. The VPRED will notify the Provost/Vice President for Academic Affairs or representative, the University Auditor, the Director of the Office of Sponsored Programs, and the Office of Student Affairs on the respective campus when students are involved. The VPRED will then appoint a qualified research misconduct inquiry panel without conflict of interest to review the allegation. The panel will be required to sign a Non-disclosure agreement (NDA) related to this procedure. If the research misconduct inquiry panel determines the allegation warrants a formal investigation, the VPRED will appoint a research misconduct investigation panel of no less than three (3) panel members. The research misconduct inquiry and investigation panels will summarize their findings and recommendations and submit a report to the Vice President for Research and Economic Development for potential action within 60 business days of convening of the panel, reviewing and determination. All processes and recommendations will be finalized within 90 days of the report of the alleged incident.

Based on the research misconduct investigation report findings and recommendations, the VPRED, in concert with the Provost/Vice President for Academic Affairs, and other appropriate offices, will take appropriate action as warranted in accordance with University policy, federal regulations, and relevant statutes.

The University will, to the greatest extent possible, keep allegations strictly confidential and protect the complainant against retaliation or reputational harm. Individuals engaging in acts of retaliation will be subject to grievance proceedings and/or disciplinary action. Records of all processes will be retained for seven (7) years from the last date of action.

## **RELATED INFORMATION**

Public Health Service, Department of Health and Human Services, Final Rule 42 Code of Federal Regulations (CFR) Part 93.

U.S. Public Health Service Office of Research Integrity (ORI) Policies and Procedures  
<http://ori.dhhs.gov/misconduct/>

White House Office of Science and Technology Policy (OSTP)  
[http://www.ostp.gov/cs/federal\\_policy\\_on\\_research\\_misconduct](http://www.ostp.gov/cs/federal_policy_on_research_misconduct)

National Science Foundation (NSF) Regulations on Research Misconduct at 45 CFR Part 689:  
<http://www.nsf.gov/oig/resmisreg.pdf>






# Resolution Research 3 Policies March 7 2026

Final Audit Report

2026-03-18

Created:	2026-03-17
By:	Andrea Moore (andrea.moore@uvi.edu)
Status:	Signed
Transaction ID:	CBJCHBCAABAAz6shTvhkTu3OQ72g906PFPCqn1yMnfCJ

## "Resolution Research 3 Policies March 7 2026" History

-  Document created by Andrea Moore (andrea.moore@uvi.edu)  
2026-03-17 - 2:27:20 PM GMT
-  Document emailed to Safiya George (safiya.george@uvi.edu) for signature  
2026-03-17 - 2:30:10 PM GMT
-  Email viewed by Safiya George (safiya.george@uvi.edu)  
2026-03-18 - 2:40:47 PM GMT
-  Document e-signed by Safiya George (safiya.george@uvi.edu)  
Signature Date: 2026-03-18 - 2:41:11 PM GMT - Time Source: server
-  Agreement completed.  
2026-03-18 - 2:41:11 PM GMT