



P.O.B. 26 Rehovot Israel 76100 ת.ד. 26 רחובות 76100
www.weizmann.ac.il

טלפון +972-(0)8-934-3860 / 4976
פקס +972-(0)8-934-4492
academic.affairs@weizmann.ac.il
www.weizmann.ac.il/acadaff

מכון ויצמן למדע
WEIZMANN INSTITUTE OF SCIENCE

הלשכה לעניינים אקדמיים
Academic Affairs Office

Academic Integrity and Responsible Conduct of Research Policy & Procedures

July 2019

Academic Integrity and Responsible Conduct of Research Policy & Procedures

I. Introduction

A. Responsible Conduct of Research - General Policy

The **Weizmann Institute of Science** (“**Weizmann Institute**”) is committed to uphold and maintain the highest standards of integrity and ethics in its research and other scientific activities.

The Weizmann Institute is therefore determined to do its utmost to prevent deviation from Responsible Conduct of Research, support good faith complaints of such deviation, and thoroughly and justly pursue any and all bona fides Allegations of deviation from Responsible Conduct of Research, in accordance with the Policy and Procedures set out hereunder.

The Weizmann Institute expects all individuals at the Weizmann Institute engaged in research, as detailed in section B below, to act in line with established principles for Responsible Conduct of Research ([RCR](#)). All Members of the Weizmann Institute are expected to adhere to the highest standards of academic integrity and display honesty, rigor, and responsible behavior in all activities in general, and in research and academic publishing in particular; and are required to avoid any scientific misconduct activities i.e. falsification, fabrication or plagiarism, or other practices that seriously deviate from those that are commonly accepted within the scientific community for proposing, conducting, or reporting research. It does not include honest error or honest differences in interpretations or judgments of data, in this policy and procedures (in this Policy and Procedures - “**Responsible Conduct of Research**”).

B. Scope

This policy and the associated procedures apply to all individuals at the Weizmann Institute engaged in research. This policy applies to any person paid by, under the control of, or affiliated with the Weizmann Institute, such as scientists, trainees, technicians and other staff members, students, postdoctoral fellows, guest scientists, guest students, or collaborators at the Weizmann Institute (“**Members of the Weizmann Institute**”).

This policy and associated procedures will apply when the duly designated institute official receives an Allegation of possible deviation from Responsible Conduct of Research. When deemed in the best interests of the Weizmann Institute, in particular circumstances or in an individual case, variations from these procedure are allowed, provided that significant variations are approved both by the Institute Designated Official and Research Integrity Officer with the approval of the Co-Chairs of the Scientific and Academic Advisory Committee, and further provided such variations maintain fair treatment to the subject of the Inquiry, or Investigation.

In case of research supported by or for which support is requested from Public Health Services (“**PHS**”) in the USA, the [PHS Regulations](#) shall apply. The **PHS Regulations** apply to any research, research-training or research-related grant (including sub-contracts) or cooperative agreement with PHS.

II. Definitions

A. **Allegation** - means any written or oral statement (including anonymous statement) or other indication of possible deviation from Responsible Conduct of Research made to an institutional official (such as the Designated Official; Research Integrity Officer; the Academic secretary or any other office holder at the Weizmann Institute).

- B. **Complainant** - means a person who makes an Allegation of deviation from Responsible Conduct of Research.
- C. **Conflict of Interest** - means the real or apparent interference of one person's interests with the interests of another person, where potential bias may occur due to prior or existing personal or professional relationships.
- D. **Designated Official** - means the Official appointed by the Weizmann Institute to make final determinations on Allegation of deviation from Responsible Conduct of Research and any responsive institutional actions. The Designated Official at the Weizmann Institute will be the President.
- E. **Good faith Allegation** - means an Allegation made with the honest belief that deviation from Responsible Conduct of Research 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.
- F. **Inquiry** - means gathering information and initial fact-finding, evaluation of the available evidence and testimony of the Respondent, Complainant, and key witnesses in order to enable the Designated Official to determine whether an apparent instance of deviation from Responsible Conduct of Research has occurred, and, if so, to determine the responsible person and the seriousness of the misconduct and if such warrants further Investigation. If deviation from Responsible Conduct of Research was found, but further Investigation is not required, the **Designated Official** will decide which action – if any - should be taken.
- G. **Investigation** - means the deeper examination and evaluation of all relevant facts in order to enable the Designated Official to determine if deviation from Responsible Conduct of Research has occurred, and, if so, to determine the responsible person and the seriousness of the deviation and which actions – if any - should be taken.
- H. **Research Integrity Officer** - means the institutional official responsible for assessing Allegations of deviation from Responsible Conduct of Research and determining when such Allegations warrant Inquiries and for overseeing Inquiries and Investigations. The Research Integrity Officer at the Weizmann Institute will be the Vice President.
- I. **Research record** - means 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 deviation from Responsible Conduct of Research. A research record includes, but is not limited to, grant or contract applications, whether funded or unfunded; grant or contract progress and other reports; laboratory notebooks; notes; correspondence; videos; photographs; X-ray film; slides; chemical reagent and biological materials; computer files and printouts; manuscripts and publications; equipment use logs; laboratory procurement records; animal facility records; human and animal subject protocols; consent forms; medical charts; and patient research files.
- J. **Respondent** - means the person against whom an Allegation of deviation from Responsible Conduct of Research is directed or the person whose actions are the subject of the Inquiry or Investigation. There can be more than one Respondent in any Inquiry or Investigation.
- K. **Retaliation** - means any action that adversely affects the employment or other institutional status of an individual that is taken by the Weizmann Institute or an employee of the Weizmann Institute, because the individual has in good faith, made an Allegation of deviation from Responsible Conduct of Research or has cooperated in good faith with an Inquiry or Investigation of such Allegation; or of inadequate institutional response thereto.

L. **The Academic Secretary** - means the official responsible for administrating the all issues within the Weizmann Institute according to these Procedures.

III. Rights and Responsibilities

A. Research Integrity Officer

The Research Integrity Officer, will have primary responsibility for implementation of the policy and procedures set forth in this document.

The Research Integrity Officer will:

1. If needed, after preliminary assessment of the allegations as detailed in chapter IV section E below, appoint Inquiry and Investigation Committees and ensure that necessary and appropriate expertise is secured to carry out a thorough and authoritative evaluation of the relevant evidence in an Inquiry or Investigation. The Research Integrity Officer will attempt to ensure that confidentiality is maintained.
2. Assist Inquiry and Investigation Committees and all Weizmann Institute personnel in complying with these Procedures and with applicable standards imposed by government or external funding sources.
3. Update the Academic Secretary of any developments during the course of an Inquiry or Investigation and provide copies of all relevant documents and materials related to an Inquiry or Investigation.

B. Complainant

The Complainant is responsible for making Allegations in good faith, maintaining confidentiality, and cooperating with an Inquiry and Investigation.

The Complainant will have an opportunity to bring his Allegations before the Inquiry and Investigation Committees, either in writing or in person, depending on the circumstances of the case, to be informed of the results of the Inquiry and Investigation, and to be protected from Retaliation. Also, if the Research Integrity Officer has determined that the Complainant may be able to provide pertinent information on any portions of the draft report of any Committee, these portions will be given to the Complainant for comment.

C. Respondent

The Respondent will:

1. Be informed of the Allegations when an Inquiry is opened and an Inquiry Committee or an Investigation Committee, as the case may be, was appointed.
2. Have the opportunity to be interviewed by and present evidence to the Inquiry and Investigation Committees, and will have the right to have the advice of counsel or other advisor, (who is not a principal - Complainant or Respondent - or witness in the case).
3. Have the opportunity to review the draft Inquiry and Investigation reports. The Research Integrity Officer will provide the Respondent with the relevant parts of the draft report, while maintaining the privacy of the Complainant and the witnesses.
4. Be notified in writing of the final determinations and resulting actions.

The Respondent is responsible for maintaining confidentiality and cooperating with the conduct of an Inquiry or Investigation.

D. Designated Official

The Designated Official will receive the Inquiry and Investigation draft reports and any written comments made by the Respondent or the Complainant on the draft report. The Designated Official will consult with the Research Integrity Officer or other appropriate officials and will determine

whether to conduct an Investigation (in the case of an Inquiry report), whether deviation from Responsible Conduct of Research occurred, whether to impose sanctions, or whether to take other appropriate administrative actions as hereafter specified.

IV. General Policies and Principles

A. Responsibility to Report Misconduct

The Weizmann Institute expects all Members of the Weizmann Institute to report observed, suspected, alleged or apparent deviation from Responsible Conduct of Research to the Research Integrity Officer.

At any time, any Member of the Weizmann Institute may have confidential discussions and consultations about concerns of possible deviation from Responsible Conduct of Research with the Research Integrity Officer and will be counseled about appropriate procedures for reporting Allegations.

If the circumstances described by the individual do not constitute deviation from Responsible Conduct of Research, the Research Integrity Officer will refer the individual or Allegation to other offices or officials with responsibility for resolving the problem, if exists.

B. Protecting the Complainant

The Complainant will be treated with fairness and respect. The Research Integrity Officer shall monitor the treatment of individuals who bring Allegations of deviation from Responsible Conduct of Research or of inadequate institutional response thereto, and those who cooperate with Inquiries or Investigations. The Research Integrity Officer will ensure that these persons will not be retaliated against in the terms and conditions of their employment or other status at the Weizmann Institute and will review instances of alleged Retaliation for appropriate action. For further information, see - [Violations of the Code and Whistleblowing](#).

The Weizmann Institute will protect the privacy, position and reputation of those who report deviation from Responsible Conduct of Research in good faith to the maximum extent possible. In particular, the Weizmann Institute shall endeavor to maintain anonymity of the Complainant to the extent possible, during the Allegation assessment or Inquiry and Investigation within applicable policies and regulations and state laws, if any.

C. Protecting the Respondent

Inquiries and Investigations will be conducted in a manner that will ensure fair treatment to the Respondent(s) in the Inquiry and Investigation and confidentiality to the extent possible without compromising or thoroughly carrying out the Inquiry and Investigation.

D. Cooperation with Inquiries and Investigations

Members of the Weizmann Institute must cooperate with the Research Integrity Officer and other institutional officials in the review of Allegations and the conduct of Inquiries and Investigations. Members of the Weizmann Institute have an obligation to provide relevant evidence to the Research Integrity Officer and the relevant Committee (Inquiry or Investigation) on deviation from Responsible Conduct of Research Allegations.

E. Preliminary Assessment of Allegations

1. Upon receiving an Allegation of deviation from Responsible Conduct of Research, the Research Integrity Officer will immediately notify the Designated Official thereof and proceed to assess the Allegation to determine whether there is sufficient evidence to warrant an Inquiry, whether external funding agencies are involved and should be informed, and whether the Allegation constitutes deviation from the Weizmann Institute definition of Responsible Conduct of Research.
2. The Allegation should be carefully reviewed by the Research Integrity Officer to determine whether it potentially constitutes deviation from Responsible Conduct of Research. The Weizmann

Institute's General Counsel, or any lawyer on his/her behalf, may be consulted throughout the review.

V. Conducting the Inquiry

A. Initiation and purpose of the Inquiry

Following the preliminary assessment, if the Research Integrity Officer determines that the Allegation provides sufficient information that may constitute deviation from the Weizmann Institute definition of Responsible Conduct of Research, he or she will immediately so notify the Designated Official and the Co-Chairs of the Scientific and Academic Advisory Committee and initiate the Inquiry process. In initiating the Inquiry, the Research Integrity Officer should identify clearly the original Allegation and any related issues that should be evaluated.

B. Sequestration of the Research Records

After determining that an Allegation may constitute deviation from the definition of Responsible Conduct of Research the Research Integrity Officer will inform the Respondent of his obligation to ensure that all original research records and materials relevant to the Allegation are secured.

The Research Integrity Officer may take steps in sequestration of records.

Appendix A sets out the relevant authorities of the Research Integrity Officer and the steps that can be taken in sequestration of records.

C. Appointment of the Inquiry Committee

The Research Integrity Officer will appoint an Inquiry Committee within 10 (ten) days of the completion of the preliminary assessment of the allegation. The Inquiry Committee should consist of at least 2 (two) individuals who do not have real or apparent conflicts of interest in the case, are unbiased, and have the necessary expertise to evaluate the evidence and issues related to the Allegation, interview the principals and key witnesses, and conduct the Inquiry. These individuals may be scientists, subject matter experts, administrators, lawyers, or other qualified persons, and they may be from inside or outside the Weizmann Institute as the Research Integrity Officer may deem appropriate. The Co-Chairs of the Scientific and Academic Advisory Committee will have the right to suggest adding or replacing members of the Inquiry Committee.

The Research Integrity Officer will notify the Respondent of the Committee membership. If the Respondent submits a written objection to any appointed member of the Inquiry Committee or expert, based on bias or conflict of interest, within five (5) days, the Research Integrity Officer will consult with the Designated Official and if relevant – with the Co-Chairs of the Scientific and Academic Advisory Committee, whether to replace the challenged member or expert with a qualified substitute.

D. Charge to the Committee and the First Meeting

The Research Integrity Officer will prepare a charge for the Inquiry Committee that describes the Allegations and any related issues identified during the Allegation assessment and states the purpose of the Inquiry.

At the Inquiry Committee's first meeting, the Research Integrity Officer will review the charge with the Inquiry Committee, discuss the Allegations, any related issues, and the appropriate procedures for conducting the Inquiry, assist the Inquiry Committee with organizing plans for the Inquiry, and answer any questions raised by the Inquiry Committee. The Research Integrity Officer and Institute's Legal Counsel will be present or available throughout the Inquiry to advise the Inquiry Committee as needed.

E. Inquiry Process

The Inquiry Committee shall have all powers and responsibilities as may be required to exercise its function diligently, efficiently and efficaciously and shall review and examine all documentation, including, but not limited to: research records, computer and written files, correspondence,

memoranda etc. The Inquiry Committee will interview the Complainant if needed, the Respondent, and key witnesses and will examine relevant research records and materials.

All interviews shall be summarized, and upon request of an interviewed party – he/she will be provided with a summary of his/her interview.

The Inquiry Committee will evaluate the evidence and testimony obtained during the Inquiry and may consult with the Research Integrity Officer and the Weizmann Institute's Legal Counsel, in order to reach its findings. The Academic Affairs Office will provide administrative assistance to the Inquiry process.

Appendix B contains the Rules of Conducting the Committee's Proceedings.

VI. The Inquiry Report

The findings of the Inquiry must be set forth in an Inquiry Report, which shall be submitted by the Research Integrity Officer to the Designated Official.

A. Elements of the Inquiry Committee Report

The report will be prepared in accordance with **Appendix C**

Upon the request of the Inquiry Committee the Institute's Legal Counsel will review the draft Report for legal sufficiency.

The draft Report will be submitted by the Inquiry Committee to the Research Integrity Officer and to the Designated Official.

B. Comments on the Draft Report by Respondent

The Research Integrity Officer will provide the Respondent with a copy of relevant parts of the draft Inquiry Report, while maintaining the privacy of the Complainant and the witnesses (as much as possible under the circumstances), for comment and rebuttal.

Within fourteen (14) calendar days of receipt of the draft report, the Respondent will provide his/her comments, if any, to the Research Integrity Officer. Any comments that the Respondent submits on the draft report will be considered by the Inquiry Committee. Based on the comments, the Inquiry Committee may revise the report as appropriate.

C. Time Limit for Completing the Inquiry Report

The Inquiry Committee will complete the Inquiry and submit its report in writing to the Research Integrity Officer no more than 60 calendar days following its first meeting, unless the Research Integrity Officer approves an extension for good cause.

VII Review Decision and Notification

A. Decision by Designated Official

The Research Integrity Officer will provide the final report of the Inquiry Committee and any comments thereto to the Designated Official. The Research Integrity Officer will offer the Respondent to appear before the Designated Official before final determination is taken.

Based on a preponderance of the evidence, the Designated Official will determine one of the following:

1. to return the report to the Inquiry Committee with a request for further fact-finding or analysis; or
2. that the Inquiry Committee's report justifies conducting an Investigation including broadening the scope beyond the initial allegations; or
3. that the Inquiry report provides sufficient evidence to support the conclusion if deviation from Responsible Conduct of Research has occurred; if so - who is the responsible person; the seriousness of the deviation from Responsible Conduct of Research and which actions – if any should be taken. The Designated Official may consult with the Co-Chairs of the Scientific

Academic and Advisory Committee before determining what would be the institutional actions, if any.

If the Designated Official's determination varies from that of the Inquiry Committee, the Designated Official will specify and explain the basis for rendering conclusions different from those of the Inquiry Committee. The Designated Official's explanation should be consistent with the Weizmann Institute definition of Responsible Conduct of Research, the Weizmann Institute's policies and procedures, and the evidence reviewed and analyzed by the Inquiry Committee;

The Inquiry will be deemed completed when the Designated Official makes his determination, which will be made within 14 days of receiving the final report of the Inquiry Committee. Any extension of this period will be based on good cause.

B. Notifications

The Research Integrity officer will notify both the Respondent and the Complainant in writing of the Designated Official's decision and will remind them of their obligation to cooperate in the event an Investigation is initiated. The Research Integrity Officer will also notify the Co-Chairs of the Scientific Academic and Advisory Committee of the Designated Official's decision.

The Academic Secretary will be notified of whatever decision reached by the Designated Official, and a copy of the Inquiry Report will be provided thereto together with such notice.

The Academic Secretary will maintain files of all documents and evidence and will be responsible for the confidentiality and the security of the files.

The Research Integrity Officer with the assistance of the Academic Secretary is responsible for ensuring compliance with all notification requirements such as notifying editors of journals in which falsified reports may have been published and funding or sponsoring agencies.

Respondent and Complainant shall keep confidential any and all parts of the written notification received from the Research Integrity Officer or the Designated Official concerning the Inquiry and/or the decision reached by the Designated Official with regard to its findings. They shall not use or employ in any way, manner or form, for any purpose whatsoever, any part of said written notification unless and subject to specific, advance written consent thereto by the Designated Official.

VIII. Conducting an Investigation

A. Purpose of an Investigation

The purpose of an Investigation is to examine the evidence in depth, and to further determine whether deviation from Responsible Conduct of Research has been committed, by whom, and to what extent if the Inquiry Committee did not reach a definite conclusion. An Investigation will also be initiated if the Designated Official determines that the Inquiry Report justifies broadening the scope beyond the initial Allegations. The findings of an Investigation will be set forth in an Investigation Report.

B. Sequestration of the Research Records

The Research Integrity Officer may sequester any additional pertinent research records that are needed for the Investigation and were not previously sequestered . This sequestration may occur before or at the time the Respondent is notified that an Investigation has begun. The need for additional sequestration of records may occur for any number of reasons, including the Weizmann Institute's decision to investigate additional Allegations not considered during the Inquiry or the identification of records during the Inquiry process that had not been previously secured. The procedures to be followed for sequestration during an Investigation are the same procedures that apply during the Inquiry, as more fully described in **Appendix A**.

C. Appointment of an Investigation Committee

The Research Integrity Officer, after consulting with the Designated Official will appoint the members for an Investigation Committee and will notify the Respondent of the appointed members as soon as practicable. An Investigation Committee should consist of at least three individuals who do not have real or apparent conflicts of interest in the case, are unbiased, and have the necessary expertise to evaluate the evidence and issues related to the Allegations, interview the principals and key witnesses, and conduct the Investigation.

These individuals may be scientists, administrators, subject matter experts, lawyers, or other qualified persons, and they may be from inside or outside the Weizmann Institute. Individuals appointed to an Investigation Committee may also have served on the Inquiry Committee. The Co-Chairs of the Scientific and Academic Advisory Committee will have the right to suggest adding or replacing members of the Investigation Committee.

If the Respondent submits a written objection to any appointed member of the Investigation Committee or expert, based on bias or conflict of interest, within five (5) days, the Research Integrity Officer will consult with the Designated Official, and if relevant – with the Co-Chairs of the Scientific and Academic Advisory Committee whether to replace the challenged member or expert with a qualified substitute.

D. Charge to the Committee and the First Meeting

1. Charge to the Committee

The Research Integrity Officer will prepare a charge for the Investigation Committee that describes the Allegations and related issues identified during the Inquiry, defines the alleged deviation from Responsible Conduct of Research, and identifies the name of the Respondent.

During the Investigation, if additional information becomes available that substantially changes the subject matter of the Investigation or would suggest additional Respondents, the Investigation Committee will notify the Research Integrity Officer, who will determine whether it is necessary to notify the Respondent of the new subject matter or to provide notice to additional Respondents.

2. The First Meeting

At the Investigation Committee's first meeting, the Research Integrity Officer will review the charge with the Investigation Committee, discuss the Allegations and the Inquiry Report, any related issues, and the appropriate procedures for conducting the Investigation, assist the Investigation Committee with organizing plans for the Investigation, and answer any questions raised by the members. The Research Integrity Officer and Institute's Legal Counsel will be present or available throughout the Investigation to advise the Investigation Committee as needed.

E. Investigation Process

The Investigation Committee will be appointed and the investigative process initiated as soon as an Investigation Committee was appointed.

The Investigating Committee shall have all powers and responsibilities as may be required to exercise its function diligently, efficiently and efficaciously. The Investigation Committee may rely on the evidence collected by the inquiry Committee – and - may review and examine all documentation, including, but not limited to: research records, computer and written files, correspondence, memoranda etc.;, if necessary, interview the Respondent(s) and any other individuals, all as the Committee may deem fit. All interviews shall be summarized, and upon request of an interviewed party – he/she will be provided with a summary of his/her interview.

The Investigation Committee will evaluate the evidence and testimony obtained during the Investigation and may consult with the Research Integrity Officer and the Weizmann Institute's Legal Counsel, in order to reach its findings. The Academic Affairs Office will provide administrative assistance to the Investigation process.

Appendix B contains the Rules of Conducting Investigation Proceedings.

IX. The Investigation Report

The findings of the Investigation Committee must be set forth in an Investigation Report, which shall be submitted by the Research Integrity Officer to the Designated Official.

A. Elements of the Investigation Committee Report

The report will be prepared in accordance with **Appendix C**

Upon the request of the Investigation Committee, the Institute's Legal Counsel will review the draft Report for legal sufficiency.

The draft Report will be submitted by the Investigation Committee to the Research Integrity Officer and to the Designated Official.

B. Comments on the Draft Report by Respondent

The Research Integrity Officer will provide the Respondent with a copy of relevant parts of the draft Investigation Report, while maintaining the privacy of the Complainant and the witnesses, as much as possible under the circumstances, for comment and rebuttal.

Within fourteen (14) calendar days of receipt of the draft report, the Respondent will provide his/her comments, if any, to the Research Integrity Officer. Any comments that the Respondent submits on the draft report will be considered by the Investigation Committee. Based on the comments, the Investigation Committee may revise the report as appropriate.

C. Time Limit for Completing the Investigation Report

The Investigation Committee will complete the Investigation and submit its report in writing to the Research Integrity Officer no more than 60 calendar days following its first meeting, unless the Research Integrity Officer approves an extension for good cause.

X. Institutional Review, Decision and Notifications

A. Decision by Designated Official

Based on a preponderance of the evidence, the Designated Official will make the final determination whether to accept the Investigation Report and its findings. If the Designated Official's determination varies from that of the Investigation Committee, the Designated Official will specify and explain the basis for rendering conclusions different from those of the Investigation Committee. The Designated Official's explanation should be consistent with the Weizmann Institute definition of Responsible Conduct of Research, the Weizmann Institute's policies and procedures, and the evidence reviewed and analyzed by the Investigation Committee. The Designated Official may also return the report to the Investigation Committee with a request for further fact-finding or analysis. Once the Designated Official concludes his finding, he may consult with the Co-Chairs of the Scientific Academic and Advisory Committee before determining what would be the institutional actions, if any. The Designated Official's determination, together with the Investigation Committee's Report, constitutes the final Investigation Report.

B. Notifications

When a final decision on the case has been reached, the Research Integrity Officer will notify both the Respondent and the Complainant in writing. In addition, the Designated Official will determine whether law enforcement agencies, professional societies, professional licensing boards, editors of journals in which falsified reports may have been published, collaborators of the Respondent in the work, or other relevant parties should be notified of the outcome of the case.

The Research Integrity Officer with the assistance of the Academic Secretary is responsible for requesting a six (6) months follow-up report to the determinations of the Designated Official in order to ensure compliance with his decisions.

The Academic Secretary will maintain files of all documents and evidence and will be responsible for the confidentiality and the security of the files.

XI Institutional Appropriate Actions

The Weizmann Institute will take appropriate actions against individuals when an Allegation of deviation from Responsible Conduct of Research has been substantiated by the findings of either Committee and as determined by the Designated Official. Such actions should be taken according to the regulations regarding the “Relations between the Institute and its Academic Staff” and any applicable laws and regulations.

XI. General Provisions

A. Termination of Employment during Process

Termination of employment of the Respondent, by resignation or otherwise, prior to completing Inquiry or Investigation will not preclude or terminate the procedures under this policy, the Inquiry or Investigation, as the case may be, will proceed. If the Respondent refuses to participate in the process after termination of employment, the Committee (either Inquiry or Investigation) 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.

B. Responding to Allegations

In responding to Allegations of deviation from Responsible Conduct of Research, the Research Integrity Officer and any other institutional official with an assigned responsibility for handling such Allegations will make diligent efforts to ensure that the following functions are performed:

1. Any Allegation assessment, Inquiry, or Investigation, is conducted in a timely, objective, thorough, and competent manner.
2. Reasonable precautions are taken to avoid bias and real or apparent conflicts of interest by all those involved in conducting the Inquiry or Investigation.

C. Cooperation

Members of the Weizmann Institute are required to cooperate with and provide the Research Integrity Officer and other institutional officials evidence as may be required in the review of Allegations and the conduct of Inquiries and Investigations.

D. Evidentiary Standards

The following evidentiary standards apply to assessment, Inquiry or Investigation hereunder:

1. Burden of Proof: The burden of proof for making a finding of deviation from Responsible Conduct of Research is on the Weizmann Institute.
2. Standard of Proof: Any finding of deviation from Responsible Conduct of Research will be established by a preponderance of the evidence, i.e., that the evidence shows that it is more likely than not that the Respondent committed deviation from Responsible Conduct of Research.

E. Referral of Non-Scientific Misconduct Issues

When review of Allegations identifies non-scientific misconduct issues, the Research Integrity Officer should refer these matters to the proper institutional officials, if needed, for further referral as required by Israeli Law and the Weizmann Institute's rules and regulations.

F. Publication of the Procedure Conclusions

The conclusions of the procedure will be published by the Academic Secretary in a summary table – that will include the name of the Respondent, a brief summary of the Allegation and findings and the decision of the Designated Official including disciplinary actions, if any (“**the Summary Table**”).

Such information shall be available in the Summary Table for a period of 5 years. The Summary Table will be accessible only to WIS PI's using their username and password. In cases where the finding of the procedure did not include Fabrication or Falsification or Plagiarism, the Respondent will have the right to request that his/her case will not be published in the Summary Table.

G. Allegations Not Made in Good Faith

If relevant, the Designated Official will determine whether the Complainant Allegations of deviation from Responsible Conduct of Research were made in good faith. If an Allegation was not made in good faith, the Designated Official will determine whether any administrative action should be taken against the Complainant.

H. Interim Administrative Actions

At any time after a Complaint has been made as herein provided for, Institutional officials will take interim administrative actions, as appropriate.

XII. Record Retention

After completion of a case and all ensuing related actions, the Academic Secretary will prepare a complete file, including the records of any assessment, Inquiry or Investigation and copies of all documents and other materials furnished to or by the Research Integrity Officer or Committees. The Academic Secretary will keep the file to permit later assessment of the case.

XIII. Applicability

These regulations supersede all previous procedures and are effective beginning 08/07/19.

APPENDIX A

Authorities of the Research Integrity Officer and steps to be taken in Sequestration of Records.

1. Secure the relevant research records;
2. Notify the Designated Official, The Institute's Legal Counsel, the Respondent and the Academic Secretary;
3. Charge the Inquiry and the Investigation Committee;
4. Sequestration of the research records:
 - 4.1. Immediate Sequestration - If the relevant research records have not been obtained at the assessment stage, the Research Integrity Officer may immediately locate, collect, inventory, and secure them to prevent the loss, alteration, or fraudulent creation of records.
 - 4.2. Institutional Access - Research records produced at the Weizmann Institute are the property of the Weizmann Institute, and Members of the Weizmann Institute cannot interfere with the Weizmann Institute's right of access to them.
 - 4.3. Original Records - The documents and materials to be sequestered will include all the original items (or copies if originals cannot be located) that may be relevant to the Allegations. These include, but are not limited to, research records as defined hereinbefore.
 - 4.4. Sequestration of records from the Respondent - The Research Integrity Officer should notify the Respondent that an Inquiry might be initiated simultaneously with the sequestration so that the Respondent can assist with location and identification of the research records. The Research Integrity Officer should obtain the assistance of the Respondent's (and if the Respondent is not a PI, than the Research Integrity Officer should obtain the assistance of the Respondent's PI at the time the Allegation addresses) and Institute's Legal Counsel in this process, as necessary. If the Respondent is not available, sequestration may begin in the Respondent's absence. The Research Integrity Officer may decide that the Respondent should not be notified in advance of the sequestration of research records to prevent questions being raised later regarding missing documents or materials and to prevent accusations against the Respondent of tampering with or fabricating data or materials after the notification. In addition to securing records under the control of the Respondent, the Research Integrity Officer may need to sequester records from other individuals, such as co-authors, collaborators, or Complainants. As soon as practicable, a copy of each sequestered record will be provided to the individual from whom the record is taken if requested.
5. Inventory of the records

A dated receipt should be signed by the sequestering official and the person from whom an item is collected, and a copy of the receipt should be given to the person from whom the record is taken. If it is not possible to prepare a complete inventory list at the time of collection, one should be prepared as soon as possible, and then a copy should be given to the person from whom the items were collected.
6. Security and Chain of Custody

The Research Integrity Officer will make sure that all records and materials are secured. The persons from whom items are collected may be provided with a copy of any item that was collected from him. Where feasible, that person will have access to his or her own original items under the direct and continuous supervision of an institutional official.

APPENDIX B

Rules of Conducting Inquiry or Investigation Proceedings.

1. Avoidance of Bias or Conflict of Interest

All necessary steps must be taken to avoid bias or conflict of interest between the Committee members and experts and the Respondent, Complainant, and witnesses.

2. Reviewing the Evidence

The Investigation Committee will obtain and review all relevant documentation and perform or cause to be performed necessary analyses of the evidence, including scientific, forensic, statistical, or other analyses as needed.

3. Conducting an Interview

2.1 Purpose of the Interview

The purpose of an interview is to allow each Respondent, Complainant, or witness, as the case may be, to tell his or her side of the story. The Committee should not attempt to speculate about what happened or might have happened or put words in the mouths of any person interviewed by the Committee (whether the complainant, respondent or witnesses). Also, the Committee should not disclose information obtained from others interviewed unless this is necessary and can be done without identifying the source of the information.

2.2 Preparing for Interviews

The Committee will prepare carefully for each interview all relevant documents and research data should be reviewed in advance and specific questions or issues that the Committee wants to cover during the interview should be identified.

2.3 Objectivity

The Committee will conduct all interviews in a professional and objective manner, without implying guilt or innocence on the part of any individual.

2.4 Issues to Cover

Before any interview, the Committee should provide the interviewee with a summary of the matters or issues intended to be covered at the interview. The interviewee should be asked to provide, in advance if possible and necessary, any relevant evidence, including their own notes, manuscripts, research records, or other documents that were not sequestered previously but are relevant to the Allegation. If the committee raises additional matters, the interviewee should be given an opportunity to supplement the record in writing or in another interview. Any person interviewed by the committee should be informed that his or her cooperation and truthful answers are expected.

2.5 Confrontation

Witnesses should not be told whether other testimony conflicts with theirs, although questions may be asked for purposes of clarifying the testimony.

2.6 Using Experts

The Committee may request that experts attend or participate in interviews to assist in its evaluation of the Allegations and related issues or it may ask an expert to prepare questions for the Committee to use at the interview. Any expert retained to assist the Committee may read the transcripts or summaries of the interviews and will be required to keep all information confidential.

2.7 Summarizing Interviews

All interviews will be summarized, or tape-recorded, or transcribed. Upon request, interviewee will receive a copy of the summarized interview and they may add comments or information. Changes to the transcript or summary will be made only to correct factual errors.

2.8 Confidentiality of Interviews

all interviewees should be advised that the proceedings are confidential and that they should not discuss the proceedings or their interview with anyone else (including not with a person who is principal or witness in the case) other than their counsel or adviser.

2.9 Access to Counsel

Any interviewee may be advised by counsel or by an adviser who is not a principal or witness in the case. However, the counsel or adviser may only advise the interviewee and may not participate directly in the interview. Interviewee will respond directly to the interview questions.

3.8 Interviewing the Complainant

In interviewing the Complainant, the Committee should attempt to obtain as much additional evidence regarding the substance of the Allegation as possible and to determine the Complainant's view of the significance and impact of the alleged misconduct. However, it is not the Complainant's responsibility to prove his or her Allegations.

3.9 Interviewing the Respondent

The Respondent should be asked to provide his or her own response to the Allegations, including any analysis of the primary data. If the Respondent claims that an honest error or difference of scientific judgment occurred, he or she should provide any evidence to support that claim.

3.10 Recording Admissions

The admission may not be a sufficient basis for closing a case. Further Inquiry or Investigation may be needed to determine the extent of the deviation from Responsible Conduct of Research or to explore additional issues. The Committee should consult with the Weizmann Institute's Legal Counsel on the specific form and procedure for obtaining admission. If the case is closed based on the Respondent Admission, the report should be forwarded to the Designated Official so he can decide what should be the appropriate institutional sanctions, if any.

4. Weizmann Institute's Legal Counsel

The Weizmann Institute's Legal Counsel may be consulted throughout the Inquiry or Investigation on compliance with these procedures, appropriate investigatory and interviewing methods and strategies, legal issues, and the standard of proof.

5. Committee Deliberations

5.1 The Committee will evaluate the evidence and testimony obtained during the proceedings:

5.2 Committee deliberations should never be held in the presence of the interviewee. During the interview, the Committee members should not debate among themselves or with witnesses over possible scientific interpretations. These questions should be reserved for private discussions among the Committee members and expert consultants or with the Research Integrity Officer.

5.3 Burden and Standard of Proof

In reaching a conclusion on whether there was deviation from Responsible Conduct of Research and who committed it, the burden of proof is on the Weizmann Institute to support its conclusions and findings by a preponderance of the evidence.

5.4 Sufficient Evidence

The Committee will consider whether there is sufficient evidence such that the Weizmann Institute can meet its burden of proving deviation from Responsible Conduct of Research by a preponderance of the evidence. The Committee will also consider whether the Respondent has presented substantial evidence of honest error or honest differences in interpretations or judgments of data, or any other substantial evidence supporting his/ her response to the

allegations such that deviation from Responsible Conduct of Research cannot be proven by a preponderance of the evidence.

6. Documenting the Proceeding files

6.1 Index of Evidence

The Committee will maintain an index of all the relevant evidence it secured or examined in conducting the process, including any evidence that may support or contradict the report's conclusions.

Evidence includes, but is not limited to, research records, transcripts or recordings of interviews, committee correspondence, administrative records, grant applications and awards, manuscripts, publications, and expert analyses.

6.2 Documentation

Appropriate documentation, whether collected or prepared, for or during the process, must be maintained in substantiation of the Committee's findings.

APPENDIX C

Standard Format and Elements of the Inquiry/ Investigation Report

1. Name and title of the Committee members and experts, if any.
2. Overview and summary of findings.
3. Background - The report will include sufficient background information to ensure a full understanding of the issues. This section should describe:
 - 3.1 the facts leading to the institutional proceeding, including a chronology of the research at issue, or other deviation from Responsible Conduct of Research;
 - 3.2 the persons involved in the alleged deviation from Responsible Conduct of Research;
 - 3.3 the role of the Complainant;
 - 3.4 external funding, if any and any associated grant applications or publications;
 - 3.5 a summary of the Institute's Inquiry and Investigation processes as the case may be;
 - 3.6 the persons interviewed;
 - 3.7 the evidence secured and reviewed;
 - 3.8 the policies and procedures used;
 - 3.9 any other factors that may have influenced the proceedings;
 - 3.10 all relevant dates should be included.
 - 3.11 public health sensitivity, if relevant.
4. Allegations - The report will list all the Allegations raised by the Complainant and any additional deviation from Responsible Conduct of Research issues that arose during the proceedings. The source and basis for each Allegation or issue should be cited except to the extent that the confidentiality of a Complainant requesting anonymity is compromised or the identity of the source is irrelevant or unnecessary.
5. Respondent's Claims - The report should summarize each claim that the Respondent raises in his or her defense against deviation from Responsible Conduct of Research Allegations and cite the source of each claim. Any inconsistencies among the Respondent's various claims should be noted. The report should not consider claims that do not address the Allegations at issue; Allegations of personal bias by the Complainant, for example, should not be addressed in the report unless they are relevant to the report's conclusions.
6. Analysis
 - 6.1 The report will provide a detailed analysis of the evidence that either supports or does not support a finding of deviation from Responsible Conduct of Research. This analysis should take into account all the relevant statements, claims, rebuttals, documents, and other evidence related to the case. Any use of expert analysis should be noted.
 - 6.2 The analysis should be consistent with the definition of Responsible Conduct of Research as noted these procedures. It should describe the relative weight given to the various witnesses and pieces of evidence, noting inconsistencies, credibility, and persuasiveness. It should demonstrate how a consideration of the evidence as a whole led to the report's findings. A finding of deviation from Responsible Conduct of Research should be supported by a preponderance of the evidence.
 - 6.3 The report should include summaries of any interviews and relate to relevant statements, including rebuttals, made by the Complainant, Respondent, and other witnesses pertinent to the report's analysis and findings. The report should provide references to the appropriate sources.
 - 6.4 If the Committee determines that the Respondent committed deviation from Responsible Conduct of Research, the report should indicate the extent and seriousness of such deviation including its

effect on prior research findings, research subjects, and the laboratory or project in which such deviation occurred. If the Committee determines that the Respondent committed deviation from Responsible Conduct of Research by seriously deviating from "other commonly accepted practices", the report should thoroughly document the commonly accepted practice of the relevant scientific community at the time such deviation occurred and indicate the extent of the Respondent's deviation from that standard. Publications, standards of the institution or relevant professional societies, expert opinion, and other sources should be described and cited as the basis for the commonly accepted practice. In case of serious deviation therefrom, such deviation should be described in detail, including an analysis of why it is a serious deviation.

6.5 Deviation from Responsible Conduct of Research does not include honest error or honest differences in interpretations or judgments of data. If the Committee concludes that deviation from Responsible Conduct of Research occurred, the report should describe the evidence that shows that the Respondent acted in deviation from Responsible Conduct of Research.

6.6 All significant pieces of evidence should be referenced in the analysis, and copies of the significant evidence should be appended to the report.

7. Summary and conclusions

7.1 in case of Inquiry report: The final report should conclude a detailed and specific summary of the Committee's overall finding for each issue. The Committee may determine whether further Investigation is required and if not whether deviation from Responsible Conduct of Research has occurred.

7.2 in case of Investigation report: The final report should conclude a detailed and specific summary of the Committee's overall finding for each issue. The Committee shall determine whether deviation from Responsible Conduct of Research has occurred.

Approved by the Management Committee at its meeting on July 8, 2019