

By letter dated November 6, 1991, [REDACTED] informed OIG that it had completed an inquiry of alleged misconduct and intended to begin an investigation related to Grant No. [REDACTED]. At [REDACTED] request, OIG deferred the investigation to them. The allegation of misconduct was made by [REDACTED] (the complainant), a [REDACTED] faculty member in the Dept. [REDACTED], against [REDACTED] (the subject), a graduate student in the Department [REDACTED]. The alleged misconduct involved (1) three submissions of papers without the complainant's knowledge or consent; and (2) three instances of fraudulent representation of experimental results. On [REDACTED], the OIG received [REDACTED] "Final Report of The Dean of the University Faculty on the Investigation of Academic Misconduct on the part of [REDACTED]" [REDACTED]

As described in its report, the investigative committee evaluated each of the complainant's six specific allegations and concluded that no academic misconduct occurred. Specifically, regarding the three papers, the committee found that (1) one submission made without consulting the complainant was unscholarly behavior but not plagiarism; (2) the second submission was based on implied permission by the complainant; and (3) the third paper was not a basis for misconduct because it existed only on the subject's computer as an unsubmitted working draft that listed three co-authors, including both the subject and the complainant. Regarding experimental results, the investigative committee found that (1) contrary to the allegation that the subject preselected input to an experiment in order to achieve a desired result, the complainant failed to provide adequate supervision to avoid what the committee found to be poor methodology rather than misconduct; (2) instead of the subject misleading the complainant as alleged, there was merely misunderstanding, caused by mutual failure of the subject and complainant to co-operate and communicate with each other; and (3) contrary to the complainant's allegation, the subject did not fake a graph.

On April 14, 1992, the OIG notified [REDACTED] that its procedures were fair and that their final investigative report was complete and accurate. OIG accepted in full [REDACTED] Investigative report including its findings of "no academic misconduct" for each of six allegations and the reasons for reaching those conclusions.

*Cathleen M. Flynn 4-20-92*  
[REDACTED]

Concurrence: *James J. Zyvolenik 5/28/92*  
James J. Zyvolenik  
Assistant Inspector General for Oversight

*Philip L. Sunshine 5/29/92*  
Philip L. Sunshine  
Counsel to the Inspector General