



# ROLLINS COLLEGE POLICY

Title: Research and Scholarly Misconduct	Type	Key Institutional
No: KI 1038	Approval Date: 4-23-2026	
Responsible Office: VPAA/Provost	Reviewed By: Dean of CLA, 4-6-2026; Dean of Holt, 4-6-2026; AD/COO of Crummer, 4-6-2026; IRB, 4-17-2026; CLA Faculty Affairs Committee, 4-21-2026; CLA Executive Committee, 4-23-2026; Crummer Faculty, 4-16-2026 Approved by: VPAA/Provost, 4-23-2026 Notifications: College Policy Committee, President’s Cabinet, President, 4-23-2026	
Next Review: 2030-2031	Revision No: 1; See <a href="#">Section VII</a> for revisioning history.	

## I. Purpose/Introduction/Rationale

**Background.** Rollins College expects adherence to the highest ethical and moral standards in the conduct of research and scholarly activity. The College is responsible for promoting academic practices that prevent misconduct and developing policies and procedures for dealing with allegations of misconduct. Students, faculty, staff, and administrators share responsibility for developing and maintaining standards to ensure ethical conduct of research and detection and appropriate handling of abuse of these standards.

**Purpose.** Rollins bears primary responsibility for addressing allegations of and investigating misconduct in research and scholarship by its faculty, staff, and students. These responsibilities exist regardless of whether the activity is funded by governmental or private sources, or is the result of unfunded efforts. The purpose of this policy is to inform those participating in research activities of both the College’s and federal funding agencies’ research misconduct policies, to identify general types of research misconduct, and to set in place mechanisms to address and resolve alleged violations.

**Who is Affected.** This policy describes procedures for investigating and resolving allegations of research misconduct and applies to all individuals engaged in and/or reporting publicly any research or scholarship conducted under the auspices of Rollins College. This includes faculty members, post-doctoral fellows, staff members, guest researchers, graduate students, and undergraduate students. Such persons are subject to this policy regardless of whether their research is conducted on campus or elsewhere. Persons found guilty of willful misconduct are subject to disciplinary action by the College.

In cases involving allegations of research or scholarly misconduct against students, the College’s Academic Honor Code procedures shall be followed. To the extent that additional procedures are necessary for students, either to comply with legal requirements or because of their involvement in cases involving other persons subject to this policy, the Vice President for Academic Affairs and Provost (VPAA|Provost) may determine such procedures on a case-by-case basis.

In cases involving research activities supported by federal funds, the College will follow all procedures required by the applicable federal regulations and agency policies, including appropriate assessment, inquiry, investigation, sequestration of records, reporting, and required timelines. In all other cases, the College may use a streamlined institutional process that is consistent with the principles of fairness, objectivity, and integrity. The Deciding Official (DO) will determine whether the alleged misconduct involves federally funded research activities and will ensure that the appropriate procedural pathway is followed.

## II. Definitions

**Allegation.** A disclosure of possible research misconduct through any means of communication brought directly to the attention of an institutional official.

**Assessment.** The consideration – only involving the review of readily available and relevant information – of whether an allegation falls within the definition of research misconduct and is sufficiently credible and specific so that potential evidence of research misconduct may be identified. The purpose of the assessment is to determine whether an allegation warrants an inquiry. The Deciding Official (DO) conducts the assessment.

**Complainant.** The individual(s) who make(s) an allegation of research misconduct in "good faith," meaning they have a reasonable, honest belief that the misconduct occurred based on information known at the time. The Complainant is typically considered a witness in the investigative process and is generally entitled to protection from retaliation. To the extent possible, the identity of the Complainant is kept confidential.

**Deciding Official (DO).** The Rollins College official who conducts initial assessment of all allegations of research misconduct and makes final determinations on allegations of research misconduct and any institutional actions. At Rollins College, the Vice President for Academic Affairs and Provost (VPAA|Provost) serves as the DO.

**Fabrication.** Making up data or results and recording or reporting them.

**Falsification.** 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.

**Inquiry.** A process involving preliminary information-gathering and preliminary fact-finding when an allegation of research misconduct is made, the purpose of which is to determine whether an investigation is warranted.

**Investigation.** A formal process to develop and examine a factual record, leading to a determination about whether or not research misconduct occurred.

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

**Research.** For the purposes of this policy, Rollins considers the term "research" to encompass the "systematic investigation, including research development, testing, and evaluation, designed to develop or contribute to generalizable knowledge"<sup>1</sup> conducted at the College, under the auspices of the College, or that utilizes College employees or resources. Systematic investigation pertains to structured approaches, e.g., hypothesis testing, data collection, and analyses, conducted according to scientific, social scientific, or humanistic methodologies. Generalizable knowledge is that which can be applied to other settings, populations, or contexts, through publication, presentation, or other public dissemination. For example, a project or study conducted with the intention of drawing conclusions that has some general applicability and uses a commonly accepted scientific method is considered "research," while random collection of information about individuals that has no general applicability is not.<sup>2</sup>

**Research Integrity Officer (RIO).** Rollins College official who has primary responsibility for administering the institution's written policies and procedures for addressing allegations of research misconduct. At Rollins College, the Associate Provost for Institutional Effectiveness serves as the RIO.

**Research Misconduct.** Fabrication, falsification, or plagiarism in proposing, performing, or reviewing research, or in reporting research results. Research misconduct can be committed by an individual directly or through the use or assistance of other persons, entities, or tools, including artificial intelligence (AI)-based tools. Research misconduct does not include honest error, methodological disagreements, differences of opinion in the interpretations, or judgments of data. A finding of research misconduct requires that:

- there be a significant departure from accepted practices of the relevant research community; and
- the research misconduct be committed intentionally, knowingly, or recklessly; and
- the allegation be proven by a preponderance of evidence.

**Respondent(s).** The individual(s) against whom an allegation of research misconduct is directed or who is the subject of a research misconduct proceeding.

### **III. Procedure or Application**

**A. Reporting Misconduct.** All members of the Rollins community are responsible for reporting what they believe to be research misconduct, as described above. Allegations of research misconduct must be immediately reported to the Deciding Official (DO), at Rollins, the VPAA|Provost. Allegations brought to other individuals must promptly be forwarded to the DO. Individuals with questions or concerns about whether something constitutes research misconduct may consult confidentially with the DO or Research Integrity Officer (RIO) for guidance or support; however, any disclosure of possible research misconduct will be promptly assessed under institutional policy. If the DO determines that the allegation does not involve federally funded research activities, the DO may require the Complainant to formalize the allegation in writing before proceeding with an inquiry.

---

<sup>1</sup> Electronic Code of Federal Regulations. (3 March 2026). *Title 45 Code of Federal Regulations § 46.102(d)*. <https://www.ecfr.gov/current/title-45/subtitle-A/subchapter-A/part-46/subpart-A/section-46.102>.

<sup>2</sup> Office of Research Integrity (U.S. Dept. of Health & Human Services). (3 March, 2026). *ORI Introduction to the Responsible Conduct of Research: Chapter 3 — The Protection of Human Subjects: Definitions*. <https://ori.hhs.gov/content/chapter-3-The-Protection-of-Human-Subjects-Definitions>.

At that time and throughout the remainder of the review process, the College will take all reasonable steps to preserve and protect the confidentiality of all information and persons involved to the extent possible. This includes: 1) limiting the disclosure of the identity of Respondents, Complainants, and witnesses to those who need to know in order to carry out a thorough, competent, objective, and fair research misconduct proceeding; and 2) except as otherwise prescribed by law, limiting the disclosure of any records or evidence from which research subjects might be identified to those who need to know in order to carry out a research misconduct proceeding. Those who need to know may include institutional review boards, journals, editors, publishers, co-authors, funding agencies, and collaborating institutions.

- B. The Assessment Process.** Upon receiving an allegation of research misconduct, the DO shall promptly assess the allegation to determine: 1) whether the allegation meets the definition of research misconduct and 2) is sufficiently credible and specific enough to identify and sequester potential evidence. Allegations that meet these criteria will trigger an inquiry. The DO will document the determination (i.e., why the College did or did not proceed with an inquiry) and ensure that such documentation is retained securely for a period of seven (7) years.
- C. The Inquiry Process.** If an inquiry is warranted, the DO will forward the documentation to the appropriate dean (for faculty Respondents) or other institutional official (for staff Respondents outside the purview of the deans) to promptly initiate an inquiry to be completed within 60 days.

At the start of the inquiry, the dean or institutional official must promptly take all reasonable and practical steps to obtain all research records and other evidence needed to conduct the research misconduct proceeding, inventory the records and evidence, and sequester them in a secure manner. Where original research records cannot be obtained, copies of the data or other evidence may be obtained, so long as the copies are substantially equivalent in evidentiary value. Whenever possible, the dean or institutional official must obtain the research records or other evidence before or at the time the Respondent is notified of the allegation(s) and at subsequent times that additional items become known or relevant to the inquiry or investigation. A Respondent's failure to provide research records documenting the research questioned is evidence of research misconduct where the Respondent claims to possess the records, but refuses to provide them upon request.

At the start of the inquiry, the Respondent shall be notified in writing that an inquiry is being conducted, shall receive a copy of the allegations, and shall have an opportunity to respond in person and/or in writing to those allegations. If the inquiry subsequently identifies additional Respondents, the appropriate dean or institutional official must notify them. Respondent(s) must be notified in writing of any additional allegations raised against them during this process. In the event the dean or institutional official identifies a conflict of interest in proceeding, they shall immediately report that conflict to the DO.

The dean or institutional official shall be directly responsible for the inquiry process and will prepare a written report that includes:

- the names, professional aliases, and positions of the Respondent and Complainant;
- a description of the allegation(s) of research misconduct;
- if the research is externally funded, the funding source and any publications listing this support;
- inventory of sequestered research records and other evidence and description of how sequestration was conducted;
- transcripts of any transcribed interviews;
- timeline and procedural history;
- any scientific or forensic analyses conducted;
- the basis for recommending to the DO that the allegation(s) warrant or do not warrant an investigation;
- any institutional actions recommended or implemented, including internal communications or external communications with journals or funding agencies; and
- documentation of potential evidence of honest error or difference of opinion.

The Respondent shall be given a copy of the draft inquiry report and the opportunity to comment. Should the Respondent fail to comment on the draft inquiry report within 10 working days, the draft inquiry report will be considered accepted. The Respondent's written comments shall be affixed to the report. The dean or institutional official may, but is not required to, provide relevant portions of the report to all Complainant(s) for comment. Any written comments by the Complainant(s) shall be affixed to the report.

The DO will receive the final inquiry report and decide whether an investigation is warranted. The inquiry process is completed when the DO makes this determination. The dean or institutional official will notify the Respondent of the inquiry's final outcome and provide a copy of the final inquiry report, referencing this policy and any relevant funding agency-specific requirements.

If an investigation is not recommended, the inquiry is complete, but all material related to the allegation and inquiry must be maintained on file for a period of seven (7) years. All individuals involved in the inquiry process, including the Respondent, the Complainant, and the Respondent's immediate supervisor or department chair, will be notified in writing that the charge of research misconduct was unfounded. The positions and reputations of persons who make allegations in good faith shall also be protected.

- D. Notification of Federal Agencies.** If the research under investigation is sponsored through federal funds, any finding that an investigation is warranted must be provided to the appropriate federal agency or agency oversight office, as required by the regulations or terms of the specific federally supported research project, together with a copy of the inquiry report, within 30 days of the end of the inquiry. In these cases, the DO shall forward this information to the Director of Grants & Sponsored Research, who shall then immediately notify the appropriate federal agency, as required by law, that an investigation has been initiated. At any time during a research misconduct proceeding, the federal agency shall also be notified immediately upon determination that:
- a) public health or safety is at risk, including an immediate need to protect human or animal subjects;
  - b) federal resources or interests are threatened;
  - c) there is reasonable indication of possible violations of civil or criminal law;
  - d) research activities should be suspended;
  - e) federal action is required to protect the interests of those involved in the research misconduct proceeding;  
or
  - f) a federal agency may need to take appropriate steps to safeguard evidence and protect the rights of those involved.
- E. The Investigation Process.** If the DO concludes that a formal investigation is warranted, the dean or institutional official will notify the respondent in writing of the allegations to be investigated. If any additional Respondent(s) are identified during the investigation, the dean or institutional official shall notify them of the allegation(s) and provide them an opportunity to respond. New inquiries are not required, but separate investigation reports and research misconduct determinations are required for each Respondent.

The dean or institutional official will appoint an ad hoc investigative committee of five (5) faculty and/or staff members, one of whom will serve as chair and at least three (3) of whom will be within the division of the individual charged with misconduct.

All committee members shall be determined to have the appropriate background to adjudicate the issues alleged. The committee should be constituted in such a way that it has the necessary and appropriate expertise to carry out a thorough and authoritative evaluation of the relevant evidence. Standing committees that deal with research issues (e.g., Institutional Review Board for Human Subjects Research, Institutional Animal Care and Use Committee) may be used as one source for members of an investigative committee. Committee members may be from within or outside the College community and must have no real or apparent conflicts of interest bearing on the question. The dean or institutional official may reserve the right to request that committee members sign confidentiality statements to ensure the protection of information and persons involved. In addition, the dean or institutional official will be present or available throughout the investigation to advise the committee as needed. The committee shall expeditiously begin a thorough investigation within 30 days of the end of the inquiry, and the entire investigation process is to be completed within 180 days.

During an investigation, the committee will examine all pertinent evidence (including, but not limited to, relevant research data and proposals, files, reports, publications, correspondence, records of oral presentations, online content, and laboratory records or materials), interview all individuals involved in making the allegation, and hear any testimony. All discussions by the committee shall be confidential. The committee shall be empowered to seek and obtain any relevant information that is pertinent to the investigation, and the Respondent may present evidence and expert testimony on her/his behalf.

The investigation committee must:

- use diligent efforts to ensure that the investigation is thorough and sufficiently documented and includes examination of all research records and evidence relevant to reaching a decision on the merits of each allegation;
- take reasonable steps to ensure an impartial and unbiased investigation to the maximum extent practical;
- interview each Respondent, Complainant, and any other available person who has been reasonably identified as having information regarding any relevant aspects of the investigation, including witnesses identified by the Respondent or the Complainant;

- ensure that interviews during the investigation are recorded and transcribed and any exhibits shown to an interviewee during an interview are numbered and referred to by that number in the interview;
- ensure that the transcript of the interview is made available to the relevant interviewee for correction;
- ensure that the transcript(s) with any corrections and numbered exhibits is/are included in the institutional record of the investigation;
- ensure that the Respondent is not present during witness interviews, but is provided a transcript of all interviews;
- pursue diligently all significant issues and leads discovered that are determined relevant to the investigation, including any evidence of any additional instances of possible research misconduct, and continue the investigation to completion; and
- if additional allegations are raised, ensure that the Respondent(s) is/are notified in writing of the additional allegations raised against them.

All institutional members will cooperate with institutional officials in the review of allegations and the conduct of inquiries and investigations. Institutional members, including Respondents, have an obligation to provide evidence relevant to research misconduct allegations to the committee or other institutional officials. After reviewing all data, the committee will decide if the charge of misconduct is or is not substantiated. At least three (3) of the five (5) members must agree that the Respondent is guilty of misconduct before such a decision can be made. At the end of the investigation, the committee shall draft a written report of its findings. If a decision is not unanimous, a minority report will be attached to the majority report, outlining the reasons for dissent.

The Respondent shall receive a copy of the draft investigation report and, concurrently, a copy of, or supervised access to, the evidence on which the report is based, and be notified that any comments must be submitted within 30 days of the date on which the copy was received and that the comments will be considered by the institution and addressed in the final report.

**F. Final Report.** The committee will complete a final report that includes the following.

- Names and qualifications of individuals comprising the investigative committee.
- Description of the nature of the allegation(s) of research misconduct, including any additional allegation(s) addressed during the research misconduct proceeding.
- Description and documentation of any external funding that supported this research, including grant numbers, grant applications, contracts, and publications listing funding support.
- Description of the specific allegation(s) of research misconduct for consideration in the investigation of the Respondent.
- Inventory of sequestered research records and other evidence, except records the institution did not consider or rely on; and a description of how any sequestration was conducted during the investigation. This inventory shall include manuscripts and funding proposals that were considered or relied on during the investigation.
- Transcripts of all interviews conducted.
- Identification of the specific published papers, manuscripts submitted but not accepted for publication (including online publication), external funding applications, progress reports, presentations, posters, or other research records that allegedly contained the falsified, fabricated, or plagiarized material.
- Any scientific or forensic analyses conducted.
- Any comments made by the Respondent (and Complainant, if applicable) on the draft investigation report and the investigation committee's consideration of those comments.
- A statement for each separate allegation of whether the investigation committee recommends a finding of research misconduct.
  - 1) If the investigation committee recommends a finding of research misconduct for an allegation, the investigation report must, for that allegation, articulate the following.
    - (i) Identify the individual(s) who committed the research misconduct.
    - (ii) Indicate whether the research misconduct was falsification, fabrication, and/or plagiarism.
    - (iii) Indicate whether the research misconduct was committed intentionally, knowingly, or recklessly.
    - (iv) State whether the other requirements for a finding of research misconduct have been met.
    - (v) Summarize the facts and the analysis which support the conclusion and consider the merits of any explanation by the Respondent.
    - (vi) Identify any specific external funding involved, if applicable.
    - (vii) Identify whether any publications need correction or retraction.

- 2) If the investigation committee does not recommend a finding of research misconduct for an allegation, the investigation report must provide a detailed rationale.
- 3) List of any current funding support or known applications or proposals for funding support that the Respondent has pending.

The DO will receive the final investigation report and is responsible for making a final determination of research misconduct findings. The investigation process is complete when the DO provides a final determination in writing to the dean or institutional official and Respondent that includes: (a) whether the institution found research misconduct and, if so, who committed the misconduct; and (b) a description of relevant institutional actions taken or to be taken.

**G. Administrative Actions.** Recommendations on appropriate administrative actions may include, but are not limited to:

- removal of the person responsible from the particular project,
- a letter of reprimand,
- special monitoring of future work,
- withdrawal or correction of all pending or published abstracts and papers emanating from the research where misconduct was found,
- probation for a specified period with specified conditions,
- suspension of rights and responsibilities for specified period, with or without salary,
- initiation of steps leading to possible rank reduction or termination of employment, and/or
- restitution of funds, as appropriate.

If applicable, the DO will provide a copy of the final report to the Director of Grants & Sponsored Research, who will ensure the full institutional record is promptly transmitted to the appropriate federal agency or agency oversight office. The DO will also 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.

If applicable, the sponsoring federal agency may also impose administrative actions, including but not limited to:

- 1) clarification, correction, or retraction of the research record;
- 2) suspending or terminating an active award, or restricting designated activities or expenditures under an active award;
- 3) special reviews of all requests for funding from an affected individual or institution to ensure that steps have been taken to prevent repetition of the misconduct;
- 4) requiring special certifications, assurances, or other administrative arrangements to ensure compliance with applicable regulations or terms of the award;
- 5) restricting or suspending participation as a reviewer, advisor, or consultant; and
- 6) debarment or suspension of an individual or institution from participation in federal programs.

**H. Timeline.** The entire investigation process is to be completed within 180 days, including appointing a committee, conducting the investigation, preparing the report, providing the draft report for comment by the Respondent, preparing and sending the final report to the DO (with all attachments) for final determination, and submitting this information to the federal agency or agency oversight office, if applicable. If it is determined that the investigation will take longer than 180 days, a written request for an extension, setting forth the reasons for the delay, will be submitted to the appropriate federal agency or agency oversight office, if applicable.

**I. Right to Appeal.** Respondent(s) may appeal the judgment of the investigating committee and/or the administrative action. A written statement of the grounds for appeal must be submitted to the DO for review by the College's Faculty Appeals Committee within 30 days of written notification of the results of the investigation. If applicable, the Director of Grants & Sponsored Research will: 1) promptly notify the appropriate federal agency or agency oversight office if a Respondent appeals an institution's finding(s) of research misconduct or institutional actions, and 2) provide the federal agency or agency oversight office a complete record of the appeal once the appeal is concluded.

Grounds for appeal include previously unconsidered evidence, administrative actions not in keeping with the findings, conflict of interest not previously known among those involved in the investigation, and other lapses in due process. Upon receipt of a written appeal, the DO will convene the College's Faculty Appeals Committee and ask for an evaluation of the evidence and a determination. The Faculty Appeals Committee will forward its conclusions and recommendations to the President. The President, may, at their discretion, reopen the

investigation. The President's decision will be binding on all parties and will be conveyed to all involved in a timely fashion. Appeals must be completed within 120 days of its filing, unless a written request for an extension has been approved by the federal agency or agency oversight office, if applicable.

**J. Maintaining Records.** The RIO will maintain records of research misconduct proceedings, including all sequestered evidence, in a secure manner for seven (7) years after completion of the proceeding. The RIO, in collaboration with the DO and Director of Grants & Sponsored research, is also responsible for providing any information, documentation, research records, evidence, or clarification requested by a federal agency to carry out its review of an allegation of research misconduct or of the College's handling of such an allegation.

**K. Other Considerations.**

***Multiple Institutions.*** When allegations of research misconduct arise in the context of collaborative projects involving multiple institutions, the institutions involved may, when appropriate and mutually agreed upon, elect to conduct a joint research misconduct proceeding. In such cases, the participating institutions will designate one institution to serve as the lead institution. The lead institution will coordinate the collection and review of relevant research records, evidence, and witness testimony from all collaborating institutions and may, by agreement, include committee members from those institutions in the proceeding. Decisions regarding whether an inquiry or investigation is warranted, whether research misconduct occurred, and what corrective or administrative actions are appropriate may be made jointly or delegated to the lead institution, with each institution retaining responsibility for meeting applicable sponsor and regulatory requirements.

***Admission of Research Misconduct.*** At any point during the assessment, inquiry, investigation, or appeals processes, the Respondent may admit that research misconduct occurred and that they committed the research misconduct. A Respondent's admission of research misconduct must be made in writing and signed by the Respondent. An admission must specify the falsification, fabrication, and/or plagiarism that occurred and which research records were affected. Upon the Respondent's admission, the DO, in consultation with the dean or other institutional officials and federal agency, if applicable, may close the research misconduct proceeding and move to determine appropriate administration actions. The admission statement, as well as an institutional statement from the DO describing how the College determined that the scope of the misconduct was fully addressed by the admission and confirmed the Respondent's culpability must be provided to the appropriate federal agency or agency oversight office before the DO closes the research misconduct proceeding.

***Resignation Prior to Completion of Inquiry or Investigation.*** If the Respondent, without admitting to misconduct, elects to resign his or her position after an allegation of research misconduct has been received, all proceedings under this policy shall continue. If the Respondent refuses to participate in the process after resignation, the investigation committee shall use its best efforts to reach a conclusion concerning the allegations, noting in its final report the Respondent's failure to cooperate and its effect on the review of the matter. The final report, the decision of the DO, and a description of any recommended administrative actions will be provided to the appropriate federal agency or agency oversight office, if applicable.

***Restoration of the Respondent's Reputation.*** Following a final finding of no research misconduct, the dean or institutional official and DO must undertake all reasonable and practical efforts to restore the Respondent's reputation. All individuals related to the review process, including the DO, the president, and the Respondent's immediate supervisor or chair will be notified that the charge of misconduct in research was unfounded.

***Protection of the Complainant, Witnesses, and Committee Members.*** During the research misconduct proceeding and upon its completion, regardless of whether the College determines that research misconduct occurred, the dean or institutional official and DO must undertake all reasonable and practical efforts to protect the reputation of, or to counter potential or actual retaliation against, any Complainant who made allegations of research misconduct in good faith and/or any witnesses and committee members who cooperate in good faith with the research misconduct proceeding.

***Allegations Not Made in Good Faith.*** If relevant, the DO will determine whether the Complainant's allegations of research misconduct were made in good faith, or whether a witness or committee member acted in good faith. If the DO determines that there was an absence of good faith, they will determine whether any administrative action should be taken against the person who failed to act in good faith.

## **IV. Related Policies or Applicable Publications**

*Not Applicable.*

## **V. Appendices/Supplemental Materials**

*Not Applicable.*

## **VI. Effective Date**

This policy is effective April 23, 2026, and supersedes all versions issued previously.

## **VII. Revisioning History**

Rev. 1, 4-23-2026: formalizing and numbering of policy; substantive revisions related to federal reporting requirements.

Originally published in the 2011-2012 Faculty Handbook, All Faculty of Rollins College, Section II: Policies and Procedures, Updated March 2026, Office of the VPAA|Provost.