Video
Insight Engine — The Anatomy of an Academic Conviction

Academic tenure is designed to be permanent, but even the most protected institutional foundations can shatter when the pressure gets high enough.

For 390 years, Harvard University never revoked the tenure of a sitting professor. That absolute streak ended with the dismissal of behavioral scientist Francesca Gino.

The catalyst for her removal was a public accusation by a group of independent data scientists known as Data Colada, who identified statistical anomalies in four of her published papers and alleged intentional data fabrication.

This diagram illustrates the strict legal standard mandated by university rules for executing a faculty dismissal. A hearing committee cannot rely on suspicion. They must find clear and convincing evidence that academic misconduct occurred.

This threshold exists for a reason. Tenure is a career-long protection designed to ensure academic independence, and removing it requires proof that leaves no room for substantial doubt. The underlying data must be able to withstand rigorous scrutiny.

A rigorous review of the forensic record reveals a stark mismatch between the university's final verdict and the physical reality of the evidence. Throughout its investigation, the institution systematically relied on two specific methodological errors. First, investigators presumed that every data anomaly they found inherently strengthened the conclusions of the research papers. Second, they bypassed the operational realities of the lab. Over 60 research assistants managed, cleaned, and merged the raw data sets across these studies, yet the committee interviewed only two of them.

To test the strength of the evidence, we need to examine the four specific allegations that cost a professor her career, stepping backward through the timeline of the research. Testing this evidence requires looking past the assumptions of motive and examining the actual people and processes that produced these data files.

The institutional review restricted the defense before the data was analyzed. For nearly two years, Gino was placed under a strict gag order and expressly denied the right to hire her own

independent forensic data experts to review the evidence compiled against her. Beyond those restrictions, academic investigations are governed by a standard statute of limitations. To prevent prosecutions based on degraded evidence, institutional rules explicitly bar the investigation of data that is more than six years old. The university bypassed its own guardrails by arguing that merely citing an old paper on a website counted as renewed use. [1] They prosecuted three separate allegations involving studies published over a decade ago.[2]

Forcing a researcher to defend decades old data without expert support systematically degraded the reliability of the fact-finding process long before the hearing began.

The oldest charge takes us back 15 years to the University of North Carolina,[3] where researchers tested whether signing an honesty pledge affected how accurately participants reported their performance on math puzzles. The institutional charge claims that Gino took a raw master dataset known as File A and intentionally altered it to produce a final fraudulent dataset, File B, that supported the study's hypothesis. This diagram shows the actual relationship: File A was an incomplete interim file, missing records for several participants. When the original paper surveys[4] were recovered, they perfectly filled the missing slots in the interim dataset, exactly matching file B. The final dataset was not a fraudulent manipulation of the original; it was simply the completed version of the data once all the paper records had been manually logged.

Using an incomplete 15-year-old draft file as the baseline to prove deliberate data manipulation is a profound failure of evidentiary logic.

Moving forward to a 12-year-old study[5] involving a coin flip, investigators found that 12 participants were marked as cheaters in

---

[1] Amplification: The university argued that self-citations counted as renewed use, even if the citations were generic citations in a broad literature review.

[2] Correction: the three papers were published 11, 12 and 14 years ago. At the time of the initial investigation, late 2021, the three papers had been published 6, 7 and 9 years earlier.

[3] Correction: the study was conducted in July 2010. That's 16 years ago, and 11 years before the start of the HBS investigation.

[4] Correction: "receipts" not "surveys."

[5] Correction: the study was conducted in 2012. That's 14 years ago, and 9 years before the start of the HBS investigation. It is disputed whether the coin flip was rigged. This analysis assumes that Harvard is correct in claiming that it was rigged.

the final data, even though they had not falsely claimed to guess the flip correctly. The principal investigator did not clean this data set. That work was handled exclusively by research assistants, who coded the survey responses over a span of 500 days. In behavioral research, assistants routinely apply multidimensional analysis to flag cheaters. If a participant completes a complex puzzle in an impossibly short amount of time. An assistant will flag them for gaming the system, regardless of their final answer. Despite this standard lab practice, the committee never interviewed the specific research assistants responsible for coding the file to ask them why those 12 flags were created.

Concluding that the lead researcher maliciously injected false data while explicitly refusing to question the people who actually handled and coded that data relies entirely on assumption, not proof.[6]

The next charge centers on a 2014 study where investigators identified exactly 154 manually altered data cells. The committee declared these changes were intentionally made to strengthen the paper's conclusion. That declaration collapses under basic statistical scrutiny. 44% of those altered cells involved variables that were completely irrelevant to the study and did nothing to support the hypothesis. [7]

This grid illustrates the defense's counter theory, an inadvertent drag and drop error. [8] If an assistant highlights a data block, clicks the boundary holding shift and drags the mouse, the software automatically swaps places with adjacent rows, instantly displacing 154 cells. [9] We can replicate this exact software glitch today to produce the identical pattern of errors. The alternative requires believing a

[6] Clarification: There are other discrepancies between the first available dataset and the dataset used for the analyses reported in the paper. Some of the changed values strengthened the results of the paper, and some weakened them. The original, raw data has not been found.
[7] Clarification: 44% of the changes affected variables irrelevant to the study hypothesis.
[8] Clarification: in Excel, the Shift-drag is a feature that swaps the cells one has selected, and places them at the destination where one releases the mouse. This feature is described in Microsoft technical documentation. See https://support.microsoft.com/en-us/office/move-or-copy-cells-rows-and-columns-3ebbcafd-8566-42d8-8023-a2ec62746cfc at "Move or copy rows and columns by using the mouse," and "Cut and insert."
[9] Clarification: 94% of the 154 changes can be explained by the swap error. The remaining changes can be explained by another Excel feature used in error.

human manually clicked and randomly edited 154 highly specific scattered cells, half of which offered no benefit to the study.

What the institutional investigators confidently labeled as a deliberate act of human fraud was mathematically demonstrated to be a common deterministic software error.

The final charge involves a 2020 networking study. Out of the four allegations, this is the only one published recently enough to actually fall within the university's six-year investigative window. Investigators found 1066 changes in the final dataset. They concluded Gino downloaded the raw data herself and spent hours actively manipulating it using SPSS statistical software. [10]

Once again, 39% of these changes affected data entirely unused by the hypothesis.[11] More critically, an independent reading of the digital SPSS logs directly refutes the timeline proposed by the committee. To settle the dispute, investigators needed the computer's metadata.[12] But when the university's IT department seized the researcher's laptop, they failed to capture a standard forensic disk image of the hard drive. By simply copying isolated folders instead of imaging the disk. The IT team permanently destroyed the specific metadata timestamps required to prove exactly when and by whom those files were downloaded and altered.

The institution revoked a tenured career based on a highly contested timeline of digital events, having already destroyed the exact digital footprints needed to verify the truth. Look at the weight of the actual evidence: recovered paper receipts, un-interviewed lab assistance, mathematically replicable Excel errors, and destroyed IT metadata. The institutional standard demands clear and convincing evidence, a threshold explicitly designed to remove all substantial doubt before severing an academic career.

These physical and operational realities are irreconcilable with the prosecution's narrative. Each finding introduces technical discrepancies that the clear and convincing standard cannot account

[10] Clarification: Harvard claimed that Gino downloaded the raw data directly from Qualtrics on the afternoon of January 24, 2020, and then spent that afternoon and evening running commands in SPSS, a statistical software program, tweaking the data to force results.
[11] Correction: 39% of the changes affected variables irrelevant to the study hypothesis.
[12] Clarification: the computer's metadata would be critical to understand whether the file uploaded in SPSS was a file already cleaned by the RA who testified cleaning the data and sharing it with Gino, or a file created by Gino.

for. Protecting academic integrity is vital to the scientific process. But abandoning due process and basic forensic standards turns the policing of science into a witch hunt against human error. When an institution ignores the operational reality of the lab to confirm a preexisting theory of fraud, it isn't conducting an investigation. It is reverse engineering a conviction. Regardless of the anomalies, the forensic record fails to meet the legal threshold.