

*Policy Sponsor:*  
**B41 TD 2**

<b>Scholarly Misconduct Policy</b>	: Research Services	<i>Revisions:</i> Senate: April 11, 2016 Board of Governors: June 22, 2016
------------------------------------	------------------------	--

A.

- e) any other circumstance that an institutional animal use and care committee deems appropriate.

Otherwise, such matters will be addressed by the applicable institutional animal use and care committee.

This Policy and Procedures DO NOT apply to situations

- a) where misconduct is alleged against a student in relation to wol T009 Tc03(9)-0.7(o)-9b7(o)714.4(i)2.6(tt7e)J.4(10)

3. In the case of collaborative or team research, the Principal Investigator or project leader shall take reasonable measures to ensure that the members of the research group or team are aware of and comply with this Policy. Principal Investigators who fail to exercise reasonable care in directing and supervising research may share in the responsibility for the Scholarly Misconduct of members of the research group or team.
4. In the case of research conducted by students, supervisors shall take reasonable measures to ensure that students conducting research are aware of and comply with this Policy.
5. Where a member of the University community has reasonable grounds to believe that Scholarly Misconduct is occurring or has occurred in the University and is not being addressed under University policy, he or she is under a positive obligation to report the matter promptly under this Policy.
6. All members of the University community are required to cooperate in any investigation process initiated under this Policy.
7. There will be no retaliation against any person on account of an allegation or an expressed intention to make an allegation under this Policy or on account of evidence or assistance given in relation to a proposed allegation under this Policy. Any concerns regarding possible retaliation shall be brought to the attention of the Scholarly Integrity Officer. Disciplinary action in response to retaliation will be addressed in accordance with applicable disciplinary processes.
8. Any communication or information gathered in any case is confidential except to the extent that disclosure is necessary to effectively implement this Policy, including an informal resolution, or to undertake any disciplinary or remedial

Dentistry, Health Professions, and Graduate Studies. Two shall be appointed by the Vice-President Research in consultation with the Deans of Science, Computer Science, Agriculture, Engineering, and Graduate Studies. Two shall be appointed by the Vice-President Research in consultation with the Deans of Architecture and Planning, Management, Law, Arts and Social Sciences, and College of Continuing Education, Graduate Studies and the University Librarian. The Scholarly Integrity Investigators shall serve for staggered three-year terms. They may not serve more than two terms consecutively.

4. Scholarly Integrity Committee: There shall be a Scholarly Integrity Committee comprising the six Scholarly Integrity Investigators and the Scholarly Integrity Officer, which shall meet at least once a year to discuss any issues arising from this Policy.
5. Conflicts of Interest: Where the Vice-President Research is unable to discharge his or her responsibilities under this policy in relation to a particular allegation due to a potential conflict of interest, as defined by the University Policy on Conflict of Interest, his or her responsibilities under this Policy may be assigned to the Vice-President AcistfideS1mecu

3. Filing Allegations of Scholarly Misconduct: Allegations of Scholarly Misconduct must be made in writing to the Scholarly Integrity Officer as promptly as possible upon becoming aware of the alleged Scholarly Misconduct. Allegations should include supporting documentation.
4. Anonymous Allegations: There may be exceptional situations where an individual has a reasonable concern that his or her career or personal safety may be compromised by raising an allegation of Scholarly Misconduct. Such persons may initiate a confidential conversation with the Scholarly Integrity Officer or submit an anonymous written allegation to the Scholarly Integrity Officer. Whether or not an anonymous allegation can proceed in the absence of an identified Complainant will be determined by the Scholarly Integrity Officer, in his or her sole discretion, having regard to all of the circumstances of the case and the evidence available.
5. Process advice: The Scholarly Integrity Officer will provide any person alleging Scholarly Misconduct (the "Complainant") with a copy of this Policy and will explain the processes for dealing with allegations under this Policy.
6. Initial Assessment: Within 10 business days of receipt of the allegation, the Scholarly Integrity Officer shall make an initial assessment of the allegation. The Scholarly Integrity Officer may request further information from the Complainant or others if required to assist in the assessment. The Scholarly Integrity Officer shall provide a written report to the Dean of the Faculty of Arts and Sciences within 10 business days of the initial assessment.

24-59121-10.6(1)46(8)7(6)43(2)75(2)7(7)31(1)05(1)09(1)31(1)7.947

Integrity Officer shall provide the Respondent with a copy of the Allegation, and a copy of this Policy.

9. Representation: Responde

- h. Each interview will be summarized in writing by the Investigating Committee in the form of an interview report, which will be forwarded to the interviewee for confirmation that the report fairly summarizes the interview.
  - i. Where the investigation uncovers information that suggests significant breaches of this Policy beyond what was contained in the initial allegation, the Investigation Committee shall refer those matters back to the Scholarly Integrity Officer for further direction.
- 13. Investigation Report: The Investigation Committee will review all of the information gathered in the course of the investigation and submit a draft investigation report to the Scholarly Integrity Officer within 30 days of completion of the investigation, that includes:
  - a. A summary of the allegation(s);
  - b. A summary of the response;
  - c. An analysis of the evidence relevant to the matters raised;
  - d. Findings of fact with respect to the allegation(s) together with supporting reasons;
  - e. A determination of whether there has been Scholarly Misconduct; and
  - f. Where Scholarly Misconduct is found, an assessment of the severity of the Scholarly Misconduct, and a review of any mitigating factors.
- 14. Review by Scholarly Integrity Officer: The Scholarly Integrity Officer will review the draft report to ensure that it is clear and that it meets the requirements of the Policy, and in so doing, may seek further clarification from, or investigation by, the Investigation Committee before the investigation report is finalized.
- 15. Comments by Parties: Within two working days of receipt of the final investigation report, the Scholarly Integrity Officer will provide a copy of the final investigation report, which may be partially redacted to address any privacy or security concerns, to the respondent for comment. The respondent will have 15 working days to provide written comments to the Scholarly Integrity Officer. In appropriate circumstances, as determined by the Scholarly Integrity Officer, the complainant will be extended the same privilege.
- 16. Consideration

18. Communication of Decision: The Vice-President Research will report in writing the outcome of the case to the Respondent in ways that appropriately address any privacy and security issues. Where the Complainant has a legitimate interest in the outcome of an investigation, the Vice-President will report in writing to the Complainant in ways that appropriately address any privacy or security concerns. Where the Vice-President Research rejected the findings of the Investigation Report in whole, or in large part, this determination, together with underlying reasons, shall be forwarded for review to the University Secretary, General Counsel and two members of the Senate Academic Programs and Research Committee appointed by the Senate Planning and Governance Committee, to ensure transparency of the process.
19. Appeal of Decision: A Respondent may appeal the decision of the Vice-President Research by filing a written notice of appeal to the Chair of Senate within 30 days of the delivery of the decision. The Chair of Senate shall request that the Senate Planning and Governance Committee establish an *ad hoc* Committee compris



### Schedule A

“Scholarly Misconduct” includes any conduct that constitutes a breach of generally accepted standards of scholarly conduct within the relevant research or scholarly community for conducting, proposing, performing, reporting, supervising or reviewing research or other scholarly activity. Scholarly Misconduct does not include honest errors or differences of interpretation or judgment relating to data or results that are reasonable in light of the circumstances in which they are made or reached.

Examples of Scholarly Misconduct include, but are not limited to:

- a. Fabrication - fabrication of research data, source material (including other researchers’ scholarship), methodology, or results;
- b. Falsification - falsification of data, source material, or results, including any manipulation of numbers, graphs, texts, transcripts, and images, that is not reported or that distorts the conclusions of a study;
- c. Plagiarism - using another’s words or ideas as one’s own;
- d. Financial misconduct - using research funds for purposes contrary to the funding agency’s or sponsor’s express requirements; misappropriation of research funds;
- e. Disregard for University research-related policies and regulations:
  - failure to meet University research-related policies (e.g., policies that protect researchers, human subjects, the health and safety of the public, the welfare of lab animals and those dealing with biohazards or radioactive materials);
  - failure to obtain the appropriate approvals before conducting research
  - failure to meet relevant legal requirements on the conduct or reporting of scholarly activity;
- f. Misrepresentation of authorship and credit:
  - failure to appropriately recognize contributions of others (e.g., denying authorship credit to someone who has contributed substantively to the intellectual content of a manuscript or not recognizing contributions of a co-inventor in a patent application);- to a mand0.7(t-s)-1.3(c)-2(rip)13.1(t-30)-2.3(

- deliberate misleading of colleagues about the results and interpretation of a study;
  - interference with a misconduct investigation;
- h. Withholding of research information:
- omission of key aspects of methodology in papers or proposals to wilfully hamper replication by colleagues;
  - undue withholding of data, research materials, or key aspects of methodology from the research community;
  - failure to inform collaborators in a timely fashion of experimental findings and developments;
- i. Misrepresentation or mismanagement of conflicts of interest
- failure to comply with University Policy on Conflict of Interest in relation to a research project;
  - failure to disclose actual or appearance of conflict of interest to institutions, sponsors, commissioners of work, or publishers (e.g., journal editors) when submitting research grant applications or manuscripts for publication, or testing products for sale or distribution to the public;
  - lack of proper disclosure of involvement with firms with an interest in the outcomes of the research;
  - inappropriate alteration or suppression of research results to favour the interests of the funding provider, be it commercial or not-for-profit, such as government or a private foundation
- j. Abuse of peer review:
- failure to disqualify oneself from process once potential conflict of interest becomes known;
  - failure to preserve the privacy and intellectual property rights of the persons whose work one is reviewing;
  - failure to obtain permission of the author before using information gained through access to manuscripts or grant applications during the peer review process;
- k. Abuse of supervision:
- failure to follow University Policy on Conflict of Interest once potential conflict of interest becomes known;
  - failure to preserve th-

!"#\$%&'()\*+,-./"01'\$"2,,34%\$5"#&'066

!

!

""!#\$%&'()\*+,-./"01'\$"2,,34%\$5"#&'066