

Mount Saint Vincent University



Guidelines, Policies, and Procedures for Integrity in Research and Scholarship

Table of Contents

Definitions.....	1
Preamble	2
1. Principles of Practice	3
2. Duties Pertaining to Authorship.....	3
2.1. Attribution of authorship.....	4
2.2. Duties of the principal author(s)	4
2.3. The duty to acknowledge sources of funding	4
2.4. Ownership of copyright	4
2.5. Student-Professor collaborations	5
2.6. Data Recording, Data Ownership, and Data Retention	5
3. Research and Scholarly Misconduct.....	5
4. Misconduct.....	7
5. Policies and Procedures for Addressing Allegations of Misconduct.....	8
5.1. Guiding Principles	8
5.2. Procedures.....	9
6. Promoting Integrity in Research and Scholarship	13
Additional Resources	14
Policy Resources.....	14
Notes.	14
Scan of Procedures and Practices in Other Universities.....	Appendix 1

GUIDELINES, POLICIES AND PROCEDURES FOR INTEGRITY IN RESEARCH AND SCHOLARSHIP

Effective: September 29, 2008

Supersedes May 2000

The development of this document, Guidelines, Policies and Procedures for Integrity in Research and Scholarship, has benefited directly from similar documents developed and made public by other Canadian universities and the national research councils. In particular, iterations presented in the research and scholarship integrity policies, procedures, and guidelines of Carleton University, Dalhousie University, Lakehead University, McGill University, St. Mary's University, University of Toronto, and the University of Western Ontario have informed the organization and content of the Mount Saint Vincent University's (MSVU) policy document. In some instances specific formulations drawn from these sources have been incorporated into this document. Similar documents developed and made public by additional universities and agencies, such as those of the University of Toronto, the Tri-Council, the Social Sciences and Humanities Research Council (SSHRC) and the Natural Science and Engineering Research Council (NSERC), have also been consulted through the course of developing MSVU policies and procedures.

MSVU's Guidelines, Policies and Procedures for Integrity in Research and Scholarship does not supersede or replace any provisions concerning similar matters that may be incorporated within existing collective agreements or Senate policy, for example, Policies and Procedures: Ethics Review of Research Involving Humans. The provisions contained herein are intended to provide appropriate clarity, specifications and guidance.

Definitions

- “Administrative Officer”: refers to any or all Senior Administrative appointments, including the offices of Dean, Associate Vice-President, Vice-President, and President.
- “all parties” – refers in the case of a formal investigation to all persons making an allegation and all persons charged with an allegation of scholarly misconduct as defined under this policy.
- “Authorship”: refers to intellectual or creative contributions that is definitive and attributable to the research work and represented in a person or persons named attribution of authorship.
- “the Committee”: refers to the independent investigative committee established to conduct a formal investigation of the allegations.
- “Complainant(s)”: refers to any individual or group accusing one or more members of the MSVU community of scholarly/research misconduct.
- “Granting Agencies” - refers to any agency or organization that provides grants and/or contracts for the funding of research, including the three major federal funding agencies, the Natural Sciences and Engineering Research Council of Canada (NSERC), the Social Sciences and Humanities Research Council of Canada (SSHRC), and the Canada Institute of Health Research (CIHR).
- “Independent Committee of Inquiry”: refers to the Committee appointed for and tasked with the responsibility of determining whether accusations of scholarly/research misconduct are sufficiently substantive for the University to initiate formal actions as specified within

Collective Agreements or other pertinent University rules and procedures. The Committee is to be composed of scholars/researchers without any known affiliations with the University and its community.

- “Independent Integrity Mediator”: refers to the MSVU Professor Emeritus tasked to complete the initial informal investigation and mediation of accusations against any member or members of the MSVU community of scholarly/research misconduct.
- “misconduct”: refers to any conscious and deliberate action that is inconsistent with and/or in violation of integrity in research and scholarship.
- “named individual(s)” – refers to the individual or individuals who are accused of scholarly misconduct (i.e. the person or persons charged) as described by this document and are named in an allegation.
- “Principal Investigator”: refers to the person who has primary responsibility for a research project and its administration.
- “research” is defined in this policy as a systematic investigation to establish facts, principles, and/or generalizable knowledge. For the purpose of this policy, research includes all forms of funded and unfunded scholarly and/or applied research and creative work conducted by and within the MSVU community and by people who use MSVU facilities for the creation, dissemination and publication of scholarly and/or applied work.
- The term “researcher”, as used in this policy, includes:
 - any MSVU faculty member, emeritus faculty, staff, part-time lecturers, administrators, students, visiting or adjunct scholars, fellows and chairs, paid and unpaid research associates and assistants, and any person in a like position, who conducts, engages with, or advances research in any capacity, or;
 - who accesses University students or staff as human research participants, or;
 - any other person who conducts, engages with or advances research as connected with the University, and/or;
 - any person who conducts research using University resources (for instance, research space, materials, equipment, or human resources).
- “Respondent(s)”: refers to any individual or group within the MSVU community accused of scholarly/research misconduct.
- “Scholarship”: intellectual or creative contributions as understood and expressed through academic discipline or professional field normative criteria that also ordinarily value and employ independent peer review evaluations in determining publication merit.
- “Tri-Council” or “Council”: refers to all or any of the three federal granting agencies (NSERC, CIHR and SSHRC).
- “the University” – refers to Mount Saint Vincent University.
- “University community” – all full-time and part-time faculty; all full-time and part-time staff; all full-time and part-time administrators; all full-time and part-time students (both undergraduate and graduate); and all people hired on term positions and/or casual employment positions at Mount Saint Vincent University and any person in a like position, who conducts, engages with, or advances research in any capacity affiliated with MSVU.

Preamble

The University is a primary social institution engaged in the search for and transmission of knowledge and understanding. Research, scholarship, and education are the main means through which these are sought and expressed. Academic and intellectual freedoms, including

independence of inquiry, provided through and defended by the University Community are essential in these pursuits. These freedoms underwrite the breadth, depth, and dynamism of the University's intellectual and educational work, assuring an open, welcoming, and supportive climate and culture of scholarly inquiry and debate. These freedoms also oblige the University to situate honesty, transparency, responsibility, and accountability within the very essence of their pursuit, representation, and communication of knowledge and understanding. Arguably, public, educator, student, and research scholar confidence in and support of the University academy reside, to a large extent, in the belief that integrity characterizes the conduct of research and scholarly comportment.

Mount Saint Vincent University is committed to excellence in research and education, expressing the highest standards of research and scholarly integrity. As such, MSVU expects all members of the University community to comport themselves with respect to the highest standards of behaviour in the conduct of research and scholarship. These standards would include attributes such as (but not limited to):

1. Principles of Practice

- 1.1. complete representation of all contributions to research and publication, including student contributions, through authorship credit and/or formal acknowledgement;
- 1.2. employing the unpublished work of others only with formal permissions and due and appropriate acknowledgement of published sources;
- 1.3. adhering to the peer assessment confidentiality provisions, expectations, and responsibilities with respect to the information, ideas, plans, and identities contained in manuscripts, research proposals, funding applications and such that one may be asked to review and assess;
- 1.4. careful development and planning of research protocols wherein the methods of data collection, sharing, and storage and the methods of analyses and collaborative oversight are specified and shown as appropriate to the research to be undertaken;
- 1.5. employment of scholarly rigor respecting the analyses and interpretations of data;
- 1.6. appropriate use of research funds and resources (e.g., space, equipment, research time);
- 1.7. employment of ethically appropriate and respectful relations with human and animal participants in research;
- 1.8. adherence to the University's research regulations, as well as the various research ethics and administrative requirements associated with accessing and employing national research council and other granting agencies funds in support of research;
- 1.9. respect for any agreements undertaken with research, community, organizational, and University collaborators and participants; and,
- 1.10. respect for one's own discipline's established ethical research conduct principles.

2. Duties Pertaining to Authorship

The determination of authorship credits often represents particular and special challenges. This section is intended to provide clarification and guidelines respecting the meaning of authorship and the assignment of authorship credits. It must be understood that the right to authorship is based on an intellectual or creative contribution that is definitive and attributable to the research

work. Research and scholarly collaborators should establish, as early as possible, how the attribution of authorship and how the allocation of copyright are to be assigned.

2.1. Attribution of authorship

The following rules govern the attribution of authorship:

- 2.1.1. authorship is attributed to all those persons who have made significant intellectual contributions to the work and who share responsibility and accountability for the results;
- 2.1.2. an administrative relationship to the investigation does not, in itself, qualify a person for authorship credit;
- 2.1.3. the order of the names in a publication should represent the importance and quality of the respective contributions of the signatories unless the rules of the journal and the custom of the discipline specify otherwise;
- 2.1.4. the attribution of authorship is not affected by whether researchers were paid for their contributions or by their employment status.

With the rise of **collaborative** research, multi-authored publications have become increasingly common. Consequently, the determination of entitlement to and the order of authorship attribution have become more challenging and difficult. There are, however, some considerations that should be taken into account. Among these are:

- 2.1.5. when appropriate, one author should be identified as being responsible for the validity of the entire manuscript or authored object;
- 2.1.6. all authors listed must have been involved actively in the research. Each is expected to have made a significant intellectual or practical contribution, understand the significance of the conclusions, and be able to share responsibility for the content and reliability of the reported data;
- 2.1.7. all authors listed should have seen and approved a manuscript or other research-based material before presentation or submission;
- 2.1.8. the concept of “honorary authorship” is unacceptable.

2.2. Duties of the principal author(s)

The author who submits a manuscript for publication or presentation at scholarly meetings accepts the responsibility of having included as co-authors all persons who are entitled to co-authorship, and none who are inappropriate. Additionally, the submitting author(s) is obligated to send each co-author a draft copy of the manuscript and must make a reasonable attempt to obtain consent to co-authorship, including the order of names. Other contributions must be indicated in a footnote or an “Acknowledgements” section, in accordance with the standards of the discipline and/or the publisher.

2.3. The duty to acknowledge sources of funding

All public and private funding sources (e.g., grants, contracts and gifts, including endowed income supporting themed research chairs) used in the conduct of research must be acknowledged in resulting publications and dissemination.

2.4. Ownership of copyright

The allocation of copyright is governed by University policy, collective agreements, and the law.

2.5. Student-Professor collaborations

2.5.1. Standard operating procedures should be developed, preferably within Faculties or Departments, regarding conditions of authorship for student research trainees (including interns, cooperative education placements and such) and these guidelines must be discussed with the trainees before the research has begun or before they become involved in it. Preferably, the student research trainee will be informed of the MSVU Policy for Integrity in Research and Scholarship, and all parties, including the student(s) trainee(s), will sign an agreement stating that the Policy has been reviewed and discussed.

[2.5.2.](#) The operating procedures above also apply in the case where the collaborators are professor and student. Further to these operating procedures, a student must be granted due prominence on a list of co-authors of any multiple-authored presentation and/or article that is based primarily on the student's own dissertation/thesis, according to the normative practice in the discipline.

2.6. Data Recording, Data Ownership, and Data Retention

2.6.1 Data recording should express the normative procedures established within disciplinary research practice and expectations, as well as comply satisfactorily with the Tri-Council Policy, as verified by the University Research Ethics Board (UREB), matters such as subject provision of informed consent, risk, and confidentiality.

2.6.2 Ordinarily research data is operationally controlled and available for the exclusive use by the individuals and/or teams which generate it through the course of research processes. Research teams would be well-advised to develop formal 'Researcher Protocols' from the outset of their collaboration wherein the all of the terms and conditions pertaining to access to and use of data gathered throughout the collaboration are specified. Additionally, MSVU-affiliated researchers and research teams engaging in contract and/or contracted services research need to be alert to contract provisions pertaining to data sharing, release, and ownership which may compromise intellectual freedom, intellectual property rights, and provisions of collective agreements.

2.6.3 Research data generated with the support of public funds such as awards from the national research councils are subject to the expectation that, once the researcher or research team is finished with the data, it will be placed within a data archive that provides public accessibility. Such public release of data requires that researchers and research teams must prepare the data respecting the UREB and Tri-Council provisions concerning attributes such as subject confidentiality and risk. Otherwise, researchers and research teams must inform themselves about and comply with any provisions respecting data storage, retention, and sharing that may be specified within the terms and conditions of research funding.

3. Research and Scholarly Misconduct

MSVU considers adherence to and championship of the highest standards of research and scholarly integrity, as noted in the Principals of Practice (Section 2), to be a community, a departmental/program, and an individual duty and responsibility. As such, the University community will not tolerate any form of intentional scholarly and/or research misconduct. Such misconduct compromises the very foundation of confidence in University-sited research and

scholarship and threatens and tarnishes the reputations of all comprising the University community. This policy is designed to promote academic integrity at MSVU by providing information about the meaning of research integrity, how to foster and achieve research integrity, and the consequences of breaching research integrity.

The primary responsibility for expressing high standards in the conduct of research and scholarship rests with the researchers and scholars. The University community also has an obligation to ensure as far as possible that research and scholarship are conducted ethically. In addition, the best interests of individuals, disciplines, the University community, and the public are served by assurances that the conduct of research and scholarship fosters confidence respecting the knowledge and understandings arising from these critically important activities.

Consistent with the spirit and substance of the University as a self-regulating community of scholars, professionals and students, every member of the University community must be prepared to accept responsibility for assuring personal and community adherence to the highest standards of academic integrity in research and scholarly activity. This responsibility engages with and is expressed through the following practices:

- 3.1. Each member of the community must be willing to invoke the approved procedures, specified in Section 6 below, in any case where there is a reasonable suspicion and evidence of research and/or scholarly misconduct.
- 3.2. The community's members must respect those of our colleagues who do fulfill their individual responsibility by invoking the approved procedures for behaving responsibly in circumstances that are difficult for all concerned.
- 3.3. Finally, the community's members must respect the principles of fairness, so as to protect researchers and scholars from malicious or spurious allegations.

Mount Saint Vincent University will not tolerate any form of intentional misconduct in the pursuit of research and scholarly objectives by members of the University community. It will take appropriate measures to maintain an environment that promotes research and scholarly integrity. Further, it will take accusations of misconduct in relation to research and scholarly activity very seriously. To this end, MSVU will act, as quickly as possible, to determine their validity and to invoke the appropriate procedures. In so doing, the University will seek to protect the integrity of academic research and scholarship and the rights of all of its members. At the same time, the University recognizes that not all actions that fail to meet the highest standards of research and scholarship constitute misconduct. **Misconduct in relation to research and scholarly activity is related to and involves a conscious and deliberate deception or action.** Even in such instances, it is recognized that research and scholarly misconduct may express degrees of seriousness. Conversely, misconduct in relation to research and scholarly activity shall not include any matter involving honest differences of opinion and/or honest errors of judgment. Finally, the MSVU community is committed to resolving issues in a collegial, equitable, transparent, accountable, and timely manner.

The University has undertaken to define its policies and expectations with regard to academic integrity in a manner consistent with encouraging the highest standards of research and scholarship. The University regards as misconduct any conscious or deliberate action that is

inconsistent with integrity. These principles of academic integrity overlap with other areas, such as financial integrity in the use of research funds and the ethical issues involving the use of human or animal subjects in research, for which the University has established guidelines and requirements. This document is concerned only with research and scholarly integrity, and does not replace any other statements from the University on other areas with which this issue may overlap.

4. Misconduct

Mount Saint Vincent University expects that all members of the University community to comport themselves with respect to the highest standards of behaviour in the conduct of research and scholarship. Conscious and deliberate misconduct is a violation of the principles of intellectual honesty and academic freedom, and would include activities such as the misappropriation of writings, research, and discoveries of others. Specifically, conscious and deliberate misconduct includes, but is not limited to:

- 4.1. fabrication of data, and/or falsification of results;
- 4.2. failure to include as authors all those who have made a significant intellectual contribution to the research, including students;
- 4.3. the inclusion as authors those who have not made a significant intellectual contribution to the research and publication (so-called 'honorary authorship' is unacceptable);
- 4.4. failure to recognize by due acknowledgement within publications and research dissemination activities the substantive contributions of others to the research such as students, blind peer reviewers, editorial reviewers;
- 4.5. failure to recognize all sources of research funding support;
- 4.6. selective reporting of data, including the purposeful omission of conflicting data, with the intent to falsify results or to mislead the reader;
- 4.7. plagiarism involving the appropriation and employment of another's words, information, creative work, intellectual property, and/or ideas without public provision of credit, citation, and/or other forms of acknowledgement;
- 4.8. taking advantage of one's privileged position through the unauthorized use of information, such as violation of confidentiality in peer review of unpublished papers, research proposals and other funding applications;
- 4.9. the use of unpublished work such as data, manuscripts and/or proposals of other researchers and scholars without their permission;
- 4.10. the use of archival materials in violation of the rules of the archival source respecting use and publication;
- 4.11. deliberate misrepresentation of the work of others;
- 4.12. the extensive use of others' (e.g., individuals, publishing houses, incorporated business) published material such as papers, articles, editorial cartoons, and intellectual property without their explicit permission (usually in written form);
- 4.13. disposing of intellectual property without due benefit to those entitled to some return;
- 4.14. conscious and deliberate violation of research protocols, memoranda of understandings, publication and dissemination agreements, including undertakings with research participants agreed to and specified within official research documents such as signed Letters of Consent;

- 4.15.intentional failure to comply with relevant federal or provincial statutes or regulations for the protection of researchers, human subjects, or the public or for the welfare of animals in research, or intentional failure to satisfy other legal and research ethics requirements that relate to the conduct of research and scholarship (ignorance of or disagreement with same do not constitute an absence of intent);
- 4.16.failure to comply with the Tri-Council Policy Statement for Ethical Conduct Involving Human Research, as outlined in MSVU Policies and Procedures: Ethical Review of Research Involving Humans, or failure to comply with the Canadian Council on Animal Care: Policies and Guidelines, for investigators conducting animal research;
- 4.17.deliberate destruction of one's own research data in order to avoid detection of wrong doing;
- 4.18.tampering with or the destruction of the research process and/or the data of others;
- 4.19.the intentional misuse of funds and resources (e.g., space, equipment, communications) designated for research and scholarship purposes;
- 4.20.engaging in verbal and/or physical behaviors intended to intimidate colleagues and/or community members for the purpose of obtaining favorable decisions and/or compliances;
- 4.21.falsification or misrepresentation of credentials; or other intentionally misleading practices in proposing, conducting, or reporting research, including failure to reveal to subjects that they are participating in a research process;
- 4.22.failure to reveal to the sponsors any material conflict of interest when asked to undertake reviews of research grant applications, manuscripts for publication, and/or to test products for sale or distribution to the public;
- 4.23.failure to reveal to the University any material financial interest, direct or indirect, in a company that contracts with the University to undertake research, particularly research involving the company's products. Material financial interests include ownership, substantial stock holding, a directorship, significant honoraria or consulting fees, but does not include minor stock holding in a large publicly traded company; and,
- 4.24.failure to reveal to the University any professional conflict of interest in a company or organization that contracts with the University to undertake research.

5. Policies and Procedures for Addressing Allegations of Misconduct

5.1. Guiding Principles

Policies and procedures respecting allegations of research and scholarly misconduct must respond in a balanced way. Also, the University must be diligent in providing its community members with the opportunity to access information and learning opportunities as an essential step in assisting community members to define what constitutes proper practice and to ensure that integrity in research and scholarship is maintained. These principles are designed to reflect a number of important values, and to balance those values appropriately where they come into conflict. The guiding principles are:

- 5.1.1. While we all have a fundamental commitment to integrity in the conduct of research and scholarly activity, there will be diversity of perspectives across disciplines with respect to the attributes and qualities of research and scholarly conduct.

- 5.1.2. We need policies that are sensitive to the reality that misconduct in relation to research and scholarly activities can vary widely in both nature and cause. This means that the policies and procedures must allow realistic responses to a continuum of culpability that might range from an honest but mistaken view of the propriety of a particular practice, through behaviour that reflects various degrees of carelessness or negligence, to the extreme case of calculated misrepresentation, plagiarism, or fraud.
- 5.1.3. We need procedures that ensure fairness to those whose integrity is brought into question. In particular, privacy and confidentiality for such persons must be assured, where appropriate, to minimize the damage that can be done by aspersions on research and scholarly integrity that are ultimately not substantiated. A related value that the procedures must reflect is that of speedy investigation and disposition of complaints, so that scholarly reputations are not damaged by clouds of suspicion.
- 5.1.4. There is a need to protect those who set the process in motion or otherwise assist in dealing with complaints. This should involve appropriate assurances of confidentiality within the institution, together with institutional reaffirmation of the impropriety of any form of retaliation against those persons. We must also guard against the risk of confidentiality and anonymity becoming cloaks for malice or injustice. The balance we seek is one that recognizes that the values of confidentiality and anonymity may have to yield to the equally important value of integrity in any case where evidence of scholarly and research misconduct can only be evaluated by clearly identifying the source of the allegation.

5.2. Procedures

The policies and procedures specified below have been developed with the above-mentioned principles, and their underlying values, in mind.

- 5.2.1. Whenever possible, MSVU encourages adoption of informal resolution processes as a means to address perceived research and scholarship misconduct. Formal notification of misconduct may be communicated to any MSVU academic administrative officer. Such messages should then be communicated to the Associate Vice-President (Research). The Associate Vice-President (Research), when notified of misconduct, will ask those involved whether they would welcome informal mediation as an early intervention and resolution service. If welcomed, the Associate Vice-President (Research) will appoint an Independent Integrity Mediator as described in Section 5.2.3 tasked with the responsibility of assisting those involved to resolve their difficulties to the satisfaction of all parties.
- 5.2.2. All allegations of misconduct in research and/or scholarship shall be made in writing, signed, dated and directed to the Associate Vice-President (Research). Anonymous allegations will not be accepted. If the Associate Vice-President (Research) is the Respondent(s), then the Vice-President (Academic) shall appoint a designate. The Associate Vice-President (Research) may consult in confidence and without identifying the parties involved with members of the Committee on Research and Publication in order to determine the particulars of conduct norms and practices of the academic discipline(s) involved.

- 5.2.3. Before initiating MSVU's formal procedures, the Associate Vice-President (Research) will ask the Complainant(s) and the Respondent(s) whether they will welcome informal mediation. If all parties agree, the Associate Vice-President (Research) will nominate a Professor Emeritus appointee or senior full professor, either of the MSVU University Community or, in the event that an MSVU appointee is unavailable, of another University community to assume the responsibilities of an Independent Integrity Mediator for the purposes of seeking informal resolutions that may underlie allegations of research and scholarly misconduct. The nominee will not be affiliated with either the parties involved or the parties' academic department(s). All parties to the allegation must agree with the nomination. The Independent Integrity Mediator will be nominated ordinarily within five (5) working days following receipt of the written allegation.
- 5.2.4. The Independent Integrity Mediator shall employ any and all means judged appropriate for arriving at mutually agreeable resolutions ordinarily within ten (10) working days.
- 5.2.5. In circumstances where mutually agreeable resolutions have been achieved, the Independent Integrity Mediator will communicate this outcome in writing ordinarily within five (5) working days to the Associate Vice-President (Research). In the event of satisfactory mediation outcomes, the party alleging research and/or scholarly misconduct is required to withdraw the allegation(s) formally and in writing. No further action will ensue, and all records of the allegation(s) will be destroyed.
- 5.2.6. In circumstances where mutually agreeable resolutions have not been achieved, the Independent Integrity Mediator will communicate this outcome in writing ordinarily within five (5) working days to the Associate Vice-President (Research). Once in receipt of this communication the Associate Vice-President (Research) will invoke MSVU's research and/or scholarly misconduct procedures, beginning with 5.2.9.
- 5.2.7. Whether agreeably resolved or not, under no circumstances will the Independent Integrity Mediator communicate or provide to the Associate Vice-President (Research) or designate or any other administrative officer or person any materials gathered or notes taken during the mediation processes or personal opinions respecting any aspect of the allegations or parties involved in the alleged research and scholarly misconduct.
- 5.2.8. Allegations originating with external agencies, institutions, or individuals in appropriate positions of authority (e.g., journal editors) shall be treated as formal complaints.
- 5.2.9. In order to determine if a formal investigation is warranted, the Associate Vice-President (Research) will strike an Independent Committee of Inquiry within a reasonable period of time of the Independent Integrity Mediator's communication. This Committee will be composed of three (3) members all of whom will be scholars/researchers without any known affiliations with the University and its community. At least one Committee member will be a practitioner within the discipline(s) involved so as to assure Committee knowledge of discipline-related norms, rules and practices. A Committee Chair will be designated by the members of the Committee.

- 5.2.10. This Committee will be appointed for and tasked with the responsibility of determining whether accusations of scholarly/research misconduct are substantive. The Committee will be provided with copies of all pertinent documents and will be enabled by the University to engage whatever measures it judges appropriate for the assurance of a thorough and equitable investigation of the alleged misconduct.
- 5.2.11. Once struck the Committee must complete its investigation within a reasonable period of time, and communicate the findings of its investigation and recommendations in a written report to the Associate Vice-President (Research). This report shall include: a copy of the signed allegation(s); the written response, if any, of the Respondent(s); and, the finding as to whether the allegation(s) has been upheld or not with a statement of reasons for the finding. Additionally, all documents and materials examined through the course of the Committee investigation are to be returned to the Associate Vice-President (Research).
- 5.2.12. Should the Committee conclude that a formal investigation is not warranted, all documents and materials pertaining to the allegation(s) are to be destroyed and no reference to the complaint shall be placed or retained in the personnel file of the Respondent(s). In cases of unfounded allegations, the University will provide the unjustly accused with a letter formally acknowledging this outcome and that affirms the meritorious attributes of the accused's reputation and research conduct.
- 5.2.13. Should the Committee find that the accusations of scholarly/research misconduct are substantive, and if the Respondent(s) is a member of bargaining unit represented by the Mount Saint Vincent Faculty Association (MSVUFA), the Associate Vice-President (Research) shall inform the member's Dean and Vice-President (Academic) of her/his findings. In such cases, the provisions of Article 34 of the Collective Agreement shall be invoked.
- 5.2.14. If the Associate Vice-President (Research) finds that the accusations of scholarly/research misconduct are substantive and formal action is warranted, and the Respondent(s) is not a member of the Mount Saint Vincent Faculty Association, but is either a member of another MSVU union or representative organization or not covered within an existing University-representative organization contract (e.g., a contract employee), she/he shall request the Vice-President (Academic) to initiate formal action/investigation.
- 5.2.15. The Vice-President (Academic) shall give written notice within five (5) working days to the Respondent(s) and the Complainant(s) that a formal investigation is to be held. The written notice shall include a copy of the signed allegation(s).
- 5.2.16. The Vice-President (Academic) shall strike an Independent Committee of Inquiry within fifteen (15) working days composed of three senior University researchers/scholars without any affiliation with MSVU. A Committee Chair will be designated by the Committee members. The Committee will be constituted by the Vice-President (Academic) within a reasonable period of time of the written notice of the formal investigation communicated by the Vice-President (Academic) to the Respondent(s) and the Complainant(s).
- 5.2.17. The Committee shall undertake to investigate the allegation(s) promptly, fairly and judiciously, and in a confidential manner, ensuring that the Respondent(s) has

adequate opportunity to know any evidence presented and to respond to that evidence if she/he chooses to do so. If deemed by the Committee as necessary and appropriate, the Complainant(s) and Accused may be provided with an opportunity to meet and to discuss the complaint.

- 5.2.18. Within a reasonable period of time (ordinarily 40 working days) following the commencement of the formal investigation, the Committee shall prepare a written report of the investigation. This report shall include: a copy of the signed allegation(s); the written response, if any, of the Respondent(s); and, the finding as to whether the allegation(s) has been upheld or not with a statement of reasons for the finding. This report will be submitted to the Vice-President (Academic). The Committee has the authority to decide on misconduct, and the Committee's decision on the matter is binding on the University. In cases of unfounded allegations, the Committee may provide the University with advice and recommendations respecting the efforts the University should undertake to protect or restore the reputation of those unjustly accused.
- 5.2.19. Ordinarily, five (5) working days after receipt of the Committee report, the Vice-President (Academic) will communicate to the Respondent(s) the disciplinary action she/he proposes to impose, if any. Copies of the Committee report will accompany the communication of disciplinary action. Copies of these documents will also be forwarded to the Associate Vice-President (Research). The Vice-President (Academic) shall also inform the Complainant(s) in writing of the outcome of the inquiry.
- 5.2.20. In cases in which the findings are sufficiently serious to consider dismissal proceedings, the Vice-President (Academic) will submit the report of the findings to the President. Ordinarily, within ten (10) working days of receipt of this report, the Respondent(s) will be given an opportunity to meet with the President in the presence of the Vice-President (Academic).
- 5.2.21. If the Respondent(s) is a member of the MSVUFA, then the provisions of Article 34 of the Collective Agreement shall apply.
- 5.2.22. If the Respondent(s) is a member of a bargaining unity other than the MSVUFA, any applicable provisions of their Collective Agreement shall apply.
- 5.2.23. If no satisfactory solution is reached at this meeting, the President shall decide the matter ordinarily within five (5) working days of the meeting.
- 5.2.24. If the University decides, following mediation, formal investigation, and discussion, not to take disciplinary action against the Respondent(s), the University shall remove and destroy all documentation concerning the allegation(s).
- 5.2.25. Where applicable, any member of the Mount Saint Vincent University Community retains her/his rights to grieve any alleged violation of their collective agreement that may arise in the application of these policies and procedures.
- 5.2.26. If the Respondent(s) are MSVU students, they will be subject to discipline and/or dismissal as specified within the University's academic rules and procedures.
- 5.2.27. If an accusation of misconduct in research is sustained in relationship to research that is funded by an outside agency, the President shall inform the agency of the final decision. More specifically:

- if the investigation was requested by the Agency, a full copy of the report should be sent to the Agency, whether or not misconduct is concluded to have occurred, within 30 days of the conclusion of the investigation; or
- if the investigation was initiated internally, within the institution, and misconduct was found to have occurred in research funded by one or more of the Agencies, the institution should provide the Agency with a copy of the report; and
- a statement respecting how Agency funding will be protected (e.g., funds will be withheld until the matter is resolved should misconduct be confirmed and the situation warrants such action).

5.2.28. Where misconduct has been found, all documents pertaining to the matter will be stored only in the Vice-President (Academic) confidential and secure files.

6. Promoting Integrity in Research and Scholarship

MSVU fosters research and scholarship integrity, through the office of the Associate Vice-President (Research), by encouraging faculty, departments, programs, and other community members to discuss and to debate the meaning and importance of research and scholarship integrity. Materials pertaining to and information concerning research and scholarship integrity are circulated within the University Community. Additionally, the Associate Vice-President (Research) will initiate an annual workshop intended, among other objectives, to review MSVU's guidelines, policies, and procedures and to facilitate discussion and consciousness. All departments and programs are encouraged to engage faculty, students and staff in educational processes respecting discipline and professional standards of practice for and understanding of research and scholarly integrity.

Additional Resources

MSVU Policies and Procedures: Ethics Review of Research Involving Humans
MSVU Faculty Association – Collective Agreement

Policy Resources

2000 - The following sources were extensively consulted in preparation of the original draft:

- CAUT (prepared by Donald Savage). Fraud and Misconduct in Academic Research and Scholarship, February, 1994
- Medical Research Council of Canada, Natural Sciences and Humanities Research Council of Canada, and Social Sciences and Humanities Research Council of Canada. Integrity in Research and Scholarship, January 1994.
- University of Ottawa, School of Graduate Studies. Guidelines for the Ethical Conduct of Research and Procedures for Investigating Misconduct, 1992.
- University of New Brunswick. Collective Agreement between University of New Brunswick and University of New Brunswick Faculty Association.
- University of Western Ontario. Guide to the Proper Conduct of Research, Draft Revision, URB Subcommittee, 1994.
- Wilfred Laurier University. Collective Agreement between Wilfred Laurier University and Wilfred Laurier University Faculty Association, July, 1993.

2006 - The following sources have been extensively consulted in preparation of revisions to this document:

- Tri-Council Policy Statement: Integrity in Research and Scholarship (January 1994)
http://www.nserc.ca/professors_e.asp?nav=profnav&lbi=p9
- SSHRC – Integrity in Research and Scholarship (2003 – web page last updated)
http://www.sshrc.ca/web/apply/policies/integrity_e.asp
- University of Western Ontario – Policy and Procedures for the Conduct of Research (October 2001) <http://www.uwo.ca/univsec/mapp/section7/mapp70.pdf>
- Saint Mary’s University: Policy Statement on Integrity in Research and Scholarship and Procedures for Reporting and Investigating Scholarly Misconduct (May 1995)
<https://fgsr.smu.ca/Publications/Research/Policies/integrity.doc>
- McGill University: Policy on Ethics in Research and Research Training (1997)
<http://www.mcgill.ca/researchoffice/policies/sponsored/policies/training/>
- York University: Misconduct in Academic Research (1994)
<http://www.yorku.ca/secretariat/legislation/senate/miscndct.htm>
- Dalhousie University: Integrity in Scholarly Activity (2001)
<http://www.senate.dal.ca/listall.cfm?policy>
- Carleton University: Policies and Procedures for Dealing with Allegations of Misconduct in Research http://www.gs.carleton.ca/ors/misconduct_in_research.html
- University of Toronto

Notes:

- Approved by Senate: March 27, 1995
- Revised: May 2000 (Section 1.2(h) was modified). Approved by Senate
- Revised: 2008, Approved by Senate on September 29, 2008

Appendix 1 - Scan of Procedures and Practices in Other Universities

University	Early Med	Complaint Recipient and Action	Formal Med	Allegation Investigator and Actions	Allegation Report and Actions	Formal Panel to Investigate and Composition	Outcomes and Process
McGill (Medicine)	No	Dean • Preliminary assessment • If yes, to Standing Committee of Inquiry	No	Standing Committee of Inquiry Dean, VP (Research), VP (Academic), Scientific Director of Research Institute • Assess substance to allegations • Decide if formal investigation is warranted	Report to Dean	• Membership of an ad hoc Investigation Committee (may include non-McGill members) • Dean appoints Committee	Dean receives Report Section 9 Academic Employment Regulations
U of T (Medicine)	No	Chair, Dean, VPs, Provost • Administrator receiving the allegation activates the process and takes the lead role	Yes, if concerns publication credits	'Administrator' • Assess allegation evidence	Report to Dean	Investigating Committee • Appointed by Dean • 3 or more members • may have members from outside the University	Report to the Dean Dean informs other Administrators of outcomes Dean initiates actions
Carleton U	No	VP (Research and International) but directed to the Committee on Research Integrity	No	Committee on Research Integrity Dean (Grad Studies and Research) is Chair and one representative from each of the Faculties)	Reports to VP (Research and International)	Committee on Research Integrity completes formal investigation	Findings and Recs to VP (Research and International) • Initiates actions • Collective Agreement
U of Manitoba	Claimant to assure not misunderstanding	Dean or Director (other Administrators)	No	Research Administrator and Dean of Graduate Studies to conduct inquiry	VP (Academic) and Provost	VP (Academic) appoints a Committee to Investigate • 3 members • all from within the University	Report to VP (Academic) VP (Academic) to President President to Board of Governors Collective Agreement
U of WO	Yes, encouraged by all parties before going	Individual Responsible for Receiving (IRR) Formal Complaints Under the Discipline Procedure Governing the Respondent(s). Informs University	No	IRR received formal complaint IRR investigates complaint Re: Collective Agreement provisions	Collective Agreement University Secretariat	Collective Agreement	

	formal. IRR invites and initiates mediation. Mediator reports to University Secretariat.	Secretariat when formal complaint filed					
SMU	No	University Research Officer	Yes, by URO	URO determines substance and recommends	VP (Research and Academic)	VP sets an Investigative Committee composed of 3 members • may include one or more from outside the University	Reports to VP VP to President Actions re: Collective Agreement
Dal U.	No	VP (Academic and Research)	No	VP determines substance and recommends	VP (Research and Academic) Collective Bargaining Agent	Procedure as per 5.2.6 Collective Agreement	President
UofAlberta	No	VP (Academic) and Provost – adjudicator, Dean of Faculty – associate adjudicator	No	Complaint Guidance Committee adjudicator, associate adjudicator and VP (Research)	If Investigation is warranted, Section 96.2.9 (1-4) authorizing adjudicator investigates	Procedure as per Collective Agreement	Procedures as per Collective Agreement
UBC	No	VP (Research)	No	VP (Research) assesses merits	Appoints Investigative Committee if warranted • 3 experienced academics • a max of 1 from outside	VP (Research)	President and Dean Collective Agreement