



THE UNIVERSITY OF BRITISH COLUMBIA

Report to the Board of Governors

SUBJECT AMENDMENTS TO POLICY #85 (SCHOLARLY INTEGRITY) AND THE ASSOCIATED PROCEDURES

MEETING DATE April 3, 2013

Forwarded to the Board of Governors on the
Recommendation of the President

**APPROVED FOR
SUBMISSION**



President Stephen J. Toope, President and Vice-Chancellor

DECISION REQUESTED IT IS HEREBY REQUESTED that *the UBC Board of Governors approve the proposed amendments to Policy #85 (Scholarly Integrity) (the "Policy"), effective immediately.*

Presented By Hubert Lai, University Counsel
John Hepburn, Vice-President Research & International

Report Date March 7, 2013

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

The Policy sets out the responsibilities of those conducting scholarly activity at the University, and establishes a process by which breaches of those responsibilities will be addressed. The proposed amendments update and clarify the University's expectations with regard to scholarly integrity and the process for dealing with allegations of scholarly misconduct, and specifically address the updated requirements that have been issued by the Tri-Council granting agencies.

The proposed amendments to the Policy have been developed by a Policy Review Committee under the oversight of the Office of the University Counsel. They create no legal or governmental liabilities.

Approval of these proposed amendments to the Policy is within the statutory powers of the Board of Governors and no governmental approvals are required.

Place and Promise COMMITMENT	The proposed amendments to the Policy support: The Research Excellence commitment - Increase the quality and impact of UBC's research and scholarship
Place and Promise ACTION	In support of the commitments to research excellence, the proposed amendments to the Policy: Enhance infrastructure to support leading edge research
Description & Rationale	In February of 2012, the Tri-Council granting agencies informed the University of two changes in the eligibility requirements for institutions, one of which was that a new <i>Tri-Agency Framework: Responsible Conduct of Research</i> would replace the <i>Tri-Council Policy Statement: Integrity in Research and Scholarship</i> and its <i>Framework for Tri-Council Review of University Policies Dealing with Integrity in Research</i> . The new Framework specifically requires that the University “develop and administer a policy(ies) to address allegations of policy breaches by researchers that meets the minimum requirements set out in the Framework” and that the University apply “this policy(ies) to all research conducted under its auspices or jurisdiction.” Since the University already had in place a policy that addressed the issue of the responsible conduct of research (Policy 85 – <i>Scholarly Integrity</i>), a new policy did not need to be developed. However, the existing policy did require some amendments to meet the new minimum requirements set out in the Framework. Furthermore, the Policy has not undergone a substantive review since its inception in January 1995, and therefore a general review and update was in order in any event.
SCHEDULE Implementation Timeline	If approved, the proposed amendments would take effect immediately.

CONSULTATION
Relevant Units,
Internal & External
Constituencies

The Office of the University Counsel convened a policy review committee to undertake a comprehensive review of the Policy. The Policy Review Committee is comprised of the following members:

- Kimberley Beck, Legal Counsel (Chair)
- Farzad Aminravan, PhD student, Mechanical Engineering, UBC Okanagan
- Peter Burns, Professor Emeritus, Law
- Helen Burt, Associate Vice-President, Research and International
- Laurel Evans, Associate Director, Ethics, Research Services
- Miriam Grant, Dean – College of Grad Studies/Vice Provost Research, UBC Okanagan
- Karen Hodges, Canada Research Chair, UBC Okanagan
- Linda McKnight, Director – Advisory Services, Human Resources
- Ben Paylor, PhD student, Experimental Medicine, UBC Vancouver
- Susan Porter, Dean Pro Tem. Graduate Studies
- Maureen Webb, Senior Manager, Faculty Relations


The Policy Review Committee prepared the proposed amendments presented to the Board of Governors at its meeting on December 4, 2012. The proposed amendments were published for public comment on the Office of the University Counsel website and an email was sent to the “Heads Up” Email list regarding the Call for Comments. In total, the Policy Review Committee received five responses.

The Policy Review Committee reviewed all of the responses in detail, and made a number of changes to address the concerns raised by the University community. The Policy Review Committee unanimously supports the proposed amendments. A summary of the comments received and a comparison of the pre- and the post-consultation versions of the proposed amendments are included as Attachment 3.

Previous Report Date	December 4, 2012	Decision	N/A
-----------------------------	------------------	-----------------	-----

Discussion Points	N/A
--------------------------	-----

Action / Follow Up	Publication for public comment.
---------------------------	---------------------------------

 <p>The University of British Columbia Board of Governors</p>	<p>Policy No.: 85</p>	<p>Approval Date: January 1995 Last Revision: [March 2013 anticipated]</p>
	<p>Responsible Executive: Vice President, Research</p>	
<p>Title: Scholarly Integrity</p>		
<p>Background & Purposes:</p> <p>The University recognizes that teaching, research, scholarship and creative activity are most likely to flourish in a climate of academic freedom. The University will strive to provide an environment that supports the best research and academic practices and that fosters UBC Persons’ abilities to act honestly, accountably, openly and fairly in the search for, and dissemination of, knowledge. The University community has always recognized the necessity for maintaining the highest ethical standards in the conduct of Scholarly Activities. UBC Persons are expected to assume direct responsibility for the intellectual and ethical quality of their work.</p> <p>The purposes of this Policy are:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - to promote scholarly integrity among UBC Persons; - to promote education on, and awareness of, the importance of the responsible conduct of scholarly activity; - to proscribe activities which breach generally acceptable standards of scholarly conduct; - to reflect the requirements set out in the <i>Tri-Agency Framework: Responsible Conduct of Research</i>; and - to provide a process for dealing with allegations of Scholarly Misconduct. 		

1. Scope

1.1. This Policy applies to all UBC Persons who engage in Scholarly Activity.

2. Promoting Scholarly Integrity

2.1. UBC Persons shall strive to follow the best research and academic practices honestly, accountably, openly and fairly in the search for and in the dissemination of knowledge. In addition, UBC Persons shall follow the requirements of all applicable University and other policies and professional or disciplinary standards and shall comply with applicable laws and regulations. At a minimum, UBC Persons are responsible for the following:

2.1.1. Using a high level of rigour in proposing and performing research; in recording, analyzing, and interpreting data; and in reporting and publishing data and findings;

2.1.2. If they are a principal investigator in any research project, ensuring that the research conditions applicable to the research project are adequately articulated in writing and disseminated to all members of the research team prior to engagement in the project. The written conditions should include a clear description of agreed upon ownership of the products of the research, including but not limited to ownership of the research data;

- 2.1.3. Keeping complete and accurate records of data, methodologies and findings, including graphs and images, in accordance with any applicable funding agreement, University policies, applicable laws, regulations, and professional or disciplinary standards, in a manner that will allow verification or replication of the work by others. This includes recording all primary data in clear, adequate, original and chronological form, and retaining primary data in a repository from which it cannot be removed, regardless of ownership. Data should be retained for at least five years after the work is published or otherwise presented (if the form of the data permits this, and if assurances have not been given that data would be destroyed to assure anonymity). Data should be retained in its original medium, or transferred to a secondary medium provided that the transfer process is fully validated, the person who transfers the data from the original to the secondary medium attests that the secondary documents are true copies of the respective primary data, including any and all notations, corrections, or other changes made to the original data prior to the creation of the secondary documents;
- 2.1.4. Referencing and, where applicable, obtaining permission for the use of all published and unpublished work, including data, source material, methodologies, findings, graphs and images;
- 2.1.5. Including as authors, with their consent, all those and only those who have materially or conceptually contributed to, and share responsibility for, the contents of the document, in a manner consistent with their respective contributions and the authorship policies of relevant publications;
- 2.1.6. Acknowledging, in addition to authors, all contributors and contributions, including writers, funders and sponsors;
- 2.1.7. Ensuring that all inventors listed on a patent application have made an inventive contribution to the invention;
- 2.1.8. If they hold a supervisory position, taking an active role in supervising and training new UBC Persons on the responsible conduct of Scholarly Activity;
- 2.1.9. Appropriately managing any real, potential or perceived conflict of interest, in accordance with the University's policy on conflict of interest and in accordance with the applicable conflict of interest requirements of any funders;
- 2.1.10. Providing true, complete and accurate information in their funding applications and related documents and representing themselves, their research and their accomplishments in a manner consistent with the norms of the relevant field;
- 2.1.11. Complying with the policies of any applicable funders when using grant or award funds, and for providing true, complete and accurate information on documentation for expenditures from grant or award accounts;
- 2.1.12. Ensuring that others listed on applications for funding have agreed to be included;
- 2.1.13. Complying with all applicable requirements and legislation for the conduct of research; and
- 2.1.14. Being proactive in rectifying any Scholarly Misconduct, for example, by correcting the research record, providing a letter of apology to those impacted by the Scholarly Misconduct, or repaying funds.

- 2.2. The Vice-President will publish public statistical annual reports on confirmed findings of breaches of this Policy and any actions taken, subject to applicable laws, including the privacy laws.

3. **Scholarly Misconduct**

- 3.1. UBC Persons involved in Scholarly Activity must not commit Scholarly Misconduct.
- 3.2. “Scholarly Misconduct” means conduct that deviates from that which is acceptable within the relevant scholarly community, and includes, but is not limited to:
 - a. Plagiarism;
 - b. re-publication or re-submission of one’s own previously published or submitted work or part thereof, or data, in the same or another language, without adequate acknowledgment of the source, or justification;
 - c. Fabrication or Falsification;
 - d. conflict of scholarly interest, such as suppressing the publication of the work of another scholar;
 - e. the dishonest evaluation of another’s Scholarly Activity;
 - f. an unfair and unjustified evaluation of a student’s work;
 - g. failure to comply with the University’s policies and procedures on research;
 - h. failure to obtain all required approvals for research (including research involving animal and human subjects, biohazards, radioisotopes, and environmental effects), or failure to conduct such research in accordance with the protocols prescribed;
 - i. conduct that contravenes guidelines or procedures on scholarly integrity that are adopted by a faculty for scholarly communities within that faculty;
 - j. failure to give appropriate recognition, including authorship, to those who have made a material intellectual contribution to the contents of the publication or research project, and only those people;
 - k. failure to equitably allocate interest of inventorship in proportion to the intellectual contribution of the contributors;
 - l. the use of unpublished work of other researchers and scholars without proper permission or without due acknowledgement;
 - m. the use of archival material in contravention of the rules of the archives;
 - n. prior to public disclosure, the use of new information, concepts or data originally obtained through access to confidential manuscripts or applications for funds for research or training as a result of processes such as peer review without obtaining permission of the author;
 - o. failure to use rigour and integrity in obtaining and analyzing data, and in reporting and publishing results;

- p. failure to comply with the terms and conditions of funders when applying for and using research funds;
- q. Breaches of Tri-Agency Policies;
- r. failure to disclose to the University, journals, funders or those requesting opinions, any conflict of interest, financial or other, that might influence their decisions on whether the individual should be asked to review manuscripts or applications, test products or be permitted to undertake work funded by outside sources; and
- s. failure to respect the intellectual property rights of others in the conduct of research, the development of academic materials, and the dissemination of results,

but does not include situations of: honest and reasonable error; conflicting data; valid differences in experimental design; or in interpretation or evaluation of information.

- 3.3. The University will investigate allegations of Scholarly Misconduct made against those to whom this Policy applies in accordance with the procedures established under this Policy.
- 3.4. All UBC Persons are personally responsible for the intellectual and ethical quality of their work and must ensure that their Scholarly Activity meets University standards. However, UBC Persons who have failed to exercise reasonable care in directing and supervising UBC Persons who have committed Scholarly Misconduct may share in the responsibility and be subject to discipline accordingly.
- 3.5. Acts of Scholarly Misconduct may be committed with varying degrees of intent. It is recognized that the borderline between scholarly incompetence, carelessness and negligence, on the one hand, and intentional dishonesty, on the other, may be very narrow. The result is objectionable in any case, even if different degrees of discipline are appropriate.
- 3.6. The University will not tolerate any retaliation, directly or indirectly, against anyone who, in good faith, makes an allegation, gives evidence, or otherwise participates in a process under this Policy.

4. Definitions

- 4.1. “Breaches of Tri-Agency Policies” means any breach of Tri-Agency policy as defined in the *Tri-Agency Framework: Responsible Conduct of Research*, and includes, but is not limited to: breaches of the Tri-Agency Research Integrity Policy; misrepresentation in an Agency application or related document; mismanagement of grants or award funds; and breaches of Agency policies or requirements for certain types of research.
- 4.2. “Fabrication” means making up data, source material, methodologies or findings, including graphs and images.
- 4.3. “Falsification” means manipulating, changing, or omitting data, source material, images, or findings.
- 4.4. “Plagiarism” means presenting and using another’s published or unpublished work, including theories, concepts, data, source material, methodologies or findings, including graphs and images, as one’s own, without appropriate referencing and without permission.

- 4.5. “Scholarly Activity” means teaching, research, scholarship or artistic/creative activity carried out in the course of a UBC Person’s work or studies at the University and includes activities that would be appropriate for inclusion on a curriculum vitae or in an Annual Report to a Department Head.
- 4.6. “Scholarly Misconduct” has the meaning provided in section 2.2 of this Policy.
- 4.7. “Secretariat on Responsible Conduct of Research” means the body that administers the *Tri-Agency Framework: Responsible Conduct of Research* on behalf of the Tri-Agencies.
- 4.8. “Tri-Agency” and “Tri-Council Agency” means the Canadian Institutes of Health Research (CIHR), the Natural Sciences and Engineering Research Council (NSERC), and the Social Sciences and Humanities Research Council (SSHRC), collectively.
- 4.9. “*Tri-Agency Framework: Responsible Conduct of Research*” means the policy addressing integrity in research and scholarship issued by the Tri-Council Agencies.
- 4.10. “UBC Persons” means full-time and part-time faculty and staff of the University, and any other person who teaches, conducts research, or works at or under the auspices of the University (including but not limited to students, adjunct and sessional faculty, librarians, program directors, post-doctoral fellows, emeriti and those holding a visiting appointment).
- 4.11. “Vice-President” means the Vice-President Research & International.

PROCEDURE

Approved: May 2001

Revised: [March 2013 anticipated]

Pursuant to Policy #1: Administration of Policies, "Procedures may be amended by the President, provided the new procedures conform to the approved policy. Such amendments are reported at the next meeting of the Board of Governors and are incorporated in the next publication of the UBC Policy and Procedure Handbook."

1. General

- 1.1. The University will exercise its authority and discretion under these Procedures in conformity with the principles of procedural fairness in the university context.
- 1.2. The complainant and the respondent may have a representative or support person present at any time during the process outlined under these Procedures. Members of unions and employee associations have all rights to representation that their collective agreements confer.
- 1.3. All matters relating to Scholarly Misconduct, including confidential enquiries, allegations of Scholarly Misconduct, and information related to allegations, are to be sent to the Vice-President. The Vice-President is normally sufficiently at arm's length so as to be viewed as impartial and free of personal conflicts of interest. If the Vice-President determines that it would be inappropriate to address a particular allegation for whatever reason, the allegation may be referred to the Vice-President, Academic who will then assume all of the responsibilities of the Vice-President under these Procedures.
- 1.4. The University respects the sensitive nature of the information that individuals may provide under these Procedures. Such information will only be disclosed to those who need the information to properly deal with the matters that have been raised, or to external agencies to which the University is required to provide such information, such as the Tri-Council Secretariat on Responsible Conduct of Research. All records are maintained by the University in accordance with the *B.C. Freedom of Information and Protection of Privacy Act* and other applicable laws and orders of the Courts, and other bodies having jurisdiction over such matters.

2. Allegations

- 2.1. An allegation of Scholarly Misconduct may come from various sources inside or outside the University. For example, the allegation may come from a UBC Person, a granting source, a member of the general public, a media report, or an anonymous source.
- 2.2. The ability of the University to investigate an allegation may be hampered if it is from an anonymous source, or if an allegation is not made in writing, and in some cases the University may be unable to proceed.
- 2.3. Subject to any applicable laws, including privacy laws, the University will advise the relevant Tri-Council Agency or the Secretariat on Responsible Conduct of Research immediately if it receives any allegations related to activities funded by a Tri-Council Agency that may involve significant financial, health and safety, or other risks. In cases where the source of funding is unclear, the University may be obligated to provide information to the Secretariat on Responsible Conduct of Research.

3. Authority of the Vice-President

- 3.1. In the case of multiple allegations involving the same respondent(s), the Vice-President may consolidate the allegations. In cases of collaborative research involving other institutions, the Vice-President may modify these Procedures to facilitate the conduct of parallel or joint investigations or as otherwise deemed appropriate by the Vice-President.
- 3.2. At any time, the Vice-President may do any or all of the following in relation to an allegation:
 - a. close down and declare “off limits” facilities used for the Scholarly Activity that is the subject matter of the allegation;
 - b. protect the administration of University and outside funds involved in the Scholarly Activity that is the subject matter of the allegation by freezing grant accounts, requiring a second authorized signature from a University representative on all expenses charged to the respondent’s grant accounts, or other measures as appropriate;
 - c. obtain and retain relevant documentation (e.g. lab notes, computer disks, hard drives, proof of credentials); and
 - d. take such other action as the Vice-President deems appropriate in order to ensure that evidence is preserved and that further possible misconduct or damage cannot occur while the process outlined under these Procedures is carried out.

4. Inquiry

- 4.1. Upon receipt of an allegation, the Vice-President will conduct an inquiry to establish whether an allegation is responsible and whether an investigation is warranted. A responsible allegation is one that is made in good faith, which is based on matters which have not been the subject of a previous allegation, and which falls within the jurisdiction of the Policy. As part of the inquiry, the Vice-President may do any or all of the following:
 - a. inquire into the allegation further;
 - b. request that the relevant unit of the University review the allegation, or some aspect of the allegation, and report to the Vice-President; and
 - c. appoint an individual(s) to review the allegation, or some aspect of the allegation, and report to the Vice-President.
- 4.2. At the conclusion of the inquiry, the Vice-President may do any or all of the following:
 - a. dismiss the allegation, or some aspect of the allegation;
 - b. appoint an Investigative Committee to investigate the allegation, or some aspect of the allegation; and
 - c. take such other action as the Vice-President deems appropriate.
- 4.3. At the conclusion of the inquiry, the Vice-President will inform the complainant and the respondent, and their respective Deans, Directors or Department Heads, of the outcome of the inquiry. In cases where the Secretariat on Responsible Conduct of Research was copied on the allegation, or where the

Secretariat was advised of the allegation by the Vice-President as set out under section 2.3 above, the Vice-President will also write to the Secretariat confirming whether or not the University is proceeding with an investigation of the allegation.

4.4. The inquiry process will normally be completed within two months of receipt of the allegation.

5. Investigation

- 5.1. If the Vice-President has determined that an investigation is warranted, he or she will appoint an Investigative Committee comprised of three individuals, at least one of whom will be external with no current affiliation with the University. The members of the Investigative Committee must be without conflict of interest, whether real or apparent, and must include members who have the necessary expertise.
- 5.2. The mandate of the Investigative Committee is to investigate the allegation and determine on a balance of probabilities whether Scholarly Misconduct has occurred, and if so, its extent and severity, and the degree of intent on the part of the respondent. The determination is made by majority vote.
- 5.3. The complainant and the respondent will be provided with an opportunity to be heard as part of the investigation. The Investigative Committee may also review any Scholarly Activity relevant to the allegation, including any abstracts, papers or other methods of scholarly communication. A special audit of accounts may also be performed on any relevant sponsored research accounts.
- 5.4. The Investigative Committee has the right to examine any University documents and question any UBC Person during its investigation. All UBC Persons must cooperate fully with the Investigative Committee and make available any documents requested by the Investigative Committee.
- 5.5. The Investigative Committee must attempt to ensure that it is cognizant of all real or apparent conflicts of interest on the part of those involved in the investigation, including both the complainant and the respondent.
- 5.6. The Investigative Committee may seek impartial expert opinions and advice, as it deems necessary or appropriate, to ensure the investigation is thorough and authoritative.
- 5.7. In the investigation process, the respondent has the right to know the allegation under investigation and to respond fully.
- 5.8. The investigation will normally be completed within three months of the Vice-President appointing an Investigative Committee to investigate an allegation.

6. Report of the Investigative Committee

- 6.1. Upon completion of its investigation, the Investigative Committee will prepare a written report addressed to the Vice-President including its determination as to whether Scholarly Misconduct occurred and its recommendations. The report will contain:
 - a. the allegation;
 - b. a list of the witnesses interviewed and a summary of the information they provided;
 - c. a summary of the relevant material reviewed;

- d. findings of fact based on the information gathered during the investigation;
 - e. a determination as to whether Scholarly Misconduct occurred;
 - f. if Scholarly Misconduct has occurred, a determination as to its extent and severity, and the degree of intent on the part of the respondent; and
 - g. recommendations on any remedial action to be taken and/or changes to procedures or practices to avoid similar situations in the future.
- 6.2. Recommendations of the Investigative Committee may include, without limitation:
- a. withdrawing any relevant articles, papers or other documents that have been submitted for publication but not yet published;
 - b. notifying publications in which any relevant Scholarly Activity was reported;
 - c. ensuring that the units involved are informed of appropriate practices for promoting scholarly integrity;
 - d. informing any outside funders of the results of the investigation and of actions to be taken; and
 - e. any other appropriate action to be taken, other than discipline.
- 6.3. The Investigative Committee will normally deliver its report to the Vice President, and to the complainant and the respondent, within one month of the completion of its investigation.

7. Recourse and Accountability

- 7.1. If the Investigative Committee determines that Scholarly Misconduct has not occurred, the Vice-President will make a final decision on what action, if any, is necessary in light of the Investigative Committee's report and will send a copy of the report and communicate that decision to the President, and to the complainant and the respondent and their respective Deans, Directors, or Department Heads, as appropriate. In such instances, every reasonable effort will be made by the Vice-President to protect or restore the reputation of the respondent as appropriate. The Vice-President will normally make a final decision and communicate that decision within one month of receipt of the Investigative Committee's report.
- 7.2. If the Investigative Committee determines that Scholarly Misconduct has occurred, the Vice-President will forward the Investigative Committee's report:
- a. In the case of a student, to the President. Taking into account the severity of the breach, the President will make a final decision as to what discipline or other action, if any, is appropriate and will send a copy of the report and communicate that decision in writing to the student, the student's Dean, and the Vice-President. The President will normally make a final decision and communicate that decision within one month of receipt of the Investigative Committee's report.
 - b. In the case of a faculty member, to the relevant Dean and the President. Taking into account the severity of the breach, the Dean or the President (consistent with the provisions of any relevant collective agreement) will make a final decision as to what discipline or other action, if any, is appropriate and will send a copy of the report and communicate that decision in writing to the


faculty member, the Dean (if the President made the final decision) or the President (if the Dean made the final decision), and the Vice-President. The Dean or the President will normally make a final decision and communicate that decision within one month of receipt of the Investigative Committee's report.

- c. In the case of a staff member, to the relevant Director or Department Head. Taking into account the severity of the breach, the Director or Department Head (consistent with the provisions of any relevant collective agreement) will make a final decision as to what discipline or other action, if any, is appropriate and will send a copy of the report and communicate that decision in writing to the staff member, the President, and the Vice-President. The Director or Department Head will normally make a final decision and communicate that decision within one month of receipt of the Investigative Committee's report.

- 7.3. Subject to any applicable laws, including privacy laws, the University will prepare a report for the Secretariat on Responsible Conduct of Research on each investigation it conducts in response to an allegation of Scholarly Misconduct related to a funding application submitted to a Tri-Council Agency or to an activity funded by a Tri-Council Agency. In cases where the source of funding is unclear, the University may be obligated to provide information and/or a report to the Secretariat on Responsible Conduct of Research.

8. Appeal

- 8.1. Students may appeal any decision or discipline that is made or imposed under these Procedures through the UBC Vancouver Senate Student Appeals on Academic Discipline Committee or the UBC Okanagan Senate Appeals of Standing and Discipline Committee.
- 8.2. Staff or faculty may appeal any decision or discipline that is made or imposed under these Procedures through the provisions of their collective agreements or their terms and conditions of employment.

 The University of British Columbia Board of Governors	Policy No.: 85	Approval Date: January 1995 Last Revision: [April 2013 anticipated]
	Responsible Executive: Vice-President, Research	
Title: <p style="text-align: center;">Scholarly Integrity</p>		
Background & Purposes: <p>The University is committed to providing an environment that supports the best research and scholarly practices and that fosters UBC Persons' abilities to act honestly, accountably, openly and fairly in the search for and dissemination of knowledge. The University community has always recognized the necessity for and importance of maintaining the highest ethical standards in the conduct of Scholarly Activities, and all UBC Persons are expected to uphold these standards. UBC Persons are personally and directly responsible for the intellectual and ethical quality of their work.</p> <p>The purposes of this Policy are:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - to meet the requirements set out in the <i>Tri-Agency Framework: Responsible Conduct of Research</i>; - to articulate the responsibilities and standards required of UBC Persons engaged in Scholarly Activity; and - to provide a process for dealing with allegations of Scholarly Misconduct. 		

1. Scope

1.1. This Policy applies to all UBC Persons who engage in Scholarly Activity.

2. Responsibilities

- 2.1. UBC Persons are responsible for familiarizing themselves with the scholarly standards and practices that are generally accepted within the relevant scholarly field and following them honestly, accountably, openly and fairly. Generally accepted scholarly standards and practices include:
- 2.1.1. complying with the requirements of all applicable funding applications and agreements, University and other policies, standards of the relevant profession or discipline, and laws and regulations;
 - 2.1.2. using a high level of scholarly rigour and integrity in proposing and performing research; in recording, analyzing, and interpreting data; and in reporting and publishing data and findings;
 - 2.1.3. if they are a principal investigator in any research project, ensuring that the research conditions applicable to the research project, including compensation and practices around supervision, authorship and recording data, are properly articulated in writing and disseminated to all members of the research team prior to engagement in the project. Templates for such documents are available from the Faculty of Graduate Studies at UBC Vancouver and the College of Graduate Studies at UBC Okanagan;

- 2.1.4. keeping complete and accurate records of data, methodologies and findings, including graphs and images, in a manner that will allow verification or replication of the work by others. This includes recording all primary data in clear, adequate, original and chronological form, and retaining it in a repository from which it cannot be removed. The principal investigator is responsible for the collection, maintenance and retention of research data. Records of data should normally be retained in the unit in which they are produced for at least five years after the work is published or otherwise presented (if the form of the record or data permits this, and subject to any assurances that data would be destroyed to assure anonymity). Records should be retained in their original medium, or transferred to a secondary medium provided that the transfer process is fully validated, and the person who transfers the data from the original to the secondary medium attests that the secondary documents are true copies of the respective original record including any and all notations, corrections, or other changes made to the original record prior to the creation of the secondary documents. In the case of collaborative research all those involved in the conduct of the research will have access to the data (subject to any assurances that access to the data would be restricted to assure anonymity), and will normally be allowed to make copies of the record. Such access may be restricted only when a request to do so is made in writing and approved by the Vice-President;
- 2.1.5. engaging in original work, and referencing (and, where applicable, obtaining permission for) the use of all published and unpublished work, including data, source material, methodologies, findings, graphs and images;
- 2.1.6. including as authors, with their consent, all those and only those who have made a material intellectual contribution to, and share responsibility for, the contents of the document, in a manner consistent with their respective contributions and the authorship policies of relevant publications;
- 2.1.7. acknowledging, in addition to authors, all contributors and contributions to research, including writers, funders and sponsors;
- 2.1.8. ensuring that all inventors listed on a patent application have made an inventive contribution to the invention, and all inventive contributors are listed;
- 2.1.9. appropriately disclosing and managing any real, potential or perceived conflict of interest, in accordance with the University's policy on conflict of interest and the applicable conflict of interest requirements of any funders;
- 2.1.10. ensuring that others listed on applications for funding have agreed to be included, providing true, complete and accurate information in their applications for funding and related documents (such as letters of support or progress reports), and representing themselves, their research and their accomplishments in a manner consistent with the scholarly standards and practices that are generally accepted within the relevant scholarly field;
- 2.1.11. providing true, complete and accurate information on documentation for expenditures from grant or award accounts;
- 2.1.12. obtaining any necessary approvals, permits or certifications before conducting certain types of research, such as research involving humans or animals; and

- 2.1.13. being proactive in rectifying any Scholarly Misconduct, for example, by correcting the research record, providing a letter of apology to those impacted by the Scholarly Misconduct, or repaying funds.

3. **Scholarly Misconduct**

- 3.1. UBC Persons involved in Scholarly Activity must not commit Scholarly Misconduct.
- 3.2. “Scholarly Misconduct” means conduct that breaches the scholarly standards and practices that are generally accepted within the relevant scholarly field. This may include a failure to meet any of the expectations set out in section 2.1 of this Policy, and also includes the following:
 - 3.2.1. Fabrication or Falsification;
 - 3.2.2. the destruction of one’s own or another’s research data or records to specifically avoid the detection of wrongdoing or in contravention of any applicable funding agreements, University or other policies, standards of the relevant profession or discipline, or laws and regulations;
 - 3.2.3. Plagiarism;
 - 3.2.4. Self-Plagiarism;
 - 3.2.5. inaccurate attribution, including attribution to persons other than those who made a material intellectual contribution to an invention or to the contents of a publication or research project, or agreeing to be listed as an inventor on a patent application or as an author or contributor to a publication or research project to which one made no material intellectual contribution; and
 - 3.2.6. failure to appropriately recognize or acknowledge the contributions of others in a manner consistent with their respective contributions and, if applicable, consistent with the authorship policies of relevant publications,but does not include situations of: honest and reasonable error; conflicting data; valid differences in experimental design; or in interpretation or evaluation of information.
- 3.3. The University will investigate allegations of Scholarly Misconduct made against those to whom this Policy applies in accordance with the procedures established under this Policy.
- 3.4. All UBC Persons are personally and directly responsible for the intellectual and ethical quality of their work and must ensure that their Scholarly Activity meets the requirements of all applicable funding agreements, University or other policies, standards of the relevant profession or discipline, and laws and regulations. However, UBC Persons who have failed to exercise reasonable care in directing and supervising UBC Persons who have committed Scholarly Misconduct may share in the responsibility and be subject to discipline accordingly.
- 3.5. Acts of Scholarly Misconduct may be committed with varying degrees of intent. It is recognized that the borderline between scholarly incompetence, carelessness and negligence, on the one hand, and intentional misconduct, on the other, may be very narrow. The result is Scholarly Misconduct in any case, although the degree of intent may be a mitigating factor in determining the appropriate consequences.
- 3.6. UBC Persons are expected to report in good faith any information pertaining to possible Scholarly Misconduct to the University, and must cooperate fully with the University in any process under this

Policy. The University will not tolerate any retaliation against anyone who, in good faith, makes an allegation, gives evidence, or otherwise participates in a process under this Policy.

4. Definitions

- 4.1. “Fabrication” means making up data, source material, methodologies or findings, including graphs and images, and recording or reporting them.
- 4.2. “Falsification” means manipulating, changing, or omitting data, source material, methodologies, or findings, including graphs and images, without acknowledgement, and which results in inaccurate recorded or reported findings or conclusions.
- 4.3. “Plagiarism” means presenting and using another’s published or unpublished work, including theories, concepts, data, source material, methodologies or findings, including graphs and images, as one’s own, without appropriate referencing.
- 4.4. “Scholarly Activity” means research, scholarship, or artistic/creative activity carried out in the course of a UBC Person’s work or studies at the University and includes activities that would be appropriate for inclusion on a curriculum vitae or in an Annual Report to a Department Head, but does not normally include research and scholarship carried out by students that is not intended for publication.
- 4.5. “Scholarly Misconduct” has the meaning provided in section 3.2 of this Policy.
- 4.6. “Secretariat on Responsible Conduct of Research” means the body that administers the *Tri-Agency Framework: Responsible Conduct of Research* on behalf of the Tri-Agencies.
- 4.7. “Self-Plagiarism” means the reuse of one’s own previously written work or part thereof, or data, whether published or unpublished, in a new written product without adequate acknowledgement of the previous use.
- 4.8. “Tri-Agency” and “Tri-Council Agency” means the Canadian Institutes of Health Research (CIHR), the Natural Sciences and Engineering Research Council (NSERC), and the Social Sciences and Humanities Research Council (SSHRC), collectively.
- 4.9. “*Tri-Agency Framework: Responsible Conduct of Research*” means the policy addressing integrity in research and scholarship issued by the Tri-Council Agencies.
- 4.10. “UBC Persons” means those participating in Scholarly Activity at or under the auspices of the University. This includes faculty (including adjunct, clinical, and sessional faculty, emeriti, lecturers, and those holding visiting appointments), librarians, staff, post-doctoral fellows, and students.
- 4.11. “Vice-President” means the Vice-President Research & International.

PROCEDURE

Approved: May 2001

Revised: [April 2013 anticipated]

*Pursuant to Policy #1: Administration of Policies, "Procedures may be amended by the President, provided the new procedures conform to the approved policy. Such amendments are reported at the next meeting of the Board of Governors."
Note: the most recent procedures may be reviewed at <http://universitycounsel.ubc.ca/policies/index/>.*

1. General

- 1.1. The University will exercise its authority and discretion under these Procedures in conformity with the principles of procedural fairness in the university context.
- 1.2. The respondent or any party involved in an investigation may have a representative or support person present at any time during the process outlined under these Procedures. Members of unions and employee associations have all rights to representation that their collective agreements confer.
- 1.3. All matters relating to Scholarly Misconduct, including confidential enquiries, allegations of Scholarly Misconduct, and information related to allegations, are to be sent to the Vice-President. The Vice-President is normally sufficiently at arm's length so as to be viewed as impartial and free of personal conflicts of interest. If the Vice-President determines that it would be inappropriate to address a particular allegation for whatever reason, the Vice-President may refer the allegation to the Vice-President, Academic who will then assume all of the responsibilities of the Vice-President under these Procedures.
- 1.4. The University respects the sensitive nature of the information that individuals may provide under these Procedures. Such information will only be disclosed in accordance with these Procedures or as otherwise authorized by law. All records are maintained by the University in accordance with the *B.C. Freedom of Information and Protection of Privacy Act* and other applicable laws and orders of the Courts, and other bodies having jurisdiction over such matters.

2. Allegations

- 2.1. An allegation of Scholarly Misconduct may come from various sources inside or outside the University. For example, the allegation may come from a UBC Person, a granting source, a member of the general public, a media report, or an anonymous source.
- 2.2. The ability of the University to investigate an allegation may be hampered if it is from an anonymous source, or if an allegation is not made in writing, and in some cases the University may be unable to proceed.
- 2.3. The Vice-President will advise the relevant Tri-Council Agency or the Secretariat on Responsible Conduct of Research immediately if any allegations are received that are related to activities funded by a Tri-Council Agency that may involve significant financial, health and safety, or other risks. The notification will include the name of the UBC Person alleged to have committed the Scholarly Misconduct and the nature of the allegation.

3. Authority of the Vice-President

- 3.1. In the case of multiple allegations involving the same respondent(s), the Vice-President may consolidate the allegations. In cases of collaborative research involving other institutions, the Vice-President may modify these Procedures to facilitate the conduct of parallel or joint investigations or as otherwise deemed appropriate by the Vice-President.
- 3.2. At any time, the Vice-President may take such action as the Vice-President deems appropriate in order to protect the administration of University and outside funds, ensure that evidence is preserved, or prevent further possible misconduct or damage while the process outlined under these Procedures is carried out, including any or all of the following:
 - 3.2.1. closing down and declaring “off limits” facilities used for the Scholarly Activity that is the subject matter of the allegation;
 - 3.2.2. freezing grant accounts or requiring a second authorized signature from a University representative on all expenses charged to the respondent’s grant accounts; and
 - 3.2.3. obtaining and securing relevant documentation (such as lab notes, electronically stored information or electronic storage devices, and proof of credentials).

4. Inquiry

- 4.1. Upon receipt of an allegation, the Vice-President will conduct an inquiry to establish whether an allegation is responsible and whether an investigation is warranted. A responsible allegation is one that is made in good faith, is based on matters which have not been the subject of a previous allegation, and falls within the jurisdiction of the Policy. As part of the inquiry, the Vice-President may do any or all of the following:
 - 4.1.1. inquire into the allegation further;
 - 4.1.2. request that the relevant unit of the University review the allegation, or some aspect of the allegation, and report to the Vice-President; and
 - 4.1.3. appoint an individual(s) to review the allegation, or some aspect of the allegation, and report to the Vice-President.
- 4.2. At the conclusion of the inquiry, the Vice-President may do any or all of the following:
 - 4.2.1. dismiss the allegation, or some aspect of the allegation;
 - 4.2.2. appoint an Investigative Committee to investigate the allegation, or some aspect of the allegation; and
 - 4.2.3. take such other action as the Vice-President deems appropriate, including referring the matter to another appropriate University office.
- 4.3. At the conclusion of the inquiry, the Vice-President will inform the respondent and the respondent’s Dean, Director or Department Head in writing as to whether or not the University is proceeding with an investigation of the allegation. The Vice-President will also normally inform the party who made the allegation and, if the party is a UBC Person, the party’s Dean, Director or Department Head.

- 4.4. If the Secretariat on Responsible Conduct of Research was advised of an allegation under section 2.3 above, the Vice-President will also advise the Secretariat as to whether or not the University is proceeding with an investigation of the allegation.
- 4.5. The inquiry process will normally be completed within two months of receipt of the allegation.

5. Investigation

- 5.1. If the Vice-President has determined that an investigation is warranted, he or she will appoint an Investigative Committee comprised of three individuals, at least one of whom will be external with no current affiliation with the University. The members of the Investigative Committee must be without conflict of interest, whether real or apparent, and must include members who have the necessary expertise.
- 5.2. The mandate of the Investigative Committee is to investigate the allegation and determine on a balance of probabilities whether Scholarly Misconduct has occurred and if so, its extent and severity, and the degree of intent on the part of the respondent. The determination is made by majority vote.
- 5.3. The Investigative Committee may investigate the allegation using any means it deems appropriate in the circumstances, subject to the principles of procedural fairness in the university context. Such means may include the following:
 - 5.3.1. requesting written submissions from the respondent and any other parties with information that might be relevant to the allegations, including the party who made the allegation;
 - 5.3.2. interviewing the respondent and any other parties with information that might be relevant to the allegations, including the party who made the allegation;
 - 5.3.3. obtaining documents relevant to the allegation;
 - 5.3.4. requesting audits of any relevant sponsored research accounts; and
 - 5.3.5. consulting with other University offices or seeking impartial expert opinions and advice.
- 5.4. In all investigations, the respondent will be informed of the allegation being made against them, and will be given an opportunity to reply.
- 5.5. At the outset of each investigation, the Investigative Committee will inform the respondent of the process and timelines it intends to follow.
- 5.6. All UBC Persons must cooperate fully with the Investigative Committee and make available any documents requested by the Investigative Committee.
- 5.7. The investigation will normally be completed within three months of the Vice-President appointing an Investigative Committee to investigate an allegation.

6. Report of the Investigative Committee

- 6.1. Upon completion of its investigation, the Investigative Committee will prepare a written report that includes the following information:
 - 6.1.1. the allegation;

- 6.1.2. a list of the parties who provided information and a summary of the information they provided;
 - 6.1.3. a summary of the relevant documents and other material reviewed;
 - 6.1.4. findings of fact based on the information gathered during the investigation;
 - 6.1.5. a determination as to whether Scholarly Misconduct occurred;
 - 6.1.6. if Scholarly Misconduct is found to have occurred, a determination as to its extent and severity, and the degree of intent on the part of the respondent; and
 - 6.1.7. recommendations on any remedial action to be taken and/or changes to University procedures or practices to avoid similar situations in the future.
- 6.2. Recommendations of the Investigative Committee under section 6.1(g) may include:
- 6.2.1. withdrawing any relevant articles, papers or other documents that have been submitted for publication but not yet published;
 - 6.2.2. notifying publications in which any relevant Scholarly Activity was published or reported;
 - 6.2.3. notifying relevant outside funders;
 - 6.2.4. ensuring that the units involved are informed of appropriate practices for promoting scholarly integrity; and
 - 6.2.5. any other appropriate action to be taken, other than discipline.
- 6.3. The Investigative Committee will normally deliver its report to the Vice-President and to the respondent within one month of the completion of its investigation.
- 6.4. Upon receipt of the report from the Investigative Committee, the Vice-President will normally send a copy of the report to the party who made the allegation.

7. Recourse and Accountability

- 7.1. If the Investigative Committee determines that Scholarly Misconduct has not occurred, the Vice-President will make a final decision on whether any remedial action is necessary, and will communicate that decision in writing along with a copy of the report to the President and the respondent, and when appropriate to the one who made the allegation, and any relevant Deans, Directors, or Department Heads. In such instances, reasonable efforts will be made by the Vice-President to protect or restore the reputation of the respondent as appropriate.
- 7.2. If the Investigative Committee determines that Scholarly Misconduct has occurred, the Vice-President will forward the Investigative Committee's report:
- 7.2.1. In the case of a faculty member or a librarian, to the relevant Dean(s) and the President. Taking into account the severity of the breach, the Dean(s) or the President (consistent with the provisions of any relevant collective agreement) will normally consult with the Vice-President and then make a final decision as to what discipline or other action, if any, is appropriate, and will send a copy of the report and communicate that decision in writing to the faculty member

or librarian, the Dean(s) (if the President made the final decision) or the President (if the Dean(s) made the final decision), and the Vice-President.

- 7.2.2. In the case of a staff member, to the relevant Director, Department Head, Dean, or appropriate Vice-President. Taking into account the severity of the breach, the Director, Department Head, Dean, or appropriate Vice-President (consistent with the provisions of any relevant collective agreement or terms and conditions of employment) will normally consult with the Vice-President and then make a final decision as to what discipline or other action, if any, is appropriate, and will send a copy of the report and communicate that decision in writing to the staff member, the President, and the Vice-President.
- 7.2.3. In the case of a postdoctoral fellow, to the relevant Department Head. Taking into account the severity of the breach, the Department Head will normally consult with the Vice-President and then make a final decision as to what discipline or other action, if any, is appropriate, and will send a copy of the report and communicate that decision in writing to the postdoctoral fellow, the postdoctoral fellow's Dean, the President, and the Vice-President.
- 7.2.4. In the case of a student, to the President. Taking into account the severity of the breach, the President will normally consult with the Vice-President and then make a final decision as to what discipline or other action, if any, is appropriate, and will send a copy of the report and communicate that decision in writing to the student, the student's Dean, and the Vice-President.
- 7.3. All final decisions under sections 7.1 and 7.2 will normally be made and communicated within one month of receipt of the Investigative Committee's report.
- 7.4. If the Investigative Committee determines that Scholarly Misconduct has occurred, the Vice-President may report the Scholarly Misconduct to other parties as deemed appropriate, including relevant outside funders, publications in which the relevant Scholarly Activity was reported or to which it was submitted, or those UBC Persons affected by the Scholarly Misconduct.
- 7.5. The Vice-President will prepare a report for the Secretariat on Responsible Conduct of Research on each investigation it conducts in response to an allegation of Scholarly Misconduct related to a funding application submitted to a Tri-Council Agency or to an activity funded by a Tri-Council Agency. The report will include the information required by the Secretariat on Responsible Conduct of Research, as set out under the reporting requirements in the *Tri-Agency Framework: Responsible Conduct of Research*.
- 7.6. The Vice-President will publish anonymized, statistical annual reports on confirmed findings of breaches of this Policy and any actions taken.

8. Appeal

- 8.1. Student respondents may appeal any discipline that is imposed under these Procedures through the UBC Vancouver Senate Student Appeals on Academic Discipline Committee if they are a UBC Vancouver student or the UBC Okanagan Senate Appeals of Standing and Discipline Committee if they are a UBC Okanagan student.
- 8.2. Faculty, librarian, and staff respondents may appeal any discipline that is imposed under these Procedures through the grievance procedures of their collective agreements or their terms and conditions of employment, if applicable.

Policy #85: Summary of Responses to Call for Comments

Committer #	Description of Comment	Committee Recommendations	Applicable Section
1	F1: Delete the words “and only those people”. F2: Supportive of the language on data handling.	F1: No changes recommended. The section has been deleted entirely for other reasons, so this comment no longer applies. F2: -	F1: [was Policy 3.2(j)] F2: Policy 2.1.3
2	F1: Correct section reference. F2: Clarity needed regarding the types of student scholarly activity that fall under this Policy vs. the types of student scholarly activity that fall under the academic misconduct provisions of the calendars.	F1: Agreed. Change made. F2: Agreed. The definition of Scholarly Activity was amended to provide more clarity.	F1: Policy 4.5 F2: Policy 4.4
3	F1: Definition of scholarly activity is confusing. F2: Definition of UBC Persons incomplete. F3: Unclear as to who makes referral to VP Academic. F4: Wording implies that all student academic discipline falls under this Policy. F5: Rights of the individual to privacy under Canadian legislation not addressed.	F1: Agreed in part. The definition was reviewed extensively and some changes were made for clarification. F2: Definition amended for other reasons, but changes clarify the jurisdiction of the Policy. F3: Agreed. Amended to clarify. F4: No changes recommended. Changes made to definitions clarify the jurisdiction of the Policy. F5: No changes recommended. Applicable legislation always applies to all University policies.	F1: Policy 4.4 F2: Policy 4.4 and 4.10 F3: Procedures 1.3 F4: Procedures 1.3 F5: Procedures 5.4

Policy #85: Summary of Responses to Call for Comments

Committer #	Description of Comment	Committee Recommendations	Applicable Section
	<p>F6: Would be helpful to have Investigative Committee make a non-binding recommendation as to appropriate level of discipline.</p> <p>F7: Deans, Directors and Department Heads should be involved earlier in the process than after Investigative Committee report is issued.</p> <p>F8: Would be helpful to have Vice-President make a non-binding recommendation as to appropriate level of discipline.</p> <p>F9: Discipline section regarding faculty does not reflect the fact that Faculty Relations and Faculty Association are likely to be involved.</p> <p>F10: Deans should also be informed if staff is disciplined.</p> <p>F11: Would like ability to disclose scholarly misconduct to those directly affected if an individual may be leaving the University.</p>	<p>F6: No changes recommended. Committee members may not have any experience with discipline, so should not make recommendations.</p> <p>F7: No changes recommended. Policy already provides for earlier notice, after inquiry complete.</p> <p>F8: Agreed. Amended discipline sections to include consultation with Vice-President.</p> <p>F9: No changes recommended. Policy is not intended to outline disciplinary process in detail, but simply state who ultimately holds the power to impose discipline for scholarly misconduct.</p> <p>F10: Agreed. Dean added to list of those informed.</p> <p>F11: Agreed. Added section regarding disclosure to affected parties.</p>	<p>F6: Procedures 6.1</p> <p>F7: Procedures 4.3</p> <p>F8: Procedures 7.2.1-7.2.4</p> <p>F9: Procedures 7.2.1</p> <p>F10: Procedures 7.2.4</p> <p>F11: Procedures 7.4</p>

Policy #85: Summary of Responses to Call for Comments

Committer #	Description of Comment	Committee Recommendations	Applicable Section
4	<p>F1: Unclear whether the list of practices that all UBC Persons are responsible for following is intended to act as a code of conduct, such that a failure to follow them would be subject to discipline.</p> <p>F2: The elements of “procedural fairness in the University context” that will apply to investigations under the Policy (e.g. notice of investigation, right to representation, and right to respond to the case made against them) should be defined.</p> <p>F3: Powers granted to the Vice-President to protect funds, preserve evidence, or prevent further damage while the inquiry and investigation are carried out should be limited as they conflict with the Collective Agreement (they could be deemed a suspension, which only the President is empowered to impose).</p> <p>F4: Advance notice in writing of investigation should be provided.</p> <p>F5: The respondent should be given access to the evidence and an opportunity to respond prior to a decision by the Investigative Committee.</p>	<p>F1: Agreed. Amendments made to ensure that it is clear that a failure to follow those practices may constitute scholarly misconduct.</p> <p>F2: No changes recommended. These elements are already incorporated into the Policy.</p> <p>F3: No changes recommended. The Committee is satisfied that these actions are not a deemed suspension. Framework requires us to act to protect the administration of Agency funds.</p> <p>F4: No changes recommended, as notice was already addressed.</p> <p>F5: Although this used to be addressed by the Investigative Committee once the investigation was initiated, changes were made to the Policy to clarify the investigative process.</p>	<p>F1: Policy 3.2</p> <p>F2: Procedures 1.2, 4.3, 5.4 and 5.5</p> <p>F3: Procedures 3.2</p> <p>F4: Procedures 4.3</p> <p>F5: Procedures 5.3</p>

Policy #85: Summary of Responses to Call for Comments

Committer #	Description of Comment	Committee Recommendations	Applicable Section
	<p>F6: The ability to investigate anonymous complaints should be deleted from the Policy.</p> <p>F7: The right to see and comment on a draft report from the Investigative Committee should be restored.</p> <p>F8: Amend to qualify scope of Investigative Committee’s recommendations to informing all “current and relevant outside funders”.</p> <p>F9: Recommended restoring “grievance procedures” to appeal section.</p> <p>F10: Recommended adding language confirming that the University will hold any adverse recommendations in abeyance pending all appeals.</p>	<p>F6: No changes recommended, as anonymous complaints can still be independently substantiated by the University. Note: anonymous complaints were permitted under the existing policy.</p> <p>F7: No changes recommended, as the parties have the right to present their full case to the investigative Committee, and they have the right to appeal. The right to review the draft is simply an unnecessary additional step in an already rigorous process.</p> <p>F8: Agreed, in part. Amended to all “relevant” funders, as this allows for flexibility to address the particular circumstances of each case.</p> <p>F9: Agreed. Wording added to appeal section.</p> <p>F10: No changes recommended, as there is no basis for such a provision, and the University must ensure that steps are taken to prevent further damage once scholarly misconduct is found.</p>	<p>F6: Procedures 2.2</p> <p>F7: -</p> <p>F8: Procedures 6.2.3</p> <p>F9: Procedures 8.2</p> <p>F10: -</p>

Policy #85: Summary of Responses to Call for Comments

Committer #	Description of Comment	Committee Recommendations	Applicable Section
	F11: The inclusion of “teaching” in the definition of scholarly activity is inconsistent with the Collective Agreement.	F11: The definition of scholarly activity was reviewed generally and teaching was deleted for various reasons. Note: Teaching was included in the existing policy.	F11: Policy 4.4
	F12: Recommended making “Breaches of Tri-Agency Policies” more general to cover all funding agencies.	F12: Agreed, and now have just a general statement regarding compliance with funding agency policies.	F12: Policy 2.1.1
	F13: Questioned impact of change from “honest error despite due diligence” to “honest and reasonable error”.	F13: No changes recommended, as Committee concluded that the error still had to be reasonable despite any due diligence, and that this was the more appropriate standard.	F13: Policy 3.2
	F14: Need to restore language stating that research records must be stored at the University.	F14: Agreed. Wording restored to clarify this issue.	F14: Policy 2.1.4
	F15: Need to restore language about access to data.	F15: Agreed. Wording restored.	F15: Policy 2.1.4
	F16: Supportive of language regarding the need to restore the reputation of those found not to have committed scholarly misconduct.	F16: -	F16: Procedures 7.1
	F17: Supportive of longer but potentially stricter time limits.	F17: -	F17: Procedures 4.5, 5.7, 6.3 and 7.3

Policy #85: Summary of Responses to Call for Comments

Committer #	Description of Comment	Committee Recommendations	Applicable Section
5	<p>F1: Clarity needed regarding the types of student scholarly activity that fall under this Policy vs. the types of student scholarly activity that fall under the academic misconduct provisions of the calendars.</p> <p>F2: Concerned about the potential for ambiguity in certain terms and phrases (e.g., high level of rigour, adequately articulated, material contribution, appropriate referencing).</p> <p>F3: Supportive of inclusion of Self-Plagiarism.</p> <p>F4: Recommended adding examples and consequences of “borderline between scholarly negligence and intentional dishonesty”.</p> <p>F5: Questioned if the Vice-President’s decision to refer an allegation to the VP Academic is reviewable.</p> <p>F6: Recommended adding a provision regarding the responsibility of instructors, supervisors and departments to educate students on scholarly integrity.</p>	<p>F1: Agreed. The definition of Scholarly Activity was amended to provide more clarity.</p> <p>F2: Changes not recommended, as these terms will have different meanings in different contexts but some changes made for other reasons that may help to clarify.</p> <p>F3: -</p> <p>F4: Changes not recommended, as this will have different meanings and outcomes in different contexts. Note: this language was in the existing policy.</p> <p>F5: Changes not recommended as this decision is not reviewable.</p> <p>F6: Changes not recommended as individuals are responsible for familiarizing themselves with the applicable standards, and this is partially addressed in the Policy already.</p>	<p>F1: Policy 4.4</p> <p>F2: Policy 2.1.2, 2.1.3, 4.3</p> <p>F3: Policy 3.2.4</p> <p>F4: Policy 3.5</p> <p>F5: Procedures 1.3</p> <p>F6: Policy 3.4</p>

Policy #85: Summary of Responses to Call for Comments

Commenter #	Description of Comment	Committee Recommendations	Applicable Section
	F7: Recommended adding provisions similar to those used by another university in their academic misconduct policy.	F7: Changes not recommended as this is a scholarly integrity policy and not a student academic misconduct policy.	F7: -
Other Issues Discussed by Committee	<p>Recommended that the list of responsibilities in section 2.1 and the definition of Scholarly Misconduct in section 3.2 be cleaned up to avoid repetition.</p> <p>Removal of need for a “Complainant” in the Investigative Committee process suggested allowing for a true inquiry model of investigation.</p> <p>Addition of specific section for postdoctoral fellows in Recourse and Accountability section suggested.</p>	<p>Agreed.</p> <p>Agreed.</p> <p>Agreed.</p>	<p>Policy 2.1 and 3.2</p> <p>Procedures 5.3</p> <p>Procedures 7.2.3</p>