

---

**INTEGRITY IN RESEARCH AND SCHOLARSHIP POLICY**

Adopted: April initiatives. Dawson w

## 2. Definitions

An **Agency** is a (usually public) body that provides research funding in the form of research grants or scholarships. These include arts councils and research councils for the funding of science (e.g. the Tri-Councils – NSERC, SSHRC, and CIHR, and the Fonds de Recherche du Québec – Nature et Technologie, Santé, and Société et Culture).

A **Researcher** is any Dawson employee who is engaged in an undertaking intended to extend knowledge or establish facts and principles of nature (science) and expression (arts, literature), through a disciplined inquiry or systematic investigation.

**Integrity** is the quality of being honest, incorruptible, impartial and fair. The behaviours that characterize and demonstrate the principles of integrity in research and scholarship are described in section 3.1 below.

**Conflict of interest** is any circumstance in which individuals or their relations may benefit or be perceived as benefiting (directly or indirectly) disproportionately from access to information or from a decision over which they may have influence.

**Misconduct** in research is any action or behaviour that is inconsistent with the *terms of this policy, the TCPS-2 and the PCRR-FRQ and/or violates federal or provincial statutes or regulations. Misconduct may include, but is not limited to, one or more of the following actions:*

- a) Fabrication or falsification of research data or results;
- b) Plagiarism or forgery of documents, including academic credentials;
- c) Failure to appropriately recognize the substantive contributions of students, co-researchers, or other collaborators;
- d) Use of the unpublished works of other researchers and scholars without permission or acknowledgement;
- e)

- b) Obtain the permission of the author before using new information, concepts or data originally obtained through access to confidential manuscripts or other sources of unpublished materials;
- c) Use scholarly and scientific rigour and integrity in obtaining, recording, analyzing and storing data, and in reporting and publishing results;
- d) Ensure that authorship of published work includes all those (and only those) who have materially contributed to, and share responsibility for, the contents of a publication;
- e) Reveal to sponsors, universities, journals or funding agencies, any material conflict of interests, financial or otherwise, that might influence decisions on whether the individual should be asked to review manuscripts or applications, test products or be permitted to undertake work sponsored from outside sources;
- f) Adhere to the terms and conditions of all project funding agreements, and with all official College policies which govern the conduct of research at Dawson;
- g)

3jEMC /LBody /MCIDP/DC -0.053 Tc 0.00-6.7



The principal researcher should

The Academic Dean is responsible for receiving and investigating all allegations of misconduct in research, and for ensuring that due process is followed. If any other College administrator or supervisor is presented with an allegation of misconduct, he/she must refer the complaint to the Academic Dean. This referral is necessary to ensure that all allegations are treated seriously, and in a fair and consistent manner.

### **8.1. Registering an Allegation of Misconduct**

Any individual, inside or outside the institution, can register an allegation of misconduct in research or scholarship with the Academic Dean. If an administrator becomes aware of possible misconduct in research, he/she must register a complaint with the Academic Dean.

Allegations of misconduct which are made to the agencies, about a Dawson researcher, will, likewise, be referred to the Academic Dean. Such allegations might also arise from the peer review processes of the agencies. The agencies will not transmit oral allegations to the institution, or otherwise act upon them, since these cannot be assessed or transferred accurately.

Any complaint which alleges misconduct must be registered with the Academic Dean, in writing, within three months of the all

If the Academic Dean decides to dismiss the allegation, the complainant may formally appeal this decision, in writing, within ten (10) working days of receiving notification of the Dean's decision. Appeals should be addressed to the Director General of the College, who will review the available information, and provide a final ruling on the matter, within ten (10) working days of receiving the appeal.

If the Director General overturns the Academic Dean's decision to dismiss the allegation, then he/she will refer the case back to the Academic Dean, who will be obliged to initiate a formal investigation of the allegation(s), as recommended by the Director General.

### **8.3. Investigation Procedures**

#### **8.3.1. Formal Investigation**

A formal investigation will be undertaken in the event that the allegation of misconduct is found to be admissible.

If the Academic Dean (or Director General) deems it necessary to undertake a formal investigation, then he/she must strike an ad hoc Research Integrity Committee (RIC); and may, depending on the nature, severity or merit of the allegation, ask the Financial Office to temporarily halt the transfer of funds from the grant until the matter is decided.

When its members have been confirmed, the Academic Dean will provide the RIC with all available documentation pertaining to the allegation, and will place the investigation in the charge of the RIC.

The RIC will, from this point, proceed to collect other relevant documentation, and will provide the complainant(s) and respondent(s) with the opportunity to present their version of the facts. In the course of its investigation, the RIC may request additional documentation from relevant College department(s), or interview other individuals involved in, or otherwise associated, with the matter under investigation.

