

## **Integrity in research and scholarship procedure**

### **Parent policy**

Integrity in Research and Scholarship Policy

### **Purpose**

This procedure outlines the enforcement of integrity in research and scholarship at Bow Valley College (BVC), including reporting allegations of misconduct, investigating allegations of misconduct, appealing charges of misconduct, and the protection of interests in cases of alleged misconduct. In addition, the procedures outline best practices researchers and scholars can follow to fulfill the policy's principal objectives.

### **Scope**

Compliance with this procedure extends to all members of the BVC community as well as any individual or group who is conducting research at BVC or with the College community.

### **Compliance**

Employees, contractors, and learners are responsible for knowing, understanding, and complying with

Bow Valley College policies, procedures, and any other attached documentation that relate to their position, employment, or enrolment at the College.

### **Procedures**

#### **1. Promoting Integrity in Scholarship and Research**

- 1.1. Integrity in research and scholarship is fostered by developing awareness among all involved of the need for the highest standards of integrity, accountability, and responsibility. There are three (3) parties involved in promoting integrity in research.

- 1.1.1. Researchers and scholars

- 1.1.1.1. The primary responsibility for high standards of conduct in research and scholarship rests with the individuals carrying out these activities. It is the responsibility of the Principal Investigator or Senior Scholar to ensure that BVC's Policy on Integrity in Research and Scholarship is communicated to their co-investigators, and research personnel. BVC expects that researchers and scholars adhere to the principles detailed in this policy.

- 1.1.2. Bow Valley College

- 1.1.2.1. Promote integrity in research and scholarship through distribution of the research policies and workshops for the BVC community,
- 1.1.2.2. Ensure that research funds will be administered with a high degree of integrity, accountability and responsibility,
- 1.1.2.3. Strive to educate those involved in the collection, recording, citing, reporting and retention of scientific or scholarly material of BVC's high standards of integrity, and
- 1.1.2.4. Promote the understanding of research ethics and integrity issues by making policies readily available to all BVC employees and referring researchers to the policy statements. BVC will also provide information sessions on the principles and practices of scientific integrity for scientists, scholars, visiting graduate students, learners and other trainees, and research personnel.

- 1.1.3. Applied Research & Evaluation

- 1.1.3.1. The Applied Research & Evaluation Lead will be responsible for promoting integrity in research and scholarship.
- 2. Collection and Retention of, and Access to, Research Data**
- 2.1. A complete set of all original research data must be retained by the principal investigator for a period of five (5) years unless otherwise required by, for example, protocols for research involving human subjects.
  - 2.2. Keep all data secure. Errors may be mistaken for misconduct if the primary data are unavailable.
    - 2.2.1. All research data, prior to public dissemination, should be stored in a locked filing cabinet or on a password protected network drive or cloud storage accessible only to the research team.
    - 2.2.2. When stored on a portable device (e.g., laptop) or an external media (e.g., flash drive), all research related materials must be password protected, and the data backed up regularly.
- 3. Authorship and Recognition**
- 3.1. Research teams will designate one author who is responsible for the validity of the entire manuscript. Co-authors will be responsible for the part of the publication to which they have contributed.
  - 3.2. Provide authorship in a manner consistent with researcher contributions and in accordance with the policies of relevant publications.
  - 3.3. In addition to authors, acknowledge all contributors and contributions to research, including writers, research personnel, funders, and sponsors.
- 4. Conflict of Interest**
- 4.1. In compliance with the Tri-Agency Framework: Responsible Conduct of Research, specific procedures to mitigate risks associated with unavoidable conflict of interest are found in BVC's policy dealing with conflict of interest.
  - 4.2. Revealing to BVC, sponsors, post-secondary institutions, journals or funding agencies, any material 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 sponsored from outside sources.
- 5. Reporting of, and Responding to, Allegations of Misconduct**
- 5.1. Integrity in research and scholarship is taken very seriously by BVC. Allegations of misconduct will be responded to through appropriate processes by the Vice President Academic & Chief Learning Officer (refer to the Appendix for the process timeline summary).
  - 5.2. BVC is responsible for investigating allegations of misconduct involving researchers, trainees, or research personnel. BVC will promote the understanding of the issues involved in integrity in research and scholarship, as a means of preventing misconduct.
  - 5.3. Individual collaborators and collaborating organizations may, at the outset of a research partnership, have a number of expectations and understandings regarding the benefits arising from the research, intellectual or physical property, or acknowledgment and remuneration. Charges of misconduct may subsequently arise when there is a perception that these expectations are not being fulfilled.
  - 5.4. Reporting allegations of misconduct.
    - 5.4.1. Allegations may arise from anonymous or identified sources within or outside BVC; the allegations may be well founded, honestly erroneous, or mischievous. Whatever their source, motivation or accuracy, such allegations have the potential to cause great harm

- to the persons accused, to the accuser, to BVC, and to research and scholarship in general.
- 5.4.2. All faculty researchers, learners, research personnel, and employees have an obligation to report to the Vice President Academic & Chief Learning Officer, any circumstances which they believe involve a breach of the Bow Valley College Policy on Integrity in Research and Scholarship.
  - 5.4.3. Reporting misconduct is essential to ensure that the research community maintains both integrity and public confidence in the research enterprise.
  - 5.4.4. As part of the peer review process, peer review committees may identify and report evidence of misconduct. In addition, any BVC employee, learner or member of the public may identify and report evidence of misconduct.
- 5.5. Responding to allegations of misconduct.
- 5.5.1. BVC will investigate possible instances of misconduct in research or scholarship. Actions arising from the investigation may include (1) imposing appropriate sanction in accordance with College policy, and (2) informing the appropriate granting council(s) or funding agency and actions taken.
    - 5.5.1.1. Disciplinary actions for misconduct can range from a warning to dismissal from BVC.
    - 5.5.1.2. In addition, misconduct may be subject to investigation and response by funders and legal authority. In the event that Tri-Council funding is involved, BVC will support and abide by the Tri-Council policies and procedures.
  - 5.5.2. Anonymous allegations will not normally be considered. However, if the evidence is compelling, the Vice President Academic & Chief Learning Office may elect to initiate a preliminary investigation.
  - 5.5.3. The Vice President Academic & Chief Learning Officer will take reasonable steps to protect against retribution or coercion of individuals who report misconduct.
  - 5.5.4. A formal complaint must be made in writing; signed and dated prior to the Vice President Academic & Chief Learning Officer taking any steps against the individual whose conduct is the subject of allegations of misconduct. A complaint may be formulated by any person who has reviewed the relevant information.
  - 5.5.5. A complaint in writing will contain sufficient detail to enable the Respondent to understand the matter under review. The complaint will identify the person or persons who made the allegations if the Vice President Academic & Chief Learning Officer deems that the identification is necessary to evaluate the evidence in the complaint. However, no such person will be identified unless that person has expressly so agreed.
  - 5.5.6. Upon receipt of a written complaint, the Vice President Academic & Chief Learning Officer, will conduct a preliminary review of the complaint, seeking information from relevant sources. Within five (5) working days of receiving the complaint, the Vice President Academic & Chief Learning Officer will discuss the nature of the complaint with the Respondent. The Respondent will be informed of his or her right to have a third party present at this meeting (and any future meetings).
  - 5.5.7. The Vice President Academic & Chief Learning Officer may attempt to resolve complaints that do not warrant an investigation (e.g., carelessness) by meeting with the relevant parties and providing a decision in writing. The complaint will be considered resolved through an informal process when the Complainant and the Respondent confirm that it has been resolved to their satisfaction (resolution, in this context, implies that the complaint is withdrawn and the Complainant and the Respondent unreservedly accept any additional resolution matters).
  - 5.5.8. The Vice President Academic & Chief Learning Officer may, at his or her discretion, determine that the complaint is without foundation and dismiss the complaint. The Vice President Academic & Chief Learning Officer, will immediately notify the Complainant and Respondent, in writing, of the justification for the decision. The

Complainant may appeal the dismissal of the complaint, in writing, to the Vice President Academic & Chief Learning Officer, whose decision regarding complaint dismissal is final.

- 5.5.9. If the Vice President Academic & Chief Learning Officer is unable to resolve the complaint and determines that an investigation is warranted, he or she will refer the complaint to an investigation committee within twenty (20) working days of the receipt of the complaint.

## **6. Investigating Allegations of Misconduct**

- 6.1. An investigation is a formal examination and evaluation of relevant facts to determine whether misconduct has occurred, and if so, to assess its gravity and propose subsequent action.
- 6.2. When referring the complaint to a committee, the Vice President Academic & Chief Learning Officer will appoint committee members to conduct an investigation, will advise the Respondent of the composition of the Committee, and will also advise any person who is identified in the written complaint or who was identified to the Respondent during the preliminary investigation of the complaint. The Committee will be appointed and individuals notified within twenty (20) working days of the receipt of the complaint.
- 6.3. The Committee to conduct an investigation will consist of three (3) independent persons with relevant experience in the area of research and scholarship involved in a particular case. No member of the department / school involved shall be among the persons appointed. The Committee must include at least one (1) individual external to BVC. In addition, the Respondent or Committee may request that a representative of the Executive of the BVC Faculty Association (BVCFA) or the BVC Alberta Union of Provincial Employees (AUPE) be present as a participating but non-voting member of the Committee to conduct an investigation, provided this individual is not in any conflict of interest situation with either the Respondent or the Complainant.
- 6.4. The Complainant and Respondent will be given an opportunity to comment on the composition of the Committee to conduct an investigation and any objection will be made to the Vice President Academic & Chief Learning Officer, within five (5) working days. The Vice President Academic & Chief Learning Officer's disposition of any such objection will be final.
- 6.5. The Committee will oversee the process of gathering information and conducting interviews with relevant parties. All interviews will be documented. The privacy of all individuals will be protected at all times during the complaint process. Documentation and materials will be recorded and held confidential to the parties involved in the dispute process and determination, under the jurisdiction of the Vice President Academic & Chief Learning Officer. Reports and records will be kept by the Vice President Academic & Chief Learning Officer, for five (5) years and access to these records will be by application to the Vice President Academic & Chief Learning Officer. Access to the information will comply with Freedom of Information and Protection of Privacy (FOIP) Act guidelines.
- 6.6. The Committee to conduct an investigation will invite the Respondent, accompanied by an advisor if the Respondent so desires, to address the Committee and make submissions in writing prior to its seeking or obtaining any other information or submissions. Thereafter, the Respondent may attend other meetings of the Committee only by invitation of the Chair until the Committee has received all the information or submissions it deems appropriate.
- 6.7. The Committee to conduct an investigation will provide the opportunity for the person who made an allegation leading to the complaint, accompanied by an advisor, if desired, to address the Committee in speech or in writing. If that person chooses to participate in the process and to be kept informed of the status of the investigation, the Committee may comply with the request. Moreover, if that person chooses to participate in the process, that individual will also agree to respect the confidentiality of the process.

- 6.8. Prior to making its decision, the Committee will advise the Respondent in sufficient detail of the evidence being considered by the Committee and will invite the Respondent and advisor, if desired, to meet with the Committee and respond to that evidence orally and / or in writing.
- 6.9. Prior to receiving evidence from any person not already identified in the complaint in writing or identified to the Respondent during the preliminary investigation, the Committee will advise that person that it may be necessary in the interests of justice to reveal that person's identity to the Respondent.
- 6.10. Within ninety (90) calendar days of being appointed, the Committee will complete its investigation and will report its reasoned decision in writing to the Vice President Academic & Chief Learning Officer. That reasoned decision will always be the confidential property of the Vice President Academic & Chief Learning Officer. The Chair of the Committee will also send a copy of the reasoned decision to the Respondent and the Complainant at the same time as it is forwarded to the Vice President Academic & Chief Learning Officer.
- 6.11. The Committee's reasoned decision (hereafter deemed an investigation report) will include: 1) a description of the allegations investigated, 2) a list of the individuals responsible for conducting the investigation, 3) a review of the steps taken to prevent real or apparent conflicts of interest in the investigation, 4) the methods and procedures used to gather information and to evaluate the allegation, 5) a summary of the records compiled, 6) the conclusions of the investigation, and 7) a description and explanation of any recommended sanctions. This investigation report will be submitted to the Vice President Academic & Chief Learning Officer, who will make the final decision in writing. This final decision will be sent to the parties involved within ten (10) days upon the Vice President Academic & Chief Learning Officer's receipt of the Committee's investigation report.
- 6.12. No person will use any of the Committee's investigation report and the Vice President Academic & Chief Learning Officer's final decision for any purpose other than for these procedures or for a related purpose under the BVC Faculty or Staff Association Collective Agreements.

## **7. Appeals**

- 7.1. The Respondent or Complainant may submit a written appeal to the Vice President Academic & Chief Learning Officer within ten (10) working days of the communication of the decision of the Committee. The Vice President Academic & Chief Learning Officer will review the written appeal and the final report of the Committee, and render a decision within ten (10) working days of the receipt of the appeal. The decision of the Vice President Academic & Chief Learning Officer will be final and binding.

## **8. Protection of Interests in Cases of Alleged Misconduct**

- 8.1. Whatever their source, motivation or accuracy, allegations of misconduct have the potential to harm: (1) the persons accused, (2) the persons making the allegation, (3) BVC, and (4) research and scholarship in general. Therefore, at any stage of an investigation, the Vice President Academic & Chief Learning Officer is responsible for promptly notifying the granting councils and funding agencies funding the scholarly activity in the event of:
  - 8.1.1. An immediate need to protect:
    - 8.1.1.1. funds or equipment;
    - 8.1.1.2. the interests of the person making the allegation;
    - 8.1.1.3. the interests the persons accused of an allegation;
    - 8.1.1.4. the interests of research participants; or
    - 8.1.1.5. the interests of the co-investigators and associates.

- 8.1.2. Reasonable indication of a possible criminal violation (in which case the funding agencies and/or granting councils must be informed within ten (10) working days of BVC receiving the information), and/or
- 8.1.3. The likelihood that the alleged incident will be reported publicly.
- 8.2. As far as possible, and given the need for due process in conducting investigations, the Vice President Academic & Chief Learning Officer is, moreover, responsible for protecting:
  - 8.2.1. The privacy of the persons accused and of the person making the allegations;
  - 8.2.2. Persons deemed to have made responsible accusations;
  - 8.2.3. Persons who have cooperated with institutional investigations; and
  - 8.2.4. Persons who have alleged that BVC has inadequately responded to an allegation of misconduct.
- 8.3. If charges of misconduct have been dismissed, the Vice President Academic & Chief Learning Officer will extend efforts to protect or restore the reputation or credibility of any person(s) wrongly accused or implicated, by:
  - 8.3.1. Ensuring that copies of documents and related files provided to third parties have been destroyed;
  - 8.3.2. Ensuring that all references to the allegation of misconduct are expunged from the personnel files of persons wrongly accused;
  - 8.3.3. Ensuring that all persons who have been interviewed or otherwise informed of the charges are notified in writing that the charges have been dropped;
  - 8.3.4. Consulting those wrongly accused regarding actions that might be taken on their behalf to restore their reputations, such as publicizing the final outcome in forums in which allegations may have previously been published.
- 8.4. Persons identified in cases of misconduct are reciprocally obliged to maintain confidentiality and to cooperate with the proceedings of an inquiry or investigation. However, anyone implicated in an investigation of an integrity case cannot be guaranteed anonymity should that case be brought to court.
- 8.5. It is expected that every precaution be taken by any BVC employee or learner to ensure that an allegation does not taint a researcher's reputation, until misconduct is proven. All employees or learners who receive or learn of an allegation of research and/or scholarly misconduct are enjoined to protect, to the maximum extent possible, the privacy of the persons accused, the persons making the allegation, and any other affected individuals. Discussion on any cases should therefore be restricted to those who need to know the details in order to determine whether there is cause for further action.
- 8.6. The Vice President Academic & Chief Learning Officer is responsible for ensuring administrative consistency in all cases of alleged misconduct in order to protect both the integrity of the adjudication processes and the individuals implicated in a case.
- 8.7. Portions of the documentation dealing with an allegation of misconduct might be accessible to third parties under the Access to Information Act of Canada, and FOIP Act of Alberta, although personal information, as defined in the FOIP Act, is not accessible. Personal information that is related to anyone who is not an employee of a federal institution qualifies for exemption from release, as does any genuinely confidential third party information, such as a trade secret. Any information not qualifying for an exemption would have to be disclosed upon request.
- 8.8. Accused persons, as well as the informants and witnesses affected by inquiries and investigations are entitled to fundamental fairness throughout the proceedings. Whatever the outcome, the Vice President Academic & Chief Learning Officer will take all reasonable steps to mitigate the consequences of the process for individuals who have been unintentionally adversely affected by it.

## **9. Investigating Other Activities of the Accused**

- 9.1. Whenever an investigation concludes that misconduct warranting dismissal is substantiated, appropriate arrangements will be made to ensure that all other scholarly activity previously undertaken by the Respondent at this College is evaluated to determine its integrity.

## **10. Time Limits**

- 10.1. All time limits in these procedures may be extended for good reason and a formal record will be kept. The Respondent will be advised of both the extension of time and the rationale.

## **11. Involvement of Tri-Agency Funded Research and Granting Councils**

- 11.1. The federal granting councils, namely, the Canadian Institutes of Health Research (CIHR), the Natural Sciences and Engineering Research Council (NSERC), and the Social Sciences and Humanities Research Council (SSHRC) have issued a joint policy statement on integrity in research and scholarship which can be found on NSERC's website at: <http://www.rcr.ethics.gc.ca/eng/policy-politique/framework-cadre/>
- 11.2. If the investigation was requested by a granting council or funding agency, the Vice President Academic & Chief Learning Officer will send a full copy of the investigation report to the granting council or funding agency within thirty (30) working days of the conclusion of the investigation, whether or not misconduct is concluded to have occurred.
- 11.3. If the investigation was initiated internally, within BVC, and the Committee concludes that misconduct has occurred in research funded by a granting council or funding agency, the Vice President Academic & Chief Learning Officer will send a full copy of the investigation report to the granting council or funding agency within thirty (30) working days of the conclusion of the investigation (i.e., after the final report was written by the Vice President Academic & Chief Learning Officer).
- 11.4. Funding agencies and/or granting councils will have an opportunity to review the investigation report in order to ensure that the process is consistent with BVC's integrity policy, and to determine whether the findings and conclusions of the investigation are based on solid evidence and reasonable arguments.
- 11.5. On reviewing the report, funding agencies and / or granting councils may request clarification or additional information or a subsequent follow-up to ascertain whether the recommendations contained in the investigation report have been implemented.
- 11.6. Should the report continue to be deemed unsatisfactory, funding agencies and/or granting councils may request that BVC conduct a further investigation, either with the same or a different investigation committee. If the final report of this continued or new investigation fails to confirm misconduct, the case will be closed and all information pertaining to the case destroyed.
- 11.7. Where misconduct is confirmed, the Vice President Academic & Chief Learning Officer will be responsible for the protection of agency funding by informing the Chief Financial Officer to withhold any payments or disbursements of agency funds, if such action is deemed appropriate.

## **Definitions**

### **Accused:**

Any person who has allegedly displayed misconduct in research and/or scholarship.

### **Advisor:**

Any person selected by the Respondent, including a person selected by the BVCFA at the request of the respondent.

**Allegation:**

Information in any form forwarded to the Vice President, Academic and Chief Learning Officer, relating to possible misconduct in scholarly activity.

**Author:**

(including co-author): The writer, or contributing writer, of a research publication or document (<http://www.rcr.ethics.gc.ca/eng/policy-politique/framework-cadre/>).

**Authorship:**

The National Research Council Canada (NRC) provides this guide in determining authorship ([http://www.nrc-cnrc.gc.ca/eng/about/policies/research\\_integrity/index.html](http://www.nrc-cnrc.gc.ca/eng/about/policies/research_integrity/index.html))

NRC research publications shall identify as authors all those, but only those, who have made a substantial intellectual contribution to the research. The other contributions should be recognized separately in the manuscript.

As a minimum requirement, recognizing that there might be variations in accepted practice between disciplines, fields of activity and research journals, the NRC recommends that inclusion as an author should be justified by direct participation in at least two of the following activities:

- conception of the research project
- performance of the research
- interpretation of the data, and
- writing of the manuscript.

**Bow Valley College employee:**

Refers to any individual employed by BVC (i.e., exempt, faculty [under the BVC Faculty Association], and staff [under the Alberta Union of Provincial Employees]).

**Conflict of interest:**

A conflict of interest may arise when activities or situations place an individual in a real, potential or perceived conflict between the duties or responsibilities related to research, and personal, institutional or other interests. These interests include, but are not limited to, business, commercial or financial interests pertaining to the individual, their family members, friends, or their former, current or prospective professional associates (<http://www.rcr.ethics.gc.ca/eng/policy-politique/framework-cadre/>).

**Complaint:**

A written and signed allegation of misconduct forwarded to the Vice President, Academic and Chief Learning Officer containing sufficient detail to enable the Vice President, Academic and Chief Learning Officer to understand the allegations.

**Complainant:**

The individual who signed the written complaint.

**Research:**

An undertaking which involves a systematic investigation to establish facts, principles, or generalizable knowledge. Most activities that involve information collected solely in the course of teaching or other usual college functions such as quality assurance studies, performance reviews, instructor evaluations, program evaluations or reviews, curriculum development projects, or testing within normal educational requirements are NOT considered research for the purposes of this policy.



**Research personnel:**

Includes undergraduate and graduate students, post-doctoral fellows, research assistants, research associates, technicians, programmers, analysts, etc., who may contribute to the research activities of a grant holder.

**Research and scholarly integrity:**

To uphold the values of honesty and uprightness in research and scholarly endeavors among colleagues, co-workers, learners and research personnel on research projects with due respect to intellectual property and ethical conduct in research involving humans and animal participants. These values extend to dealings with research and funding collaborators both within and outside the education community.

**Research and scholarly misconduct:**

Includes, but is not limited to, the areas listed below. This list includes what Tri-Agency labels as *Breaches of Agency Policies* (Section 3.1 of the Tri-Agency Framework: Responsible Conduct of Research). Items denoted with Tri-Agency at the end indicates that the definition comes from the Tri-Agency Framework: Responsible Conduct of Research (<http://www.rcr.ethics.gc.ca/eng/policy-politique/framework-cadre/>).

1. **Fabrication:** Making up data, source material, methodologies or findings, including graphs and images (Tri-Agency).
2. **Falsification:** Manipulating, changing, or omitting data, source material, methodologies or findings, including graphs and images, without acknowledgement and which results in inaccurate findings or conclusions (Tri-Agency).
3. **Destruction of research records:** The destruction of one's own or another's research data or records to specifically avoid the detection of wrongdoing or in contravention of the applicable funding agreement, institutional policy and/or laws, regulations and professional or disciplinary standards (Tri-Agency).
4. **Plagiarism:** 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, if required, without permission (Tri-Agency).
5. **Redundant publications:** The re-publication of one's own previously published work or part thereof, or data, in the same or another language, without adequate acknowledgment of the source, or justification (Tri-Agency).
6. **Invalid authorship:** Inaccurate attribution of authorship, including attribution of authorship to persons other than those who have contributed sufficiently to take responsibility for the intellectual content, or agreeing to be listed as author to a publication for which one made little or no material contribution (Tri-Agency).
7. **Inadequate acknowledgement:** Failure to appropriately recognize contributions of others in a manner consistent with their respective contributions and authorship policies of relevant publications (Tri-Agency).
8. **Mismanagement of Conflict of Interest:** Failure to appropriately manage any real, potential or perceived conflict of interest, in accordance with the Institution's policy on conflict of interest in research, preventing one or more of the objectives of the Framework (Section 1.3) from being met (Tri-Agency).
9. Failure to honor the confidentiality that the researcher promised or was contracted to as a way to gain valuable information from a party internal or external to BVC.
10. Retaliation of any kind against persons, acting in good faith, which have reported or provided information about suspected or alleged misconduct. Retaliation means any response by BVC that adversely affects the employment or other status of the originator(s) of the allegation.

11. Failure to report to BVC an involvement in research dealing with human subjects, bio-hazardous materials or animals.
12. Material failure to comply with relevant statutes, regulations or policies concerning the conduct of research.
13. Abuse of supervisory power affecting coworkers, learners and others associated with the research.
14. Financial misconduct, including misuse of funds acquired for research and failure to adhere to terms and conditions of grants and contracts.
15. Suppressing publication of the work of another scholar and improper negative reviewing of a research grant application or work submitted for peer review in consideration for publication by another scholar.

Misconduct does not include honest errors, differences in opinion or different interpretations of scientific discoveries. Those involved in judging research and scholarly misconduct must bear in mind the ethical sensitivities of the period in which the research was conducted. Although a researcher may have conscientiously followed the standards of the period, protocols previously in use may not necessarily accord with current standards on the use of data.

**Researcher:**

Anyone who engages in research activities.

**Respondent:**

An individual who is identified in an allegation of possible misconduct in research or scholarly activity. The individual is identified in a complaint received by the Vice President, Academic and Chief Learning Officer.

**Scholarly activity:**

Includes all research or other creative activity undertaken by BVC employees or learners.

**Scholarship:**

A serious formal study or research of a subject.

**Tri-Council or Tri-Agency:**

Refers to the Canadian Institutes of Health Research (CIHR), National Sciences and Engineering Research Council (NSERC), and Social Sciences and Humanities Research Council (SSHRC).

## Data sheet

### Responsible officer

The Director, Academic Innovation & Applied Research is responsible for the content development, implementation, and operation of these procedures. This officer is considered responsible for monitoring compliance. Questions regarding this procedure should be addressed to the Responsible Officer.

### Relevant dates

Approved	Board of Governors: BOG170125-04
Effective	January 26, 2017
Next Review	January 2022
Modification History	April 2010, October 2011, January 2017 Rebranded 2021
Verified by	Office of the President, March 2022*

### Directly related policy

Integrity in Research and Scholarship Policy (#500-3-3)

### Associated policy(ies), procedure(s), and guideline(s)

Employee Code of Conduct (#200-1-1)  
 Ethical Business Practices (#200-1-5)  
 Records Management (#200-1-8)  
 Learner Code of Conduct (#500-1-1)  
 Academic Honesty (#500-1-7)  
 Ethical Conduct for Research involving Human Participants (#500-3-2)

### Related legislation

Tri-Council Policy Statement: Ethical Conduct of Research involving Human Participants (2010)  
[\(http://www.pre.ethics.gc.ca/eng/policy-politique/initiatives/tcps2-eptc2/Default/\)](http://www.pre.ethics.gc.ca/eng/policy-politique/initiatives/tcps2-eptc2/Default/)  
 Tri-Agency Framework: Responsible Conduct of Research (2011)  
[\(http://www.rcr.ethics.gc.ca/eng/policy-politique/framework-cadre/\)](http://www.rcr.ethics.gc.ca/eng/policy-politique/framework-cadre/)

**Appendix: Process timeline summary**

step	Key action	Days to complete	Procedure section number
1	VP <sup>a</sup> receives complaint	0 working days	5.5.6
2	VP preliminary reviews complaint and tries to resolve it	5 working days	5.5.6 to 5.5.9
3	VP refers complaint to a committee if it needs investigation	5 working days (20 working days after complaint)	5.5.9
4	VP appoints committee members/ informs parties <sup>b</sup> involved	10 working days (20 working days after complaint)	6.2 to 6.3
5	Parties involved can comment on/object to the committee composition	5 working days after being informed	6.4
6	Committee begins and completes their investigation. Output is the investigation report	90 calendar days to begin and complete investigation	6.5 to 6.10
7	VP makes a decision with a final report	10 working days after VP's receipt of investigation report	6.11
8	Parties involved can appeal decision	10 working days after decision is relayed to parties	7.1
9	VP makes decision on appeal	10 working days after appeal	7.1
10	Full copy of report given to Funders – if investigation was requested by granting council or funding agency	30 working days after VP writes the final report.	11.2 to 11.7
Notification is given to Funders in cases of criminal conduct - 10 working days of receiving reasonable indication of criminal conduct <b>at any point</b> in the investigation. If charges are dropped then reputation restoration procedures will take place. (Procedure section 8.1.2 to 8.8)			

<sup>a</sup>VP here refers to the Vice President Academic & Chief Learning Officer

<sup>b</sup> Parties refer to "Complainant and/or Respondent"