

Memo



To: Georgina Moore, University Secretariat

From: Susan Marlin, Associate Vice-Principal (Research)

Date: September 9, 2010

Re: Proposed Amendment to the Queen's Senate Policy
Integrity in Research

Vice-Principal (Research)
251 Richardson Hall
Queen's University
Kingston, ON K7L 3N6
Tel: (613) 533-6933
Fax: (613) 533-6934

The Queen's University Senate policy *Integrity in Research* was approved by Senate in 2000

The proposed amendment described in the attached was reviewed and approved by the Senate

Proposed Amendment to the Queen's University Senate Policy on Integrity in Research

September 8, 2010

The Queen's University Senate Policy on Integrity in Research was approved by Senate in January 2009. The proposed amendment described herein was reviewed and approved by the Senate Advisory Committee on Research on June 7, 2010.

Policy approved by the Senate in January 2009 states that the complainant (individual submitting an allegation) will be informed of the outcomes of the review and investigation of the allegation in the following circumstances:

Section 6 (j) – If a full investigation is conducted, the complainant will be provided with a copy of the investigative committee's report (which includes documents reviewed, summary of interviews conducted, key considerations and a finding with regard to whether misconduct has occurred) to review for factual errors

Section 6 (k) – The complainant is provided with a copy of the final report.

We have received legal advice indicating that providing the information described above to a complainant violates the rights of the respondent under the *Freedom of Information and Protection of Privacy Act*. The report and findings resulting from a research integrity investigation contain personal information about an individual (i.e. the respondent) which cannot be disclosed without the consent of the individual to whom the personal information relates. The research integrity process is not an investigation into a dispute between a complainant and a respondent. It is the responsibility of the University to maintain integrity standards and respond effectively to complaints and allegations. The complainant is not a party in this investigative process (although a complainant may contribute evidence and give testimony).

The proposed amendment seeks to remove the complainant as recipient of the information described in sections 6 j and k. The proposed text to be deleted is indicated in the attached copy of the Policy.

QUEEN'S UNIVERSITY
SENATE POLICY ON INTEGRITY IN RESEARCH

Approved by the Senate January 29, 2009

[Supersedes "A Code of Research Ethics] approved by Senate in October 1987]

1. INTRODUCTION

Academic integrity is an expectation fundamental to the mission of the university, whether it be in teaching or in research. The Senate Academic Integrity Statement¹, adopted in 2006, recognizes the university's commitment to upholding integrity in all scholarly work. Queen's University Senate Policy on Integrity in Research is respectful of the five core fundamental values defined in the Senate Academic Integrity Statement: honesty, trust, fairness, respect

and responsibility.

The Policy has been written to be consistent with, and complementary to, existing University policies and agreements addressing related research ethics and integrity issues. It is meant to be used in conjunction with, not as a replacement for, existing University procedures or agreements. If there is a conflict between this Policy and provisions of a collective

agreement the agreement will prevail.

THE BOARD OF TRUSTEES OF THE UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA

- e. Make results of work accessible to the scholarly community and general public through the submission for publication, conferences, lectures, public performance and/or other appropriate means.
- f. Indicate affiliation with Queen's or other institutions as appropriate and properly attribute contributions of others.
- g. Retain research records within their personal control for a minimum of 5 years from the date of publication or other form of presentation (if appropriate for the data format), or longer if mandated by a legal requirement or an applicable funding or oversight agency. An exception to this would be when for anonymity purposes destruction of data has been approved by a Research Ethics Board at Queen's University.

Original data are normally stored in the laboratory or department of the principal investigator. In the case of collaborative research all those involved in the conduct of the

research (including supervisors and students) will have access to the data. Such access may be restricted only when a request to do so is made in writing to and approved by the Vice-Principal (Research).

4. MISCONDUCT IN RESEARCH OR SCHOLARLY ACTIVITY

Misconduct in research or scholarly activity may include, but is not limited to, one or more of the following:

- a. Fabrication³ or falsification⁴ of research data or source material
- b. Plagiarism⁵
- c. Failure to appropriately recognize contributions of others in publications

- i. Failure to reveal conflicts of interest to the University, sponsors, commissioners of work, or when reviewing research grant applications or manuscripts for publication

- j. Financial misconduct involving research funds including the misuse or misappropriation of research funds
- k. Failure to inform co-workers in a timely manner of experimental findings and developments
- l. Failure to disclose conflict or appearance of conflict of interest

Honesty, accuracy, conflicting data or differences in interpretation of data, or differences in

under the jurisdiction of the Policy the procedures outlined in the following sections will

apply.

If the alleged misconduct involves collaborative research conducted at multiple institutions the following procedures may need to be modified to facilitate joint or parallel investigation

processes

a. The Vice-Principal (Research) shall inform the individual submitting the allegation

- iv. A member of the Queen`s community with legal expertise
- v. For respondents who are not faculty, a member with the same appointment status as the respondent (eg. staff member, post doctoral fellow, student)

required on the Investigative Committee the Chair may appoint up to two additional

Committee for consideration. A final report will be submitted to the Vice-Principal (Research) within 10 working days of receipt of the revisions.

1. The findings of the Investigative Committee regarding the case of [redacted]

successfully appealed according to the grounds noted in Section 2) The Vice

Principal (Research) [redacted]

- c. Annually, in December, a general summary report regarding internal complaints will be forwarded to the appropriate Tri-Council as required by the *Tri-Council*

Memorandum from the [redacted] to the [redacted] dated [redacted]