
TITLE: INTEGRITY IN RESEARCH AND SCHOLARSHIP**POLICY STATEMENT:**

Through its guiding values RDC is committed to the highest standards of practice and behavior in research and scholarship integrity.

1. The College promotes integrity in research and scholarship and investigates possible instances of misconduct in research and scholarship including:
 - imposing appropriate sanctions in accordance with College policy
 - informing the appropriate Council(s) or funding agency of conclusions reached and actions taken.
2. The College ensures that research funds are administered with a high degree of integrity, accountability and responsibility.

PURPOSE:

The purpose of this policy is to promote and advance a high standard of integrity in research and scholarship. Such integrity requires careful supervision of research including that conducted by students, competent use of methods, adherence to ethical standards of discipline and the refusal to engage in or to condone instances of fraud or misconduct.

SCOPE:

This policy governs all research and scholarship undertaken by members of the College community, including all faculty, staff, students, visitors and contractors.

PRINCIPLES:

1. Three fundamental principles underlie research and scholarly integrity:
 - truthfulness in describing the manner in which data is collected, analyzed and reported
 - scrupulousness in recognizing the authors and sources of the original research concepts and results
 - probity in the use of research funds.
2. The College engages mechanisms consistent with due process and natural justice, and thus:
 - allows accused persons full opportunity to respond to allegations
 - provides an opportunity for the persons making the allegation to comment on the findings of the inquiry and the investigation, and ensure that any comments they make become part of the record
 - reports the results of the investigation to both the accused persons and the persons making the allegation
 - reports the results to the federal granting Agencies according to Tri-Council policy guidelines
 - informs the accused persons of any actions or sanctions that have been decided on as a result of the investigation
 - protects the privacy of the complainant and respondent as far as possible.

3. This policy is concerned with integrity in research and scholarship, and does not replace any other policy statements on other areas with which this issue may overlap. The principles of research and scholarship integrity overlap with other areas, such as financial integrity in the use of research funds, intellectual property, and the ethical issues involving the use of human or animal subjects in research, in which the College has other established practices, guidelines and requirements stated herein or in other policies.

DEFINITIONS:

Integrity in research and scholarship means:

- honesty and uprightness in dealings among colleagues, co-workers within the research and scholarly establishment as well as with students, assistants and staff on research projects, and in dealings with research and funding collaborators both within and outside the education community
- respect for intellectual property and
- due regard for the ethical points involved in the use of human and animal participants in research.

Misconduct in research and scholarship means, but is not limited to:

- *Fabrication*: Making up data, source material, methodologies or findings, including graphs and images.
- *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.
- *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.
- *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.
- *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.
- *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.
- *Inadequate acknowledgement*: Failure to appropriately recognize contributions of others in a manner consistent with their respective contributions and authorship policies of relevant publications.
- *Mismanagement of conflict of interest*: Failure to appropriately manage any real, potential or perceived conflict of interest, in accordance with RDC's *Conflicts of Interest and Mandatory Disclosure Policy*.
- *Misrepresentation in a grant application or related document*: Providing incomplete, inaccurate or false information in a grant or award application or related document, such as a letter of support or a progress report; applying for and/or holding a Tri-Council Agency award when deemed ineligible by NSERC, SSHRC, CIHR or any other research or research funding organization world-wide for reasons of breach of

responsible conduct of research policies such as ethics, integrity or financial management policies; listing of co-applicants, collaborators or partners without their agreement.

- *Mismanagement of grants or award funds*: Using grant or award funds for purposes inconsistent with the policies of the Tri-Council Agency or funding body; misappropriating grants and award funds; contravening financial policies of the funding body or Tri-Council Agency, including the *Tri-Agency Financial Administration Guide*, Agency grants and awards guides; or providing incomplete, inaccurate or false information on documentation for expenditures from grant or award accounts.
- *Breaches of Tri-Council Agency policies or requirements for certain types of research*: Failing to meet Tri-Council Agency policy requirements or, to comply with relevant policies, laws or regulations, for the conduct of certain types of research activities; failing to obtain appropriate approvals, permits or certifications before conducting these activities.

Advisor: any person selected by the Respondent, including a person selected by the Faculty Association of Red Deer College (FARDC) at the request of the Respondent.

Allegation: information in any form forwarded to the Vice President Academic relating to possible misconduct in research and scholarship.

Complaint: a written, signed allegation of misconduct forwarded to the Vice President Academic containing sufficient detail to enable the Respondent to understand the allegations.

Complainant: the individual who signed the written complaint.

Research: a systematic investigation to establish facts, principles or generalizable knowledge.

Respondent: a person in respect of whom the Vice President Academic has received information relating to possible misconduct in scholarly activity.

Scholarship: the discovery, integration, application and transmission of knowledge, ideas, skills or artistic efforts.

SRCR: The Tri-Council's Secretariat on Responsible Conduct of Research.

GUIDELINES:

Responsibilities

Any faculty or staff in the employ of Red Deer College who is involved in research and scholarship upholds the following practices:

- a. Recognizing the substantive contributions of collaborators and students.
- b. Referencing and, where applicable, obtaining permission for the use of all published and unpublished work.
- c. Using archival material in accordance with the rules of the archival source.
- d. Using scholarly and scientific rigor and integrity in proposing and performing research; in obtaining, recording and analyzing data; and in reporting and publishing results.

- e. Keeping complete and accurate records of data, methodologies and findings, in accordance with applicable funding agreements, laws or regulations, and professional or disciplinary standards in a manner that allows verification or replication of the work by others.
- f. Ensuring that authorship of published work includes all those who have materially contributed to, and share responsibility for, the contents of the publication, and only those people.
- g. Acknowledging, in addition to authors, all contributors and contributions to research, including writers, funders and sponsors.
- h. Revealing to the College, 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.
- i. Providing confidential disclosure in writing to the College regarding the development of Intellectual Property that may be owned by the College or jointly by the researcher and the College and which the researcher intends to commercialize. The disclosure is intended to protect the interests of the research and scholarly enterprise and the College.
- j. Complying with the policies and guidelines of granting or funding agencies.

Authorship and Publication

1. Authorship of published work shall include all who have made a significant intellectual and practical contribution, and only those people.
2. Students and research assistants are given appropriate recognition for authorship or collection of data in any publication.
3. Research teams designate one author who is responsible for the validity of the entire manuscript. Co-authors are responsible for the part of the publication that they have contributed.

Collection and Retention of Research Data

During the process of scientific and scholarly inquiry, researchers must retain accurately recorded data in order to respond to questions regarding research. Errors may be mistaken for misconduct if the primary experimental results are unavailable.

- a. A complete set of all original research data must be retained by the principal investigator for a period of 5 years.
- b. Before undertaking research, investigators, supervisors, students and the College should come to a common understanding regarding ownership, intellectual property rights, storage, reproduction and publication of data, access to data and any other relevant circumstances. In the case of collaborative work, all members of the research team must have access to the relevant data at all times, subject to contractual obligations or other agreements regarding access to data.

Research Involving Biohazards

No research at RDC involves the use of biohazards. Should such research be conducted at the College in the future, the College will comply with recognized standards outlined in the *Health Canada Laboratory Biosafety Guidelines*, and will immediately notify relevant granting agencies.

Promoting Integrity and Preventing Misconduct in Research and Scholarship

1. Researchers and Scholars

The primary responsibility for high standards of conduct in research and scholarship rests with the individuals carrying out these activities. The College expects researchers and scholars to adhere to the principles detailed in this policy.

2. The College

The College is responsible for investigating allegations of misconduct involving scholars, researchers, trainees or research staff. The College promotes understanding of the issues involved in integrity in research and scholarship as it offers a valuable means of preventing misconduct.

2.1 Promoting Integrity in Research and Scholarship

Integrity in research and scholarship is best encouraged by developing awareness among all involved of the need for the highest standards of integrity, accountability and responsibility.

The College strives to educate all that are involved in the collection, recording, citing, reporting and retention of scientific or scholarly material of its high standards of integrity. The College promotes the understanding of research and scholarship ethics and integrity issues by making policies readily available to all staff and referring researchers to the policy statements, and by providing information sessions on the principles and practices of scientific integrity for scientists, scholars, visiting graduate students, students and other trainees, and research staff. The Vice President Academic is responsible for promoting integrity in research and scholarship.

2.2 Investigating Allegations of Misconduct in Research and Scholarship

The College is responsible for receiving, investigating, documenting and judging - within an established time period - allegations of misconduct involving their own scholars, researchers, trainees or research staff.

Allegations of misconduct might involve past or present grantees, researchers, scholars, trainees, assistants, staff, students, or others working in research and scholarly enterprises, as well as private individuals, organizations and partners involved in collaborative research projects. These procedures apply to all allegations and complaints of misconduct against any person holding an appointment or position administered by or related to RDC, and also apply with such variations as are necessary to complaints against visiting scientists, graduate students, and persons holding Post-Doctoral Fellowships or their equivalent. Allegations against students are governed by the existing policy dealing with Academic Misconduct.

Allegations may arise from anonymous or identified sources within or outside the College; 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 the College, and to research and scholarship in general.

3. Research Funding Councils and Granting Agencies

3.1. The National 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 *The Tri-Agency Framework: Responsible Conduct of Research*. The

- framework is posted on the Panel on Responsible Conduct of Research web site. Researchers working with funds from any of the three Councils are responsible for using grant funds in accordance with Tri-Council policies and guidelines.
- 3.2. Allegations of misconduct made to funding Councils or Granting Agencies might involve past or present grantees or awardees, or trainees or staff supported from their funds or working in laboratories receiving their funds. Such allegations might also arise from the peer review processes of the Councils and Granting Agencies. Under provisions of the Privacy Act, such allegations of misconduct in research will be transmitted only with the permission of the person making the allegations. Where this permission is not provided, the allegation will be treated as anonymous.
 - 3.3. Subject to any applicable laws, including privacy laws, the College advises the relevant Tri-Council Agency or the SRCR immediately of any allegations related to activities funded by the Tri-Council that may involve significant financial, health and safety, or other risks.
 - 3.4. The College writes a letter to the SRCR confirming whether or not the College is proceeding with an investigation where the SRCR was copied on the allegation or advised of the proceeding as described in 3.3.
 - 3.5. The College and the researcher may not enter into confidentiality agreements or other agreements related to an inquiry or investigation that prevent the College from reporting to the Tri-Council through the SRCR.
 - 3.6. In cases in which misconduct is concluded to have occurred, the Council(s) or Granting Agency may consider imposing its/their own sanction(s) in relation to grants made to the individual(s) implicated. These sanctions may include, but are not limited to:
 - refusing to consider future applications for a defined time period
 - withdrawing remaining installments of the grant or award
 - seeking a refund of all or part of the funds already paid as a grant or award for the research or scholarship involved
 - seeking other forms of redress such as an apology where the reputation or integrity of the Council or Granting Agency has been seriously jeopardized.

Reporting Misconduct and Allegations

Reporting misconduct is essential to ensure that researchers and scholars maintain both integrity and public confidence in the research and scholarly enterprise.

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.

As part of the peer review process, peer review committees may identify and report evidence of misconduct.

In addition, any College staff, student or member of the public may identify and report evidence of misconduct.

All those involved in the research and scholarly enterprise are advised to report any alleged misconduct directly to the institution of the accused. A question of misconduct may arise involving an individual at an institution other than that of the person making

the allegation. If a person has contacted the institution about a matter of misconduct, and the institution is found unable or unwilling to deal with the problem, the College will process the allegation.

It is not necessary to have categorical evidence of misconduct; truthfully reported substantial information is sufficient to file a report.

All allegations are submitted to the Vice President Academic who then assesses whether there is cause to suppose misconduct, and if so, review its severity and where necessary bring the case forward for investigation. Where the Respondent is the Vice President Academic, any allegations are forwarded directly to the President. The President is then responsible for ensuring that these procedures are followed.

The Vice President Academic may delegate any function specified in these procedures but is ultimately responsible for ensuring that the procedures are complied with, and that all allegations and complaints are properly investigated, documented and disposed of.

PROCEDURE:

Confronting Alleged Misconduct

1. Complaints

- 1.1. All faculty researchers, students, research assistants and staff have an obligation to report to the Vice President Academic any circumstances which they believe involve a breach of the RDC Policy on Integrity in Research and Scholarship. Complaints received by other individuals or administrators must be channeled to the Vice President Academic. For allegations involving breaches of Tri-Council Policy in activities funded by the Tri-Council, the individual making the allegation submits the allegation to the Vice President Academic and also sends an exact copy to the Tri Council's SRCR.
- 1.2. The Vice President Academic takes reasonable steps to protect against retribution or coercion of individuals who report misconduct.
- 1.3. A formal complaint must be made in writing; signed and dated before the Vice President Academic takes 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.
- 1.4. A complaint in writing contains sufficient detail to enable the Respondent to understand the matter under review. The complaint identifies the person or persons who made the allegations if the Vice President Academic 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.
- 1.5. Anonymous allegations are not normally considered. However, if the evidence is compelling, the Vice President Academic may elect to initiate a preliminary investigation.

- 1.6. Upon receipt of a written complaint, the Vice President Academic conducts a preliminary review of the complaint, seeking information from relevant sources. Within five working days of receiving the complaint, the Vice President Academic discusses the nature of the complaint with the Respondent. The Respondent is informed of his or her right to have a third party present at this meeting (and any future meetings).
 - 1.7. The Vice President Academic may independently, or at the request of a funding agency, take immediate action to protect the administration of grant funds. Immediate actions could include freezing grant accounts, requiring a second authorized signature on all expenses charged to grant accounts, or other measures, as appropriate.
 - 1.8. The Vice President Academic may attempt to resolve complaints that do not warrant an investigation (e.g. unintentional error) by meeting with the relevant parties and providing a decision in writing. The complaint is 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).
 - 1.9. The Vice President Academic may, at his or her discretion, determine that the complaint is without foundation and dismiss the complaint. The Vice President Academic immediately notifies the Complainant and Respondent, providing written justification of the decision. The Complainant may appeal the dismissal of the complaint, in writing, to the President, whose decision regarding complaint dismissal is final.
 - 1.10. If the Vice President Academic is unable to resolve the complaint and determines that an investigation is warranted, he or she refers the complaint to a committee for investigation within ten working days of the receipt of the complaint.
2. Investigations
 - 2.1 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.
 - 2.2 When referring the complaint to a committee (1.10), the Vice President Academic appoints committee members to conduct an investigation, advises the Respondent of the composition of the Committee, and also advises 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 is appointed and individuals notified within ten working days of the receipt of the complaint.
 - 2.3 The Committee to conduct an investigation consists of three members with sufficient expertise to address the issues involved. One member is appointed as a Chair and at least one member has no current affiliation with the College. Members of the Committee are from a Department or Program other than the Respondent's, or from outside the College. In situations involving faculty research or scholarship, committee membership includes at least one continuous faculty member. In addition, the Respondent or Committee may request that a representative of the Executive of the Faculty Association of Red Deer College 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 complaint.

- 2.4 The complainant and respondent are given an opportunity to comment on the composition of the Committee to conduct an investigation and any objection is made to the Vice President Academic within seven working days. The Vice President Academic's disposition of any such objection is final.
- 2.5 The Committee oversees the process of gathering information and conducting interviews with relevant parties. All interviews are documented. The privacy of all individuals is protected at all times during the complaint process. Documentation and materials are recorded and held confidential to the parties involved in the dispute process and determination, under the jurisdiction of the Office of the Vice President Academic. Reports and records are kept by the Vice President Academic for five years and access to these records is by application to the Vice President Academic. Access to the information complies with Freedom of Information and Protection of Privacy guidelines.
- 2.6 The Committee to conduct an investigation invites the Respondent, accompanied by an advisor if the Respondent so desires, to address it 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.
- 2.7 The Committee to conduct an investigation provides the opportunity for a person who made an allegation leading to the complaint, accompanied by an advisor, if desired, to address it 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 also agrees to respect the confidentiality of the process.
- 2.8 Prior to making its decision, the Committee advises the Respondent in sufficient detail of the evidence being considered by the Committee and invites the Respondent and advisor, if desired, to meet with it and respond to that evidence orally and/or in writing.
- 2.9 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 advises that person that it may be necessary in the interests of justice to reveal that person's identity to the Respondent.
- 2.10 Within ninety calendar days of being appointed, the Committee completes its investigation and reports its reasoned decision in writing to the Vice President Academic. That reasoned decision is at all times the confidential property of the Vice President Academic. The Chair of the Committee also sends 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.
- 2.11 The Committee's reasoned decision (hereafter deemed an investigation report) includes: 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 sanctions recommended and/or imposed by the College.
- 2.12 In determining whether misconduct constitutes a serious breach, the Committee considers the extent to which the breach jeopardizes the safety of the public or brings the conduct of research and scholarship into disrepute.

This determination is based on an assessment of the nature of the breach, the level of experience of the researcher, whether there is a pattern of breaches by the researcher, and other factors as appropriate. Examples of serious breaches may include:

- recruiting human participants into a study with significant risks or harms without Research Ethics Board approval, or not following approved protocols
- using animals in a study with significant risks or harms without Animal Care Committee approval, or not following approved protocols
- deliberate misuse of research grant funds for personal benefit not related to research
- knowingly publishing research results based on fabricated data
- obtaining grant/award funds from the Tri-Council Agencies by misrepresenting one's credentials, qualifications and/or research contributions in an application
- presenting and using another's published or unpublished work as one's own, without appropriate referencing.

- 2.13 The Committee is authorized to make decisions regarding misconduct, and their reasoned decision is binding on the College, Respondent and Complainant.
- 2.14 The Vice President Academic advises any person identified to the Respondent of the complaint's outcome. No person will use any of the reasoned decision or outcome information for any purpose other than for these procedures or for a related purpose under the Faculty Association of Red Deer College Collective Agreement.
- 2.15 If the investigation was requested by a Granting Council or Tri-Council Agency, the Chair of the Committee sends a full copy of the investigation report to the Granting Council or Tri-Council Agency within 30 days of the conclusion of the investigation, whether or not misconduct is concluded to have occurred.
- 2.16 If the investigation was initiated internally, within RDC, and the Committee concludes that misconduct has occurred in research funded by a Granting Council or Tri-Council Agency, the Chair of the Committee sends a full copy of the investigation report to the Granting Council or Tri-Council Agency within 30 days of the conclusion of the investigation.
- 2.17 Funding Councils and/or Tri-Council Agencies will have an opportunity to review the investigation report in order to ensure that the process is consistent with the College's integrity policy, and to determine whether the findings and conclusions of the investigation are based on solid evidence and reasonable arguments.
- 2.18 On reviewing the report, funding Councils and/or Tri-Council Agencies may request clarification or additional information or a subsequent follow-up to ascertain whether the recommendations contained in the investigation report have been implemented.
- 2.19 Should the report continue to be deemed unsatisfactory, funding Councils and/or Tri-Council Agencies may request that the College 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 is closed and all information pertaining to the case is destroyed.
- 2.20 Where misconduct is confirmed, the Vice President Academic is 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.

3. Appeals

The Respondent or Complainant may submit a written appeal to the President within one week of the communication of the decision of the Committee. The President reviews the written appeal and the final report of the Committee, and render a decision within five days of the receipt of the appeal. The decision of the President is final and binding.

4. Protection of Interests in Cases of Alleged Misconduct

Whatever their source, motivation or accuracy, allegations of misconduct have the potential to harm:

- the persons accused
- the persons making the allegation
- the College
- research and scholarship in general.

Therefore, at any stage of an investigation, the Vice President Academic is responsible for promptly notifying the Councils and Tri-Council Agencies funding the scholarly activity in the event of:

- a. an immediate need to protect:
 - i. funds or equipment
 - ii. the interests of the person making the allegation
 - iii. the interests the persons accused of an allegation
 - iv. the interests of research participants or the interests of the co-investigators and associates.
- b. reasonable indication of a possible criminal violation (in which case the funding Councils and/or Tri-Council Agencies must be informed within seven working days of the College receiving the information), and/or
- c. the likelihood that the alleged incident will be reported publicly.

As far as possible, and given the need for due process in conducting investigations, the Vice President Academic is, moreover, responsible for protecting:

- the privacy of the persons accused and of the person making the allegations
- persons deemed to have made responsible accusations
- persons who have cooperated with institutional investigations, and
- persons who have alleged that the College has inadequately responded to an allegation of misconduct.

If charges of misconduct have been dismissed, the Vice President Academic extends efforts to protect or restore the reputation or credibility of any person(s) wrongly accused or implicated, by:

- ensuring that copies of documents and related files provided to third parties have been destroyed
- ensuring that all references to the allegation of misconduct are expunged from the personnel files of persons wrongly accused
- ensuring that all persons who have been interviewed or otherwise informed of the charges are notified in writing that the charges have been dropped and
- 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.

Moreover, persons identified in cases of misconduct are reciprocally obliged to maintain confidentiality and to cooperate with the proceedings of an inquiry or investigation.

It must be made clear however; that anyone implicated in an investigation of an integrity case cannot be guaranteed anonymity should that case be brought to court.

It is expected that every precaution be taken by any College staff or student to ensure that an allegation does not taint a researcher's reputation, until misconduct is proven. All staff or students 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.

The Vice President Academic 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.

In addition, certain 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 Freedom of Information and Protection of Privacy Act of Alberta, although personal information, as defined in the Privacy Act, is not accessible. Personal information that is related to anyone that 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.

Accused persons, as well as the informants and witnesses affected by inquiries and investigations are all entitled to fundamental fairness throughout the proceedings. Whatever the outcome, the Vice President Academic takes all reasonable steps to mitigate the consequences of the process for individuals who have been unintentionally adversely affected by it.

5. Institutional Responsibility

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

6. Time Limits

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

OFFICER RESPONSIBLE: Vice President Academic

RECOMMENDING AUTHORITY: Deans' Council

CONSULTATION FOR REVIEW: Deans' Council, Academic Policy Committee, Chief Financial Officer, School Councils

POLICY REVIEW DATE: November 2018

EFFECTIVE DATE: January 1, 2013

REVISION HISTORY: July 1, 2006
January 1, 2013

RELATED POLICIES:

- Intellectual Property
- Conflicts of Interest and Mandatory Disclosure
- Ethical Conduct for Research Involving Human Participants

CONNECTION TO BOARD POLICIES:

All RDC policies support relevant Board of Governors operational policies.