

Appendix D - Policy on Scholarly Integrity (AC1105-B)

POLICY ON SCHOLARLY INTEGRITY (Pursuant to the Collective Agreement)

University Policy No.: AC1105 (B)
Classification: Academic and Students
Approving Authority: Board of Governors
Effective Date: June 2023
Supersedes: December/12
Last Editorial Change: April 2021

1 Preamble

- 1.1 The University of Victoria is a place of education and scholarly enquiry. Our professional ethics require us as individuals and as an institution to adhere to principles of scholarly integrity and of respect for our students, staff and colleagues. The University of Victoria

- 3.6 “**Respondent**” means a person in respect of whom an allegation of misconduct in Scholarly Activity has been made.
- 3.7 “**Review**” means the process described in Section 8.
- 3.8 “**Reviewer**” means a person appointed to conduct the review described in Section 8.
- 3.9 For the purposes of this policy, “**Scholarly Activity**” includes all activities by Members that are appropriate for inclusion in a curriculum vitae as scholarship, research (including graduate student supervision), or other creative activity.
- 3.10 “**Tri-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), sponsors of the Tri-Agency Framework: Responsible Conduct of Research which informs this policy.
- 3.11 “**Working day(s)**” means Monday to Friday, except statutory holidays and University-wide closures.

4 Scholarly Integrity

- 4.1 Members engaged in Scholarly Activity shall exhibit honest and thoughtful inquiry, rigorous analysis, commitment to the dissemination of research results, and adherence to the use of professional standards, intellectual honesty and integrity in all their scholarly activities.
- 4.2 Members engaged in Scholarly Activity shall be sensitive to the objectives of scholarship that include:
- (a) the pursuit of knowledge and understanding;
 - (b) the communication and application of knowledge within the University and the broader community;
 - (c) the communication to students of the specialized skills and knowledge of the academic discipline in which the research is conducted;
 - (d) the improvement of the quality of instruction.
- 4.3 Members are also responsible for scholarly rigour and integrity in teaching including evaluating the work of students in a fair manner.
- 4.4 Members shall strive to follow best practices honestly, accountably, openly and fairly in their research, scholarship and creative endeavours, and in the dissemination of knowledge. At a minimum, Members are responsible for the following:
- (a) Scholarly and scientific rigour in proposing and performing research; in recording, analyzing, and interpreting data; and in reporting and publishing data and findings.
 - (b) Keeping complete and accurate records of data, methodologies and findings, including graphs and images, in accordance with the applicable funding agency or agreement, institutional policies, laws, regulations, and professional or disciplinary standards in a manner that will allow verification or replication of the work by others.
 - (c) Referencing and, where applicable, obtaining permission for the use of all published and unpublished work, including theories, concepts, data, source material, methodologies, findings, graphs and images.

- 7.3 A Complaint containing allegations of scholarly misconduct shall be forwarded to the Office of the Vice-President Research and Innovation. Where the allegation is related to conduct that occurred at another institution, the Vice-President Research and Innovation (or designate) will contact the other institution and determine with that institution's designated point of contact which institution is best placed to conduct the inquiry, if warranted. The receiving institution must communicate to the complainant which institution will be the point of contact for the allegation.
- 7.4 If the Respondent and the matter complained of fall within the scope of this policy, the Vice-President Research and Innovation shall designate the Administrative Authority in respect of the Complaint, who shall normally be the Re C- ny93272 -1.141](he C92 (om)4.è (ei)2.6 (l)2.6

- (b) not later than ten (10) Working days after receiving a Complaint, appoint a Reviewer who shall be a senior faculty or academic staff member in a unit other than that (those) of the Respondent(s) and complainant(s) to conduct a Review. Where the Faculty is not divided into units, the Administrative Authority shall appoint a senior faculty or academic staff member from another Faculty. The purpose of the Review is to determine whether the Complaint is a responsible complaint under s. 8.5.1 and therefore warrants an Inquiry.
 - (c) advise the Respondent and complainant of the name of the person appointed to conduct the Review.
- 8.2 Any objection to the person appointed to conduct the Review shall be made to the Administrative Authority within seven (7) Working days. The only grounds for objection are alleged bias or conflict of interest. The Administrative Authority's disposition of any such objection shall be final.
- 8.3 The Reviewer shall proceed informally and in complete confidentiality, except as required under s. 8.4. The Respondent shall be invited to make a written submission that responds to the Complaint and to submit any documents that may be relevant to the Complaint. Prior to submitting their Report, the Reviewer may request the complainant and the Respondent to comment on all or portions of a draft report.
- 8.4 The Reviewer shall consult with the Respondent's Chair to understand relevant standards in the Respondent's field. The Chair may seek the advice of other scholars in the Respondent's field, without disclosing the presence of the Complaint.
- 8.5 Normally, within thirty (30) Days of being appointed, the Reviewer shall report in writing to the Administrative Authority, with copies to the Respondent, the complainant, and the Vice-President Academic.
- 8.5.1 A Review shall conclude that the Complaint warrants an Inquiry only where the allegation:
- (a) is based on facts which have not been the subject of a previous investigation;
 - (b) falls within s. 4.4, s. 4.5 and s. 5.1 of this policy; and
 - (c) if proven, would constitute a breach at the time the alleged breach occurred.
- 8.5.2 Where the Review concludes that the Complaint warrants an Inquiry, the Review report shall:
- (a) specify the allegations of misconduct in Scholarly Activities that require an Inquiry;
 - (b) include particulars of the evidence considered by the Reviewer that may be relevant to each allegation of misconduct;
 - (c) list any documents considered by the Reviewer; and
 - (d) attach copies of all documents provided to the Reviewer by either the complainant or the Respondent or the Chair under s. 8.4.

9 INQUIRIES

- 9.1 Within five (5) Working days following receipt of the Review report, the Administrative Authority shall advise the Respondent and the complainant of the outcome of the Review and shall forward a copy of the Review to the Vice-President Research and Innovation.
- 9.2 Where the Review concludes that the Complaint does warrant an Inquiry, the Administrative Authority shall, within ten (10) Working days of receiving the Review, request the Vice-President Research and Innovation to appoint a Committee of Inquiry to conduct an Inquiry into the Complaint.
- 9.3 The Committee of Inquiry shall consist of three (3) members who are not members of either the Respondent's or the complainant's departments. One of the members should be chosen from outside the Faculty of either the Respondent or the complainant and may be from outside the University. That member must be from outside the University if the allegation relates to Tri-Agency funding. One of the members shall be appointed as the Chair. The Administrative Authority shall advise the Respondent and the complainant of the composition of the Committee of Inquiry.
- 9.4 Any objection to the composition of the Committee of Inquiry shall be made to the Authority within five (5) Working days. The only grounds for objection are alleged bias or conflict of interest. The Administrative Authority's disposition of any such objection shall be final.
- 9.5 The terms of reference of the Committee of Inquiry are:
 - (a) to determine in accordance with s. 9.11 (a) and (b) whether the Respondent has committed misconduct in relation to a com70 Td[c]- t ()apson ttee

12 TIME LIMITS

- 12.1 All time limits in these procedures may be extended in writing by agreement of a designated representative of the Faculty Association and Faculty Relations. The Respondent, complainant and Administrative Authority shall be advised of both the extension of time and the reasons for the extension.