

HEC MONTRÉAL

**Politique sur la conduite
responsable de la recherche**

**Policy for the Responsible
Conduct of Research**

Adoptée par le Conseil pédagogique le 25 avril 2012

**Adopted by the Academic Council
April 25, 2012**



Policy for the Responsible Conduct of Research

Preamble:

HEC Montréal is accountable to society for the integrity of its researchers. This policy sets out the principles, rules and procedures relating to the responsible conduct of research. Researchers are expected to apply the best research practices honestly, responsibly, openly and equitably in the production and dissemination of knowledge. Moreover, they are required to comply with all applicable policies at HEC Montréal, with professional or disciplinary standards, and with all laws and regulations in effect.

1. Application of Best Research Practices

1.1 Research Integrity Best Practices

1.1.1 At a minimum, researchers are responsible for the following with respect to research integrity:

- a. Using a high level of 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 agreement, institutional policies, laws, regulations, and professional or disciplinary standards in a manner that allows 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- c. Referencing and, where applicable, obtaining permission for the use of all published and unpublished work, including data, source material, methodologies, findings, graphs and images;
- d. Including as authors, with their consent, all those and only those who have materially or conceptually contributed to, and share responsibility for, the contents of the publication or document, in a manner consistent with their respective contributions, and with the authorship policies of relevant publications;
- e. Acknowledging, in addition to authors, all contributors and contributions to research, including writers, funders and sponsors;

- f. Appropriately managing any real, potential or perceived conflict of interest in accordance with HEC Montréal's Policy on Conflicts of Interest in Research.

1.2 Applying for and Holding Agency Funding

- 1.2.1 Applicants and holders of grants and awards shall provide true, complete and accurate information in their funding applications and related documents and represent themselves, their research and their accomplishments in a manner consistent with the norms of the relevant field.
- 1.2.2 When submitting an application for funding, applicants shall certify that they are not ineligible to apply for, and/or hold, funds from any granting agency, whether in Canada or abroad, for reasons of breach of responsible conduct of research policies, including policies concerning ethics, integrity or financial management.
- 1.2.3 Principal funding applicants must ensure that others listed on the application have agreed to be included.

1.3 Management of Agency Grant and Award Funds

- 1.3.1 Researchers are responsible for using grant or award funds in accordance with the policies of the agencies, including the Tri-Agency Financial Administration Guide and agency grants and awards guides, and for providing true, complete and accurate information on documentation for expenditures from grant or award accounts.

1.4 Tri-Agency Requirements Regarding Compliance with Regulations

- 1.4.1 Researchers must comply with all applicable agency requirements and legislation for the conduct of research, including, but not limited to:
 - 2nd edition of the Tri-Council Policy Statement: Ethical Conduct of Research Involving Humans (TCPS 2);
 - Canadian Council on Animal Care Policies and Guidelines;
 - Agency policies related to the Canadian Environmental Assessment Act;
 - Licenses for research in the field;
 - Laboratory Biosafety Guidelines;
 - Controlled Goods Program;

- Canadian Nuclear Safety Commission (CNSC) Regulations;
- Canada's Food and Drugs Act.

1.5 Promoting Awareness and Education

1.5.1 The institution shall be responsible for:

- a. Promoting awareness of what constitutes the responsible conduct of research, including agency requirements as set out in the institution's policies, the consequences of failing to meet those requirements, as well as the process for addressing allegations, to all those engaged in research activities at the Institution;
- b. Communicating its policy on the responsible conduct of research within the Institution, and making public annual statistical reports on confirmed findings of breaches of that policy and actions taken, subject to the applicable laws, including the privacy laws;
- c. Communicating the identity of the central point of contact within the Institution who is responsible for receiving confidential enquiries, allegations and information related to allegations of breaches of Agency policies.

2. Breaches of Best Research Practices

2.1 Breaches of Minimal Responsibilities Respecting Research Integrity by Researchers

2.1.1. Breaches of minimal responsibilities with respect to research integrity by researchers include, without being limited to, the following:

- a. *Fabrication*: Making up data, source material, methodologies or findings, including graphs and images;
- b. *Falsification*: Manipulating, changing, or omitting data, source material, methodologies or findings, including graphs and images, without acknowledgement with the aim of falsifying findings or conclusions;
- c. *Destruction of research records*: The destruction of one's own or another person'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;

- d. *Plagiarism*: Presenting and using another person'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 without permission, where required;
- e. *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 without justification;
- f. *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 to which one made little or no material contribution;
- g. *Inadequate acknowledgement*: Failure to appropriately recognize contributions of others in a manner consistent with their respective contributions and with the authorship policies of the relevant publications;
- h. *Mismanagement of conflicts of interest*: Failure to appropriately manage any real, potential or perceived conflict of interest. In this regard, researchers shall refer to HEC Montréal's Policy on Conflicts of Interest in Research.
- i. *Multiple submissions*: The simultaneous submission of an article to more than one scientific or trade journal.

2.2 Misrepresentation in an Agency Application or Related Document

- 2.2.1 Breaches of minimal responsibilities with respect to grant or award applications include, without being limited to, the following:
 - a. 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;
 - b. Applying for and/or holding an agency award when deemed ineligible by any funding agency, whether in Canada or abroad, for reasons of breach of responsible conduct of research policies, including policies concerning ethics, integrity or financial management;
 - c. Listing co-applicants, collaborators or partners without their consent.

2.3 Mismanagement of Grants or Award Funds

- 2.3.1 Breaches of minimal responsibilities with respect to the management of grants or award funds include, without being limited to, the following:

- a. Using grant or award funds for purposes inconsistent with the policies of the agencies;
- b. Misappropriating grants or award funds, contravening the financial policies of the agencies, namely the Tri-Agency Financial Administration Guide and agency grants and awards guides;
- c. Providing incomplete, inaccurate or false information on documentation for expenditures from grant or award accounts.

2.4 Breaches of Agency Requirements Regarding Compliance with Regulations

2.4.1 Breaches of policies concerning certain types of research include, without being limited to, the following:

- a. Failing to meet agency policy requirements or to comply with relevant policies, laws or regulations, for the conduct of certain types of research activities;
- b. Failing to obtain appropriate approvals, permits or certifications before conducting these activities.

3. Addressing Allegations of Breaches

3.1 Receiving Allegations

3.1.1 Any individual who has knowledge of a situation that could constitute a breach under Article 2 can report it to the Director of Research. Such an allegation may also be submitted by a funding agency.

3.1.2 The allegation may concern one or more researchers.

3.1.3 The Director of Research shall protect the identity of the complainant who requests it.

3.1.4 In the event that the allegation concerns the Director of Research, it shall be referred directly to the Director.

3.1.5 The Director of Research or, in his absence, the Director, may take immediate action, before or during the inquiry, notably if there is a threat to the safety or security of any individual, if there is a risk of agency funds being misappropriated, of School property being damaged or of damage to the School's reputation. The Director of Research or, in his/her

absence, the Director, may also take immediate action to protect the reputation of the persons involved.

- 3.1.6 The Director of Research shall conduct an initial inquiry to determine whether there is a credible basis for the allegation. He/she may reject a manifestly unfounded claim, or accept to receive the responsible allegation and to refer it to an investigation committee as stipulated in Article 3.2.1.
- 3.1.7 If the allegation is rejected after being deemed to be manifestly unfounded, the complainant shall be notified in writing within twenty (20) days of submission of the allegation. The Director of Research shall make every effort to protect or restore the reputation of the individuals wrongly subjected to the allegation.
- 3.1.8 Anonymous allegations shall be addressed in accordance with the procedures described in this section, while making the necessary adjustments.
- 3.1.9 If the allegation is deemed to be responsible, the Research Office shall forward a certified copy of the documents provided to back up the allegation to the Secretariat on Responsible Conduct of Research (SRCR). The SRCR is a federal agency that notably provides substantive and administrative support for the Panel on Responsible Conduct of Research (PRCR), and for the three federal research granting agencies with respect to the Tri-Agency Framework: Responsible Conduct of Research.

3.2 Investigating Allegations

- 3.2.1 If the allegation is determined to be responsible, the Director of Research shall convene an investigation committee to handle the complaint.
- 3.2.2 The investigation committee shall be appointed by the Director, who shall also designate its chairperson. This committee shall be composed of two full professors at HEC Montréal and one external member who is not affiliated with the School.
- 3.2.3 The Director of Research shall ensure that the members of the committees are not in a potential conflict of interest with the person who is the subject of the complaint and/or with the complainant.
- 3.2.4 The Director of Research shall have thirty (30) days from the date of receipt of the complaint in which to convene an investigation committee. Upon its appointment, the investigation committee shall act with diligence.

- 3.2.5 The person who is the subject of the complaint shall be given written notice of the substance of the complaint.
- 3.2.6 As part of its mandate, the investigation committee make take any steps necessary to obtain the information required for its investigation. It shall keep a register of all documents it receives.
- 3.2.7 The person who is the subject of the complaint shall be given the opportunity to be heard both in person and in writing by the investigation committee.
- 3.2.8 In the process of handling allegations, the principles of confidentiality and the presumption of innocence must be respected. The individuals investigating complaints shall protect the privacy of both the respondent and the complainant. They shall sign a confidentiality agreement to this effect. All documents and information provided to the committee shall be confidential.
- 3.2.9 The investigation committee shall submit its report to the Director of Research within sixty (60) days of its completion of the investigation. The report shall provide details of the complaint, the evidence presented, its findings with respect to the merits of the allegation, and, if applicable, recommendations to avoid similar situations in the future.

3.3 Decisions on Misconduct

- 3.3.1 In the event that the investigation committee finds the allegation to be unfounded, the Director of Research shall close the file and inform the person who is the subject of the allegation as well as the complainant of the committee conclusions. The Director of Research shall take the necessary steps to safeguard or restore, as the case may be, the reputation of the persons involved.
- 3.3.2 In the event that the investigation committee finds the allegation to be substantiated, the Director of Research shall forward the investigation committee's report and relevant documentation to the Associate Director, Academic Affairs and Strategic Planning, along with a recommendation of appropriate sanctions.
- 3.3.3 Before imposing a sanction, the Associate Director, Academic Affairs and Strategic Planning, shall take into consideration the nature and severity of the alleged misconduct. He shall also give the person who is the subject of the allegation the opportunity to comment on the sanction.

- 3.3.4 The main sanctions that can be imposed include: a warning, suspension of access to research grants, suspension or dismissal. The Associate Director, Academic Affairs and Strategic Planning, may also impose any other sanction deemed appropriate, including:
- issuing a letter of concern to the researcher;
 - requesting that the researcher correct the research record and provide proof that the research record has been corrected;
 - advising the researcher that the Research Office will not accept applications for future funding from him/her for a defined time period or indefinitely;
 - terminating remaining instalments of the grant or award;
 - seeking a refund of all or part of the funds already paid within a defined timeframe.
- 3.3.5 In the case of a dismissal, prior to imposing the sanction, the Associate Director, Academic Affairs and Strategic Planning, may confer with the Human Resources Department. All decisions involving the dismissal of a professor must be authorized by HEC Montréal's Board of Directors.
- 3.3.6 In addition to, and independently of, the sanctions imposed by HEC Montréal, the researcher may also be subject to sanctions imposed by any of the funding agencies.
- 3.3.7 Professors must include any notice of sanction in all future applications for promotion, in the section concerning research. The Director of Research may include the notice of sanction in a candidate's application for promotion if the latter fails to do so.
- 3.3.8 The Director of Research may request that the decision regarding an application for promotion be suspended pending the completion of the investigation committee's report or the dismissal of the allegation, or, in the case of disciplinary action, pending the expiration of the appeal deadline or the completion of the appeal process.
- 3.3.9 At the end of the process, the Associate Director, Academic Affairs and Strategic Planning, shall inform the person who is the subject of the allegation of the sanction to be imposed. He/she may inform the complainant that the investigation has been completed and a finding made, but is not required to inform him/her of the sanction imposed.

- 3.3.10 A person who is found guilty of a breach of this policy may request a review of the finding and the sanction by a research integrity appeal committee. The appeal committee shall be composed of three members, mainly HEC Montréal faculty members, appointed by the Director, who shall also designate one of these members to act as chairperson. The application for review must be submitted to the Director of Research no later than thirty (30) days following receipt of the notice of sanction.
- 3.3.11 The application for review shall be analyzed on the basis of the file as it stands. The research integrity appeal committee shall present its conclusions and recommendations to the Director. Upon receiving the Appeal Committee's recommendations, the Director shall render a decision he/she deems appropriate on the decision made by the investigation committee and on the sanction imposed. He/she shall then inform the person who is the subject of the complaint. The Director's decision shall be final and binding.

4. Information to be Provided to Federal Granting Agencies

- 4.1 Subject to any applicable laws, including privacy laws, the Research Office shall immediately advise the relevant granting agency or the SRCR of any allegations related to activities funded by the agency that may involve significant financial, health and safety, or other risks.
- 4.2 The Research Office shall write a letter to the SRCR confirming whether or not the Institution is proceeding with an inquiry where the SRCR was copied on the allegation or advised as per the previous section. If a breach is confirmed at the investigation stage, reporting requirements outlined in the following section.
- 4.3 The Research Office shall prepare a report for the SRCR on each investigation it conducts in response to an allegation of policy breaches related to a funding application submitted to an agency or to an activity funded by an agency. Subject to any applicable laws, including privacy laws, each report shall include the following information:
- the specific allegation(s), a summary of the finding(s) and reasons for the finding(s);
 - the process and time lines established for the inquiry and/or investigation;
 - the researcher's response to the allegation, investigation and findings, and any measures the researcher has taken to rectify the breach;

- the investigation committee's decisions and recommendations and the actions taken by the Institution;

4.4 The Research Office's report should not include:

- information that is not related specifically to agency funding and policies;
or
- personal information about the researcher, or any other person, that is not directly related to the institution's findings and its report to the SRCR.

4.5 Inquiry letters and investigation reports should be submitted to the SRCR within two and seven months, respectively, of receipt of the allegation by the institution. These deadlines may be extended in consultation with the SRCR if circumstances warrant, and with monthly updates provided to the agency until the investigation is complete.

4.6 The Institution and the researcher may not enter into confidentiality agreements or other agreements related to an inquiry or investigation that prevent the institution from reporting to the agencies through the SRCR.

4.7 In cases where the source of funding is unclear, the SRCR reserves the right to request information and reports from the Institution.