



SIMON FRASER UNIVERSITY  
ENGAGING THE WORLD

**TO:** Senate

**FROM** Joy Johnson  
Chair – Senate Committee on Agenda and Rules

**DATE:** November 26, 2021

**SUBJECT:** Updated Policy R60.01

---

**Motion:**

That Senate approve and recommend to the Board of Governors updated policy R60.01.

## R60.01 Policy

<b>Senators' Comments</b>	<b>Response</b>
Should define 'benefence' if used in the intro (ethics vs social benefence)	Agreed. Entire sentence removed
"Equity" should be deleted from introduction	Agreed. Entire sentence removed
Values laden sentences in the introduction	Agreed. Entire sentence removed
Principles – what is 'honest and thoughtful inquiry?' – should be 'rigorous analysis' (etc)	Principles are a direct quote from the Framework.
Pol 5.2.1 – ambiguous; is this REB review? Possible to leverage this clause to claim that a particular methodology is immoral.	Agreed, and the statement is redundant with a small amount of editing. 5.2.1 removed
Pol 5.2.2 – vague – same issue as above	Direct quote from Framework (see Framework 1.1 and 2.1.2)
Protection for complainants throughout, but lack of protection for researchers accused. Should incorporate presumption of innocence	Implied by the term 'procedural fairness', but now added explicitly as a defined term, including presumption of innocence. Terminology confirmed with Counsel.
Procedural fairness only exists in the procedures. Needs to be in the policy to 'lock it in'.	Added to Pol 5.7 (and is now a defined term)
The word "publication" is used and not defined; concern is that social media might be included	The Framework has not defined 'publication' and has broadened to 'publication or document'. I don't believe social media is considered academic publication generally.
"Research" is too broad. Would like to see an exemption for student not supervised by a faculty member nor funded by a grant. Does not want to see an independently motivated student get tripped up by regulations	The Framework applies to "anyone who conducts research activities". Our policy narrows to "under the auspices of the University". If they are a student of SFU and doing Research (as defined) then the policy will apply.
Asking for a version that highlights what specific wording is required by the Tri-Agency and what is required by General Counsel's review.	Done for T-A. However, GC's review touches all of the document and it would be difficult to tease out legal requirements vs legal opinions.
Pol 9.3 – should point to policies re faculty member's conduct (points to S10 for students)	I believe the only relevant policy focusing specifically on this is A30.01, the 1992 'Code of Faculty Ethics and Responsibilities'. Given how dated the language is I don't believe that pointing to this as principles would be wise. Senate should consider whether this policy should remain in play.
Where is document retention specified?	Only generally in 11.1. This is boilerplate language used in every policy.
The Framework does not use the term 'misconduct'. Recommends replacing the term with 'breach of policy'.	While the Framework does not use the term, the framework itself is more of a recipe for policies than a policy. This was discussed extensively during legal review, and the lawyer required that there be a clear statement in the main policy section. The policy statement can't just be "don't breach the policy". Misconduct, while definitely a negative term, covers all the 'disciplinary norms' that are not

## R60.01 Policy

explicitly stated. Most universities also have used the term 'research misconduct' in their modern RCR policies. After discussion with Senators a new policy statement line was added (5.1.2)

Clarify misconduct vs breach.	See above. Also – added Pol 5.1.2 after discussion with Senators – an additional key policy statement: “No Member shall Breach the principles of this policy”
Recommends starting with positive statements – is the policy here to encourage ethical research or to punish those who breach?	This is actually more the latter – to determine if a Breach occurred and to do something about it. Many other policies contain positive statements. The Framework is structured the same way, and the positive components are primarily focused on education. The draft policy notes this in the introduction and with a (short) section in the policy (6.0)
There should be expectation of the university in the policy – not just researchers. eg 'each person who engages in research can expect to receive support from the Office of Research Ethics / ORS etc'	The <i>responsibilities</i> of the university are very specific: creating this policy, reporting, and educating. Researchers are responsible for ethical conduct (etc) in their research. However, there are lots of shared <i>accountabilities</i> . Those are detailed in other policies.
Pol 5.3.1 – SFU should acknowledge responsibility for compliance – it is shared with researchers	As above. The University is responsible for a compliance framework. Researchers are responsible for compliance.
Pol 5.3.1 – should stop with 'directly responsible for the quality and ethics of their work'	Deleted 5.3.1 entirely after minor edits. (Redundant)
Pol 5.3.2 – how do you determine what is 'generally accepted' in the researcher's field?	This is part of the responsibility of the RIO and/or the investigation committee. This can be a considerable undertaking – eg plagiarism can differ. Based on the Framework.
Pol 5.3.2 – strike out 'honestly, accountably, openly and fairly' – too aspirational.	Direct from the Framework
Pol 5.3.4 – remove 'thoroughly familiar with ... applicable law...'	Direct from the Framework
Pol 5.4 – strike 'misconduct' or make 'may be misconduct'	Direct from the Framework
Pol 5.5 – implies that failure to report a breach may itself be a breach. Also in Pol 7.2	Generally taken from the Framework. “Expected to report the matter” does not imply that not reporting is a breach. Also taken from the Framework.
Pol 5.6 – how is the accused person protected (presumption of innocence...)	Added under new definition of 'procedural fairness'

## R60.01 Policy

Pol 5.7 – will the procedures be made public?	Confusion over the term – it refers to the procedures of the <u>policy</u> (not a new set). Added words to clarify
Pol 5.11 – reasonable but misaligned with appendices (ie xxx but not limited to...)	This is a general statement of possible consequences.
Pol 6.1 – good but underdeveloped.	Agreed. This area needs to be developed outside the policy, as it is a responsibility of the University under the Framework. An online system is in place and work is underway on supplementary materials.
Pol 7.2 and 7.3 – Does the university hold accountability for a fair and transparent process?	Insofar as it is defined in the policy as fair and transparent, yes.
(cont) – Univ expected to ensure principles of natural justice are applied..	Yes. Added definition of ‘procedural fairness’
(verbal) Failure to specifically state that privacy will be protected as far as possible	Added as a new item - Pol 10.2



# RESPONSIBLE CONDUCT OF RESEARCH

<b>Date</b> May 25, 1995	<b>Number</b> R60.01
<b>Date of Last Review/Revision</b>	<b>Mandated Review</b> ____, 2026

Policy Authority: Vice-President Research and International

Associated Procedure: Procedures to Address Allegations

**Commented [TD1]:** Highlighted in yellow = required by federal Framework on RCR

## EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

Research and scholarship are central, critical components of the University. Post-secondary research is predicated on a climate of academic freedom, where scholars may challenge convention, remain free of institutional censorship, and engage with human or animal research subjects. With such freedoms comes the personal responsibility to ensure that the work and the outcomes are informed by the principles of integrity, trust and honesty, and meet high scientific, ethical and professional standards. The trust that the public places in university scholars is based largely on respect for the integrity of the research process.

**Deleted:** Further, such work and outcomes must meet  
**Deleted:** ; and demonstrate the values of fairness, beneficence and equity

The responsible conduct of research (“RCR”) is about more than just the research process itself. RCR also pertains to applying for funding, financial management, the process of dissemination, monitoring for potential conflicts of interest or commitment, as well as maintaining a fair and equitable work environment.

Simon Fraser University is committed to encouraging these values through ongoing education of its members in the responsible conduct of research, and through the adoption of policies specifying how the research and scholarship process should be conducted. This policy sets out the responsibilities for researchers with respect to research integrity, applying for funding, financial management, and requirements for conducting certain types of research, and defines what constitutes a Breach of the policy. The procedures accompanying this policy detail the process for submitting allegations of misconduct, and the procedures to assess, investigate and address such allegations.

## 1.0 PRINCIPLES

**Commented [TD2]:** Section adopted near verbatim from the Framework.

1.1 In order to maximize the quality and benefits of research, a positive research environment is required. For researchers, this implies duties of honest and thoughtful inquiry, rigorous analysis,

commitment to the dissemination of research results, and adherence to the use of professional standards. The minimum standards, adopted from the *Tri-Agency Framework: Responsible Conduct of Research*, include:

- 1.1.1 **Rigour:** Scholarly and scientific rigour in proposing and performing research; in recording, analyzing, and interpreting data; and in reporting and publishing data and findings.
- 1.1.2 **Record keeping:** Keeping complete and accurate records of data, methodologies, and findings, including graphs and images, in accordance with all relevant agreements, policies, laws, regulations, and professional or disciplinary standards in a manner that will allow verification or replication of the work by others.
- 1.1.3 **Accurate referencing:** 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.
- 1.1.4 **Authorship:** Including as authors, with their consent, all those and only those who have made a substantial contribution to, and who accept responsibility for, the contents of the publication or document. The substantial contribution may be conceptual or material.
- 1.1.5 **Acknowledgement:** Acknowledging appropriately all those and only those who have contributed to research, including funders and sponsors.
- 1.1.6 **Conflict of interest management:** Appropriately identifying and addressing any real, potential or perceived conflict of interest in accordance with the University's policy on Conflict of Interest and Conflict of Commitment (GP 37).

## 2.0 PURPOSE

- 2.1 This policy is intended to:
  - 2.1.1 promote the responsible conduct of Research;
  - 2.1.2 establish the University's expectations for the conduct of Research;
  - 2.1.3 assign responsibility for addressing Allegations.

## 3.0 SCOPE AND JURISDICTION

- 3.1 This policy applies all persons engaged in Research under the auspices of, or in affiliation with, the University, including Research that:
  - 3.1.1 is conducted by University employees, postdoctoral scholars, or students; or
  - 3.1.2 uses University equipment, facilities, space, or resources, or involves employees, postdoctoral scholars, or students;
- 3.2 Students engaged in Research are subject to this policy. Should such a student Breach this policy, any sanctions or actions will be addressed through the Procedures for Academic Misconduct in the University's Policy S10.01.

## 4.0 DEFINITIONS

- 4.1 Appendix A contains the definitions of words used in this policy and its associated procedures.

## 5.0 POLICY

### Prohibited Conduct

- 5.1 No Member of the University community shall:
- 5.1.1 engage in Research Misconduct;
  - 5.1.2 Breach the principles of this policy;
  - 5.1.3 make a deliberately misleading Allegation; or
  - 5.1.4 retaliate against anyone who invoked this policy or its procedures in good faith, or against a person who participated or cooperated in good faith in a process addressing an Allegation.

Formatted: Not Highlight

### Expectations for the Conduct of Research

- 5.2 Each person who engages in Research:
- 5.2.1 is expected and required to be thoroughly familiar with and to comply with the scholarly standards and practices that are generally accepted in the academic community and their scholarly field, and to comply with those standards honestly, accountably, openly, and fairly;
  - 5.2.2 is expected and required to familiarize those under their supervision with the scholarly standards and practices that are generally accepted in the academic community and their scholarly field;
  - 5.2.3 is expected and required to be thoroughly familiar with and to comply with all applicable law, policies, rules, guidelines, contractual obligations, and standards, including those of Funding Organizations and funding agreements. Some common Funding Organization requirements include, but are not limited to:
    - a. [Tri-Agency Framework: Responsible Conduct of Research](#)
    - b. The current edition of [Tri-Council Policy Statement: Ethical Conduct for Research Involving Humans \(TCPS\)](#); and
    - c. [Canadian Council on Animal Care](#) Policies and Guidelines.
- 5.3 Failing to meet the requirements of a relevant Funding Organization or failure to comply with other applicable law, policies, rules, guidelines, contractual obligations, or standards constitutes Research Misconduct and is a Breach of this policy.

Commented [TD3]: Deleted former 5.2.1 - redundant

Deleted: <#> is directly responsible for the quality and ethics of their work and must personally ensure that they have complied with all requirements;

Commented [TD4]: Deleted - redundant.

Deleted: ¶

Deleted: agencies

Deleted: ¶ is expected and required to follow the principles of responsible Research generally accepted in the academic community and the specific requirements of all relevant Funding Organizations.. ...

### Responsibility to Report

- 5.4 Researchers and others play an important role in the process of addressing [allegations of policy Breaches](#). Every person who has reasonable grounds to believe that a Breach of this policy is occurring or has occurred at the University is expected to report the matter, in good faith and confidentiality, to the University Research Integrity Officer ("RIO").
- 5.5 To protect a person who makes a good faith Allegation from Retaliation, the RIO will act in accordance with the protection of identity principles contained in the University's Protected Disclosure Policy (GP 41).

Deleted: Research Misconduct

Deleted: by a University employee, postdoctoral scholar, student, or other researcher affiliated with SFU

### University's Response to Allegations of Research Misconduct

- 5.6 An Allegation under this policy will be addressed in accordance with the procedures [of this policy](#) established and maintained by the Vice-President, Research and International.
- 5.7 Allegations made under this policy may vary in their source, accuracy, intent, and motivation and have the potential to cause harm to the individuals involved, to the University, and to research and scholarship in general. [The University will therefore assess and, where appropriate, investigate Allegations promptly and fairly, utilizing the principles of Procedural Fairness.](#)
- 5.8 [With no prejudice to the outcome of the assessment or investigation, the University may independently, or at the request of a Funding Organization, take immediate action to protect the administration of research funds. Such actions could include freezing grant accounts, requiring a second authorized signature from an institutional representative on all expenses charged to the researcher's grant accounts, or other measures as appropriate.](#)

### Consequences

- 5.9 [Intent will not be considered in assessing and investigating allegations. Intent will, however, be considered in recommending sanctions or actions.](#)
- 5.10 Individuals found to have Breached this policy may be subject to sanctions or discipline or other action under this or other University policies and procedures, applicable collective agreements, and applicable law.

**Deleted:** may lose the privilege of conducting Research and  
**Deleted:** also

### 6.0 EDUCATION AND AWARENESS

- 6.1 [The University will actively promote awareness and education of the importance of the Responsible Conduct of Research through a variety of measures, including dissemination of written materials, and through workshops and seminars.](#)

### 7.0 ROLES AND RESPONSIBILITIES

- 7.1 [Researchers are responsible for complying with this policy.](#)
- 7.2 [Every person who has reasonable grounds to believe that a Breach of this policy is occurring or has occurred is expected to report it, \[in confidence\]\(#\), to the Research Integrity Officer.](#)
- 7.3 All Members of the University community, including Complainants and Respondents, are expected to cooperate with the Research Integrity Officer and, if one is constituted, the Investigation Committee.
- 7.4 The Vice-President, Research and International is responsible for implementing this policy and for fulfilling the University's reporting obligations to Funding Organizations in relation to Breaches of this policy.

### 8.0 REPORTING

- 8.1 [Subject to the \*Freedom of Information and Protection of Privacy Act\*, the University will report annually, or as otherwise required, to Funding Organizations about breaches of this policy to fulfill the University's legal, contractual, or other obligations to the Funding Organization.](#)



## 9.0 RELATED LEGAL, POLICY AUTHORITIES AND AGREEMENTS

9.1 If an Allegation involves research supported by the Public Health Service (“PHS”) of the United States Department of Health and Human Services, the PHS policies on research misconduct as outlined in the US Federal Code of Regulations (42 CFR Part 93) will be consulted and followed to the extent possible. [Policy R60.01](#) will prevail when its requirements are more stringent than the US Federal Code of Regulations.

Deleted: This policy

9.2 Existing University contracts (such as a collective agreement) or applicable legislation (such as British Columbia’s *Freedom of Information and Protection of Privacy Act*) will prevail when there is a conflict with the US Federal Code of Regulations, or with other external policies or regulations of Funding Organizations, or the laws of other jurisdictions.

9.3 The legal and other University Policy authorities and agreements that may bear on the administration of this policy and may be consulted as needed include but are not limited to:

9.3.1 *University Act*, R.S.B.C. 1996, c. 468

9.3.2 *Freedom of Information and Protection of Privacy Act*, R.S.B.C. 1996, c. 165

9.3.3 Conflict of Interest and Conflict of Commitment (GP 37)

9.3.4 SFU’s Information Policies (I10)

9.3.5 Ethics Review of Research Involving Human Participants (R 20.01)

9.3.6 Treatment of Animals in Research and Teaching (R 20.03)

9.3.7 Radiation Safety (R 20.04)

9.3.8 Student Academic Integrity Policy (S 10.01)

9.3.9 Student Conduct Policy (S 10.05)

9.3.10 Collective agreements and human resources and employment policies.

9.3.11 [Tri-Agency Framework: Responsible Conduct of Research](#)

9.3.12 The current edition of [Tri-Council Policy Statement: Ethical Conduct for Research Involving Humans](#) (TCPS)

9.3.13 [Canadian Council on Animal Care](#) Policies and Guidelines

## 10.0 ACCESS TO INFORMATION AND PROTECTION OF PRIVACY

[10.1](#) The information and records made and received to administer this policy are subject to the access to information and protection of privacy provisions of British Columbia’s *Freedom of Information and Protection of Privacy Act* and the University’s Information Policy series.

[10.2](#) [Subject to 10.1, the University will protect the privacy of the Complainant\(s\) and Respondent\(s\) as far as is possible.](#)

## 11.0 RETENTION AND DISPOSAL OF RECORDS

11.1 Information and records made and received to administer this policy are evidence of the University’s actions to address misconduct in Research. Information and records must be retained and disposed of in accordance with a records retention schedule approved by the University Archivist.

**12.0 POLICY REVIEW**

12.1 This policy must be reviewed every 5 years and may always be reviewed as needed.

**13.0 POLICY AUTHORITY**

13.1 This policy is administered under the authority of the Vice-President, Research and International.

**14.0 INTERPRETATION**

14.1 Questions of interpretation or application of this policy or its procedures shall be referred to the President, whose decision shall be final.

**15.0 PROCEDURES AND OTHER ASSOCIATED DOCUMENTS**

15.1 Appendix A contains the definitions applicable to this policy and its associated procedures.

15.2 Appendix B contains examples of Research Misconduct.

15.3 The procedures for this policy are: Procedures to Address Allegations.

# APPENDIX A - DEFINITIONS - RESPONSIBLE CONDUCT OF RESEARCH

<b>Date</b> May 25, 1995	<b>Number</b> R60.01
<b>Date of Last Review/Revision</b>	<b>Mandated Review</b> _____, 2026

Policy Authority: Vice-President, Research and International

Parent Policy: Responsible Conduct of Research (R60.01)

## 1.0 PURPOSE

1.1 The definitions in this Appendix define the words used in the Responsible Conduct of Research policy (R60.01) (the “Policy”) and in the Procedures to Address Allegations (“the Procedures”).

## 2.0 DEFINITIONS

- 2.1 **Allegation** means a declaration, statement, or assertion communicated in writing that there has been, or continues to be, a Breach of the Responsible Conduct of Research Policy, the validity of which has not been established.
- 2.2 **Breach** means any conduct, behaviour, actions, or omissions that are inconsistent with or violate the Policy. A Breach includes innocent errors and oversights. The Respondent’s intention is a factor that is considered before imposing sanctions or taking other measures following an Investigation.
- 2.3 **Complainant** means a person who makes an Allegation. The University reserves the right to assume the role of Complainant.
- 2.4 **Conflict of Interest** means a situation in which the private interests of a Member or related party compromise, or have the appearance of compromising, the Member’s independence and objective judgment in actions or decisions taken by the Member on behalf of the University, including in the performance of their teaching, research, service, or other obligations to the University. In the research context, this includes influencing an investigator’s professional judgment in conducting or disseminating research. A conflict of interest can be real, potential, or perceived.
- 2.5 **Funding Organization** means a government agency, a foundation, or a private or corporate sponsor of Research at the University. This includes Canada’s three federal granting agencies (also referred to as the “Tri-Agency”).

- 2.6 **Inquiry** means the process of reviewing an Allegation to determine whether it has a sufficient factual basis, whether the facts would, if established on a balance of probabilities, constitute a Breach of the Policy, and whether an Investigation is warranted.
- 2.7 **Investigation** means a systematic process conducted by the designated Investigation Committee to consider an Allegation, to collect and examine evidence related to the Allegation, and to determine whether, on a balance of probabilities, a Breach of a policy has occurred.
- 2.8 **Investigation Committee (“Committee”)** is a group appointed by the Vice-President, Research and International (“VPRI”), or the VPRI’s delegate, authorized to conduct an Investigation to determine whether a Breach has occurred.
- 2.9 **Member** means any person who teaches, conducts Research, or works at or under the auspices of the University, including, but not limited to, any person acting their capacity as part- or full-time faculty, staff or student, post-doctoral fellows, and any other persons while they are acting on behalf of or at the request of the University.
- 2.10 **Procedural Fairness** means the process of decision making based on the following principles: the presumption of innocence, the right of the Respondent to be heard, the right of the Respondent to know the case against them, decisions issued with reasons, and the application of Conflict of Interest processes (including independence and lack of bias) to the decision-makers.
- 2.11 **Representative** means a person chosen by the Respondent, or by the Complainant, to accompany them to meetings or other processes under the Procedures, which may be a member or staff employee of an employee group to which they belong.
- 2.12 **Research** means an undertaking intended to extend knowledge through a disciplined inquiry and/or systematic investigation. For the purposes of the Responsible Conduct of Research Policy and its associated procedures, Research includes applying for and managing research funds, performing research, and disseminating results, but does not normally include research carried out by students that is not intended for publication.
- 2.13 **Research Integrity Officer (“RIO”)** is an academic staff member designated by the Vice-President Research and International, responsible for implementing the Procedures to Address Allegations.
- 2.14 **Research Misconduct** means conduct that breaches the standards and practice generally accepted within the relevant research/scholarly field and may include but is not limited to: fabrication or falsification, destruction of research records, plagiarism, self-plagiarism, invalid authorship, inadequate acknowledgement, mismanagement of conflict of interest, misrepresentation, mismanagement of research funds, failure to comply with the requirements of funding applications, agreements and related policies, and failure to obtain the necessary approvals before commencing work with human participants. Research Misconduct does not include situations of conflicting, though valid, data, valid differences in experimental design, or differences in interpretation or evaluation of information. See Appendix B to the Policy for examples of Research Misconduct.
- 2.15 **Respondent** means a Member or Members against whom an Allegation is directed, or who may be implicated in an Allegation (for example, co-authors or co-investigators or other members of a research team), or who become the subject of an Investigation. Respondent also includes a past

Member against whom an Allegation is directed with respect to Research activities conducted while a Member.

- 2.16 **Retaliation** means an adverse action or threatened action, direct or indirect, taken or made through any means, against a person who invoked the Policy or its procedures in good faith, or against a person who participated or cooperated in good faith in a University process addressing an Allegation. Retaliation is prohibited conduct
- 2.17 **Secretariat on the Responsible Conduct of Research (“SRCR”)** means the body, external to the University, that provides substantive and administrative support for the Panel on Research Ethics (“PRE”), the Panel on Responsible Conduct of Research (“PRCR”), and for the Tri-Agency with respect to the *Tri-Council Policy Statement: Ethical Conduct for Research Involving Humans*, 2nd edition, and the *Tri-Agency Framework: Responsible Conduct of Research*.
- 2.18 **University** means Simon Fraser University, also referred to as SFU.

# RESPONSIBLE CONDUCT OF RESEARCH

**Date**  
May 25, 1995

**Number**  
R60.01

**Date of Last  
Review/Revision**

**Mandated  
Review**  
\_\_\_\_, 2026

Policy Authority: Vice-President Research and International

Associated Procedure: Procedures to Address Allegations

---

## EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

Research and scholarship are central, critical components of the University. Post-secondary research is predicated on a climate of academic freedom, where scholars may challenge convention, remain free of institutional censorship, and engage with human or animal research subjects. With such freedoms comes the personal responsibility to ensure that the work and the outcomes are informed by the principles of integrity, trust and honesty, and meet high scientific, ethical and professional standards. The trust that the public places in university scholars is based largely on respect for the integrity of the research process.

The responsible conduct of research (“RCR”) is about more than just the research process itself. RCR also pertains to applying for funding, financial management, the process of dissemination, monitoring for potential conflicts of interest or commitment, as well as maintaining a fair and equitable work environment.

Simon Fraser University is committed to encouraging these values through ongoing education of its members in the responsible conduct of research, and through the adoption of policies specifying how the research and scholarship process should be conducted. This policy sets out the responsibilities for researchers with respect to research integrity, applying for funding, financial management, and requirements for conducting certain types of research, and defines what constitutes a Breach of the policy. The procedures accompanying this policy detail the process for submitting allegations of misconduct, and the procedures to assess, investigate and address such allegations.

---

## 1.0 PRINCIPLES

- 1.1 In order to maximize the quality and benefits of research, a positive research environment is required. For researchers, this implies duties of honest and thoughtful inquiry, rigorous analysis,

commitment to the dissemination of research results, and adherence to the use of professional standards. The minimum standards, adopted from the *Tri-Agency Framework: Responsible Conduct of Research*, include:

- 1.1.1 **Rigour:** Scholarly and scientific rigour in proposing and performing research; in recording, analyzing, and interpreting data; and in reporting and publishing data and findings.
- 1.1.2 **Record keeping:** Keeping complete and accurate records of data, methodologies, and findings, including graphs and images, in accordance with all relevant agreements, policies, laws, regulations, and professional or disciplinary standards in a manner that will allow verification or replication of the work by others.
- 1.1.3 **Accurate referencing:** 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.
- 1.1.4 **Authorship:** Including as authors, with their consent, all those and only those who have made a substantial contribution to, and who accept responsibility for, the contents of the publication or document. The substantial contribution may be conceptual or material.
- 1.1.5 **Acknowledgement:** Acknowledging appropriately all those and only those who have contributed to research, including funders and sponsors.
- 1.1.6 **Conflict of interest management:** Appropriately identifying and addressing any real, potential or perceived conflict of interest in accordance with the University's policy on Conflict of Interest and Conflict of Commitment (GP 37).

## 2.0 PURPOSE

2.1 This policy is intended to:

- 2.1.1 promote the responsible conduct of Research;
- 2.1.2 establish the University's expectations for the conduct of Research;
- 2.1.3 assign responsibility for addressing Allegations.

## 3.0 SCOPE AND JURISDICTION

3.1 This policy applies all persons engaged in Research under the auspices of, or in affiliation with, the University, including Research that:

- 3.1.1 is conducted by University employees, postdoctoral scholars, or students; or
- 3.1.2 uses University equipment, facilities, space, or resources, or involves employees, postdoctoral scholars, or students;

3.2 Students engaged in Research are subject to this policy. Should such a student Breach this policy, any sanctions or actions will be addressed through the Procedures for Academic Misconduct in the University's Policy S10.01.

## 4.0 DEFINITIONS

4.1 Appendix A contains the definitions of words used in this policy and its associated procedures.

## 5.0 POLICY

### Prohibited Conduct

- 5.1 No Member of the University community shall:
- 5.1.1 engage in Research Misconduct;
  - 5.1.2 Breach the principles of this policy;
  - 5.1.3 make a deliberately misleading Allegation; or
  - 5.1.4 retaliate against anyone who invoked this policy or its procedures in good faith, or against a person who participated or cooperated in good faith in a process addressing an Allegation.

### Expectations for the Conduct of Research

- 5.2 Each person who engages in Research:
- 5.2.1 is expected and required to be thoroughly familiar with and to comply with the scholarly standards and practices that are generally accepted in the academic community and their scholarly field, and to comply with those standards honestly, accountably, openly, and fairly;
  - 5.2.2 is expected and required to familiarize those under their supervision with the scholarly standards and practices that are generally accepted in the academic community and their scholarly field;
  - 5.2.3 is expected and required to be thoroughly familiar with and to comply with all applicable law, policies, rules, guidelines, contractual obligations, and standards, including those of Funding Organizations and funding agreements. Some common Funding Organization requirements include, but are not limited to:
    - a. [\*Tri-Agency Framework: Responsible Conduct of Research\*](#)
    - b. The current edition of [\*Tri-Council Policy Statement: Ethical Conduct for Research Involving Humans \(TCPS\)\*](#); and
    - c. [\*Canadian Council on Animal Care Policies and Guidelines\*](#).
- 5.3 Failing to meet the requirements of a relevant Funding Organization or failure to comply with other applicable law, policies, rules, guidelines, contractual obligations, or standards constitutes Research Misconduct and is a Breach of this policy.

### Responsibility to Report

- 5.4 Researchers and others play an important role in the process of addressing allegations of policy Breaches. Every person who has reasonable grounds to believe that a Breach of this policy is occurring or has occurred at the University is expected to report the matter, in good faith and confidentiality, to the University Research Integrity Officer (“RIO”).
- 5.5 To protect a person who makes a good faith Allegation from Retaliation, the RIO will act in accordance with the protection of identity principles contained in the University’s Protected Disclosure Policy (GP 41).



## **University's Response to Allegations of Research Misconduct**

- 5.6 An Allegation under this policy will be addressed in accordance with the procedures of this policy established and maintained by the Vice-President, Research and International.
- 5.7 Allegations made under this policy may vary in their source, accuracy, intent, and motivation and have the potential to cause harm to the individuals involved, to the University, and to research and scholarship in general. The University will therefore assess and, where appropriate, investigate Allegations promptly and fairly, utilizing the principles of Procedural Fairness.
- 5.8 With no prejudice to the outcome of the assessment or investigation, the University may independently, or at the request of a Funding Organization, take immediate action to protect the administration of research funds. Such actions could include freezing grant accounts, requiring a second authorized signature from an institutional representative on all expenses charged to the researcher's grant accounts, or other measures as appropriate.

## **Consequences**

- 5.9 Intent will not be considered in assessing and investigating allegations. Intent will, however, be considered in recommending sanctions or actions.
- 5.10 Individuals found to have Breached this policy may be subject to sanctions or discipline or other action under this or other University policies and procedures, applicable collective agreements, and applicable law.

## **6.0 EDUCATION AND AWARENESS**

- 6.1 The University will actively promote awareness and education of the importance of the Responsible Conduct of Research through a variety of measures, including dissemination of written materials, and through workshops and seminars.

## **7.0 ROLES AND RESPONSIBILITIES**

- 7.1 Researchers are responsible for complying with this policy.
- 7.2 Every person who has reasonable grounds to believe that a Breach of this policy is occurring or has occurred is expected to report it, in confidence, to the Research Integrity Officer.
- 7.3 All Members of the University community, including Complainants and Respondents, are expected to cooperate with the Research Integrity Officer and, if one is constituted, the Investigation Committee.
- 7.4 The Vice-President, Research and International is responsible for implementing this policy and for fulfilling the University's reporting obligations to Funding Organizations in relation to Breaches of this policy.

## **8.0 REPORTING**

- 8.1 Subject to the *Freedom of Information and Protection of Privacy Act*, the University will report annually, or as otherwise required, to Funding Organizations about breaches of this policy to fulfill the University's legal, contractual, or other obligations to the Funding Organization.

## **9.0 RELATED LEGAL, POLICY AUTHORITIES AND AGREEMENTS**

- 9.1 If an Allegation involves research supported by the Public Health Service (“PHS”) of the United States Department of Health and Human Services, the PHS policies on research misconduct as outlined in the US Federal Code of Regulations (42 CFR Part 93) will be consulted and followed to the extent possible. Policy R60.01 will prevail when its requirements are more stringent than the US Federal Code of Regulations.
- 9.2 Existing University contracts (such as a collective agreement) or applicable legislation (such as British Columbia’s *Freedom of Information and Protection of Privacy Act*) will prevail when there is a conflict with the US Federal Code of Regulations, or with other external policies or regulations of Funding Organizations, or the laws of other jurisdictions.
- 9.3 The legal and other University Policy authorities and agreements that may bear on the administration of this policy and may be consulted as needed include but are not limited to:
- 9.3.1 *University Act*, R.S.B.C. 1996, c. 468
  - 9.3.2 *Freedom of Information and Protection of Privacy Act*, R.S.B.C. 1996, c. 165
  - 9.3.3 Conflict of Interest and Conflict of Commitment (GP 37)
  - 9.3.4 SFU’s Information Policies (I10)
  - 9.3.5 Ethics Review of Research Involving Human Participants (R 20.01)
  - 9.3.6 Treatment of Animals in Research and Teaching (R 20.03)
  - 9.3.7 Radiation Safety (R 20.04)
  - 9.3.8 Student Academic Integrity Policy (S 10.01)
  - 9.3.9 Student Conduct Policy (S 10.05)
  - 9.3.10 Collective agreements and human resources and employment policies.
  - 9.3.11 [Tri-Agency Framework: Responsible Conduct of Research](#)
  - 9.3.12 The current edition of [Tri-Council Policy Statement: Ethical Conduct for Research Involving Humans](#) (TCPS)
  - 9.3.13 [Canadian Council on Animal Care](#) Policies and Guidelines

## **10.0 ACCESS TO INFORMATION AND PROTECTION OF PRIVACY**

- 10.1 The information and records made and received to administer this policy are subject to the access to information and protection of privacy provisions of British Columbia’s *Freedom of Information and Protection of Privacy Act* and the University’s Information Policy series.
- 10.2 Subject to 10.1, the University will protect the privacy of the Complainant(s) and Respondent(s) as far as is possible.

## **11.0 RETENTION AND DISPOSAL OF RECORDS**

- 11.1 Information and records made and received to administer this policy are evidence of the University’s actions to address misconduct in Research. Information and records must be retained and disposed of in accordance with a records retention schedule approved by the University Archivist.

**12.0 POLICY REVIEW**

12.1 This policy must be reviewed every 5 years and may always be reviewed as needed.

**13.0 POLICY AUTHORITY**

13.1 This policy is administered under the authority of the Vice-President, Research and International.

**14.0 INTERPRETATION**

14.1 Questions of interpretation or application of this policy or its procedures shall be referred to the President, whose decision shall be final.

**15.0 PROCEDURES AND OTHER ASSOCIATED DOCUMENTS**

15.1 Appendix A contains the definitions applicable to this policy and its associated procedures.

15.2 Appendix B contains examples of Research Misconduct.

15.3 The procedures for this policy are: Procedures to Address Allegations.

# APPENDIX A - DEFINITIONS - RESPONSIBLE CONDUCT OF RESEARCH

<b>Date</b> May 25, 1995	<b>Number</b> R60.01
<b>Date of Last Review/Revision</b>	<b>Mandated Review</b> _____, 2026

Policy Authority: Vice-President, Research and International

Parent Policy: Responsible Conduct of Research (R60.01)

## 1.0 PURPOSE

1.1 The definitions in this Appendix define the words used in the Responsible Conduct of Research policy (R60.01) (the “Policy”) and in the Procedures to Address Allegations (“the Procedures”).

## 2.0 DEFINITIONS

- 2.1 **Allegation** means a declaration, statement, or assertion communicated in writing that there has been, or continues to be, a Breach of the Responsible Conduct of Research Policy, the validity of which has not been established.
- 2.2 **Breach** means any conduct, behaviour, actions, or omissions that are inconsistent with or violate the Policy. A Breach includes innocent errors and oversights. The Respondent’s intention is a factor that is considered before imposing sanctions or taking other measures following an Investigation.
- 2.3 **Complainant** means a person who makes an Allegation. The University reserves the right to assume the role of Complainant.
- 2.4 **Conflict of Interest** means a situation in which the private interests of a Member or related party compromise, or have the appearance of compromising, the Member’s independence and objective judgment in actions or decisions taken by the Member on behalf of the University, including in the performance of their teaching, research, service, or other obligations to the University. In the research context, this includes influencing an investigator’s professional judgment in conducting or disseminating research. A conflict of interest can be real, potential, or perceived.
- 2.5 **Funding Organization** means a government agency, a foundation, or a private or corporate sponsor of Research at the University. This includes Canada’s three federal granting agencies (also referred to as the “Tri-Agency”).

- 2.6 **Inquiry** means the process of reviewing an Allegation to determine whether it has a sufficient factual basis, whether the facts would, if established on a balance of probabilities, constitute a Breach of the Policy, and whether an Investigation is warranted.
- 2.7 **Investigation** means a systematic process conducted by the designated Investigation Committee to consider an Allegation, to collect and examine evidence related to the Allegation, and to determine whether, on a balance of probabilities, a Breach of a policy has occurred.
- 2.8 **Investigation Committee (“Committee”)** is a group appointed by the Vice-President, Research and International (“VPRI”), or the VPRI’s delegate, authorized to conduct an Investigation to determine whether a Breach has occurred.
- 2.9 **Member** means any person who teaches, conducts Research, or works at or under the auspices of the University, including, but not limited to, any person acting their capacity as part- or full-time faculty, staff or student, post-doctoral fellows, and any other persons while they are acting on behalf of or at the request of the University.
- 2.10 **Procedural Fairness** means the process of decision making based on the following principles: the presumption of innocence, the right of the Respondent to be heard, the right of the Respondent to know the case against them, decisions issued with reasons, and the application of Conflict of Interest processes (including independence and lack of bias) to the decision-makers.
- 2.11 **Representative** means a person chosen by the Respondent, or by the Complainant, to accompany them to meetings or other processes under the Procedures, which may be a member or staff employee of an employee group to which they belong.
- 2.12 **Research** means an undertaking intended to extend knowledge through a disciplined inquiry and/or systematic investigation. For the purposes of the Responsible Conduct of Research Policy and its associated procedures, Research includes applying for and managing research funds, performing research, and disseminating results, but does not normally include research carried out by students that is not intended for publication.
- 2.13 **Research Integrity Officer (“RIO”)** is an academic staff member designated by the Vice-President Research and International, responsible for implementing the Procedures to Address Allegations.
- 2.14 **Research Misconduct** means conduct that breaches the standards and practice generally accepted within the relevant research/scholarly field and may include but is not limited to: fabrication or falsification, destruction of research records, plagiarism, self-plagiarism, invalid authorship, inadequate acknowledgement, mismanagement of conflict of interest, misrepresentation, mismanagement of research funds, failure to comply with the requirements of funding applications, agreements and related policies, and failure to obtain the necessary approvals before commencing work with human participants. Research Misconduct does not include situations of conflicting, though valid, data, valid differences in experimental design, or differences in interpretation or evaluation of information. See Appendix B to the Policy for examples of Research Misconduct.
- 2.15 **Respondent** means a Member or Members against whom an Allegation is directed, or who may be implicated in an Allegation (for example, co-authors or co-investigators or other members of a research team), or who become the subject of an Investigation. Respondent also includes a past

Member against whom an Allegation is directed with respect to Research activities conducted while a Member.

- 2.16 **Retaliation** means an adverse action or threatened action, direct or indirect, taken or made through any means, against a person who invoked the Policy or its procedures in good faith, or against a person who participated or cooperated in good faith in a University process addressing an Allegation. Retaliation is prohibited conduct
- 2.17 **Secretariat on the Responsible Conduct of Research (“SRCR”)** means the body, external to the University, that provides substantive and administrative support for the Panel on Research Ethics (“PRE”), the Panel on Responsible Conduct of Research (“PRCR”), and for the Tri-Agency with respect to the *Tri-Council Policy Statement: Ethical Conduct for Research Involving Humans*, 2nd edition, and the *Tri-Agency Framework: Responsible Conduct of Research*.
- 2.18 **University** means Simon Fraser University, also referred to as SFU.