

Procedures for Addressing Allegations of Research Misconduct at the University of Saskatchewan

1.0 Application

These procedures accompany the Research Integrity Policy and apply to all allegations of research misconduct against members of the University of Saskatchewan, except when the member is a graduate or undergraduate student. Allegations of research misconduct by graduate and undergraduate students will be dealt with through the *Regulations on Student Academic Misconduct*¹ or the *Standard of Student Conduct in Non-Academic Matters*². Oversight of the procedures is the responsibility of the Office of the Vice-President Research.

For the purposes of this document, “research” encompasses the creation of new knowledge and understanding through research, scholarly, and artistic work conducted by members of the University of Saskatchewan. A University member includes, but is not limited to, all faculty, professors emeriti, sessional lecturers, staff, trainees, clinical faculty, graduate and undergraduate students, adjunct professors, visiting professors, visiting scholars, professional affiliates, associate members, residents, and postdoctoral fellows (PDFs), at the University of Saskatchewan.

Procedures shall be consistent with appropriate clauses in Collective Agreements including University of Saskatchewan Faculty Association (USFA), Canadian Union of Public Employees (CUPE) Local 1975, the Administrative and Supervisory Personnel Association (ASPA), Canadian Union of Public Employees (CUPE) Local 3287, the Professional Association of Interns and Residents (PAIRS).

2.0 Reporting Research Misconduct

A person or representative of a funding agency who believes that he or she has knowledge of research misconduct that violates this policy should immediately report their allegation of research misconduct in writing to a Senior Administrator or a University Official. Anonymous allegations will be considered only if all relevant facts are publicly available or otherwise independently verifiable.

Reporting to a Senior Administrator: Subject to the provisions in sections 3 and 4 of the Research Integrity Policy, the Senior Administrator will provide a confidential consultation to assess allegations of research misconduct, determine whether they fall under this policy, and outline options for resolution. Individuals who consult with the Senior Administrator may choose:

- a. to ask the Senior Administrator to facilitate a resolution or resolve the matter informally;
- b. to request a hearing under this Policy; or,
- c. to take action to resolve the issue directly or address it using another University procedure.

Reporting to a University Official: Incidents may also be reported to a University Official. When these individuals receive an allegation of research misconduct or become aware of an incident, they should refer the allegation to the relevant Senior Administrator to determine an appropriate course of action.

¹ http://www.usask.ca/university_secretary/honesty/StudentAcademicMisconduct.pdf

² http://www.usask.ca/university_secretary/honesty/StudentNon-AcademicMisconduct.pdf

3.0 Options for Resolution

Reports and allegations of research misconduct can be resolved using informal and/or formal procedures. Informal approaches focus on resolving the problem as opposed to determining right or wrong or taking disciplinary action. This type of resolution may include consultation, raising the matter directly with the offending party, or mediation.

4.0 Requesting a Hearing

Hearings may be requested by complainants, respondents and University Officials. A request for a hearing is initiated by filing a written allegation of research misconduct and submitting it to the relevant Senior Administrator, who will decide whether a hearing is warranted. This decision will be made after the Senior Administrator has reviewed the written allegation, shared it with the respondent(s) and provided an opportunity for the respondent(s) to respond to the allegation.

The Senior Administrator will assess whether the allegation:

- a. is outside the jurisdiction of these procedures as outlined in Section 3.0 of the Research Integrity Policy;
- b. is clearly mistaken or unjustified;
- c. involves allegations that, even if proven, would not constitute Research Misconduct as defined in Section 4.0 of the Research Integrity Policy;
- d. is frivolous, vexatious, or in bad faith,

The Senior Administrator will inform the complainant, the respondent, and the Vice-President Research of his or her decision in writing within twenty-eight (28) calendar days of having received the written allegation. If deemed necessary, the Senior Administrator may restrict research and/or related activities until the allegation is resolved.

5.0 Appeal of the Senior Administrator's Decision

- a. Either the complainant or the respondent may appeal the decision of the Senior Administrator about whether a hearing is warranted, by delivering to the Vice-President Research a written notice of appeal before the expiry of fourteen (14) calendar days from the date a copy of the decision was delivered to that person. The notice should include a written statement of appeal that indicates the grounds on which the appellant intends to rely, any evidence the appellant wishes to present to support those grounds, and (where relevant) what remedy or remedies the appellant believes to be appropriate.
- b. An appeal will be considered only on one or more of the following grounds:
 - i. That the Senior Administrator had no authority or jurisdiction to reach the decision he or she did;
 - ii. That there was a reasonable apprehension of bias on the part of the Senior Administrator;
 - iii. That the Senior Administrator made a fundamental procedural error that seriously affected the outcome
 - iv. That new evidence has arisen that could not reasonably have been presented to the Senior Administrator and that would likely have affected her/his decision.
- c. Upon receipt of a notice of appeal, the Vice-President Research or designate will review the original allegation and the written decision of the Senior Administrator and within twenty-one

6.0 The Rights and Responsibilities of Parties to a Hearing

Hearings provide an opportunity for a balanced airing of the facts before an impartial board of decision-makers. All hearings of alleged academic misconduct will respect the rights of members of the university community to fair treatment in accordance with the principles of natural justice. In particular,

- a. A university member against whom an allegation of research misconduct is made is to be treated as being innocent until it has been established, on the balance of probabilities and before a board of impartial and unbiased decision-makers, that he/she has committed an act of research misconduct.
- b. The parties have a right to a fair hearing before an impartial and unbiased decision-maker. This right includes the right for either party to challenge the suitability of any member of the hearing board based on a reasonable apprehension of bias against the complainant's or respondent's case. The Senior Administrator will determine whether a reasonable apprehension of bias is warranted.
- c. Reasonable written notice will be provided for hearings, and hearings will be held and decisions rendered within a reasonable period of time. It is the responsibility of all parties to ensure that the University has current contact information for them. Any notice not received because of a failure to meet this requirement will have no bearing on the proceedings.
- d. Hearing board procedures and protocols will be communicated to all parties prior to the hearing.
- e. All information provided to a hearing board in advance of a hearing by either party will be shared with both parties prior to the hearing.
- f. Neither party will communicate with the hearing board without the knowledge and presence of the other party. This right is deemed to have been waived by a party who fails to appear at a scheduled hearing or to send an advocate in her/his place.
- g. The complainant and the respondent have a right to bring an advocate (which may be a person selected by the appropriate bargaining unit, or where a member prefers or is not part of a bargaining unit by a friend, advisor, or legal counsel) to a hearing, and to call witnesses, subject to the provisions below in keeping with the rights of the hearing board to establish its own procedures. This right is subject to the provision that the names of any witnesses and/or advocates are provided to the Senior Administrator or designate at least 2 days prior to the hearing.
- h. Parties to these proceedings have a right to a reasonable level of privacy and confidentiality, subject to provincial legislation on protection of privacy and freedom of information.
- i. The hearing board has a right to determine its own procedures subject to the provisions of these Procedures, and to rule on all matters of process including the acceptability of the evidence before it and the acceptability of witnesses called by either party. Hearing boards may at their discretion request further evidence or ask for additional witnesses to be called.

- j. No disciplinary measures shall be taken against the complainant if the allegation is found to have been made in good faith. Moreover efforts will be made to ensure that no retaliatory action is taken against the complainant in such cases. If the allegation is found to have been made in bad faith, the Senior Administrator will further investigate under the University Policy on Discrimination and Harassment.
- k. Complaints alleging acts of retaliation including threats, intimidation, reprisals or adverse employment or education action against a person who has filed a complaint or participated in any manner in the investigation or resolution of a report of research misconduct will be investigated under the University Policy on Discrimination and Harassment.

7.0 Procedures for Formal Hearings

When it has been determined that a formal hearing should proceed, the following steps will be taken.

- a. Within twenty eight (28) calendar days, the Senior Administrator or designate shall convene a hearing board composed of a chair, and at least three senior members of the University or of another academic institution. The hearing board may be a standing committee of the university appointed for this purpose. The members of the hearing board will have no actual, apparent, reasonable, perceived, or potential conflict of interests or bias and will jointly have appropriate subject matter expertise and administrative background to evaluate the allegation of research misconduct and the response to it. The complainant and the respondent will be advised of the composition of the hearing board and will have seven (7) calendar days from time of notification to advise the Senior Administrator of their intent to challenge the suitability of any member of the hearing board based on a reasonable apprehension of bias against the complainant's or respondent's case.
- b. The hearing board is to receive the evidence, decide whether an act of research misconduct has been committed and if so, recommend disciplinary action proportional to the misconduct. The Senior Administrator shall co-ordinate suitable administrative support to the hearing board.
- c. The Senior Administrator or designate shall provide both the complainant and the respondent with at least seven (7) calendar days' written notice of the time, date and place of the hearing. The hearing may be rescheduled if necessary to accommodate participants' schedules, with the guideline that the hearing should wherever possible be held within thirty (30) calendar days of the determination by the Senior Administrator, or in the case of an appealed decision, by the Vice-President Research that a formal hearing will proceed. Where there are special circumstances (as determined by the Senior Administrator or designate), the matter may be heard on less than seven (7) calendar days' notice.
- d. If the respondent does not respond to the written notification of the hearing, or chooses not to appear before the hearing board, the hearing board has the right to proceed with the hearing. An absent respondent may be represented by an advocate who may present his or her case at the hearing.
 - i. Generally, hearings will be held with all parties present. If any of the parties to the hearing, or any advocate, witness, or observer is unable to attend in person, the hearing board may at its discretion and where circumstances demand proceed on the basis of written submissions. The hearing board may also provide for such person(s) to participate by telephone, subject to the provision that either party to the dispute (or their advocate) must be capable of hearing all evidence being presented, and of responding to all evidence and questions, and that witnesses and/or observers may be invited to join the hearing by telephone for the part

- e. The hearing board is not bound to observe strict legal procedures or the rules of evidence, but shall establish its own procedures subject to the following:
 - i. Hearing boards under these regulations have an adjudicative role. It is the responsibility of the complainant(s) to provide a rationale for the allegation of research misconduct and to present the evidence in support of it, and it is the responsibility of the respondent(s) to answer the charge.
 - ii. Both complainant and respondent shall be given adequate notice in writing and full opportunity to participate in the proceedings other than the deliberations of the hearing board.
 - iii. The hearing shall be restricted to persons who have a direct role in the hearing as complainant or respondent or their advocates, members of the hearing board, persons who are acting as witnesses. At the discretion of the chair, other persons may be admitted to the hearing for training purposes, or other reasonable considerations.
 - iv. When the hearing board meets, the complainant and the respondent or their advocates shall have the opportunity to be present before the hearing board at the same time. Either side may call witnesses, who would normally be present only to provide their evidence. Exceptions may be made at the discretion of the chair. Hearing boards may at their discretion request further evidence or ask for additional witnesses to be called.
 - v. The allegation of research misconduct and the evidence allegedly supporting it, and supporting documentation and/or witnesses, shall be presented by the person who made the allegation, or that person's advocate.
 - vi. The chair may at his or her discretion grant an opportunity for the respondent or the respondent's advocate and members of the hearing board to ask questions of the person presenting the allegation of research misconduct and any person giving evidence allegedly supporting it.
 - vii. The respondent or the respondent's advocate shall then be allowed to respond to the allegation and to present supporting documentation and/or witnesses.
 - viii. The chair may at his or her discretion grant an opportunity for the person presenting the allegation and members of the hearing board to ask questions of the respondent and any witness for the respondent.
 - ix. Both the complainant and the respondent will have the opportunity to explain their respective interpretations of the evidence presented in a closing statement, and to suggest what sanctions, if any, they believe are appropriate to the matter before the hearing board.
- f. If, during the course of the investigation, the evidence discloses a new related instance of possible Research Misconduct that was not part of the original allegation or which suggests additional respondents, the hearing board may expand the investigation, provided that the complainant and respondent are notified and the respondent is allowed to respond. If the expanded investigation

- g. Once a hearing concludes, the hearing board may not consider any additional evidence without re-opening the hearing to ensure that the parties have an opportunity to review and respond to the new evidence.
- h. The Chair shall notify both the Senior Administrator and the Vice-President Research of interim findings, if any, that he/she believes should be reported because of the University's obligations to students, staff, and faculty members, funding agencies and sponsors or, where there are compelling issues of public safety. Any interim report shall be in writing and copied to all members of the hearing board, to the complainant and respondent, the Senior Administrator and the Vice-President Research. The report shall set out the findings, the reason for the interim report, and a recommendation regarding appropriate administrative action.

7.1 Decision of the Hearing Board and Determination of Consequences

After all questions have been answered and all points made, the hearing board will meet *in camera* to decide whether an act of research misconduct has been committed and, if so, to determine one or more appropriate sanctions. These deliberations are confidential³. The hearing board has the sole authority to determine whether or not the respondent has committed an act of research misconduct.

- a. The standard of proof shall be whether the balance of probabilities is for or against the respondent having committed the offense.
- b. Within sixty (60) calendar days of being appointed, the hearing board shall complete its inquiry and shall submit a report on its reasoned decision in writing to the complainant, the respondent, the relevant Senior Administrator, and the Vice-President Research. If there is more than one respondent or complainant, reasonable efforts will be made to provide each with parts of the report that are pertinent to him/her. It is recommended that the format of the hearing board report contain the following:
 - i. the full allegation of research misconduct;
 - ii. a list of hearing board members and their credentials;
 - iii. a list of the people who contributed evidentiary material to the investigation or were interviewed as witnesses;
 - iv. a summary of relevant evidence;
 - v. a determination of whether Research Misconduct occurred;
 - vi. if Research Misconduct has occurred, its extent and seriousness;
 - vii. recommendations on any remedial action to be taken in the matter in question; and,
 - viii. recommendations of changes to procedures or practices to avoid similar situations in the future (for example, in the case of Research Misconduct or if a serious scientific error has been made which does not constitute Research Misconduct).

Recommendations of the hearing board may also include, without limitation:

- i. withdrawing all pending relevant publications;

³ Records of deliberations may be subject to a Freedom of Information request

- ii. notifying publishers of publications in which the involved research was reported;
 - iii. notifying co-investigators and collaborators of the decision;
 - iv. ensuring the unit(s) involved is informed of appropriate practices for promoting the proper conduct of research;
 - v. informing any outside funding sponsor(s) of the results of the inquiry and of actions to be taken.
- c. Members of the hearing board must sign a statement indicating that they agree to the release of the report based on majority rule. No minority reports shall be allowed.
- d. The report of the hearing board is final and not subject to revision.
- e. If it is established that the respondent has committed an act of research misconduct, the Senior Administrator shall, upon receipt of this advice of the hearing board, determine whether or not formal disciplinary action is to be taken or where appropriate recommend formal disciplinary action to the President, taking into consideration contractual and other obligations to external organizations and prior offenses under this policy. The respondent and complainant will have seven (7) calendar days from the receipt of the hearing board report to make submissions to the Senior Administrator regarding the findings, in advance of any disciplinary action recommended by the Senior Administrator. Decisions about disciplinary action shall be made and communicated in writing to the complainant, the respondent, the relevant Senior Administrator, and the Vice-President Research within fourteen (14) calendar days of the date that the Senior Administrator receives the hearing board report
- f. The disciplinary action taken as a consequence of research misconduct will be proportional to the misconduct, and may include:
- i. verbal reprimand;
 - ii. written reprimand with a letter held in the individual's permanent personnel file;
 - iii. withdrawal of specific research privileges;
 - iv. revoking membership in the College of Graduate Studies and Research, if applicable;
 - v. suspension with or without pay; or,
 - vi. termination.
- g. If the Hearing Board advises that the allegation should be dismissed, and the Senior Administrator accepts this advice, the Senior Administrator shall so advise any person identified in the allegation of research misconduct, the respondent, other appropriate Deans or Directors, and the Vice-President Research. In addition, the notification requirements of the applicable Collective Agreement shall be followed.
- h. Where the allegation is not substantiated, the Senior Administrator, in consultation with the Respondent and the hearing board that conducted the investigation, shall take all reasonable steps to repair any damage that the Respondent's reputation for scholarly integrity or research activities may have suffered by virtue of the allegation. The Senior Administrator shall ensure that a letter confirming the finding of no misconduct is sent to the respondent, with a copy to the complainant, the Vice-President Research. With the consent of the respondent, a letter confirming the finding of no misconduct may be sent to other persons with knowledge of the allegation. These persons may include co-authors, co-investigators, collaborators, and others who may have been notified by the Senior Administrator.

- i. The respondent(s) and the complainant who brought the allegation shall be advised that either of them may appeal the hearing board results through the applicable grievance process⁴ or through the appeal process outlined in section 8.0. Any penalties that are the outcome of a hearing board remain in force unless and until they are overturned by an appeal board or through a grievance process.

8.0 Appeals under this Policy

- a. Appeals under this policy may be requested by university members who are not represented by a collective agreement and who are not students. Members of ASPA, CUPE 1975, CUPE 3287, PAIRS, or USFA may grieve any action taken by the University using the grievance procedure set out in the relevant collective agreement.
- b. Either the complainant or the respondent may appeal the decision of the hearing board and/or the penalty imposed by delivering to the Vice-President Research a written notice of appeal within thirty (30) days of receipt of a copy of the hearing board report. The notice should include a written statement of appeal that indicates the grounds on which the appellant intends to rely, any evidence the appellant wishes to present to support those grounds, and (where relevant) what remedy or remedies the appellant believes to be appropriate.
- c. An appeal will be considered only on one or more of the following grounds:
 - i. That the original hearing board had no authority or jurisdiction to reach the decision or impose the sanction(s) it did;
 - ii. That there was a reasonable apprehension of bias on the part of a member or members of the original hearing board;
 - iii. That the original hearing board made a fundamental procedural error that seriously affected the outcome;
 - iv. That new evidence has arisen that could not reasonably have been presented at the initial hearing and that would likely have affected the decision of the original hearing board.
- d. Upon receipt of a notice of appeal, the Vice-President Research or designate will review the record of the original hearing and the written statement of appeal and determine whether or not the grounds for appeal are valid. If the Vice-President Research determines that there are no valid grounds under these Procedures for an appeal, then the appeal will be dismissed without a hearing. If the Vice-President Research determines that there may be valid grounds for an appeal, then the appeal hearing will proceed as provided for below. The decision of the Vice-President Research with respect to allowing an appeal to go forward is final, with no further appeal.

8.1 Appeals Board

The appeal board will be constituted by the Vice-President Research within twenty one (21) calendar days and will be composed of three senior members of the University or of another academic institution. One member of the appeal board shall be named chair. Individuals appointed to serve on an appeal board shall exclude anyone who was involved in the original hearing of the case. The members of the hearing board will have no actual, apparent, reasonable, perceived, or potential conflict of interests or bias and will jointly have appropriate subject matter expertise and administrative background to evaluate the allegation

⁴ Members of ASPA, CUPE 1975, CUPE 3287, PAIRS, or USFA. may grieve any action taken by the University using the grievance procedure in the relevant collective agreement.

and the response to it. The complainant and the respondent will be advised of the composition of the hearing board and will have seven (7) calendar days to advise the Vice-President Research of their intent to challenge the suitability of any member of the hearing board based on a reasonable apprehension of bias against the complainant's or respondent's case.

8.2 Appeal Procedure

- a. The appeal board shall convene to hear the appeal within twenty-one (21) calendar days of being constituted. Under exceptional circumstances, the Board may extend this period.
- b. Written notice of the hearing, along with a copy of these Procedures and of the written statement of appeal, will be delivered by the Vice-President Research or designate to the appellant, to the other party in the original hearing as respondent, to the chair of the original hearing board, and to members of the appeal board. Where possible and reasonable, the schedules of all parties will be accommodated and at least seven (7) calendar days notice of the time and location of the hearing will be provided. Where there are special circumstances (as determined by the Vice-President Research or designate), the matter may be heard on less than seven (7) calendar day notice.
- c. If any party to these proceedings does not attend the hearing, the appeal board has the right to proceed with the hearing, and may accept the written record of the original hearing and the written statement of appeal and/or a written response in lieu of arguments made in person. An appellant who chooses to be absent from a hearing may appoint an advocate to present his/her case at the hearing.
- d. The appeal board is not bound to observe strict legal procedures or rules of evidence but shall establish its own procedures subject to the following principles:
 - i. Appeal boards under these regulations will not hear the case again but are limited to determining whether the original hearing board had authority and jurisdiction to hear the original case; whether there was a reasonable apprehension of bias on the original hearing board that heard the case; whether the original hearing board made fundamental procedural errors that seriously affected the outcome; or whether any new evidence that is being presented would likely have affected the original outcome AND could not reasonably have been presented at the original hearing.
 - ii. The parties to the hearing shall be the appellant (who may be either the original complainant or the original respondent) and the other party to the original hearing as respondent. The chair (or another member designated by the chair) of the original hearing board is invited to attend and at the discretion of the chair will be permitted to participate in the hearing and to answer questions of either party or of the appeal board.
 - iii. Except as provided for under 8.0 c. iv. above, no new evidence will be considered at the hearing. The record of the original hearing, including a copy of all material filed by both sides at the original hearing, and the written statement of appeal, will form the basis of the appeal board's deliberations.
 - iv. It shall be the responsibility of the appellant to demonstrate that the appeal has merit.
 - v. Hearings shall be restricted to persons who have a direct role in the hearing. Witnesses will not normally be called, but the appellant may request the presence of an advocate and up to three observers. At the discretion of the chair, other persons may be admitted to the hearing for training purposes, or other reasonable considerations.

- vi. The appellant and the respondent shall be present before the appeal board at the same time.
- vii. Both the appellant and the respondent will have an opportunity to present their respective cases and to respond to questions from the other party and from members of the appeal board.
- viii. Both the appellant and the respondent will have the opportunity to suggest what sanctions, if any, they believe are appropriate to the matter before the appeal board.

8.3 Disposition by the Appeal Board

- a. After all questions have been answered and all points made, the appeal board will meet *in camera* to decide whether to uphold, overturn or modify the decision of the original hearing board. The deliberations of the appeal board are confidential.
- b. The appeal board may, by majority,
 - i. Conclude that the appellant received a fair hearing from the original hearing board, and uphold the original decision; or
 - ii. Conclude that the appellant did not receive a fair hearing, but that the outcome determined remains appropriate and the original decision is upheld; or
 - iii. Conclude that the appellant did not receive a fair hearing, and dismiss or modify the original decision and/or sanctions using any of the remedies available in Section 7.1; or
 - iv. Order that a new hearing board be struck to re-hear the case. This provision shall be used only in rare cases such as when new evidence has been introduced that could not reasonably have been available to the original hearing board and is in the view of the appeal board significant enough to warrant a new hearing.
- c. The chair of the appeal board shall prepare a report of the board's deliberations that shall recite the evidence on which the board based its conclusions and state any penalty imposed or withdrawn. The report shall be delivered to the Vice-President Research and distributed as provided for in Section 6.5.
- d. If the decision of a hearing board is successfully appealed, the chair of the appeal board shall ask the relevant Senior Administrator to take all reasonable steps to repair any damage that the appellant's reputation for academic integrity may have suffered by virtue of the earlier finding of the hearing board.

8.4 No Further Appeal

The findings and ruling of the appeal board shall be final with no further appeal.

8.5 Reports

Not later than 15 days after a hearing board or an appeal board has completed its deliberations, the chair shall deliver a copy of the report to the Appellant, the Respondent, the relevant Senior Administrator, and the Vice-President Research. If there is more than one Appellant or Complainant, reasonable efforts will be made to provide each with parts of the report that are pertinent to him/her.

9.0 Records

Records pertaining to allegations that result in disciplinary action will be retained in the respondent's official file in accordance with existing University policies, procedures and collective agreements.

No record of an allegation of research misconduct will be kept in the complainant's official file except the record of disciplinary action resulting from a complaint that is made in bad faith.

Subject to the provisions of the Research Integrity Policy and Procedures and the requirements of law, any and all records pertaining to charges and/or hearings and/or sanctions under these Procedures are confidential and should be kept in a file accessible only to the Vice-President Research and their confidential assistants for a period of fifty years or while any legal or official proceedings are pending. After this time, the records may be destroyed. These records are strictly confidential and will be disclosed only when disclosure is required by law or by a legal or official proceeding. The Vice-President Research shall make them available to hearing boards and appeal boards as provided for in section 7.1e.

De-identified summaries of decisions based on investigations of research misconduct will be prepared periodically by the Office of the Vice-President Research.

10.0 Funding Agencies and Research Collaborators

When an investigation into alleged misconduct in research that has been funded by a Tri-Council Agency is substantiated, in whole or in part, the conclusions reached and actions taken as a result of the investigation will be reported to the appropriate Agency within thirty (30) calendar days of the report being submitted to the Vice-President Research.⁵ Other sponsors or funding agencies that require similar notification will be notified in accordance with the procedures identified by the specific agency.

In instances involving researchers and research collaborators associated with other institutions, the Senior Administrator or the Vice-President Research shall inform the Senior Administration of the collaborator's institution of the substantiated allegation of research misconduct.

⁵ From the Tri-Council Policy Statement: Integrity in Research and Scholarship. Full document available at http://www.nserc-crsng.gc.ca/doc/NSERC-CRSNG/tpsintegrity-picintegritie_eng.pdf