

SUMMARIES OF ALL RCR FILES INVOLVING A CONFIRMED BREACH
(CLOSED BEFORE APRIL 1, 2016)

FILE 1

Allegations: Plagiarism; redundant publication

Findings: R, a faculty member, reported the same material in four different publications over a period of two years, without citing previous publications and co-contributors. R also published the proceedings of two conferences that he/she did not attend. In general, the processes for preparation and submission of publications in R's research group were inadequate. However, R did not intentionally set out to contravene the Institution's integrity policy. R also withdrew one of the publications.

Breaches: Plagiarism (3.1.1.d); redundant publication (3.1.1.e)

Institutional Disposition:

- required R to develop systematic and written processes with his/her research group addressing co-authorship, acknowledgement, paper submission and sign-off, recording, access to storage and ownership of research data;
- required R to meet with each member of his/her research group to discuss good practices in those areas; and
- undertook to implement an educational program on integrity in research and scholarship for all faculty, post-doctoral fellows and graduate students.

Agency Recourse:

- declared R ineligible to participate in Agency peer review processes for two years.

FILE 2

Allegation: Manipulation of research data

Findings: Images in R's published research articles were manipulated or copied. It could not be established precisely whether R (a faculty member) or a colleague based at a foreign institution was responsible for the manipulation. Nevertheless R, as the Principal Investigator and head of a research lab, was ultimately responsible.

Breach: Falsification (3.1.1.b)

Institutional Disposition:

- requested the retraction of all articles containing suspected manipulations; and
- developed a policy on international collaborations.

Agency Recourse:

- cancelled R's grants;
- required the reimbursement of unused funds associated with R's grants; and
- declared R ineligible to apply for Agency funding or to participate in Agency peer review processes, both for four years.

FILE 3

Allegations: Self-plagiarism; plagiarism

Findings: R, a faculty member, published two journal articles without reference to his/her own earlier conference paper on the same topic. This is a common practice in R's field, as long as there is significantly more data in the article. This was the case here, but a second article did not contain enough additional data and, therefore, the earlier conference papers should have been cited. The omission was not intentional.

In addition, R published two papers that had overlapping material but did not cross-reference them. The papers described similar research methods but probed entirely different research questions, which were carried out in parallel, and did not build on each other. Consequently, there was no need to cross-reference them.

Breach: Redundant publication (3.1.1.e)

Institutional Disposition:

- advised R to take greater care in preparing documents such as manuscripts and grant applications, and to pay particular attention to complete and accurate citations.

Agency Recourse:

- declared R ineligible to participate in Agency peer review processes for two years.

FILE 4

Allegations: Redundant publication; falsification of data

Findings: R, a faculty member, included figures in a submitted manuscript that were based on data presented in an article he/she had previously published. Also, the manuscript contained data errors, as did the published article. R did not intend to deceive but had inadvertently confused two data sets. R resigned from his/her position at the Institution.

Breaches: Redundant publication (3.1.1e); lack of rigour (3.1.1)

Institutional Disposition:

- requested that the manuscript be withdrawn; and
- required R to submit an erratum to the journal regarding data errors in the published article, and to review the rest of the data and retract the article if additional errors were identified.

Agency Recourse:

- declared R ineligible to apply for or hold Agency funding for three years; and
- declared R permanently ineligible to participate in Agency peer review processes.

FILE 5

Allegation: Misrepresentation in a grant application

Findings: R, a faculty member, included the name of an individual as co-investigator in the signature page of his/her grant application, against the latter's wishes.

Breach: Misrepresentation in an Agency application or related document (3.1.2.c)

Institutional Disposition:

- placed a letter of reprimand on R's file for five years.

Agency Recourse:

- declared R ineligible to apply for Agency funding and to participate in Agency peer review processes, both for one year.

FILE 6

Allegation: Plagiarism

Findings: R, an Agency-funded doctoral student, copied approximately forty percent of his/her doctoral candidacy examination document and a lesser portion of his/her thesis proposal from several other sources without quotation marks or proper citation. R admitted to the breaches but claimed extenuating factors of extreme stress and time constraints. In addition, R did not appropriately cite unpublished materials.

Breach: Plagiarism (3.1.1.d)

Institutional Disposition:

- required R to apologize in writing to his/her advisor, and a student whose works he/she plagiarized;
- failed R on his/her doctoral candidacy examination;
- suspended R from his/her faculty for a year with no extension of the maximum time allowed in the doctoral program; and
- placed an official reprimand on R's academic transcript.

Agency Recourse:

- terminated R's award;
- required the Institution to reimburse award funds not yet disbursed to R; and
- declared R permanently ineligible to apply for or hold Agency funding.

FILE 7

Allegation: Misrepresentation in a grant application

Findings: R, a faculty member, unintentionally failed to reference his/her new journal publication in a grant application and CV. The error was interpreted to be the result of incomplete and careless review and revision.

Breach: Misrepresentation in Agency application or related document (3.1.2.a)

Institutional Disposition:

- provided R with training focused on the *Tri-Agency Framework: Responsible Conduct of Research* and institutional policies; and
- required R's grant applications to be reviewed by the Institution's designated RCR contact before submission, for three years.

Agency Recourse:

- declared R ineligible to participate in Agency peer review processes for two years.

FILE 8

Allegation: Data falsification

Findings: Two figures in a publication were intentionally falsified. It was not possible to determine whether R, a faculty member, or his/her lab technician had falsified the data. However, as Principal Investigator and as first author of the publication, R was ultimately responsible. Another of R's publications contained previously published data as well as incorrect data, which were caused by miscommunication and carelessness. R's procedures for data management, organization and archival protection did not comply with the Institution's requirements on the conduct of research.

Breach: Falsification (3.1.1.b)

Institutional Disposition:

- directed R and corresponding authors to correct the two publications;
- corrected the research record through the submission of errata and replacement figures; and
- directed R to review and revise the procedures in his/her laboratory.

Agency Recourse:

- issued a letter of reprimand to R reiterating his/her responsibilities as a Principal Investigator and author, and stressing the importance of proper management of research data; and
- declared R ineligible to apply for Agency funding or to participate in Agency peer review processes, both for a year.

FILE 9

Allegation: Misrepresentation in a grant application

Findings: R, a post-doctoral Fellow, was unable to obtain the signature of his/her supervisor in time to submit a grant application. Instead, R admitted to inserting copies of two pages from his/her previous year's application, which included the supervisor's signature. The supervisor had been willing to sign in support of the latest application, but was unable to do so in time. R left the Institution.

Breach: Misrepresentation in an Agency application or related document (3.1.2.a)

Institutional Disposition:

- no actions taken due to R's departure.

Agency Recourse:

- issued a letter of reprimand to R.

FILE 10

Allegation: Plagiarism

Findings: R, who held an Agency-funded post-doctoral Fellowship at a non-Canadian institution, was a former Masters student at Institution A and a former doctoral student at Institution B. On the basis of investigations completed by Institutions A and B, it was found the R had plagiarized portions of his/her Master thesis, his/her doctoral thesis, and a co-authored article. The co-author was not a party to the breaches.

Breach: Plagiarism (3.1.1.d)

Institutional Disposition:

- Institution A issued a letter of reprimand and placed a record of unacceptable behaviour in R's file.
- Institution B suspended R's doctoral degree, but allowed R to re-register as a student to revise the plagiarized passages within six months and resubmit the dissertation. If the examining committee were to approve the revisions, the degree would be reinstated; and
- required R to retract the article.

Agency Recourse:

- cancelled R's post-doctoral Fellowship;
- declared R ineligible to apply for Agency funding for five years;
- advised Institutions A and B to educate their researchers and students on the responsible conduct of research;
- asked Institutions A and B to provide the Secretariat with copies of their RCR education plans; and
- requested that Institution B report to the Secretariat on its final determination with respect to R's doctoral degree.

FILE 11

Allegation: Mismanagement of grant funds

Findings: R, a faculty member, was a co-investigator on a grant. The Principal Investigator's Institution transferred funds to R's Institution for R's use. R left his/her Institution without submitting records of grant expenditures or reconciling expenditures made with a purchase card linked to the grant account. Due to inadequate procedures, R's Institution was unable to verify that grant funds had been spent on eligible expenses.

Breach: Mismanagement of grant or award funds (3.1.3)

Institutional Disposition:

- sued R for recovery of grant funds; and
- revised its policy and procedures on monthly reconciliation of expenses.

Agency Recourse:

- required R's Institution to reimburse the Agency for expenditures that lacked receipts, and to change its expense verification process;
- declared R permanently ineligible to apply for Agency funding; and
- issued a letter of awareness to the Principal Investigator's Institution and R's Institution reminding them that financial issues should be reported promptly, as the allegation was submitted a few years after R left his/her Institution.

FILE 12

Allegation: Plagiarism in a grant application

Findings: R, a faculty member submitted an application for funding that contained a sufficient amount of uncited text from ten publications by other authors. However, most of the publications were included in the reference list. A Research Fellow in R's lab had inserted the un-cited texts. The Fellow admitted his/her errors and confirmed they were made without R's knowledge. However, as a Principal Investigator, R failed in his/her duty to supervise the Fellow.

During the investigation, R directed the Fellow to attend a course on research practices and acquired plagiarism detection software.

Breach: Plagiarism (3.1.1.d)

Institutional Disposition:

- directed R to submit grant applications, with evidence of software screening, to an administrative official at the Institution, for approval, for three years;
- placed a letter on R's file for three years stating that any further incident would result in the revocation of R's privileges to submit grants;
- prohibited the Fellow from submitting grants on his/her own for five years;
- placed a letter on the Fellow's file for three years stating that any further incident would result in dismissal; and
- developed case-based training learning modules for faculty on issues such as authorship, publication practices and plagiarism.

Agency Recourse:

- issued a letter of reprimand to R reminding him/her that, as the Fellow's supervisor, R had a responsibility to review the Fellow's work;
- declared the Fellow ineligible to apply for Agency funding for five years; and
- issued a letter to the Institution expressing concern with the lack of supervision associated with this file and stressing the importance of collective responsibility not only of researchers and students, but also of institutions in the responsible conduct of research.

FILE 13

Allegation: Mismanagement of conflict of interest

Findings: R1, a faculty member, provided a letter of support for a fellowship application submitted by his/her spouse, R2, and agreed to act as supervisor. The spousal relationship was not disclosed in the application. R2 was awarded the Fellowship.

Both spouses were in a clear conflict of interest situation. However, the application did not contain false or misleading facts. Some institutional officials, who were involved in the application process, were aware of the conflict of interest but failed to intervene.

Breaches: Mismanagement of conflict of interest (3.1.1.h); misrepresentation in an Agency application or related document (3.1.2.a)

Institutional Disposition:

- permitted R1 and R2 to work together on the research project described in the application but appointed a replacement supervisor;
- prohibited R2 from evaluating any research assistants, affiliates or associates employed by R1; and
- advised R1 and R2 to explicitly and clearly disclose their family status in any future applications.

Agency Recourse:

- revoked R2's Fellowship; and
- issued a letter of reprimand to R1.

FILE 14

Allegation: Plagiarism in a grant application

Findings: In his/her own application for funding, R, a faculty member, used material that came from an application to which he/she had previously been given access while serving as a peer reviewer.

Breach: Plagiarism (3.1.1.d)

Institutional Disposition:

- none, since R was no longer at the Institution and therefore the Institution had no ability to enforce a remedy.

Agency Recourse:

- declared R ineligible to apply for Agency funding for five years; and
- declared R permanently ineligible to participate in Agency peer review processes.

FILE 15

Allegation: Falsification of data

Findings: R, a graduate student, admitted that he/she manually changed some of the raw data values from his/her research to achieve the final results, which were reported in his/her Master's thesis and a published article.

Breach: Falsification (3.1.1.b)

Institutional Disposition:

- withdrew R's thesis and revoked R's Master's degree;
- requested that the published article be retracted;
- directed R's supervisor to discuss responsible conduct of research with his/her students; and
- reviewed its agreements, policies and guidelines against the Tri-Agency Framework to ensure consistency, added material to the institutional website, and provided more RCR training opportunities.

Agency Recourse:

- required R to reimburse funds received for his/her Master's award;
- declared R ineligible to apply for Agency funding for five years.
- issued a letter of reprimand to R's supervisor, who was also an author on the paper, stating:
 - that he/she failed to pay sufficient attention to R's work;
 - the importance of proper supervision;
 - that additional care should be taken when authoring a paper; and

FILE 16

Allegation: Mismanagement of grant funds

Findings: R, a faculty member, followed an inappropriate process for travel charged to a grant. He/she took multiple trips without obtaining the required approvals or submitting travel claims. Other expense irregularities were identified. The eligibility of some expenses could not be verified as supporting documentation was no longer available. R did not fully understand what expenses were eligible. The Institution's expense claims process lacked proper controls.

Breach: Mismanagement of Agency grant or award funds (3.1.3)

Institutional Disposition:

- required R to reimburse the total amount of expenses that the Institution deemed ineligible;
- improved controls over research expenditures by implementing new procedures and hiring additional personnel;
- started training administrative staff and researchers at the Institution on the eligibility of grant funds; and
- took no action against R as it believed that financial mismanagement was mostly due to its own inadequate controls.

Agency Recourse:

- required the Institution to reimburse the amount representing the reported ineligible expenses;
- issued a letter of reprimand to R stressing his/her responsibility to manage grant funds in accordance with Agency policies; and
- declared R ineligible to apply for Agency funding for two years.

FILE 17

Allegation: Invalid experimental results published in a journal article

Findings: A publication by R, a faculty member, contained two errors; an inaccurate legend in a figure and a calculation error. An investigation concluded that the errors were a result of inattention; not dishonesty or intent to deceive, and they did not affect the results of the research.

Breach: Lack of rigour (3.1.1)

Institutional Disposition:

- required R to:
 - remind all members of his/her team of the importance of rigorous and objective use of research results which, if preliminary or incomplete, should be presented as such;
 - meet with all individuals in his/her lab regarding research practices; and
 - supervise more closely the activities in his/her lab and ensure that research results are verified.
- given that the errors in the article were minor and had no impact on the validity of the results, the Institution did not require a retraction of the article.

Agency Recourse:

- issued a letter of reprimand to R regarding his/her supervisory responsibilities;
- required R to correct the research record, either through a corrigendum or retraction; and
- issued a letter of reprimand to a doctoral student in R's lab, who was involved in the occurrence of the errors, for a lack of rigour.

FILE 18

Allegation: Self-plagiarism

Findings: R, a faculty member, published a review article very similar to another one that he/she had published earlier that same year, with inadequate citation of the first article. R retracted the second article as soon as the journal approached him/her about the duplication. R acknowledged his/her error.

Breach: Redundant publication (3.1.1 e)

Institutional Disposition:

- placed a copy of the inquiry report in R's file.

Agency Recourse:

- issued a letter of awareness to R emphasizing the importance of acknowledging one's own previously published work in subsequent publications.

FILE 19

Allegation: Plagiarism

Findings: R copied a few words of text, without referencing, in two sections of his/her doctoral thesis: the literature review section and the discussion of the findings of others.

Breach: Plagiarism (3.1.1.d)

Institutional Disposition:

- withdrew R's thesis from the Institution's Library and from the National Library; and
- required R to correct the thesis and resubmit it.

Agency Recourse:

- issued a letter of reprimand to R, emphasizing the importance of proper citation.

FILE 20

Allegation: Misrepresentation in a grant application

Findings: R, a faculty member, failed to reference his/her new journal publication in a grant application and the accompanying CV, but not with intent to deceive.

Breach: Misrepresentation in Agency application or related document (3.1.2.a)

Institutional Disposition:

- provided R with training focused on the *Tri-Agency Framework: Responsible Conduct of Research* and institutional policies; and
- explored the development and delivery of additional training opportunities for all researchers at the Institution.

Agency Recourse:

- declared R ineligible to participate in Agency peer review processes for two years.

FILE 21

Allegation: Mismanagement of grant funds

Findings: R, a faculty member, charged ineligible expenses under \$5,000 to his/her research account.

Breach: Mismanagement of Agency grant or award funds (3.1.3)

Institutional Disposition:

- suspended R for one month, without pay; and
- reimbursed the ineligible expenses to the Agency.

Agency Recourse:

- issued a letter of reprimand to R advising him/her:
 - of his/her responsibility as a grant holder to manage funds in accordance with Agency policies; and
 - of the importance of keeping documentation to support grant-related expenses.

FILE 22

Allegations: Plagiarism; self-plagiarism

Findings: R, a former doctoral student, plagiarized several passages of his/her doctoral thesis and parts of an article. As well, two of R's scientific publications each contained more than 50% of material published in the other, without cross-reference. The three articles were co-authored by a Principal Investigator responsible for a grant as well as two other faculty members who co-supervised R. All were found to have been involved in the plagiarism.

Breaches: Plagiarism (3.1.1.d); redundant publication (3.1.1.e)

Institutional Disposition:

- expelled R from the Institution as this was a second offence;
- requested a retraction of one paper and a corrigendum for another;
- provided the Principal Investigator and co-supervisors with coaching and training on research integrity and the supervision of students; and
- provided additional targeted education, especially for faculty members involved in research teams, regarding expectations with respect to standards of integrity in graduate supervision, oversight of thesis documents, and multi-authored publications.

Agency Recourse:

- declared R ineligible to apply for Agency funding for three years;
- declared the Principal Investigator and co-supervisors ineligible to apply for Agency funding, for two years, and ineligible to participate in Agency peer review processes, for two years;
- issued a letter of awareness to the Principal Investigator emphasizing the importance of paying closer attention when co-authoring a paper; and
- issued letters of awareness to the co-supervisors emphasizing the importance of proper supervision and of paying closer attention when co-authoring a paper.

FILE 23

Allegations: Plagiarism; self-plagiarism

Findings: R1, a faculty member, and R2, a PhD student supervised by R1, co-authored a paper. R2 was the main author. The paper contained substantial blocks of unaltered text and figures taken from eight other papers, four written by R1 and R2, and four written by other authors, without appropriate references. The plagiarized text had been inserted into the paper by R2 without the knowledge of R1. Nevertheless, R1, who was also the Editor-in-chief of the journal that published the paper, failed in his/her supervisory duties.

Breaches: Plagiarism (3.1.1.d); redundant publication (3.1.1.e)

Institutional Disposition:

- suspended R1 without pay for four months; and
- placed R2 on disciplinary probation for the remainder of his/her studies and placed a disciplinary letter in his/her file.

Agency Recourse:

- discontinued Agency funding for R1 and required the Institution to reimburse a portion of the funds;

- declared R1 ineligible to hold or apply for Agency funding, and to participate in Agency peer review, both for two years; and
- declared R2 ineligible to hold or apply for Agency funding for two years.

FILE 24

Allegations: Inappropriate authorship; plagiarism

Findings: R, a faculty member, failed to list C as a co-author, and to acknowledge his/her contribution, in a published journal article. C, who had worked in R's lab, had compiled data and carried out certain other tasks that contributed to the findings published. The allegation of plagiarism was not supported.

Breach: Invalid authorship (3.1.1.f)

Institutional Disposition:

- required R to add C to the authorship of the paper and to notify the journal.

Agency Recourse:

- issued a letter of reprimand to R emphasizing the importance of appropriately acknowledging authorship.

FILES 25 & 26 (*Same R and facts but involved funding from two Agencies*)

Allegation: Mismanagement of grant funds

Findings: R, a faculty member, intentionally misused between \$150,000 and \$200,000 in grant funds by improperly claiming the cost of purchases of personal items and travel against his/her grant accounts.

Breach: Mismanagement of Agency grant or award funds (3.1.3)

Institutional Disposition:

- terminated R's employment; and
- reviewed its procedures and implemented new measures related to the management of grant funds (i.e., policies, regulations and procedures).

Agency Recourse:

- terminated R's grants;
- required the Institution to reimburse the misused funds and any grant funds remaining in R's grant account; and
- declared R permanently ineligible to hold or apply for Agency funding or participate in Agency peer review processes.

FILE 27

Allegation: Image manipulation in journal articles

Findings: Erroneous data was found in four articles authored by R and R's graduate student. R is a senior scientist, faculty member and corresponding author on the four articles. In one case, the grad

student admitted to inserting blots from unrelated samples into figures. There were other minor irregularities in the data in the other publications but these were found not to have affected the results reported. R contacted the relevant journals seeking guidance on how to proceed. One article was retracted and one was corrected. The journal for a third article was contacted and was considering whether a retraction or correction was required. Changes were not warranted for the fourth article.

Breach: Falsification (3.1.1.b)

Institutional Disposition:

- no further action taken, as Institution was satisfied with actions taken by R.

Agency Recourse:

- issued a letter of reprimand to R acknowledging his/her mitigating actions but reminding him/her to ensure the accuracy of the contributions of members of his/her lab and other co-authors.

FILE 28

Allegations: Redundant publication; plagiarism

Findings: R, a researcher not affiliated with an eligible institution and an applicant for a Fellowship, authored several published papers in which he/she repeated the same figures and paragraphs, without appropriate referencing. In addition, the investigator found that many of R's published works included paragraphs taken from various other sources, without proper referencing.

Breaches: Redundant publication (3.1.1.e); plagiarism (3.1.1.d)

Institutional Disposition:

- not applicable, as R was not affiliated with an eligible institution.

Agency Recourse:

- denied R's application for a Fellowship; and
- declared R ineligible to hold or apply for Agency funding and to participate in Agency peer review processes, both for one year.

FILE 29

Allegation: Plagiarism

Findings: R, a faculty member, used parts of the work of his/her students in a book, without appropriate referencing. R acknowledged the plagiarism but claimed it was accidental and the result of carelessness.

Breach: Plagiarism (3.1.1.d)

Institutional Disposition:

- revoked R's title at the Institution and placed a permanent letter of reprimand in his/her file;
- required R to prepare letters to the two students stating that their writing is indeed their own, and confirming that they had not engaged in plagiarism of material from R's book. The intent is that

letters could be submitted to journal editors or book publishers, along with their work, should the students choose to publish; and

- asked R's publisher to acknowledge the students in future versions of the book and in its advertising.

Agency Recourse:

- declared R ineligible to apply for Agency funding and to participate in Agency peer review processes, both for two years.

FILE 30

Allegation: Failure to comply with Agency financial policies

Findings: R, a post-doctoral Fellow not affiliated with an eligible institution, accepted awards from an Agency and from a private funder for the same research, which constituted a breach of the policies of both organizations. In addition, R failed to inform the Agency in a timely fashion of a transfer from one Institution to another and forged his/her supervisor's signature on three documents related to the transfer.

Breaches: Mismanagement of Agency grant or award funds (3.1.3); misrepresentation in an Agency application or related document (3.1.2.a)

Institutional Disposition:

- Not applicable.

Agency Recourse:

- terminated R's Agency award;
- required R to reimburse Agency funds already disbursed; and
- declared R ineligible to apply for Agency funding and participate in Agency peer review processes, both for three years.

FILE 31

Allegation: Plagiarism in a grant application

Findings: R, a faculty member, used passages in his/her grant application from the work of another scientist and failed to reference some of them. The Institution concluded that the Respondent had submitted an incomplete working draft, but this error was unintentional.

Breach: Plagiarism (3.1.1.e)

Institutional Disposition:

- no action was taken.

Agency Recourse:

- issued a letter of reprimand to R reminding him/her of the importance of appropriately referencing the work of others.

FILE 32

Allegation: Falsification of data

Findings: R, a faculty member, was the corresponding author on several publications that included duplication of figures and gross manipulation of data. R took responsibility for adjusting certain images obtained from a student by increasing the number of pixels and adjusting the color, contrary to proper research practices. R alleged that junior lab personnel had also manipulated the data before providing it to R, without R's knowledge. The Institution could neither verify nor dispute this claim, but determined that R failed to adequately supervise the student, review the primary data sources, keep complete and accurate records, and examine the research findings generated in his/her laboratory. R resigned from the Institution.

Breach: Falsification (3.1.1.b)

Institutional Disposition:

- requested a retraction of the publications.

Agency Recourse:

- declared R ineligible to apply for Agency funding or to participate in Agency peer review processes, both for five years; and
- directed the Institution to reimburse the remaining grant funds.

FILE 33

Allegation: Plagiarism in a grant application

Findings: In an application for funding, R, a faculty member, did not adequately reference a work jointly produced by R and a colleague. There was no discernible intention to deceive, and R's omission had little or no impact on the research record or on the colleague's reputation because the omission occurred in an application and not in a published work.

Breach: Plagiarism (3.1.1.d)

Institutional Disposition:

- took no action, due to the factors cited above.

Agency Recourse:

- issued a letter of awareness to R reminding him/her of the importance of appropriate attribution and recognition of the contributions of others.

FILE 34

Allegation: Plagiarism

Findings: R, a student at a foreign institution, was involved in an international collaboration for an Agency-funded research study. R included data collected for the study in his/her PhD thesis. R had not obtained approval from the Principal Investigator to do so and had falsely claimed the data as his/her

own. As well, R failed to reference the study or the researchers involved. R's thesis was submitted before the results of the study were published. As a result, it was not possible for the Principal Investigator and the other researchers to publish the results of their study.

Breaches: Plagiarism (3.1.1.e); inadequate acknowledgement (3.1.1.g); invalid authorship (3.1.1.f)

Disposition:

- The Principal Investigator directed R to:
 - correct and re-submit the thesis to reflect the true origin of the data and his/her role in the study;
 - correctly reference and attribute credit to the researchers who designed, led and carried out the study, and to the funding Agency; and
 - commit to not disseminate or publish the research results derived from R's use of the data.

Agency Recourse:

- issued a letter of reprimand to R.

FILE 35

Allegation: Mismanagement of grant funds

Findings: R, a faculty member, was the recipient of an Agency award in which he/she would work on a research project partly at the premises of a sponsoring partner. R engaged a number of students to assist him/her. By carrying out an investigation and an audit, the Institution concluded that R and the partner breached the conditions of the grant in a number of respects, including the following:

- the partner did not supervise the students as required by the program, and the students did not spend the required amount of time working at the partner's site;
- R likely received money from at least two of the students, which he/she likely used to improperly pay back the partner for its expenses;
- R was reimbursed in full for the same grant expenses from the Agency as well as from two other organizations involved in the research project;
- R was aware that reports submitted by students concerning their work included false information; and
- R counselled students to mislead the investigators.

Breaches: Mismanagement of Agency grant or award funds (3.1.3); breach of Agency policies or requirements for certain types of research (3.1.4)

Institutional Disposition:

- terminated R's employment; and
- informed the police of R's financial impropriety.

Agency Recourse:

- declared R permanently ineligible to apply for Agency funding or to participate in Agency peer review processes;
- issued a letter of concern to the partner outlining the manner in which it failed to meet the Agency's expectations and the impact that this had;

- required the Institution to reimburse all misspent Agency funds; and
- required the Institution to develop a plan to prevent similar breaches.

FILE 36

Allegation: Plagiarism in a published paper

Findings: R, a faculty member, included text copied from two other sources without referencing them in a published paper. R also failed to list a student as second author of the paper, and failed to adequately supervise the student. The student was also found to have plagiarized from various sources in his/her Master's major paper.

Breach: Plagiarism (3.1.1.d)

Institutional Disposition:

- suspended R without pay for several months;
- required R to retract the article; and
- rescinded the student's Master's degree.

Agency Recourse:

- declared R and the student ineligible to apply for Agency funding for three years; and
- declared R ineligible to participate in Agency peer review processes for three years.

FILE 37

Allegation: Plagiarism in a grant application

Findings: R, a graduate student, used material from four articles published by other authors in his/her grant application, without referencing them.

Breach: Plagiarism (3.1.1.e)

Institutional Disposition:

- required each grant application by R to be verified by a Dean prior to submission, for two years.

Agency Recourse:

- declared R ineligible to apply for Agency funding and to participate in Agency peer review processes, both for two years.

FILE 38

Allegation: Mismanagement of grant funds

Findings: The Institution's internal audit department discovered that a former administrative officer responsible for administering R's grant funds had fraudulently misappropriated a large amount of those funds by issuing cheques to an entity that the officer had created. The officer had concealed this activity from R and the Institution.

Breach: Mismanagement of Agency grant or award funds (3.1.3)

Institutional Disposition:

- strengthened its financial control framework; and
- reported the former administrative officer's actions to the police.

Agency Recourse:

- issued a letter to the Institution acknowledging the steps it took to strengthen its financial controls;
- required the Institution to reimburse the misappropriated funds; and
- issued a letter of reprimand to R emphasizing the need to pay closer attention to the authorization of his/her grant expenditures.

FILE 39

Allegation: Misrepresentation in a grant application

Findings: R, a part-time faculty member at a Canadian institution, failed to advise an Agency that he/she had accepted and commenced a full time position at a foreign institution. This new full-time affiliation rendered R ineligible to continue to hold existing Agency funding or to apply for new Agency funding.

Breach: Misrepresentation in Agency application or related document (3.1.2.a)

Institutional Disposition:

- reimbursed the Agency the funds remaining in R's grant account.

Agency Recourse:

- declared R ineligible to apply for funding or to participate in Agency peer review processes, both for two years.

FILE 40

Allegation: Misrepresentation in a grant application

Findings: R, a faculty member, claimed in a grant application to have supervised or co-supervised a number of students and to have recently published certain articles. Partly on the basis of this information, R was awarded a grant. In fact, R had not supervised any students and had not published the articles.

Breach: Misrepresentation in Agency application or related document (3.1.2.a)

Institutional Disposition:

- terminated R's employment.

Agency Recourse:

- declared R ineligible to apply for Agency funding or to participate in Agency peer review processes, both for three years;

- required the Institution to reimburse the Agency the entire amount of R's grant; and
- issued a letter of awareness to the Institution reminding it to verify the accuracy of each application that it endorses.

FILE 41

Allegations: Plagiarism; invalid authorship.

Findings: R, a short-term trainee from a foreign institution, worked at a research lab at a Canadian institution. After returning to his/her home country, R published a thesis on a research project that he/she had carried out at the Canadian institution with other members of that research lab. The thesis included descriptions of experiments performed by others, without proper reference or permission, such that they could be taken to be R's work. The investigation found that some of R's errors could be attributed to less than optimal communication and support in the lab where R had worked.

Breach: Plagiarism (3.1.1.d)

Institutional Disposition:

- recommended to the foreign institution that R withdraw his/her thesis, with the right to submit a new one if he/she obtained the consent of the other contributors, added proper references, and removed the Canadian institution's name from the title page.

Agency Recourse:

- issued a letter of reprimand to R stressing that:
 - his/her breach of the RCR Framework was unacceptable, and advising that, should he/she relocate to Canada, his/her eligibility to apply for and hold Agency funds in the future would be conditional on R providing evidence of retraction of the thesis; and
 - he/she needs to familiarize him/herself with, and respect, the research integrity policies applicable to his/her research; and
- issued a letter of awareness to R's supervisor highlighting:
 - that not investing the necessary time to read a visiting graduate scholar's thesis, when part of the scholar's work was done in his/her lab, falls below the appropriate standard of scientific behaviour. The head of a lab is responsible for the work arising from the lab; and
 - the importance of establishing appropriate communication and support mechanisms in the lab, including assignment of authorship; and
- issued a letter to the Canadian institution:
 - underscoring that its controls and support for visiting students were inadequate;
 - requesting that it submit a plan on how it intended to address these inadequacies; and
 - emphasizing that all research conducted under its auspices or jurisdiction has to comply with Agency policies.

FILE 42

Allegation: Breach of Agency policies or requirements for certain types of research

Findings: The team made simultaneous research applications to an Agency and to a second funding organization without properly disclosing this fact on either application form. The application to the second funding organization was successful. Agency guidelines required the team to withdraw their application to the Agency upon learning that the other application had been successful. The team did not do so. Their application to the Agency was not successful.

Breach: Breach of Agency policies or requirements for certain types of research (3.1.4)

Institutional Disposition:

- introduced measures to assist researchers in completing grant application forms.

Agency Recourse:

- issued a letter of awareness to the Principal Investigator of the research team reminding him/her of his/her responsibility to provide accurate and complete information on applications and inform the Agency in a timely fashion of any significant changes.

FILE 43

Allegations: Misrepresentation in an Agency application or related document; breach of Agency policies or requirements for certain types of research

Findings: R falsified a letter of support from an industrial partner and included it in a grant application. Also, R kept high risk pathogens in his/her lab, which was not equipped to handle them. This was done without the consent of the Institution and without approval by the regulatory authority. R also directed his/her assistant and students to deny the presence of the pathogens.

Breaches: Misrepresentation in Agency application or related document (3.1.2.a); breach of Agency policies or requirements for certain types of research (3.1.4)

Institutional Disposition:

- closed R's lab;
- terminated R's employment;
- assisted the students of R's lab in continuing their studies and reorienting their work to obtain their degrees; and
- reimbursed the grant funds to the Agency.

Agency Recourse:

- declared R ineligible to hold or apply for Agency funding or to participate in Agency peer review processes, both for five years.

FILE 44

Allegation: Data fabrication in a PhD dissertation

Findings: R, a doctoral student, deliberately falsified the identity of the majority of the participants in his/her research and then fabricated the resulting participant data. R submitted an article for publication based on the falsified data. R misled his/her research assistants and asked them to make false statements to R's faculty supervisor. R withdrew the manuscript submitted for publication.

Breaches: Fabrication (3.1.1.a); falsification (3.1.1.b)

Institutional Disposition:

- expelled R, with no possibility of re-admission.

Agency Recourse:

- terminated R's Agency scholarship award;
- required R to reimburse Agency funding already disbursed;
- declared R permanently ineligible to apply for Agency funding; and
- required the Institution to reimburse any funds remaining in R's scholarship award account.

FILE 45

Allegation: Mismanagement of grant funds

Findings: R, a faculty member, claimed a small amount of personal travel expenses that were ineligible for reimbursement under the terms of R's grant.

Breach: Mismanagement of Agency grant or award funds (3.1.3)

Institutional Disposition:

- required R to reimburse the ineligible amounts;
- issued a letter of reprimand to R; and
- imposed restrictions and conditions on R's ability to make travel arrangements and submit expenses for five years.

Agency recourse:

- issued a letter of reprimand to R reminding him/her that expenses claimed must be eligible in accordance with Agency policies.

FILES 46 & 47 (*Note: these files involve two separate allegations from two complainants against the same R and were considered together.*)

Allegations: Falsification of data; breach of confidentiality; plagiarism

Findings: In eight publications, R failed to meet the standards of the discipline in several respects, including lack of scholarly rigour, self-plagiarism, falsification, fabrication, and failure to acknowledge the contributions of other researchers appropriately. R also failed, in several instances, to keep records of the research conducted.

It was found that some misrepresentations of data in the articles were the result of honest and reasonable error while others were caused by R's failure to exercise reasonable care in the direction and oversight of the research. R also deliberately misled the investigating committee by presenting altered figures which misrepresented data obtained during repeat experiments.

Finally, R shared a confidential grant application, which he/she obtained as an Agency peer reviewer, with a PhD student in his/her lab.

R resigned his/her position at the Institution.

The Institution's integrity policy was found to have inadequate guidance on data retention and on submitting allegations.

Breaches: Falsification (3.1.1.b); fabrication (3.1.1.a); lack of rigour (3.1.1); redundant publication (3.1.1.e); inadequate acknowledgement (3.1.1.g); breach of Agency policies or requirements for certain types of research (3.1.4)

Institutional Disposition:

- notified journals and co-authors of the papers in which scholarly misconduct was identified; and
- implemented changes to its procedures and practices regarding retention of records and submission of allegations.

Agency Recourse:

- declared R ineligible to hold or apply for Agency funding for five years, and permanently ineligible to participate in Agency peer review processes.

FILE 48

Allegation: Plagiarism

Findings: R, a faculty member, committed extensive plagiarism and manipulated the plagiarized text in a number of publications. Specifically, R used a substantial portion of text from a book by another author in his/her own book, without referencing. R also plagiarized passages in several other publications. R admitted to the plagiarism in one of his/her works and also in three other journal articles. R left the Institution.

Breach: Plagiarism (3.1.1.d)

Institutional Disposition:

- removed R from a prestigious role at the Institution;
- suspended R's access to research funds; and
- supported and reassigned R's students to other supervisors so that they could continue their work.

Due to R's departure, the Institution took no further action.

Agency Recourse:

- declared R ineligible to hold or apply for funding or to participate in Agency peer review processes, both for five years;
- cancelled R's grant; and
- required the Institution to reimburse the funds remaining in R's grant account.

FILE 49

Allegations: Invalid authorship; misrepresentation in a grant application

Findings: R, a post-doctoral Fellow, listed him/herself as first author on a publication in a CV that was included in his/her Fellowship application. The publication itself, however, showed R as second author, although the two authors had contributed equally. There was no explanation in the application as to why the authorship order was changed. Once he/she was told that this was not an acceptable practice, R readily admitted his/her error. R explained that the citation in the publication listed the authors alphabetically and that he/she thought it would be permissible to reverse the order of the authors in the application.

Breaches: Invalid authorship (3.1.1.f); Misrepresentation in an Agency application or related document (3.1.2.a)

Institutional Disposition:

- took no action, as the breach was considered minor.

Agency Recourse:

- issued a letter of awareness to R, reminding him/her to follow accepted authorship practices and, if unsure, to consult an expert in the field.

FILE 50

Allegation: Mismanagement of award funds

Findings: R, a doctoral student, was successful in an Agency competition and advised the Agency that he/she would take up studies at a foreign institution. Subsequently, R decided not to proceed with his/her studies at that time. R did not immediately advise the Agency of his/her change in plans and continued to make arrangements with the Agency to receive the first installment of the award. R provided an explanation for the oversight and provided documentation to support a deferral of the award.

Breach: Breach of Agency policies or requirements for certain types of research (3.1.4)

Institutional Disposition:

- not applicable as R was not affiliated with a Canadian eligible institution.

Agency Recourse:

- required R to reimburse the installment paid; and
- issued a letter of reprimand to R stressing the importance of adhering to the terms and conditions of awards and of advising the Agency immediately of any change in status.

FILE 51

Allegation: Plagiarism in a grant application

Findings: A grant application was co-authored by two faculty members: a principal applicant (R1) and a co-applicant (R2). Approximately 50% of the text in the application was copied exactly, or adjusted slightly, from about 20 articles written by other authors, without quotation marks. The plagiarized parts were only found in the sections written by R2. R1 was not aware of the plagiarism.

Breach: Plagiarism (3.1.1.d)

Institutional Disposition:

- suspended R2, without pay, for four months.

Agency Recourse:

- declared R2 ineligible to hold or apply for Agency funding or to participate in Agency peer review processes, both for three years;
- issued a letter of reprimand to R1 reminding him/her to ensure that information in his/her application is accurate and includes references, even if written by a colleague.

FILES 52 & 53 (Note: these two files were considered together, as they involved the same research project)

Allegations: Destruction of data; breach of confidentiality

Findings: This file involves the Principal Investigator (R1) and a co-investigator (R2) of a research project. Both are faculty members. Each filed an allegation of research misconduct against the other. R1 alleged that R2 had failed to provide certain data files to R1, and had possibly destroyed them. This allegation was determined to be unfounded. However, the project lacked a rigorous chain of custody process, which contributed to this dispute.

R2's allegation concerned a breach of confidentiality. R2 alleged that R1 allowed research participant and focus group data to be disclosed to researchers who had recently been added to the research team, although their names had not been included in participant agreement documents or consent forms. Once R1 realized the error, he/she worked closely with institutional officials to remedy it. The allegation against R1 was upheld.

Breaches: Breach of Agency policies or requirements for certain types of research (3.1.4); lack of rigour (3.1.1)

Institutional Disposition:

- no action was taken against R1 because he/she took responsibility for the breach and acted quickly to remedy it; and
- no action was taken against R2, since the allegation against him/her was unfounded.

Agency Recourse:

- issued a letter of awareness to R1 stressing the importance of:
 - respecting the principle of continuing consent by informing participants of any changes to the research or the research team; and
 - establishing an agreement among team members on issues such as data management and chain of custody; and
- issued a letter of awareness to R2 stressing the importance of having an agreement among team members on issues such as data management and chain of custody.

FILE 54

Allegation: Fabricated data in a grant application

Findings: R, a faculty member, included two images in a grant application that were created by a student at a foreign institution. Unknown to R, one of the images was a mirror image of the other, rather than a valid depiction of data. R did not check the validity of the images, or inform their author, before including them in the application. Therefore, although R did not fabricate or falsify data, R did breach the RCR Framework by providing false information in a grant application.

Breach: Misrepresentation in an Agency application or related document (3.1.2.a)

Institutional Disposition:

- took no action against R as the inclusion of the mirror image was deemed to be an honest error.

Agency Recourse:

- issued a letter of reprimand to R emphasizing the importance of only using trusted images or figures, of obtaining consent to use them, and of referencing their authors.

FILE 55

Allegation: Plagiarism in a grant application

Findings: R, a faculty member, committed plagiarism by:

- using two sentences similar to text found in other publications. Although the sentences should have been put in quotation marks, R did include the sources, and R's wording did not fully duplicate that in the other publications; and
- using text from a website but did not reference the site.

Generally, R lacked knowledge on referencing practices and had mistakenly believed that web sites did not have to be referenced. R undertook to be more careful in the future.

Breach: Plagiarism (3.1.1.d)

Institutional Disposition:

- took no action against R.

Agency Recourse:

- issued a letter of awareness to R reminding him/her to reference all text taken from other sources, including web sites.

FILE 56

Allegation: Plagiarism in a grant application

Findings: R, a faculty member, plagiarized three paragraphs of text from a colleague's application. The colleague recalled providing a copy of his/her application to R for reference. It was accepted that R did not try to present someone else's ideas as his/her own. R took full responsibility for the breach.

Breach: Plagiarism (3.1.1.d)

Institutional Disposition:

- issued a letter of admonishment to R, which was placed in his/her file.

Agency Recourse:

- declared R ineligible to participate in Agency peer review processes for one year.

FILE 57

Allegation: Falsification of data

Findings: R duplicated and mislabelled an image of a western blot that he/she had used in an earlier article. The errors were due to carelessness rather than a deliberate attempt to mislead and did not affect the interpretation of the data. Nevertheless, the error was not in keeping with a researcher's responsibility to use a high level of rigour in reporting and publishing data and findings.

Breach: Lack of rigour (3.1.1)

Institutional Disposition:

- took no action.

Agency Recourse:

- issued a letter of reprimand to R reminding him/her of his/her obligations with respect to scholarly rigour; and
- declared R ineligible to participate in Agency peer review processes for one year.

FILE 58

Allegation: Mismanagement of grant funds

Findings: Over a number of years, R (faculty member) repeatedly submitted false travel claims related to attendance at scholarly conferences. R systematically altered or fabricated documentation, including credit card statements, as well as accommodation and taxi receipts, to support false claims for reimbursement of travel expenses.

Breach: Mismanagement of Agency grant or award funds (3.1.3)

Institutional Disposition:

- terminated R's employment; and
- notified the police.

Agency Recourse:

- required R to reimburse misused grant funds;
- required the Institution to reimburse any remaining funds in R's grant account; and
- declared R permanently ineligible to hold or apply for funding or to participate in Agency peer review processes.

FILE 59

Allegation: Mismanagement of grant funds

Findings: R charged a significant amount of ineligible expenses to his/her grant account. R was negligent in the management of research expenses, failed to keep proper receipts and had not made himself/herself familiar with the Institution's or the Agency's financial procedures. However, R had not intended to breach the financial policies. As well, he/she cooperated with the investigation, expressed remorse and was willing to rectify the problem.

Breach: Mismanagement of Agency grant or award funds (3.1.3)

Institutional Disposition:

- reimbursed the Agency and instituted a repayment plan with R;
- suspended R for one month without pay; and
- implemented additional financial controls.

Agency Recourse:

- terminated R's grant; and
- declared R ineligible to hold or apply for funding or to participate in Agency peer review processes, both for one year.

The Agency informed the Institution that its inability to identify and rectify the issue within R's department over a period of several years fell below the standard expected of an eligible institution, but recognized the actions that the Institution has taken to ensure such an occurrence does not recur.

FILE 60

Allegation: Lack of rigour in a publication

Findings: R was the senior and corresponding author of a published paper, which:

- contained several errors;
- should have included a balanced overview of available data;
- lacked clarity as to the basis and details of certain conclusions; and
- should have been more balanced in communicating the research data.

In addition, a public communication document released by the Institution overstated the research results. The Institution's communications office had not provided R with an opportunity to review the document.

Breach: Lack of rigour (3.1.1)

Institutional Disposition:

- required R to submit an erratum to the journal;
- directed that R and the Institution's communications office issue a more appropriate communication document to correct and avoid public miscommunication; and
- instituted a new requirement that senior or corresponding authors be asked to review future public communication documents before they are issued.

Agency Recourse:

- issued a letter of reprimand to R, emphasizing the importance of balanced and responsible scientific communication in publications; and
- issued a letter to the Institution reminding it that any public communication document regarding a scientific publication should be reviewed in its entirety, and approved, by the senior and corresponding author prior to being issued.

FILE 61

Allegation: Misrepresentation of data in a grant application

Findings: R submitted an application that included wrongly identified and misleading data regarding his/her research contributions.

Breach: Misrepresentation of an Agency grant application or related document (3.1.2.a)

Institutional Disposition:

- placed a letter of discipline in R's file .

Agency Recourse:

- declared R ineligible to hold or apply for funding or to participate in Agency peer review processes, both for one year; and
- issued a letter of reprimand to R emphasizing the importance of reviewing all information in a grant application for accuracy prior to submission.

FILE 62

Allegation: Mismanagement of grant funds

Findings: R breached Agency financial policies by:

- submitting false claims about time worked by a student, and directing the student to do the same;
- charging the costs of a laptop and a research conference to salary expenses;
- claiming expenses incurred after the end of the grant; and
- submitting an inaccurate Statement of Account to the Agency.

R acknowledged his/her mistakes and repaid the ineligible expenses.

Breach: Mismanagement of Agency grant or award funds (3.1.3)

Institutional Disposition:

- suspended R for two weeks without pay;
- removed R from his/her position as student coordinator and prohibited him/her from supervising graduate students for 24 months unless there was co-supervision; and
- required R to provide a written apology to the student.

Agency Recourse:

- declared R ineligible to hold or apply for funding or to participate in Agency peer review processes, both for two years.

FILE 63

Allegation: Considerable similarities and overlap between two grant applications

Findings: R, a faculty member, presented selective and misleading information in his/her application, claiming sole credit for the research activities, publications, and supervision of students, when in fact the majority of these activities were undertaken in collaboration with a colleague. R deliberately withheld relevant information about these collaborations from his/her application. R also plagiarized text from his/her colleague's application.

Breaches: Misrepresentation in an Agency application or related document (3.1.2.a); plagiarism (3.1.1.d)

Institutional Disposition:

- did not renew R's term position at the Institution;
- made provisions for the continued academic and financial support of one of R's students to ensure he/she could complete his/her degree.

Agency Recourse:

- declared R ineligible to hold or apply for funding or to participate in Agency peer review processes, both for two years.
