



Integrity in Scholarly Activity

CONTENTS

1. Definitions
2. Policy Overview – Scholarly Integrity
 - 2.1 Scholarly Integrity – Preamble
 - 2.2 Scholarly Integrity – Policy
 - 2.3 Scholarly Integrity – Guidelines
3. Application of procedures
 - 3.3 Guidelines for Dealing with Allegations of Misconduct
 - 3.4 Procedures for Allegations
 - 3.5 Allegations
 - 3.6 Responsibilities of Director of Research and/or Vice-President Programming
 - 3.7 Complaints
 - 3.8 Inquiries
 - 3.9 Investigations
4. Authority of the Director of Research
5. Notification of Funding Agencies
6. Institutional Responsibility
7. Time Limits
8. Privacy
9. Protection for Good Faith Claims
10. Approval

1. Definitions

"Institution" means "The Banff Centre."

"Member" means a member of The Banff Centre community and includes all members of the academic and program staff, support staff, contract and sessional staff, Workstudies, Fellows, program participants, resident artists, and trust employees.

"Academic and Program Staff" includes both teaching and non-teaching staff, part-time or full-time, with or without definite term appointments. Academic and Program Staff also includes Adjunct (as the case may be) and other honorary appointees when carrying out their professorial duties at The Banff Centre.

"Support Staff" means persons covered by the Centre's/CUPE collective agreement and persons designated as "exempt" by virtue of their management or supervisory status.

"Program Participant" means a person registered in course or program of work.

"Workstudy or Fellow" means a person, enrolled in a program at The Banff Centre, who enjoys privileges of access to and use of Centre facilities and services for study, practice, and work. Workstudy and Fellow participants are provided an educational contract that clearly lays out the learning goals and specifies how these goals are to be achieved. Workstudy and Fellow programs

are intended to provide the participant with a combination of learning opportunities and supervised, practical work related to the participant's learning objectives. Learning opportunities may be formal sessions and/or workshops or may be informal.

"Trust Employee" means persons paid from funds held in trust or administered by The Banff Centre on behalf of an outside organization.

"Advisor" means any person selected by the respondent.

"Allegation" means information in any form forwarded to a Head of a Programming Division relating to possible misconduct in scholarly activity.

"Complaint" means the written charge of misconduct forwarded by a Head of a Programming Division to a Committee to hold an Inquiry.

"Gross Misconduct" means 'misconduct' judged to be deliberate or reckless, going beyond negligence, and of sufficient gravity to justify initiation of dismissal proceedings.

"Inquiry" means the informal process of gathering information for the sole purpose of determining whether or not a complaint warrants an Investigation.

"Investigation" means the more formal procedure to be followed once an Inquiry has concluded that a complaint has sufficient potential foundation to warrant full investigation. The Investigation will examine and evaluate the relevant facts to determine whether or not the complaint is substantiated.

"Misconduct" in this document means, but is not limited to, any or all of the dishonest behaviours identified below:

- a. Falsifying or fabricating data;
- b. Plagiarism, (i.e., copying large body of copyrighted material without acknowledging the author and the source);
- c. Willfully misrepresenting and misinterpreting (for any reason) of findings resulting from conducting research and scholarly activities;
- d. Failure to recognize relevant contributions (contribution of an idea that leads to a concrete improvement of results, time spent in collecting and analyzing data, writing paper on a particular subject, ...) of others; (collaborators, coworker, in the authorship of the papers or invention disclosures);
- e. Failure to honour the confidentiality that the researcher promised or was contracted to as a way to gain valuable information from a party internal to The Banff Centre;
- f. Failure to adhere to terms and conditions of contracts with a third party (in most cases external to The Banff Centre) that is sponsoring research;
- g. Failure to report to The Banff Centre an involvement in research dealing with human subjects, bio-hazardous materials or animals;
- h. Failure to disclose conflict of interest;
- i. Misconduct does not include honest errors, differences in opinion or different interpretations of scientific discoveries.

2. Policy Overview – Scholarly Integrity

2.1 Scholarly Integrity – Preamble

2.1.1 The Banff Centre is a community of individuals that share a common vision and commitment to the arts, lifelong learning, the development and showcasing of new work, and the advancement

of applied research. As an internationally respected arts, cultural, and educational institution and conference facility, The Banff Centre is a leader on the local, national and global levels in the development and promotion of creative work in the arts, sciences, business, and the environment.

Research is the cornerstone of advancement in the arts, humanities, and sciences. Not only do research discoveries directly contribute to economic development, they are also fundamental in promoting societal well-being, health, and culture. The Banff Centre recognizes that excellence in research depends on the creativity, hard work, and dedication of its practitioners. The Banff Centre also recognizes that excellence in research depends on integrity; dishonesty and fabrication fundamentally undermine the worth and usefulness of research and other scholarly work.

The Banff Centre also highly values collaborative work and practice in its research programs and initiatives and makes every effort to establish mutual credit and acknowledgment of all researchers involved in collaborative initiatives. As such, the practice of scholarly integrity and honesty is fundamental to The Banff Centre's unique creative and intellectual environment; in the interest of maintaining The Banff Centre's reputation, position, and unique environment, we have established the following policy for scholarly integrity and honesty. The Banff Centre's Scholarly Integrity Policy is based on the values that:

- scholarly integrity is a crucial aspect of nurturing personal responsibility, respect, and esteem;
- scholarly integrity fosters continuous, lifelong learning;
- scholarly integrity validates the recognition of artistic success and creative achievement; and
- scholarly integrity establishes enduring respect for the artistic and creative work of others, and enables effective collaboration and partnerships.

As such, scholarly integrity is a keystone of both The Banff Centre's research mandate and The Banff Centre's vision and mandate as a whole. All members share the responsibility of nurturing scholarly integrity.

Integrity in research and creation requires honesty in research activities, respect for intellectual property, and due regard for ethical principles. The foundation for this Banff Centre policy is based on the "Tri-Council Statement: Integrity in Research and Scholarship" developed by the Canadian Institutes of Health Research (CIHR), the Natural Sciences and Engineering Research Council (NSERC) and the Social Sciences and Humanities Research Council (SSHRC). The Banff Centre supports and promotes integrity in research and creation and The Banff Centre endorses the Tri-Council policy statement. The Banff Centre recognizes that some of its members also are obliged to abide by the ethical standards of conduct of the professional organizations of which they are a member.

The Banff Centre Policy on Integrity in Scholarly Activity starts from the premise that we are committed both individually and institutionally to integrity in scholarly activity. Accordingly, we do not need pro-active approaches designed to monitor the proposals, implementation and results connected with scholarly activity. Rather, we need procedures that respond in a balanced way to concerns that are raised. The policy elaborated here is designed to reflect a number of important values, and to balance those values appropriately where they come into conflict.

First, we need procedures that ensure fairness to those whose integrity is brought into question. In particular, strict confidentiality for respondents must be assured to minimize the damage that can be done by aspersions on scholarly integrity that are ultimately not substantiated. A related value that the procedures must reflect is that of speedy investigation and disposition of complaints, so that scholarly reputations are not damaged by clouds of suspicion. Finally, there must be a proper balance in the allocation of The Banff Centre's human resources to ensure that

complaints are fully investigated without making unreasonable demands on the time of busy scholars.

Second, there is a need to protect those who set the process in motion or otherwise assist in dealing with complaints. This will involve assurances of confidentiality or even anonymity where appropriate, together with institutional reaffirmation of the impropriety of any form of retaliation against those persons. On the other hand, we must guard against the risk of confidentiality and anonymity becoming cloaks for malice or injustice. In this respect, we are particularly concerned with the possibility that there may be an absence of reasonable factual foundation for a complaint. The balance we seek is one that recognizes that the values of confidentiality and anonymity may have to yield to the equally important values in any case where evidence of scholarly misconduct is only capable of proper evaluation if the source of the allegation is clearly identified. In this way we seek to offer encouragement and support to those whose sincere concern for scholarly integrity leads them to become involved in a complaint, while yet both protecting scholarly reputations for unfounded smears and protecting us all from the dangers of damaging public litigation.

Third, we need a policy that is sensitive to the reality that misconduct in scholarly activity can be almost infinitely various in both nature and cause. This means that the policies and procedures must be capable of responding realistically to a continuum of culpability that might range from an honest but mistaken view of the propriety of a particular practice, through behaviour that exhibits various degrees of carelessness or negligence, to the extreme case of calculated plagiarism or fraud. Some variation in procedure is surely appropriate at least at the level of final disposition of a complaint to reflect the diversity that necessarily inheres in the concept of misconduct in scholarly activity. Finally, it must be remembered that the range of dispositions available is designed to preserve the integrity and reputation of The Banff Centre and not to provide personal redress for aggrieved individuals.

2.2 Scholarly Integrity – Policy

2.2.2 Scholarly Integrity – Policy Preamble

- that all members (Academic and Program staff, Program Participants, Workstudies, Fellows, and Trust employees) have the responsibility to encourage and foster an environment of intellectual integrity and honesty;
- that misconduct in scholarly activities, as defined in Section 1 above, is strictly prohibited;
- that all members (Academic and Program staff, Program Participants, Workstudies, Fellows, and Trust employees) will foster an environment of respect, lifelong learning, creative achievement, and will endeavor to work collaboratively towards these ends.

2.2.3 Banff Centre researchers, Workstudies, Fellows and scholars shall:

- i) apply stringent standards of honesty and of scholarly, artistic, and scientific practice in the collection, representation, recording and analysis of research (whether quantitative or qualitative) and other information, and in the dissemination of information, findings and discoveries, including unauthorized duplicate publication;
- ii) observe stringent ethical standards for the treatment of human and animal research participants, and obtain approval from the appropriate ethics review committee before the research commences (see Banff Centre Policy on the Ethics of Human Research);
- iii) make every effort to establish mutual credit and acknowledgment of collaborative initiatives; appropriately recognize the assistance and substantive contributions of all collaborators through acknowledgment or authorship; include as authors of a work intended for publication or presentation all persons, and only those persons, who made

- significant scholarly and/or scientific contributions to, and share responsibility for, the contents of the publication or presentation;
- iv) ensure that all co-authors of a work intended for publication or presentation are aware of their responsibilities as co-authors, and obtain their approval of the final version of the work intended for publication or presentation;
 - v) appropriately cite the work of others and use others' writings, discoveries, findings, conceptual developments, unique methods, and data with proper attribution;
 - vi) obtain the permission of others to use their unpublished findings and works, and appropriately acknowledge such sources;
 - vii) obtain the permission of others before using information, concepts or data originally obtained through confidential exchanges, or through access to confidential manuscripts or funding applications that may have been read as a result of activities such as peer review (where permitted by publisher or funding agency regulations);
 - viii) gain access to and use private or confidential materials and information (eg, private archives, medical records) legitimately by complying with source regulations;
 - ix) avoid conflicts of interest and commitment, and the real or perceived bias that may arise from such conflicts; reveal to sponsors, universities, journals or funding agencies, any material conflicts of interest and commitment (financial or other) that might influence their decisions on whether the individual should be asked to review manuscripts or applications, test products or be permitted to undertake work sponsored from outside sources;
 - x) where data are collected and used for scholarly purposes, ensure appropriate provisions are in place for the collection and secure storage of the data, and ensure provisions are in place for dissemination of the data for secondary analysis for legitimate scholarly purposes.

2.2.4 Data policy

2.2.4.1 A factor in many cases of alleged Scholarly Misconduct has been the absence of a complete set of verifiable data. It is of utmost importance that The Banff Centre retains accurately recorded and retrievable results. All primary data must be recorded in clear, adequate, original and chronological form. In scientific departments, a record of the primary data, regardless of ownership, must be maintained in the laboratory and cannot be removed. Original data for any given study must be retained in the unit of origin for at least five years after the work is published or otherwise presented (if the form of the data permits this, and if assurances have not been given that data would be destroyed to assure anonymity). Supervisors and collaborators will have unrestricted access to all data and products of their collaborative research (if assurances have not been given that access to the data and/or products would be restricted to assure anonymity).

2.2.5 Awareness of Policy on Scholarly Integrity

2.2.5.1 Dissemination. The Banff Centre will ensure that the Policy on Scholarly Integrity is available on the website of the Office of Research, and that this policy is brought to the attention of new employees, workstudy students, and scholarly and artistic residents at the time of appointment, during their orientations sessions, or with the package of materials provided at the time they commence their residency.

2.2.5.2 Education. The Banff Centre will organize an information session, at least once annually, on research issues. One of the topics that will be included in this information session is the Policy on Integrity in Scholarly Activity.

2.3 Scholarly Integrity – Guidelines

2.3.1 Responsibilities of Members

2.3.2 Academic honesty is based on the principle that one's work is one's own. The Banff Centre encourages all its members to accept responsibility for taking intellectual honesty and integrity

seriously by contributing to an environment in which such integrity is valued, and by fostering responsible ways to discourage dishonesty in the work of others.

2.3.3 To make every effort to establish mutual credit and acknowledgment of collaborative initiatives and to appropriately recognize the assistance and substantive contributions of all collaborators through acknowledgment or authorship.

2.3.4 To include as authors of a work intended for publication or presentation all persons, and only those persons, who made significant scholarly and/or scientific contributions to, and share responsibility for, the contents of the publication or presentation.

2.3.5 To foster an environment of respect, lifelong learning, creative achievement, and to endeavor to work collaboratively towards these ends.

2.3.6 No member shall condone or tolerate deception, misrepresentation, plagiarism, or falsification, because such activity adversely affects every single member of The Banff Centre's community.

3. Application of Procedures

3.1 These procedures apply to all allegations and complaints of misconduct in scholarly activity against any member of the Banff Centre community as defined in section 1 above.

3.2 Misconduct does not include actions or omissions based on honest errors, conflicting data, or interpretation differences.

3.3 Guidelines for Dealing with Allegations of Misconduct

3.3.1 For dealing with allegations and misconduct The Banff Centre refers to the procedures used by SSHRC. This document refers to the SSHRC policy (http://www.sshrc.ca/web/about/policies/integrity_e.asp).

3.3.2 Allegations may arise from anonymous or identified sources within or outside The Banff Centre; the allegations may be well founded, honestly erroneous or mischievous. Whatever their source, motivation or accuracy, such allegations have the potential to cause great harm to the persons accused, to the accuser, to The Banff Centre, and to research and scholarship in general.

3.3.3 The following guidelines protect the interests of all individuals involved in cases of allegation of misconduct, and affirm that The Banff Centre will handle allegations of misconduct in a timely manner.

- i) All staff members, researchers or artists of The Banff Centre involved in allegations of misconduct cases need to maintain confidentiality.
- ii) Individuals involved in allegations of misconduct cases need to be informed of the process and the results of investigations.
- iii) Accused individuals have the right to respond to allegations. Until misconduct is proven, privacy of the accused and the person(s) making the allegations must be protected.
- iv) Individuals involved in the process of providing information to the accusation of misconduct must be informed that their anonymity cannot be guaranteed if the case goes to court.

3.4 Procedures for Allegations

3.4.1 The Banff Centre has a three-stage procedure for dealing with allegations of misconduct:

- i) Receipt of an allegation of misconduct;

- ii) Conducting an inquiry; and
- iii) Conducting a formal investigation.

3.5 Allegations

3.5.1 An allegation of Scholarly Misconduct may come from various sources inside or outside The Banff Centre. For example, the allegation may come from a member of The Banff Centre community, a granting source, a research associate, a member of the general public, a media report or an anonymous source. The ability of The Banff Centre to investigate an allegation may be hampered if it is from an anonymous or uncooperative source, and investigations are always subject to principles of Natural Justice.

3.5.2 Allegations of Scholarly Misconduct received by The Banff Centre are forwarded to the Director of Research. The Director of Research normally is sufficiently at arm's length so as to be viewed as impartial and free of personal conflicts of interest and is therefore the central point of contact. If the Director of Research feels it would be inappropriate to receive a particular allegation for whatever reason, he/she may refer the allegation to the Vice-President Programming.

3.6 Responsibilities of Director of Research and/or Vice-President Programming

3.6.1 The Director of Research or the Vice-President Programming may delegate any function specified in these procedures but is ultimately responsible for ensuring that the procedures are complied with, and that all allegations and complaints are properly investigated, documented and disposed of.

3.7 Complaints

3.7.1 On receipt of an allegation of possible misconduct in scholarly activity the Director of Research shall determine if it is possible to formulate a complaint in writing. Such a complaint may be formulated by any person who has reviewed the relevant documentation, including the Director of Research. If for any reason a complaint in writing cannot be formulated no further steps shall be taken against the respondent under these Procedures.

3.7.2 A complaint in writing shall identify the person or persons who made the allegations leading to the formulation of the complaint if it appears to the Director of Research that the evidence supporting the complaint might reasonably require such identification for its proper evaluation, and in any event the complaint shall contain sufficient detail to enable the respondent to understand the matter that is to be inquired into.

3.7.3 Where the documentation in support of the complaint reasonably requires knowledge of the identify of any person who caused it to be forward to the Director of Research for its proper evaluation, no complaint in writing shall be valid unless it identifies that person. However, no such person shall be identified unless that person has expressly so agreed.

3.8 Inquiries

3.8.1 As soon as possible after a complaint has been formulated in writing, and in any event within ten days of receipt of an allegation, the Director of Research shall send a copy of the complaint to the respondent, to the Vice-President Programming, and to a Committee of three persons to conduct an inquiry.

3.8.2 The Director of Research shall forthwith upon sending a complaint to a Committee to conduct an inquiry advise the respondent of the composition of that Committee, and shall also so advise any person who is identified in the complaint.

3.8.3 Any objection to the composition of the Committee to conduct an inquiry shall be made to the Director of Research within seven days. The Director of Research's disposition of any such objection shall be final.

3.8.4 The Committee to conduct an Inquiry shall consist of a Chair who shall normally be a senior person from the Programming Division in question, and two other persons who shall normally be senior members of staff who may be from outside the Programming Division, with the requisite expertise to address the issues involved.

3.8.5 The Committee to conduct an Inquiry shall proceed informally and in complete confidentiality to determine whether or not the complaint warrants an investigation. The respondent, accompanied by an advisor if the respondent so desires, shall be invited to address the Committee at the commencement of its work, and to make submissions in writing. Thereafter the respondent may attend other meetings of the Committee only by invitation of the Chair until the Committee has received all the information or submissions it deems appropriate.

3.8.6 Prior to meeting to consider its decision, the Committee shall advise the respondent in sufficient detail of the evidence being considered by the Committee and shall invite the respondent, accompanied by an advisor if the respondent so desires, to meet with it and respond to that evidence orally and/or in writing.

3.8.7 Prior to receiving evidence from any person not already identified in the complaint in writing, the Committee shall advise that person that it may be necessary in the interest of justice to reveal that person's identity to the respondent.

3.8.8 Within thirty days of being appointed, the Committee shall complete its inquiry and shall determine whether or not it finds that the complaint warrants an investigation. The Committee may recommend to the Director of Research a way to resolve a situation that does not warrant an investigation. Its decision shall be reported in writing to the Director of Research, and shall at all times be the confidential property of the Director of Research. The Committee shall also provide the Director of Research with the information used to reach its decision, which the Director of Research shall convey to any Committee of Investigation.

3.8.9 If the Committee reports that the complaint does not warrant an investigation, the Director of Research shall advise the respondent, any person identified in the complaint and the Vice-President Programming that the complaint is dismissed.

3.9 Investigations

3.9.1 If the Committee reports that the complaint does warrant an investigation, the Director of Research shall so advise the respondent, any person identified in the complaint and the Vice-President Programming and shall inform them comprehensively in writing of that which is to be investigated.

3.9.2 Upon being advised that there is a complaint warranting an investigation the Director of Research shall within 10 days appoint a Committee to conduct the investigation, and shall forthwith thereafter advise the respondent of the composition of that Committee, and shall also so advise any person who is identified in the complaint or who was identified to the respondent during the inquiry as a person who had given evidence.

3.9.3 Any objection to the composition of the Committee to conduct an investigation shall be made to the Director of Research within seven days. The Director of Research's disposition of any such objection shall be final.

3.9.4 The Committee to conduct an Investigation shall consist of a Chair and two members who shall be senior members who did not serve on the Committee to conduct an Inquiry, and who have sufficient expertise to address the issues involved. Whenever possible, members of the Committee shall be from a Department other than that to which the respondent belongs or from outside The Banff Centre.

3.9.5 The mandate of the Investigative Committee is to determine on a balance of probabilities whether Scholarly Misconduct has occurred, and if so, its extent and seriousness.

3.9.5.1 The Investigative Committee may review any Scholarly Activity relevant to the allegation, including any abstracts, papers or other methods of scholarly communication. A special audit of accounts may also be performed on the sponsored research accounts of the involved individual(s). Individual(s) may be required to prove credentials.

3.9.5.2 The Investigative Committee has the right to examine any documents of The Banff Centre and question any member of The Banff Centre community during its investigations. All members of The Banff Centre community must cooperate fully with the Investigative Committee and make available any documents requested by the Investigative Committee in the course of its investigation.

3.9.5.3 The Investigative Committee shall keep a confidential record of all documentation reviewed, notes on interviews conducted, and minutes of all meetings throughout the investigation period. At the completion of the Investigation, the complete file of records will be provided to the Director of Research, for secure storage for a period of 10 years.

3.9.6 The Committee to conduct an investigation shall invite the respondent, accompanied by an advisor if the respondent so desires, to address it and make submissions in writing prior to its seeking or obtaining any other information or submissions. Thereafter, the respondent may attend other meetings of the Committee only by invitation of the Chair until the Committee has received all the information or submissions it deems appropriate.

3.9.7 The Committee to conduct an investigation shall provide the opportunity for a person who made an allegation leading to the complaint, accompanied by an advisor, if desired, to address it in speech or in writing. If that person chooses to participate in the process and to be kept informed of the status of the investigation, the Committee may comply with the request. Moreover, if that person chooses to participate in the process, that individual shall also agree to respect the confidentiality of the process.

3.9.8 Prior to meeting to consider its decision, the Committee shall advise the respondent in sufficient detail of the evidence being considered by the Committee and shall invite the respondent, accompanied by an advisor if the respondent so desires, to meet with it and respond fully to that evidence orally and/or in writing.

3.9.9 Prior to receiving evidence from any person not already identified in the complaint in writing or identified to the respondent during the inquiry, the Committee shall advise that person that it may be necessary in the interests of justice to reveal that person's identity to the respondent.

3.9.10 Prior to completing its final report, the Investigative Committee will provide the individual(s) alleged to have committed the Scholarly Misconduct and those making the allegation with an opportunity to review and comment on a draft report. Comments on the draft report must

be received by the Investigative Committee within 10 days of the draft report being made available for review.

3.9.11 Within ninety days of being appointed, the Committee shall complete its investigation and shall report its reasoned decision in writing to the Director of Research. The decision of the Investigative Committee is binding. That reasoned decision shall at all times be the confidential property of the Director of Research in question. The chair of the Committee shall also send a copy of the reasoned decision to the respondent. No person shall make any use of the reasoned decision or any part thereof save for the purposes of these Procedures or for related purposes regarding disciplinary procedures.

3.9.11.1 The written report of the Investigative Committee will include:

- * the full allegation;
- * a list of the witnesses interviewed;
- * a summary of relevant material;
- * a determination of whether Scholarly Misconduct occurred;
- * If Scholarly Misconduct has occurred, its extent and seriousness; and
- * recommendations on any remedial action to be taken in the matter in question and/or changes to procedures or practices to avoid similar situations in the future.

3.9.12 The Committee shall advise the Director of Research of the disposition of the complaint. That advice shall take one of three forms:

3.9.12.1 that the respondent is not guilty of misconduct as defined in this document and the complaint should be dismissed;

3.9.12.2 that the complaint is substantiated, in whole or in part, and the respondent is guilty of misconduct as defined in this document that can be appropriately dealt with under the existing disciplinary powers of The Banff Centre;

3.9.12.3 that the complaint is substantiated in whole or in part, and the respondent is guilty of gross misconduct as defined in this document.

3.9.13 The Director of Research shall, upon receipt of notification of the disposition of the complaint, forthwith as appropriate:

3.9.13.1 advise the respondent, any person identified to the respondent, and the Vice-President Programming that the complaint is dismissed;

3.9.13.2 advise the respondent, any person identified to the respondent, and the Vice-President Programming that the complaint is substantiated as misconduct which can appropriately be dealt with under the existing disciplinary powers of The Banff Centre. The case is then referred to the Vice-President Programming for appropriate action;

3.9.13.3 advise the respondent, any person identified to the respondent, and the Vice-President Programming that the complaint is substantiated as gross misconduct in scholarly activity, and refer the matter to the Vice-President Programming and the President for further proceedings.

3.9.14 Where the complaint is not substantiated, the Director of Research in consultation with the respondent and the Committee that conducted the investigation shall take all reasonable steps to repair any damage that the respondent's reputation for scholarly integrity may have suffered by virtue of the complaint.

3.9.15 Whatever the outcome, the Director of Research shall also take all reasonable steps to mitigate the consequences of the process for individuals who have been unintentionally adversely affected by it.

4. Authority of the Director of Research

4.1 The Director of Research is the point of central contact for dealing with allegations of Scholarly Misconduct. Where the Director of Research has referred an allegation of Scholarly Misconduct to the Vice-President Programming according to section 3.5.2, the Vice-President Programming will act in the matter with the Authority ascribed to the Director of Research.

4.2 In cases of collaborative research involving other institutions, the Director of Research may modify these procedures to facilitate the conduct of parallel or joint investigations or as otherwise deemed appropriate by the Director of Research.

4.3 At any time, the Director of Research has the authority to:

- * close down and declare "off limits" facilities used for research;
- * protect the administration of The Banff Centre and outside funds involved in the research, including placing limits on the expenditure of funds pending the outcome of an inquiry and/or an investigation;
- * obtain and retain documentation (e.g., lab notes, computer disks, hard drives, proof of credentials) related to an investigation;
- * request that members of The Banff Centre community appear before an Investigative Committee and answer the Investigative Committee's questions or provide materials to it; and
- * dismiss the allegation if, based on reasonable information, the Director of Research believes that continued investigation will result in a determination that the alleged Scholarly Misconduct has not occurred.

5. Notification of Funding Agencies

5.1 When a Committee that has conducted an inquiry reports to the Director of Research that an investigation is warranted, within 10 days of receiving the report the Director of Research shall inform any granting agency or sponsor of the scholarly activity in question of this fact whenever that granting agency or sponsor had so requested at the time the grant was made, or so requires by its policies as they existed at the time of the grant or sponsorship, and shall notify the Vice-President Programming.

5.2 When a Committee that has conducted an investigation reports its conclusions to the Director of Research, within 30 days of receiving the report the Director of Research shall inform any granting agency or sponsor that has already been informed under clause 4.1 of the conclusion. Further, where the decision is that gross misconduct is substantiated, within 30 days of receiving the report the Director of Research shall inform any granting agency or sponsor known to have provided support for the scholarly activity in question of that conclusion, and may inform such other persons or agencies as it seems essential to inform in the interests of protecting the integrity of scholarly activity. The Vice-President Programming shall also be notified.

5.3 Where a respondent disciplined under paragraphs 3.9.11.2 or 3.9.11.3 has proceeded with a grievance or arbitration the President shall inform any granting agency, sponsor, person or agency that has already been informed under paragraphs 3.9.11.2 and 3.9.11.3 of the result of that grievance or arbitration.

6. Institutional Responsibility

6.1 Whenever an investigation concludes that gross misconduct is substantiated, appropriate arrangements shall be made to ensure that all other scholarly activity previously undertaken by the respondent at The Banff Centre is evaluated to determine its integrity.

7. Time Limits

7.1 All time limits in these procedures may be extended for good reason of which a formal record is kept. The respondent shall be advised of both the extension of time and the reasons therefore.

8. Privacy

8.1 The Banff Centre will protect personal information and deal with records in accordance with the Freedom of Information and Protection of Privacy Act.

9. Protection for Good Faith Claims

9.1 The Banff Centre will make every effort to protect those making an allegation of Scholarly Misconduct or who have provided information to The Banff Centre in good faith from retaliation. Retaliation does not include actions of The Banff Centre pursuant to section 9.4.

9.2 No person to whom this policy applies may retaliate against a person making such allegations or providing such information in good faith.

9.3 If a person who has made such an allegation or who has provided such information in good faith believes that they have suffered retaliation from a person to whom this policy applies, they may file a written complaint to the Director of Research. The Banff Centre will conduct an investigation of the alleged retaliation. Anyone who does engage in such retaliation is subject to disciplinary action. Where retaliation is found to have occurred, The Banff Centre will act accordingly.

9.4 The Banff Centre may take disciplinary action against individuals found to have made allegations of Scholarly Misconduct pursuant to the Policy where such allegations were not made in good faith. This includes, but is not limited to, allegations that are based upon facts that the complainant knows to be false, or allegations made with reckless disregard towards, or willful ignorance of, facts that would disprove the allegations.

10. Approval

10.1 This policy was approved by the Program Council of The Banff Centre on (July 31, 2006), and by the Executive Officers of The Banff Centre on (August 15, 2006).