



# Memorandum

**Research Integrity Office**

3647 Peel Street

Room 105

Tel: number 0279

**TO:** Senate

**FROM:** Abraham Fuks, Research Integrity Officer

**SUBJECT:** Annual Report Concerning the Investigation of Research Misconduct

**DATE:** September 22, 2011

**DOCUMENT #:** D11-07

**ACTION REQUIRED:**  INFORMATION     APPROVAL/DECISION

**ISSUE:** An annual report submitted to the Board of Governors in accordance with the provisions of the *Regulations Concerning the Investigation of Research Misconduct*.

**BACKGROUND & RATIONALE:** According to article 10.6 of the *Regulations Concerning the Investigation of Research Misconduct*, the Research Integrity Officer is to provide an annual report to Senate and to the Board of Governors on the operation of the *Regulations*. The report includes the following:

- (i) the number of Research Misconduct allegations received;
- (ii) the number of Research Misconduct allegations investigated;
- (iii) a summary of the findings of the investigations conducted;
- (iv) a summary of any actions taken pursuant to the investigations.

**MOTION OR RESOLUTION FOR APPROVAL:** N/A

**PRIOR CONSULTATION:** N/A

**NEXT STEPS:** N/A

**APPENDICES:** Appendix A: *2010-2011 Annual Report: Regulations Concerning the Investigation of Research Misconduct*

**2010-2011 ANNUAL REPORT:  
Regulations Concerning Investigation of Research Misconduct**

**Introduction**

The *Regulations Concerning the Investigation of Research Misconduct* (“the Regulations”) call for the Research Integrity Officer (“RIO”) to report annually to Senate and the Board of Governors on the application of the Regulations. This is the second annual report presented to Senate and the Board of Governors in discharge of this obligation.

**Background**

The Regulations provide for an internal process for the assessment and, where appropriate, the formal investigation of allegations of research misconduct brought against members of the University community regardless of faculty or discipline.

The tables below provide statistical information concerning allegations and their disposition for the two years the Regulations have been in operation – together the five years preceding the introduction of the new process, during which research misconduct allegations were addressed under faculty specific or ad hoc processes.

**The Big Picture**

As is evident from Table 1, during the five years preceding the introduction of the Regulations there were 10 allegations; the same number of allegations were received during the two years of operation of the Regulations. The incidence of allegations varies from year to year as does their nature.

**Table 1: Nature of Allegations**

Nature	Year							Total
	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	09/10	10/11	
<b>Plagiarism &amp; Authorship</b>	2	1	1			3	2	<b>9</b>
<b>Fabrication/ Falsification</b>			1	2	1		4	<b>8</b>
<b>Ethical Miscond</b>						1		<b>1</b>
<b>Misrep of Credentials.</b>					1			<b>1</b>
<b>Non-comp with SOP, etc.</b>			1					<b>1</b>
<b>Total</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>6</b>	<b>20</b>

**The Source of Allegations**

The sources of allegations have been various as shown in Table 2. The majority of the respondents have been academic staff, though this past year two of the respondents were post-doctoral fellows and one was a graduate student.

---

<sup>1</sup> Non-compliance with standard operating procedures

**Table 2: Source of Allegations**

Source of Allegation	Year							Total
	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	09/10	10/11	
Agency	1		2		1			4
Member of University	1	1	1		1	2	5	11
External				1		2	1	4
Anonymous				1				1
<b>Total</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>6</b>	<b>20</b>

**Disposition of Allegations**

The disposition of the allegations received are presented in Table 3.

**Table 3: Disposition of Allegations**

Nature of Complaint	Year	Total Cases	No Prima Facie Case	Investigated
Plagiarism & Authorship	2004-08	4	1	3
	2009-10	3	1	2
	2010-11	2	(1) <sup>2</sup>	1
Fabrication/ Falsification	2004-08	4	2	2
	2009-10			
	2010-11	4	1	(3) <sup>3</sup>
Ethical Miscond.	2004-08			
	2009-10	1		1
	2010-11			
Misrep. of Credentials	2004-08	1		1
	2009-10			
	2010-11			
Non-comp. with SOP, etc.	2004-08	1		1
	2009-10			
	2010-11			
<b>Totals</b>		<b>20</b>	<b>6</b>	<b>14</b>

In eight of the fourteen cases investigated misconduct was established and appropriate action taken. Where discipline was imposed the sanctions ranged from reprimand to dismissal.

**Consultative Activities**

<sup>2</sup> One allegation was withdrawn after initial assessment

<sup>3</sup> One allegation was adjudicated within a Faculty

In addition to the formal allegations noted above, the RIO opened six files and conducted a preliminary discussion with current or former members of the McGill community who were concerned about an issue of research misconduct, but for which no formal allegations of misconduct were submitted.

**Conclusion**

The RIO and University Administration would like to take this opportunity to thank all those who have served on, or cooperated with, investigation committees. All recognize the critical importance of such allegations and the major impact that they can have on the academic and professional lives of respondents. The dedication that committee members have exhibited in this very important role, the integrity with which they have fulfilled their responsibilities, and the time and energy they have devoted to ensuring a fair and impartial investigation of all the issues deserve commendation.