



GORD  
**INSTITUTE**

RESEARCH MISCONDUCT  
POLICY

V2.0 - 2018

## Table of Contents

I. Policy Statement: .....	2
II. Applicability and Scope: .....	2
III. Effective Date: .....	2
IV. Definitions: .....	2
V. Delegation of Authority (DoA) and Responsibilities: .....	3
VI. Confidentiality: .....	4
VII. Reporting Allegations.....	4
VIII. Inquiry Procedures.....	5
IX. Investigation Procedures .....	7
X. Resolution, Disciplinary Procedures, and Appeal .....	8

## I. Policy Statement:

GORD Institute (Institute) is committed to the ethical conduct of research and condemns any form of dishonesty or misconduct in research and accepts responsibility for developing and maintaining the highest standards of intellectual integrity. All members of the Institute are responsible for promoting the highest ethical principles in research and implementing this Policy concerning any research activities with which he/she is associated and for helping his/her associates in continuing efforts to avoid any activity that might be considered in violation of this Policy. Failure to comply with this Policy shall be dealt with according to the procedures specified herein and is considered to be a violation of the trust placed in each member of the Institute.

## II. Applicability and Scope:

This Policy applies to all research activities conducted under GORD Institute regardless of the source of funding, and to any person affiliated with the Institute such as Lead Principle Investigators (LPs), Principle Investigators (PIs), research fellows, technicians, graduate students, trainees, guest researchers, collaborators and other staff members at the Institute, in addition to the sub-awardees and subcontractors.

This Policy will be implemented when an allegation of research misconduct is received related to research activities conducted at the Institute. In such situations where the Institute determines that a deviation from the Policy is necessary to handle the allegation more appropriately, such deviation must be fair to all parties involved and approved by GORD's BoD and GORD's Founding Chairman.

## III. Effective Date:

The provisions of this Policy shall be effective from the date of publication.

## IV. Definitions:

- a. **Research Misconduct** means fabrication, falsification, or plagiarism, or other practices that seriously deviate from those that are commonly accepted within

the research community for proposing, performing, or reviewing research, or in reporting research results. It does not include honest error or honest differences in interpretations or judgments of data.

- i. **Fabrication** is making up data or results and recording or reporting them.
  - ii. **Falsification** is manipulating research materials, equipment, or processes, or changing or omitting data or results such that the research is not accurately represented in the research record.
  - iii. **Plagiarism** is the appropriation of another person's ideas, processes, results, or words without giving appropriate credit.
- b. **Allegation** means a disclosure of possible research misconduct through any means of communication. The disclosure may be by a written or oral statement or other communication to the Institute or Research Funding Agency.
  - c. **Inquiry** is the first stage of the review process. It means preliminary information-gathering and preliminary fact-finding that meets the criteria and follows the procedures outlined in Sections VIII & IX of this Policy
  - d. **Investigation** is a stage of the review that will be initiated only after an inquiry leading to a finding that calls for further review. The purpose is to explore the allegations more thoroughly and determine whether there has indeed been research misconduct. The investigation may uncover information that justifies broadening the scope of the review beyond the initial allegation.
  - e. **Complainant** is a person who makes an allegation of research misconduct.
  - f. **Respondent** is the person accused of research misconduct.
  - g. **Research** means systematic investigations including testing, evaluation, and research development designed to develop or contribute to general knowledge. The research includes all basic and applied research in all academic fields.

## V. Delegation of Authority (DoA) and Responsibilities:

- a. the institutional official who makes the final decision on allegations of research misconduct and any institutional administrative actions as well as the

- appointment of the investigation parties including officers and committee. The DO shall have no direct prior involvement in the institution's inquiry, investigation, or allegation assessment. The DO is the Founding Chairman of GORD.
- b. **Research Integrity Officer (RIO):** means the institutional official who is responsible for reviewing the allegations of research misconduct and defining when such allegations warrant inquiries and for supervising inquiries and investigations. The DO appoints the RIO.
  - c. **Committee member:** any individual appointed in the Inquiry Committee or the Investigation Committee.

## VI. Confidentiality:

All Research Misconduct reviews, Inquiries and Investigations will be conducted in a manner that will maintain the confidentiality of the misconduct proceeding.

The RIO shall:

- Protect the identity of respondents and complainants to those who need to know in order to carry out a thorough, competent, objective, and fair research misconduct proceeding.
- Informing individuals involved in the research misconduct proceeding of the need to maintain confidentiality.
- Use written confidentiality agreements or other mechanisms to ensure that the recipient makes no further disclosure of identifying information.

## VII. Reporting Allegations

The RIO will be receiving a written report of the allegation of research misconduct. The RIO shall immediately inform the DO of the allegations. In case the RIO has a conflict of interest, the allegation shall be investigated by another administrator appointed by the DO.

The RIO shall consult with confidence any individual who submits an allegation of research misconduct or concern regarding potential misconduct. If the individual raising the concern does not wish to submit a formal allegation, but the RIO considers there is enough reason to warrant an inquiry, the case can still be investigated at the RIO authority. There is no "Complainant" for this policy purpose in such a case. An allegation may be efficiently investigated without the complainant being involved. Cases which rely on the complainant's findings or comments may not be able to proceed without that individual's extensive involvement.

## VIII. Inquiry Procedures

- a. The inquiry process can be managed, at the discretion of the DO, with or without an inquiry committee. The DO C will assign the RIO and the Committee.

It is the responsibility of the RIO to ensure that the inquiry is conducted reasonably and, the Committee involved in the inquiry has no actual or apparent conflicts of interest and has adequate experience for evaluating the issues posed.

- b. The RIO shall inform the respondent within a reasonable period upon initiation of an inquiry. The respondent shall be notified of the charges and the procedures to be followed, and copies of any written documents supporting the allegations shall be provided. If the RIO wishes to include a committee in the investigation, the members of the Committee shall be assigned, and the Committee convened. The RIO and the members of the Committee shall be allowed to obtain and review relevant documents; to interview professors and staff involved; to request additional information when required; and, if required or appropriate, to request advice from experts outside the Institution.
- c. Upon deciding that an allegation falls under the scope and definition of research misconduct, the RIO must ensure prompt securing of all original research documents, materials and information related to the inquiry and investigation.
- d. The respondent shall be required to file a written response to the allegations upon initiation of the inquiry. The respondent is required to assist in the procurement

of the materials necessary for conducting an inquiry. Uncooperative behavior, as described below, can result in immediate conduct of an investigation or disciplinary action.

- e. The Institute shall uphold any assurances of privacy previously provided to research subjects during the investigation process.
- f. The inquiry process must usually be completed within sixty (60) calendar days of notifying the respondent that the inquiry has been initiated. If the RIO or the Committee of Inquiry anticipates that the deadline of sixty (60) calendar days cannot be met, the reasons for the delay and the progress to date shall be explained in a written document which will form part of the case file. Copies of the progress report shall be submitted to the complainant and to the respondent.
- g. The conclusion of the inquiry shall be indicated in a written report detailing the names and titles if any, of the members of the Committee and the experts; the allegations; the investigative support agency, if any; a summary of the inquiry procedure used; a list of the investigative documents reviewed; a summary of any interviews; a description of the facts in sufficient detail to indicate that the investigation has been carried out.. Copies of the draft report shall be given to the complainant and the respondent and they shall have fourteen (14) days to submit their observations. Any remarks made by the complainant or respondent will become part of the final report and record. The Committee of Inquiry may, based on its findings, update the report as necessary. If an inquiry is to be carried out and the research is funded by an external funding agency, the funding agency shall also be informed on or before the date of initiation of the inquiry.
- h. If an allegation is considered unwarranted after inquiry, the parties concerned shall be informed. The fact that an investigation has been undertaken and the respondent's identity shall remain confidential to the degree allowed by laws, unless the respondent expressly waives that privilege, and the case file shall be protected.

- i. The Institute shall make concerted efforts to preserve the identity and reputation of the complainant. However, if an allegation is found to be unwarranted and to have been maliciously motivated, disciplinary action can be taken against the complainant.

## IX. Investigation Procedures

- a. If the stage of the inquiry results in a finding that an investigation is warranted, the investigation shall begin within thirty (30) days of the completion of the inquiry. A three-member investigating body shall be named by the DO and the Investigation committee is headed by the RIO. Members can be chosen from inside or outside the Institute. It is the duty of the RIO to ensure, that the investigation is conducted fairly and that the members selected to work on the Investigating Committee do not have any actual or apparent conflicts of interest, are unbiased, and have an adequate background to the evaluation of the issues posed. The members of the Committee shall be allowed to obtain and review relevant documents; to interview professors, staff and students involved; to request additional information when required; and, if required or applicable, to seek guidance from experts outside the Insitute. The respondent shall be entitled to test any evidence against him or her. For this reason, the Committee can hold a hearing.
- b. The resulting report and supporting documents shall be provided to the respondent at the end of the Inquiry. If it is found that there is ample evidence available to warrant a formal investigation, the respondent would have the right to waive the investigation, approve the investigation and proceed to the sanction process of the investigation.
- c. The RIO shall immediately inform the complainant and the respondent that an investigation has been conducted and shall invite the respondent to file a written reply to the allegations. The respondent is entitled to legal counsel to provide advice. The respondent is required to assist in the procurement of the materials



- necessary for conducting the investigation. Uncooperative actions can lead to immediate disciplinary action.
- d. The investigation process is typically finished within 120 calendar days from the first meeting of the Investigative Committee is the start of the inquiry.
  - e. This investigation process involves conducting the investigation; drafting the results report; making the draft report available for review to the respondent (14 days); revising the report, if necessary, in the light of the respondent's comments; submitting the report to the DO for approval, and submitting the report to the funding agency of the research project concerned.

## X. Resolution, Disciplinary Procedures, and Appeal

- a. The conclusion of the inquiry shall be indicated by a written report from the Investigating Committee to the RIO showing whether research misconduct of the inquiry under the scope of this Policy has occurred. A copy of the final report shall be given to the complainant, the respondent and the funding agency funding the concerned research.
- b. If the respondent comments on the report, the comments can be included in the final report and record.
- c. Respondent may appeal within 15 calendar days of receiving the findings. DO may request that RIO reconvene the previous Committee, or a new committee may be convened.
- d. If the allegation is found to be unjustified in the investigation process, the parties concerned shall be informed. The inquiry and the identity of the respondent shall be held in strict secrecy to the degree allowed by regulation and laws, unless this right is waived by the respondent and the case file shall be maintained at the RIO and the Director of Research and Development.
- e. If the allegation is found to be unjustified, the Institute shall make concerted efforts, as necessary, to restore the reputation of the respondent.

## GORD INSTITUTE- Research Misconduct Policy

- f. The Institute shall make concerted efforts to protect the complainant's position and reputation. However, if an allegation is found to be unjustified and mischievously motivated, disciplinary action can be taken against the complainant.
- g. If the investigation finds an occurrence of research misconduct, the DO shall refer the matter to a potential disciplinary action, as stated below.
- h. Disciplinary action will be taken in compliance with the Institute Policy in the event of research misconduct. The following list of potential GORD's penalties is illustrative: exclusion from a particular research project; special supervision of future work; letter of reprimand; suspension; reduction of salary; reduction of rank; and termination of employment.
- i. The Institute shall also have the right to take administrative steps such as informing all parties involved, including co-authors, co-investigators or research collaborators; editors of the journals in which the work has been published; funding agencies and organizations and funding agency with which the individual has been associated; and professional societies with which the individual has been associated.
- j. In the event of a finding research misconduct during investigation, the case file shall be maintained within the Research Office (RO). The record shall be held for at least three (3) years after the conclusion of the case.