



PROTECTED

MEMORANDUM

**DATE :** June 23, 2006

**TO :** Dr. Nigel Lloyd

**FROM :** Marie Emond  
Research Ethics Coordinator

**SUBJECT :** Request for approval – Recommendation of the Committee on Professional Scientific Integrity (CPSI)  
[REDACTED] (complainants)  
( [REDACTED] )  
vs. [REDACTED] (respondent) ( [REDACTED] )

**SUMMARY :**

The CPSI comprised of Joanne Keselman (University of Manitoba) (Chair), Tom Calvert (Simon Fraser University), Max Blouw (University of Northern British Columbia) and Gretchen Harris (University of Waterloo) met via teleconference on June 16 at 10:30 a.m. EDT, with Martine Dupré (NSERC Corporate Secretary) and Marie Emond (NSERC Research Ethics Coordinator) to discuss the issue of academic misconduct regarding repeat publications, falsification and fabrication of data and plagiarism (see attached report of CPSI teleconference).

**BACKGROUND:**

In August 2005 [REDACTED] from [REDACTED] contacted the Research Ethics Coordinator (REC) by telephone with an allegation of repeat publications against [REDACTED]. The complainant indicated that this matter had been reported to institution authorities about one year ago and had not heard the outcome. It was suggested the documentation be forwarded to NSERC along with written permission to bring the matter forward. [REDACTED] followed through with this suggestion. On September 9, 2005, the matter was forwarded to [REDACTED] by the REC.

In November 2005 [REDACTED] from [REDACTED] contacted the REC by telephone with allegations of repeat publications,

falsification and fabrication of data and plagiarism against [REDACTED] from [REDACTED]. The complainant indicated that the matter has been brought forward to university authorities without any results. The same suggestion was made that he forward the documentation to NSERC along with written permission to bring the matter forward and request that an investigation be carried out. On November 21, 2005 the matter was sent to [REDACTED] by the REC.

A report dated December 22, 2005 prepared by [REDACTED] was received at NSERC on January 4, 2006. The following outlines the findings of the investigation:

- 1- No evidence of plagiarism
- 2- No evidence of data falsification
- 3- Copyright agreements with publishers may not have been observed

The materials received from the university with the report on investigation included a copy of the letter to the respondent from the [REDACTED] which indicated the above findings and also that:

- significant concerns were raised regarding the liberal reuse of published materials and data in multiple publications;
- the university was concerned with the example set by supervisor vis-à-vis training of HQP in appropriate publication practices;
- the respondent accepted the findings that there were some errors and questionable practice in the past regarding the reuse of materials;
- the university, in light of the respondent's acknowledgement of findings, accepts the respondent's commitment that practices have now been implemented to prevent any further such occurrences;
- the university expects complete and rigorous compliance with the Tri-Council Policy Statement: Integrity in Research and Scholarship and the [REDACTED] in the future;
- should there be any findings of a similar nature related to work published subsequent to the date of the letter (December 21, 2005), the university will review whether the respondent will be permitted to continue supervising of graduate students and publishing under the name of [REDACTED].

## ISSUE

The remedial action taken by the university is in staff's opinion, rather minor in light of the many breaches of publication practices that were brought forward by two different researchers and recognized in the report on the investigation. The report addressed the liberal reuse of previously published material and data in several publications by [REDACTED] concluding that this was a practice that was not acceptable and that would have to change.

In light of the many contraventions of publication methods that have occurred, staff sought CPSI's advice on the suitability of the remedial action imposed by the university and on whether further action by NSERC was warranted? Or if the new policies the researcher was required to put in place to ensure there are no further occurrences were sufficient?



REQUEST APPROVAL

Approval of the following CPSI recommendations (see attached report on CPSI teleconference for details) is requested:



1. NSERC send a letter of reprimand to [redacted] indicating NSERC's expectation of complete and rigorous compliance with the *Tri-Council Policy Statement: Integrity in Research and Scholarship* and the [redacted]
2. A termination of [redacted] Grant effective March 31, 2007 (end of 2<sup>nd</sup> instalment of a 3 year grant, this will allow a phase-out for support of students).
3. An indefinite ban from applying for NSERC funding.
4. An indefinite ban from acting as an external reviewer for NSERC.
5. An indefinite ban from being considered a potential NSERC peer review committee member.

In accordance with the *Tri-Council Policy Statement: Integrity in Research and Scholarship*, if the recommended sanction is approved, the respondent will be given a one month period within which to present a response to the impending sanctions.

Maree Emond  
Research Ethics Coordinator

06-06-23  
Date

Martine Dupuis  
Corporate Secretary to Council

2006.06.20  
Date

N D H Lloyd  
Executive Vice-President NSERC

June 27, 2006.  
Date