

Research Misconduct Policy Workflow - Text Version

# **Summary**

This document is an accessible text version of the Research Misconduct Policy Workflow. The workflow was created to give an overview of the Research Misconduct Policy and the underlying process at the University of Glasgow. Both the workflow and the text files are open access via [EdShare at Glasgow](https://edshare.gla.ac.uk/1548/) and available from the [Research Misconduct Policy webpage](https://www.gla.ac.uk/myglasgow/ris/researchintegrity/misconduct/). Appendix 1 provides a Glossary of terms, the research integrity mailbox address, and relevant webpage links.

# **Informal Resolution Stage**

## **Start point A: Complainant raises matter to Research Integrity Adviser or Research Integrity Champion**

The matter is discussed by the School Integrity Adviser and College Champion. The Integrity Adviser/Champion records the initial complaint in the Logbook (see Appendix to access the Logbook template).

**Question point: Does the matter need to be escalated to Named Person via the Research Integrity Mailbox?**

**If No:** Allegation(s) can be resolved informally at College level. The Champion/Adviser updates the Logbook with the outcome, and the case can be closed.

**If Yes:** Allegation(s) are forwarded to the Named Person (NP). There are two possible outcomes:

1. Allegation(s) can be resolved informally at College level with the support of central research integrity team. The Champion/Adviser updates the Logbook with the outcome, and the case can be closed.
2. Allegation(s) move into the Initial Investigation Stage as outlined below.

## **Start point B: Complainant raises matter to Research Integrity Mailbox**

The allegation(s) are forwarded to Named Person (NP). There are 2 possible outcomes:

1. Allegation(s) can be resolved informally at College level with the support of central research integrity team. The Champion/Adviser updates the Logbook with the outcome, and the case can be closed.
2. Allegation(s) move into the Initial Investigation Stage as outlined below.

# **Initial Investigation Stage**

The NP and Research Integrity Adviser for Misconduct (RIAM) discuss the case and send a summary to the Research Integrity Council (RIC).

**Question point: Are the allegation(s) to be investigated formally? (NP and RIC to decide)**

**If No:** The decision is included in a summary report. There are four different outcomes:

1. Allegation(s) fall within scope of another process, for example student related. The RIAM then informs relevant School of the allegation(s), and this ends the process regarding the research misconduct policy.
2. Allegation(s) warrant referral to external organisation. The RIAM then informs relevant external organisation of the and allegation(s) this ends the process regarding the research misconduct policy.
3. Allegation(s) relate to poor practice rather than misconduct. The RIAM addresses poor practice with line management, and this ends the process regarding the research misconduct policy.
4. Allegation(s) unfounded and will be dismissed. The NP concludes the investigation and the RIAM informs the relevant parties of outcome. The case can be closed.

**If Yes:** The NP convenes the initial investigation panel. The initial investigation panel examines the allegation(s). The decision is included in summary report from initial investigation panel. There are five different outcomes:

1. Allegation(s) fall within scope of another process, for example student related. The RIAM then informs relevant School of the allegation(s), and this ends the process regarding the research misconduct policy.
2. Allegation(s) warrant referral to external organisation. The RIAM then informs relevant external organisation of the and allegation(s) this ends the process regarding the research misconduct policy.
3. Allegation(s) relate to poor practice rather than misconduct. The RIAM addresses poor practice with line management, and this ends the process regarding the research misconduct policy.
4. Allegation(s) unfounded and will be dismissed. The NP concludes the investigation and the RIAM informs the relevant parties of outcome. The case can be closed.
5. Allegation(s) are sufficiently serious to advance to the full investigation stage as outlined below.

# **Full Investigation Stage**

The NP convenes the initial investigation panel. The formal investigation panel examines the allegation(s). The decision is included in summary report from the formal investigation panel. There are six different outcomes:

1. Allegation(s) fall within scope of another process, for example student related. The RIAM then informs relevant School of the allegation(s), and this ends the process regarding the research misconduct policy.
2. Allegation(s) warrant referral to external organisation. The RIAM then informs relevant external organisation of the and allegation(s) this ends the process regarding the research misconduct policy.
3. Allegation(s) relate to poor practice rather than misconduct. The RIAM addresses poor practice with line management, and this ends the process regarding the research misconduct policy.
4. Allegation(s) unfounded and will be dismissed. The NP concludes the investigation and the RIAM informs the relevant parties of outcome. The case can be closed.
5. Allegation(s) are upheld in full and further steps are taken as outlined below.
6. Allegations are upheld in part and further steps are taken as outlined below.

**Where the allegation(s) are upheld in full or in part**: the NP and RIC decide what steps need to be taken to correct the scientific record and establish if any further disciplinary action required. The NP/RIAM informs relevant parties of the outcome, and the case can be closed.

Should the Respondent(s) wish to appeal this outcome, they can appeal the decision within 10 days on stated grounds only. The Research misconduct appeals process is then followed. Any actions from the appeals process are then followed up by relevant parties (People and Organisational Development or RIAM). The case can be closed.

# **Appendix 1.**

## **Glossary of terms**

**Complainant** - Person who is making the allegation(s)

**Respondent** - Person whom the allegation(s) refer to

**Research Integrity Champions and Advisers**

There are 26 Research Integrity Advisers who act as local contacts at the School level. They support staff and students with research integrity matters within their School.

There are 4 Research Integrity Champions who operate at the College level. They are also there to provide support to staff and students but additionally they support the Research Integrity Advisers within their College.

**Named Person (NP**) - Senior person responsible for overseeing misconduct investigations) and/or Research Integrity Adviser Misconduct (RIAM)

**Research Integrity Council (RIC)** - 4 Senior members of staff from Ethics, HR and Central Services who review cases of research misconduct

**Logbook** - Anonymised formal record of all research misconduct discussions that are reported to Integrity Champions and Advisers.

## **Research Integrity Mailbox**

research-integrity@glasgow.ac.uk

## **Webpage links**

[Link to the open access workflow in EdShare at Glasgow](https://edshare.gla.ac.uk/1548/)

[UofG Research Misconduct Policy webpage](https://www.gla.ac.uk/research/strategy/ourpolicies/researchmisconductpolicy/)

[UofG Code of Good Practice in Research webpage](https://www.gla.ac.uk/research/strategy/ourpolicies/codeofgoodpracticeinresearch/)

[Research Integrity Champions and Advisers website](https://www.gla.ac.uk/myglasgow/ris/researchintegrity/advisers/)

Research Integrity Champions and Advisers [training information](https://www.gla.ac.uk/myglasgow/ris/researchintegrity/advisers/resourceforintegritychampionsandadvisers/#trainingforchampionsandadvisers) and [logbook](https://www.gla.ac.uk/myglasgow/ris/researchintegrity/advisers/resourceforintegritychampionsandadvisers/#whatrecordkeepingshouldintegritychamps%2Fadvisersdo%3F)

[UofG Research Integrity website](https://www.gla.ac.uk/myglasgow/ris/researchintegrity/)
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