The Procedure followed by the Named Person for Investigating Allegations of Research Misconduct

**INFORMAL RESOLUTION**

1. Concern is communicated to Named Person (NP).
2. Does NP2 have any conflict of interest / involvement?
   - **YES**
   - **NO**
3a. NP continues to lead process.
3b. NP2 assumes leadership of process.
4. NP2 attempts informal mediation / resolution.

**PRE SCREENING STAGE** [10 working days]

5. Allegations are formally reported to NP2 in writing. Allegations must be specific and provide relevant evidence.
6. Integrity Council is convened and reviews allegations. NP2 informs Respondent(s) in writing of the allegation. Are the allegations wholly mistaken, malicious or frivolous?
   - **NO**
   - **YES**
7. Allegations are dismissed. The Respondent(s) is informed.
8. Possible disciplinary action against those making allegations found to be frivolous, vexatious or malicious.
9. NP2 communicates the allegations and the decision to the relevant Head(s) of College and Head(s) of College HR. Are actions necessary to avoid risk to health and safety, patients, etc?

**SCREENING**

10. Is the Institution the Respondent(s) primary employer?
   - **YES**
   - **NO**
11. NP2 ensures that any contractual obligations to funding bodies, partner institutions, etc. are fulfilled, such as informing them of the allegations.
12. Procedure continues to Screening Stage.
13. NP2 works with Integrity Council and convenes Screening Panel. (normally within 30 working days)
14. Screening Panel determines the nature of the allegations as below. The Panel must interview the Respondent(s).

**FORMAL INVESTIGATION** (no set timetable)

17. NP2 informs Respondent(s), Complainant(s). The Principal, relevant Head(s) of College, Head(s) of College of HR, Head of School/Institute Director and relevant external bodies that a formal investigation is to take place.
18. NP2 convenes Investigation Panel, distinct in composition from the Screening Panel (normally within 30 days of report from Screening Panel).
19. Investigation Panel carries out a comprehensive, fair and timely investigation into the allegations.
20. Does the formal investigation uncover evidence of misconduct by others or of misconduct by the Respondent(s) that is unconnected to the allegations under investigation?
21. Investigation Panel states whether:
   - Allegations are dismissed
   - Allegations are upheld in part
   - Allegations are upheld in full

**DISCIPLINARY ACTION**

22. Mitigating actions are taken by Head of College HR.
23. NP2, Head of College HR and other senior staff decide what actions should be taken following the result of the formal investigation, including any mitigating actions.
24. Possible initiation of disciplinary process where allegations have been upheld in full or in part.

---

**Procedure to be taken by:**
- Complainant(s)
- Named Person (2), in consultation with Integrity Council
- NP2 in conjunction with Integrity Council
- Screen Panel: one member from Respondent’s own College, two members from outside own College (including external to UoG)
- Integrity Adviser

---

NP = Clerk of Senate
NP2 = Vice Principal (Research), Research Strategy & Innovation Office (RSIO)
Contact the Clerk of Senate and the RSIO administrator at: research-policy@glasgow.ac.uk
Integrity Council: Clerk of Senate, Vice Principal (Research), and Deputy Director of HR

Links
- Code of Good Practice in Research: http://www.gla.ac.uk/services/riso/researchstrategypolicies/ourpolicies
- Code of Policy and Procedures for Investigating Allegations of Misconduct in Research: http://www.gla.ac.uk/services/riso/researchstrategypolicies/ourpolicies
- UoG Whistleblowing Policy: http://www.gla.ac.uk/services/humanresources/employees/whistleblowing/
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