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

**Informal Resolution**

1. Concern is communicated to Named Person (NP).
2. Does NP have any conflict of interest / involvement?
   - **Yes**: Proceed to step 3a.
   - **No**: Relay allegation to NP of primary employer.
3a. NP2 continues to lead process.
3b. NP 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**: NP2 continues to lead process.
   - **Yes**: Allegations are dismissed. The Respondent(s) is informed.

**Screening Panel**

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. Is the institution the Respondent(s) primary employer?
   - **Yes**: Relay allegation to NP of primary employer.
   - **No**: NP2 communicates the allegation 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?
   - **Yes**: Continue with this procedure.
   - **No**: Refer to other internal process.
10. Is the institution the Respondent(s) primary employer?
    - **Yes**: Relay allegation to NP of primary employer.
    - **No**: NP2 communicates the decision to the relevant Head(s) of College and Head(s) of College HR. Is the Institution the Respondent(s) primary employer?
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.

**Screening**

13. NP2 works with Integrity Council and convenes Screening Panel.
14. Screening Panel determines the nature of the allegations as below. The Panel must interview the Respondent(s).
   - **Normally within 30 working days**
   - Allegations are wholly mistaken, malicious or frivolous:
   - Allegations should be referred to disciplinary or other internal procedure.
   - Allegations should be addressed via education, training and supervision.
   - Allegations have sufficient substance to justify a formal investigation.
15. Report of Screening Panel is circulated to Integrity Council, Complainant(s) and 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?
   - **Yes**: Go to Step 1.
   - **No**: NP2 convenes Investigation Panel, distinct in composition from the Screening Panel (normally within 30 days of report from Screening Panel).
21. Investigation Panel states whether:
   - Allegations are dismissed.
   - Allegations are upheld in part.
   - Allegations are upheld in full.
22. 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.
23. Conclusion of panel is circulated to Respondent(s), Complainant(s). The Principal, Heads of College, Head of College HR and Head of School/Institute Director. Where the allegation is upheld (in full or in part) this communication will typically take place after the disciplinary process is complete.
24. Possible initiation of disciplinary process where allegations have been upheld in full or in part.

**Action to be taken by:**
- Complainant(s)
- Named Person (2), in consultation with Integrity Council
- Others
- NP2 in conjunction with Head of College and Head of College HR
- Screening Panel: one member from Respondent’s own College, two members from outside own College [including external to UoSG]
- Integrity Adviser
- Formal Investigation Panel

**Links**
- Code of Good Practice in Research: [https://www.gla.ac.uk/myglasgow/researchpolicies/ourpolicies/](https://www.gla.ac.uk/myglasgow/researchpolicies/ourpolicies/)
- Code of Policy and Procedures for Investigating Allegations of Misconduct in Research: [https://www.gla.ac.uk/myglasgow/researchpolicies/ourpolicies/](https://www.gla.ac.uk/myglasgow/researchpolicies/ourpolicies/)
- UoG Whistleblowing Policy: [http://www.gla.ac.uk/services/humanresources/mgrs-SCREENING-STAGE](http://www.gla.ac.uk/services/humanresources/mgrs-SCREENING-STAGE)
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