A. TERMS OF REFERENCE FOR THE SCREENING STAGE INVESTIGATOR

1. The Screening Stage Investigator will determine whether there is prima facie evidence of research misconduct. They will have considered that the allegations:

   - Constitute research activity where the College has primary responsibility
   - Involve a Respondent where the College is the primary employer or for whom it has primary responsibility
   - Do not encompass breaches of the law or under those areas in the domain of the relevant regulatory authority
   - Do not encompass breaches of the organisation’s Regulations which should be dealt with under the Disciplinary Procedure
   - Are not mistaken, frivolous, vexatious or malicious

2. The Screening Stage Investigator will be either the Head of Faculty/ Department/ Centre or other unit or an independent and appropriately qualified nominee. In certain circumstances it will be more appropriate for the Chair of the RMRG to consult with the Vice Provost (Research) to determine who should investigate the allegation.

3. The Screening Stage Investigator shall normally:

   - Maintain a record of evidence sought and received, and conclusions reached
   - Conduct an assessment of the evidence including interviewing the Respondent and Complainant and other staff considered relevant to the investigation
   - Utilise guidance from the UKRIO where needed
   - Provide a draft report to the RMRG, who’s Chair will forward it to the Respondent and Complainant for comment limited to the accuracy of facts within the Report.
   - The Investigator shall assess the validity of any suggested factual amendments and amend accordingly
   - Produce a final report within 30 working days

B. TERMS OF REFERENCE FOR THE FULL INVESTIGATION PANEL

4. The Investigation Panel shall be convened by the Provost to investigate allegations of research misconduct which the Screening Investigator has deemed to have sufficient substance to warrant a full investigation.
5. The Panel shall consist of a College Consul of the relevant Faculty. The rest of the panel shall consist of three other members of academic staff from the College, appointed by the Provost. Alternatively one of the three further Panel members may be selected from the UKRIO’s Register of Advisors, at the discretion of the Provost in consultation with the RMRG and the UKRIO.

6. The Panel shall:

- Receive all relevant information from the Screening Panel as background for the investigation,
- Set a date for the investigation, which shall be conducted as reasonably expeditiously as possible,
- Maintain a record of evidence sought and received, and conclusions reached,
- Conduct an assessment of the evidence,
- Hear the Complainant and such other individuals as the Panel consider relevant to the investigation,
- Hold a Formal hearing, to hear the Respondent’s response to the allegations made.
- Consider the allegations of misconduct in research and reach a conclusion on the allegations with the standard of proof used to reach that decision being ‘on the balance of probabilities’,
- Provide a draft report to the RMRG, who’s Chair should forward it to the Respondent and the Complainant (and their representatives by agreement) for comment only on the factual accuracy of the Report,
- Shall assess the validity of any suggested factual amendments and amend accordingly,
- Report any further or distinct incidents of Research Misconduct encountered, which warrant separate investigation,
- Aim to reach a unanimous decision, failing which a majority decision will be acceptable.

7. The Investigation Panel should then produce a final report that:

- Summarises the conduct of the investigation,
- States whether the allegation of misconduct in research have been upheld in whole or in part, giving the reasons for its decision and recording any different views;
- Makes recommendations in relation to any matters relating to any other misconduct identified during the investigation;
- Addresses any procedural matters that the investigation has brought to light within the College and relevant partner organisations or funding bodies.
FORMS FOR TRACKING A CASE’S PROGRESS

Initial Report
To be used by the Chair of the RMG

Information

1: Department

2. Source of allegations: Internal [ ] external [ ]

3. Details of allegations:

4. External funding involved: Yes [ ] No [ ]

5. If yes to question 5 does it include:
   
i) funding from a UK Research Council: Yes [ ] No [ ]
   ii) funding from a DH or NHS scheme: Yes [ ] No [ ]
   iii) funding from a Charitable body: Yes [ ] No [ ]
   iv) funding from a Commercial body: Yes [ ] No [ ]
   v) funding from a Overseas body: Yes [ ] No [ ]

6. Date formal allegations received: Day____ Month____

7. Does the project have an external Sponsor: Yes [ ] No [ ]

8. Does the project have an external partner(s): Yes [ ] No [ ]

9. Does the project involve an international partner(s): Yes [ ] No [ ]

10. Has the Organisation taken any action(s) to contact any regulatory or professional bodies: Yes [ ] No [ ]

11. Has the Organisation taken action(s) to use its disciplinary process: Yes [ ] No [ ]

12. Has the Organisation taken action(s) to bar the Respondent from relevant parts of the workplace: Yes [ ] No [ ]

13. Date on which the Screening Panel start/started work: Day____ Month____

14. Are external nominations to the Panel required: Yes [ ] No [ ]
15. Does the Screening Panel include members external to the Organisation:
   Yes ☐ No ☐

16. Other Details (optional):

Conclusion of the Screening Panel

To be used by the Chair of the RMRG to record the conclusions reached by the Screening Panel.

Information

1. Date the report submitted:       Day________ Month_________

2. The allegations reviewed by the Screening Panel were considered:
   i) to be mistaken, frivolous, vexatious and/or malicious;   Yes ☐ No ☐
   ii) to need to be referred to the Organisation’s disciplinary or other internal process;
        Yes ☐ No ☐
   iii) to have some substance but due to a lack of intent or motivation to deceive or due to their relatively minor nature, they should be addressed through education and training, or other non-disciplinary route, rather than through the next stage of the Procedure or other Formal Proceedings;
        Yes ☐ No ☐
   iv) be sufficiently serious and of sufficient substance to justify a Formal Investigation.
        Yes ☐ No ☐

3. If the Screening Panel found the allegations to be mistaken, frivolous, vexatious and/or malicious, please outline any actions taken to support the Respondent and, if found frivolous, vexatious and/or malicious, whether any actions considered against the Complainant.

4. If the matter does not require formal procedures but rather should be addressed through a different route, please outline steps taken.
5. If to be taken to a Formal Investigation, please specify date planned to start the investigation:
   Day_______ Month_______

6. If to be taken to a Formal Investigation, are external nominations to the Investigation Panel required? Yes _____ No_______

7. Any other comments:

   

Conclusion of the Investigation Panel

To be used by the Chair of the RMRG to record the outcome of the Investigation Panel to UKRIO (and others).

Information

1. Date the report issued: Day_______Month_______

2. Allegations not upheld: Yes □ No □
   Allegations upheld: Yes □ No □
   Allegations upheld in part: Yes □ No □

3. If not upheld, please indicate whether any action should be taken to support the Respondent:

   

4. If the allegations were upheld in full or in part, whether the allegations will be referred to the Organisation's disciplinary process:
   Yes □ No □

5. If yes to question 6, whether a date has been set to start the disciplinary process.
   Yes □ (Day____ Month____) No □

6. Whether action to correct the record of evidence is considered necessary.
   Yes □ No □

7. Whether there may be organisational issues that the Organisation should address in the management of research. Yes □ No □
8. Has the outcome of the investigation been communicated to all other interested parties:
   Yes ☐       No ☐

9. Any other comments: