

# Checklist for Research Misconduct Procedure

The Checklist aims to help institutions to ensure they have considered all aspects of the UKRIO Model Procedure. It should be used with the Model Procedure, not instead of it!

It is not compulsory to include something on each point for a procedure to be compatible with the Model Procedure. A note at the end of this document sets out our view on what is needed to be compatible with the Model Procedure.

## Preamble – setting the scene and general issues

- |    |                          |  |
|----|--------------------------|--|
| 1  | <input type="checkbox"/> | Set national context: reference to Concordat for Research Integrity, UKRIO, and other requirements   |
| 2  | <input type="checkbox"/> | Statement of commitment to research integrity  |
| 3  | <input type="checkbox"/> | Set institutional context: reference to Code of Practice for Research, or equivalent, and other relevant policies, including disciplinary procedure, academic misconduct, or professional misconduct |
| 4  | <input type="checkbox"/> | Involvement of other departments such as HR, legal, finance, etc.  |
| 5  | <input type="checkbox"/> | Reference to public interest disclosure/whistleblowing policy and how this procedure links to that   |
| 6  | <input type="checkbox"/> | Glossary of terms used in procedure, including a definition of research  |
| 7  | <input type="checkbox"/> | Flow chart/summary   |
| 8  | <input type="checkbox"/> | Principles and standards underpinning procedure (e.g., confidentiality, fairness, etc).  |
| 9  | <input type="checkbox"/> | Discuss stress and other repercussions: ensuring wellbeing of those involved, how to seek help and support, mentors, etc.  |
| 10 | <input type="checkbox"/> | Responsibilities of researchers, including an expectation to report  |
| 11 | <input type="checkbox"/> | Who does the procedure cover (i.e., which researchers are included and excluded)?  |
| 12 | <input type="checkbox"/> | Cross-institutional matters and how they are handled, including joint and honorary contracts   |
| 13 | <input type="checkbox"/> | How those involved may be represented/accompanied to meetings  |

## Making an allegation

- |    |                          |  |
|----|--------------------------|--|
| 14 | <input type="checkbox"/> | Who can raise an allegation (i.e., not restricted to people internal to the institution)?                      |
| 15 | <input type="checkbox"/> | How complainants should raise complaints, and opportunities for confidential discussion                        |
| 16 | <input type="checkbox"/> | Informal resolution and mediation: whether it is offered and how   |
| 17 | <input type="checkbox"/> | Anonymous allegations  |
| 18 | <input type="checkbox"/> | Historic allegations or those relating to a large body of work over a period of time                           |
| 19 | <input type="checkbox"/> | Ability to deal with matters not raised by individuals (e.g., in media or public reports, that raise concerns) |

# Checklist for Research Misconduct Procedure

## Definitions of research misconduct

- |    |                          |  |
|----|--------------------------|--|
| 20 | <input type="checkbox"/> | What does it cover (i.e., which forms of research misconduct)?   |
| 21 | <input type="checkbox"/> | Which definition of research misconduct is used and is it comprehensive?   |
| 22 | <input type="checkbox"/> | Does the definition refer to exclusions such as honest errors?   |
| 23 | <input type="checkbox"/> | Reference to questionable research practice or the equivalent (including explanation) and what processes are used to resolve them if not the research misconduct procedure |
| 24 | <input type="checkbox"/> | Reference to level of intent, recklessness etc. (i.e., when the activities meet the definition)  |

## Receipt of allegations

- |    |                          |  |
|----|--------------------------|--|
| 25 | <input type="checkbox"/> | Ability to take immediate action where necessary   |
| 26 | <input type="checkbox"/> | The need to take care when dismissing at this stage as complainant has no other recourse                                 |
| 27 | <input type="checkbox"/> | Legal notifications and notifications to funders   |
| 28 | <input type="checkbox"/> | What you do when people leave, drop out, don't engage, admit the allegation, etc.  |
| 29 | <input type="checkbox"/> | How to deal with situations where people have left the institution, there are multiple complainants or respondents, etc. |
| 30 | <input type="checkbox"/> | How to approach historic allegations or accusations spanning many years or projects                                      |

## Investigations

- |    |                          |   |
|----|--------------------------|---|
| 31 | <input type="checkbox"/> | Seeking expert advice   |
| 32 | <input type="checkbox"/> | Process to appoint investigator/panels                                |
| 33 | <input type="checkbox"/> | Panel members independent of institution                              |
| 34 | <input type="checkbox"/> | Conflicts of interest (COIs) and recusal of those with potential COIs |
| 35 | <input type="checkbox"/> | Complainant/respondent opportunity to comment on panel members        |
| 36 | <input type="checkbox"/> | How investigations are carried out                                    |
| 37 | <input type="checkbox"/> | Interviews with complainants, respondents, and witnesses              |

# Checklist for Research Misconduct Procedure

## Outcomes and reporting

- |    |                          |  |
|----|--------------------------|--|
| 38 | <input type="checkbox"/> | To correct the record as well as deal with individual behaviour; to include contacting journals for retractions/corrections. This is the responsibility of the institution, not the respondent |
|----|--------------------------|--|

## Appeals

- |    |                          |   |
|----|--------------------------|---|
| 39 | <input type="checkbox"/> | Whether the procedure meets the requirements set out in the Concordat |
| 40 | <input type="checkbox"/> | Grounds for appeal permitted  |
| 41 | <input type="checkbox"/> | How the appeal is dealt with – review or reinvestigation              |
| 42 | <input type="checkbox"/> | Who manages the process?  |

## General

- |    |                          |   |
|----|--------------------------|---|
| 43 | <input type="checkbox"/> | How to raise concerns about the procedure or its operation  |
| 44 | <input type="checkbox"/> | Review of the procedure, and how often this is done   |
| 45 | <input type="checkbox"/> | Record keeping and retention  |
| 46 | <input type="checkbox"/> | Timescales for managing investigations  |
| 47 | <input type="checkbox"/> | Language used – is it open, helpful, jargon-filled, overly bureaucratic, etc?   |
| 48 | <input type="checkbox"/> | Availability and accessibility of procedure – is it openly available or on an intranet? Can it be read by screen readers? |

As a minimum, to meet the UKRIO 'standard' a procedure should:

- Meet the minimum standards set out in the Concordat;
- Include clarity on who is covered by the procedure, such as students, former staff, etc;
- Be clear on what is covered – clear definition of research misconduct;
- Have a two-stage process, i.e., initial and full investigation – though receipt of allegations and initial investigation could be merged;
- Include an opportunity for both the complainant and respondent to contribute and have their say;
- Include external panel members for the full investigation;
- Include follow-up to correct the record where necessary, in addition to actions relating to respondents.