

Research Misconduct Procedures

Table of Content

1	Purpose and Scope	3
2	Definitions.....	4
2.1	Allegation	4
2.2	Complainant.....	4
2.3	Respondent.....	4
2.4	Research Integrity Officer (RIO)	5
2.5	Inquiry.....	5
2.6	Inquiry Panel.....	5
2.7	Investigation	5
2.8	Research Misconduct.....	5
3	Roles and Responsibilities.....	5
3.1	Research Integrity Officer (RIO)	5
3.2	Complainant.....	6
3.3	Respondent.....	7
3.4	Inquiry Panel.....	8
4	Research Misconduct Procedures.....	8
4.1	Receipt of an Allegation and Initial Review	8
4.1.1	Allegations of Research Misconduct Against a Student	9
4.1.2	Allegations of Research Misconduct Against Staff Member(s).....	9
4.2	Mistaken, Frivolous, Vexatious and/or Malicious Allegations	10
4.3	Two Stage based Investigation Procedure for Research Misconduct	10
4.3.1	Stage 1: Inquiry Stage	10
4.3.2	Stage 2: Investigation Stage.....	11
4.4	Inquiry Panel Membership	13
4.5	Right to Appeal.....	14
4.6	Possible Outcomes and Recommendations for Actions.....	15
4.7	Record Retention	16
5	Related Documentation	16
6	Version Control.....	17
7	Appendix 1 – Policy Implementation and Indicative Timeline	17
8	Appendix 2 Research Misconduct Procedures Flowchart.....	18

1 Purpose and Scope

This document outlines the procedures to be followed when managing allegations of research misconduct, and it complements and supports National College of Ireland's Research Integrity Policy.

These procedures should be used in conjunction with:

- National Policy Statement on Ensuring Research Integrity in Ireland (2024), and European Code of Conduct for Research Integrity (2023)
- The principles laid out in National College of Ireland's Research Integrity Policy
- The terms and conditions attaching to relevant research funding provided by a third-party research funder.

National College of Ireland will take all reasonable steps to adhere to the principles that underpin transparent, fair and effective procedures to deal with allegations of research misconduct.

These principles include:

- **Integrity of the process:** Investigations into research misconduct allegations must be fair, comprehensive, and timely, while maintaining accuracy and objectivity. Those parties involved in the process must disclose and manage any potential conflicts of interest. Detailed and confidential records are maintained on all aspects of the process.
- **Fairness:** Investigations into research misconduct allegations must be fair, transparent and in accordance with relevant laws. Respondent should receive written details of the allegations, have a fair opportunity to respond. Respondent is allowed to have a representative present for any meeting or interview associated with the investigation or disciplinary hearing part of the Stage 2 – Investigation of the research misconduct procedure.
- **Confidentiality:** The investigation process should be conducted with confidentiality, in line with NCI's Procedures for Responding to Allegations of Research Misconduct. Where possible, disclosures to third parties should be made on a confidential basis. Any legal obligations to inform third parties about misconduct allegations must be fulfilled appropriately and through the correct channels.
- **No detriment:** Person accused of research misconduct is to be treated as innocent unless proven otherwise. No person should face unnecessary penalties before the allegation is proven.

The procedures specified in this document and the associated NCI Research Integrity Policy apply to any person engaged in research activities under the auspices of National College of Ireland (NCI), including academic staff and visiting scholars, research assistants, postdoctoral researchers, research fellows, visiting researchers, undergraduate students, postgraduate students, exchange students, research support staff and administrative personnel involved in research governance, Early Learning Initiative staff and non-academic staff, external collaborators conducting research in partnership with NCI.

Any person, whether employed by NCI or not, may make an allegation of research misconduct.

2 Definitions

2.1 Allegation

An allegation means any written or oral statement or other indication of possible research misconduct made to the Research Integrity Officer. Allegations based on conduct, which occurred 5 years or more prior to the making of the allegation will not be inquired into. An allegation is not in good faith if it is made with reckless disregard for or wilful ignorance of facts that would disprove the allegation.

2.2 Complainant

Complainant means a person making allegations of research misconduct against one or more Respondents. Any person, whether employed by NCI or not, may make an allegation of research misconduct

NCI does accept anonymous allegations, however, the ability to investigate such claims may be limited without a named complainant. The Research Integrity Officer will decide whether to pursue anonymous allegations, based on the seriousness of the concerns raised and the potential to verify them through credible and independent sources or evidence.

If a number of persons come together to make a joint allegation, they shall constitute joint complainants and all references to “Complainant” in this procedure is deemed to refer to the joint complainants.

2.3 Respondent

Respondent means a person against whom allegations of research misconduct have been made, or whose actions are the subject of an inquiry or investigation. There may be more than one Respondent involved in a single case. In such instances, in the Inquiry Stage or the Investigation Stage, the Inquiry Panel will determine if Respondents should

be considered jointly or individually during the inquiry and investigation stages, as well as in any resulting reports.

2.4 Research Integrity Officer (RIO)

Research Integrity Officer is the person nominated by Registrar to assist in the processing of any instances of allegations of research misconduct. RIO receives allegations of research misconduct and oversees the compliance aspect of the Inquiry Stage and the Investigation Stage of the research misconduct procedures.

2.5 Inquiry

An inquiry means gathering information and conducting preliminary fact-finding to assess whether an allegation or suspected case of research misconduct merits a full investigation.

2.6 Inquiry Panel

Inquiry Panel means a group of people appointed by Research Integrity Officer, in collaboration with Registrar to conduct an evaluation (Inquiry Stage) of allegations of research misconduct and, based on the conclusion it reaches, the panel may conduct a full investigation (Investigation Stage).

2.7 Investigation

An investigation means the formal process and evaluation of all relevant facts to determine if research misconduct has occurred and, if so, to identify the responsible person and evaluate the severity of the misconduct.

2.8 Research Misconduct

For the purposes of this document, research misconduct is as defined in the National College of Ireland's Research Integrity Policy document.

3 Roles and Responsibilities

3.1 Research Integrity Officer (RIO)

The Research Integrity Officer is the person appointed by Registrar responsible for overseeing adherence to Research Integrity Policy and Research Misconduct Procedures and will be assisted by the Registrar's Office.

Research Integrity Officer will have responsibility for:

- receiving and formally acknowledging allegations of research misconduct

- assessing whether allegations meet the definition of research misconduct under NCI's Research Integrity Policy and these procedures and whether there is sufficient information to initiate an inquiry
- initiating and coordinating the inquiry and investigation into research misconduct allegation
- appointing the Inquiry Panel in collaboration with the Registrar, ensuring that necessary and appropriate expertise is secured to carry out a thorough evaluation of the relevant evidence in an inquiry or investigation.
- implementing the processes referred to in the Research Misconduct Procedures
- assisting Inquiry Panels and all institutional personnel in complying with Research Misconduct Procedures
- maintaining information records and ensuring insofar as is possible that all relevant information and evidence are secured so that the Inquiry Panel can have access to them
- communicating findings of the Inquiry Panel and issuing correspondence to Complainant and Respondent
- reporting on the investigation to internal contacts (Dean of School/ Head of Department, Director of Human Resources and the Vice President for Academic Affairs) and where appropriate, in coordination with the Registrar, to external organisations

RIO shall not personally participate in any investigation panels or process, or seek to influence the work, findings or deliberations of panels.

The Office of Registrar is responsible for maintaining files of all documents and evidence and for the confidentiality and the security of these files.

3.2 Complainant

The Complainant is the person who makes an allegation of research misconduct. This person may be a member of NCI (e.g., staff, student, or affiliate) or an external party.

Responsibilities of the Complainant include:

- Submitting the Allegation: Providing a clear, specific, and factual account of the suspected research misconduct, including any supporting evidence available at the time of the complaint.
- Co-operation: Co-operating in good faith with the Inquiry Panel and/or investigation process, which may include providing additional information, documentation, or participating in interviews if requested.
- Confidentiality: Respecting the confidentiality of the proceedings to protect the integrity of the process and the rights of all individuals involved.

- **Good Faith:** Acting in good faith when making the allegation. Allegations made with malicious intent or knowingly false information may be subject to disciplinary action.

The Complainant is not responsible for proving misconduct but for presenting sufficient information to warrant an inquiry.

The Complainant will be informed by RIO of the results of the inquiry and investigation.

NCI will make diligent efforts to protect the position and reputation of a good faith Complainant. All staff members who make a complaint or are subject to an investigation are afforded protection in line with NCI policies. This includes safeguarding their dignity, confidentiality, and reputation—provided actions are taken in good faith. Protections are outlined in relevant policies such as the Dignity at Work Policy, the Grievance Procedure, the Protected Disclosures Policy, and the Disciplinary Policy.

If an allegation is deemed to have been made in bad faith through implementation of these procedures, or wilfully disregards facts which would disprove the allegation, then the College may seek to apply disciplinary procedures against the Complainant.

3.3 Respondent

The Respondent is the person against whom an allegation of research misconduct has been made. This person is the subject of the inquiry and/or investigation.

Responsibilities of the Respondent include:

- **Cooperation:** Fully cooperating with the inquiry and investigation processes, including attending interviews, providing relevant documentation, and responding to requests for information in a timely manner.
- **Respecting Confidentiality:** Maintaining the confidentiality of the proceedings to protect the integrity of the process and the rights of all parties involved.
- **Providing a Response:** Having the opportunity to review and respond to evidence, findings, or draft reports at various stages of the process.
- **Acting in Good Faith:** Engaging with the process respectfully and without attempting to obstruct or influence the outcome improperly.

The Respondent has the right to be treated fairly and with impartiality throughout the process, including the presumption of innocence until proven otherwise. They also have the right to be informed of the allegations made against them and to seek advice or representation. The Respondent will be provided with a written notice when an inquiry is opened and notified in writing of the final determinations and resulting actions.

NCI will make diligent efforts to protect the position and reputation of Respondent against unsubstantiated claims. All staff members who are subject to an investigation

are afforded protection in line with NCI policies. This includes safeguarding their dignity, confidentiality, and reputation—provided actions are taken in good faith. Protections are outlined in relevant policies such as the Dignity at Work Policy, the Grievance Procedure, the Protected Disclosures Policy, and the Disciplinary Policy.

3.4 Inquiry Panel

The role of the Inquiry Panel is to determine whether, in their reasonable opinion, clearly supported by the evidence, the allegations of research misconduct have sufficient substance to justify the establishment of an investigation.

As part of Stage 1: Inquiry Stage, the Inquiry Panel reviews relevant evidence, interviews the Complainant and the Respondent, if necessary, and decides whether the case should proceed to the full investigation (Stage 2: Investigation Stage) and reports the findings to RIO.

As part of Stage 2: Investigation Stage, the Inquiry Panel explores in detail the allegations, examines the evidence in depth, and determines specifically whether misconduct has been committed, by whom, and to what extent.

Once initiated, the Inquiry Panel should follow its course irrespective of the Complainant withdrawing the allegations, the Respondent admitting to the allegations, or the Complainant or Respondent resigning.

The Inquiry Panel operates under principles of fairness, confidentiality, and impartiality.

The Inquiry Panel should normally aim to complete its work within 60 working days of being convened, or a longer period as the panel deems reasonably appropriate in the circumstances.

4 Research Misconduct Procedures

4.1 Receipt of an Allegation and Initial Review

An allegation of research misconduct must be submitted to the Research Integrity Officer (RIO) in writing. A submission to the RIO may be made anonymously; however, for an inquiry to proceed, it is typically necessary for the Complainant to be identified in a formal, written complaint. Appendix 2 presents the Research Misconduct Procedures Flowchart.

Upon receiving an allegation, the RIO should formally acknowledge its receipt to the Complainant within 5 working days and provide an outline of the procedures that will be followed. However, if there is no identifiable Complainant, a formal acknowledgement may not be possible.

The RIO will conduct an initial review of the allegations to assess whether, if proven, they fall within the definition of research misconduct as outlined in NCI's Research Integrity Policy and these procedures and that the allegations provide sufficient information to initiate an enquiry. This initial review will be carried out in a timely manner. The RIO may consult with one or more senior academics in the relevant field for subject-specific advice.

Following the initial review, if an enquiry is not required, the matter may be dismissed or addressed under another applicable NCI's policy or procedure, and the Complainant will be notified in writing about this decision. Complaints that are considered to be mistaken, frivolous, vexatious and/or malicious will be dismissed at this stage.

The Institution's policy is, where the RIO considers it appropriate, to attempt to resolve issues or disputes outside the disciplinary procedure, i.e. informally. The RIO may seek, at any stage before the application of a disciplinary procedure, to resolve informally any matter regarding performance or conduct which might be subject to these procedures. Where appropriate, at the discretion of the RIO, this may involve a process of mediation. Where the RIO does not consider it appropriate to attempt to resolve the dispute informally, the appropriate disciplinary procedures as set down in the NCI's Research Misconduct Procedures and NCI's Student Discipline Policy will apply thereafter.

4.1.1 Allegations of Research Misconduct Against a Student

If, following the initial review, the Research Integrity Officer concludes that a complaint may give rise to a concern of a disciplinary nature and should be dealt with under the appropriate disciplinary procedure, RIO shall refer the complaint to the Registrar. The appropriate disciplinary procedures as set down in the NCI's Student Disciplinary Policy will apply.

4.1.2 Allegations of Research Misconduct Against Staff Member(s)

If, following the initial review, the Research Integrity Officer determines that the allegation provides sufficient information, they will initiate the Inquiry Process. The Complainant will be notified in writing that an inquiry process is being initiated, and the Respondent will receive a written notice that an allegation of research misconduct has been received against them and is being investigated.

The RIO will inform the Respondent's Dean of School/Head of Department, Director of Human Resources and the Vice President for Academic Affairs and Research that allegations have been received and that an Inquiry Panel will now be set up using these procedures. They should be advised in confidence of the date of receipt of the allegations, the identity of the Respondent, the identity of the Complainant.

4.2 Mistaken, Frivolous, Vexatious and/or Malicious Allegations

The Research Integrity Officer, in conjunction with the relevant HR representative (or with the Registrar in cases involving students), may recommend that action be taken against the Complainant found to have made frivolous, vexatious and/or malicious allegations. The action is taken under the appropriate NCI's disciplinary procedures having regard to the Complainant's status as a student or a staff member of NCI.

Those who made allegations in good faith should not be penalised and may need additional support.

4.3 Two Stage based Investigation Procedure for Research Misconduct

The investigation of allegations of research misconduct will follow a structured, two-stage procedure to ensure fairness and transparency.

Following the RIO's initial review of the received allegations, and the decision taken by RIO that the allegation provides sufficient information, Stage 1: Inquiry Stage may be initiated. If the Inquiry Panel who conducts the evaluation of allegations as part of Inquiry Stage determines that the allegations are sufficiently serious and have sufficient substance to justify a full investigation, the case will progress to Stage 2: Investigation Stage.

4.3.1 Stage 1: Inquiry Stage

The purpose of Inquiry Stage is to make an evaluation of the available evidence and testimony of the Respondent and Complainant, and to determine whether the allegations of research misconduct are sufficiently serious and have enough evidence to warrant a full investigation (Stage 2: Investigation Stage).

The Inquiry Panel examines relevant evidence, interviews the Complainant and the Respondent, if necessary, and produces an Inquiry Report (Stage 1 Report) that reports the findings.

The Inquiry Report includes

- the names and titles of the panel members and external experts, if any
- the allegations
- a summary of the inquiry process followed
- a list of the research records reviewed
- summaries of any interviews
- a description of the evidence in sufficient detail to demonstrate whether an investigation is warranted or not
- and the panel's determination as to whether:

- a full investigation (Stage 2: Investigation Stage) should be conducted or not
- whether any other actions should be taken if Investigation Stage is not to be initiated.

The Inquiry Panel must produce a draft Inquiry Report (Stage 1 report) and the Chair of the panel will submit it to RIO within 60 working days of being convened, or a longer period as the panel deems reasonably appropriate in the circumstances.

The RIO will provide the Respondent with a copy of the draft Inquiry Report for comments and will provide the Complainant with portions of the draft Inquiry Report that address the Complainant's role and opinions in the investigation.

The RIO may establish reasonable conditions for review to protect the confidentiality of the draft Inquiry Report.

The Complainant and Respondent will provide their comments, if any, to the Inquiry Panel within 10 working days of their receipt of the draft Inquiry Report. Any comments that the Complainant or Respondent submits on the draft report will become part of the final Inquiry Report and record.

Based on the comments, the Inquiry Panel may revise the draft Inquiry Report as appropriate. it will determine its findings and finalise the Inquiry Report (stage 1 report) accordingly.

Stage 1 is completed when the panel Chair forwards the final Inquiry Report to the RIO.

The RIO will provide a copy of the final Inquiry Report to the Respondent and Complainant, advise both parties whether or not the process will proceed to Investigation stage (Stage 2) within 10 working days of receipt of Final Investigation Report.

The RIO will notify all appropriate institutional officials of the Inquiry Report's conclusion, including the Director of Human Resources, Dean of School/Head of Department, and the Vice President for Academic Affairs and Research.

If the Inquiry Panel determines that the allegations are untrue, unwarranted, not sufficiently serious or not well-founded, or that for any other reason they should not progress any further, the case will not progress to Stage 2: Investigation Stage.

4.3.2 Stage 2: Investigation Stage

The purpose of Investigation Stage is to formally and thoroughly examine allegations of misconduct to determine whether research misconduct has occurred, and if so, to what extent. This stage builds on the initial inquiry (Inquiry Stage) and is more comprehensive and detailed.

The Inquiry Panel explores in detail the allegations, examines the evidence in depth, and determines specifically whether misconduct has been committed, by whom, and to what extent. Should any evidence or allegation of misconduct, connected or unconnected, arise during the formal Investigation Stage that suggests potential research misconduct by the Respondent or by another person, then the Chair of the Inquiry Panel should submit these new allegations to the Research Integrity Officer in writing. The submission should be accompanied by supporting evidence and/or details of the alleged misconduct. Research Integrity Officer initiates a new research misconduct procedure investigation.

The investigation process typically includes a thorough examination of all relevant documentation. This may encompass, but is not limited to, research records, computer files, financial records, proposals, manuscripts, publications, correspondence, memoranda, and telephone/online call notes. The Inquiry Panel may also secure additional research materials not previously examined.

The Inquiry Panel will work closely with the Research Integrity Officer (RIO) to ensure that principles of natural justice and fair procedures are upheld throughout the process. Wherever possible, the Inquiry Panel will interview the Complainant, the Respondent, and other individuals who might have information regarding aspects of the allegations. Interviews may be recorded or transcribed. The Respondent is entitled to seek appropriate advice and may have an advisor present during the interviews.

The Inquiry Panel produces an Investigation Report (Stage 2 Report) that reports the findings of the investigation.

The Investigation Report must

- describe the policies and procedures under which the investigation was conducted
- describe how and from whom information relevant to the investigation was obtained
- state whether the allegations have been upheld in full, upheld in part, or not upheld, and indicate the level of seriousness of any misconduct, giving the reasons for and context of its findings and recording any differing views
- state what actions are necessary to be taken, if all or any part of the allegations are upheld by the Inquiry Panel and outline the timeframe for the actions, their implementation and monitoring process.
- address any procedural matters that the investigation has brought to light within NCI and/or relevant partner organisations.

The actions to be taken if all or any part of the allegations are upheld may include, but are not limited to, one or a combination of the following: Respondent undergo training and education; publications are corrected or withdrawn, written warning, the matter to be

referred to the staff disciplinary process. Section 4.6 Possible Outcomes and Recommendations provides detailed list of actions. Investigation Report will also outline the timeframe for such actions and the process through which their implementation will be monitored.

The Inquiry Panel shall provide a draft Investigation Report of its findings, and the Chair of the panel will submit it to RIO within 60 working days of Stage 2 convened, or a longer period as the panel deems reasonably appropriate in the circumstances.

The RIO shall make a copy of the draft report available to the Respondent and any party/parties against whom adverse outcomes are contemplated.

The RIO will provide the Complainant, if they are identifiable, with those portions of the draft Investigation Report that address the Complainant's role and opinions in the investigation.

Such parties may comment on the factual accuracy of the report before it is finalised within 10 working days of their receipt of the draft report. The report should only be modified for errors of fact and/or clarification purposes and be agreed by the panel before amendment. The final Investigation Report will include details of all comments received and the panel's responses.

In distributing the draft report, or portions thereof, to the Respondent and Complainant, the Research Integrity Officer will inform the recipient of the confidentiality under which the draft report is made available and may establish reasonable conditions to ensure such confidentiality.

Stage 2 is completed when the Chair of the panel forwards the final Investigation Report to the RIO.

The RIO will provide a copy of the final Investigation Report to the Respondent and any party/parties against whom adverse outcomes are contemplated within 10 working days of receipt of Final Investigation Report.

The RIO will notify all appropriate institutional officials of the Investigation Report's conclusion, including the Director of Human Resources, Dean of School/Head of Department, and the Vice President for Academic Affairs and Research.

4.4 Inquiry Panel Membership

Once it has been determined that an inquiry process should be initiated, the Research Integrity Officer (RIO) in collaboration with Registrar, is responsible for establishing an Inquiry Panel and a Panel Chair, not more than 21 working days following initiation of the inquiry. The RIO may consult with Registrar and senior academic staff when forming the panel, and the composition of the panel.

The Inquiry Panel shall consist of at least three individuals, including a designated Chair of the panel, and must consist of an uneven number of members. Panel members are selected to ensure a balanced representation in terms of gender, departmental affiliation and subject-matter expertise. All members must not have real or apparent conflicts of interest in the case and are impartial.

For the Investigation stage, a member from an external institution may be added to the Inquiry Panel to ensure objectivity or access to specific expertise.

Signed declarations of confidentiality and conflicts of interest will be obtained from the panel members and any other relevant staff involved in the inquiry or investigation stages. These written declarations will be kept as part of the documentation of the inquiry and investigation proceedings.

4.5 Right to Appeal

There is no right of appeal against the decision of the Research Integrity Officer to take an action against the complainant if it was concluded that the complaint was frivolous, vexatious and/or malicious, since it refers to preliminary procedures only. Respondent has a right of appeal under the appropriate disciplinary procedures in the event that further action is taken thereunder.

The Respondent has the right to appeal on grounds which include (but are not restricted to): failure to follow appropriate procedures in the investigation; new evidence; arbitrary, capricious or erroneous decision-making, and inappropriate disciplinary action.

An appeal must be in writing, it must clearly set out the grounds for seeking the review (including all relevant evidence) and it must be submitted to RIO within 10 working days of receipt of the notification of the decision of the Research Integrity Officer.

A Review Officer will be appointed by the President to be the institution official responsible for conducting the appeal. If the Review Officer requires assistance of a technical or specialist nature, the Review Officer may appoint a suitably qualified person or persons from inside and/or outside NCI and shall adopt such procedures as they may consider appropriate to enable the carrying out of the requested review. If the Respondent raises concerns over those appointed, the Review Officer will record and consider any such concerns and take any actions they consider necessary.

During the appeal process, the Review Officer will review the appeal documents, may interview any party involved in the original investigation and will take appropriate actions to consider any new evidence.

Following consideration of the appeal request and the grounds submitted, the following findings are available to the Review Officer:

- Uphold the decision of the Inquiry Panel

- Not uphold the decision of the Inquiry Panel
- Vary the decision of the Inquiry Panel

If varying or not upholding the decision of the Inquiry Panel, the Review Officer may require the Respondent to meet specified conditions, and/or make recommendations, either specific to the case or more generally in relation to the process, to the Research Integrity Officer.

The Review Officer will produce an appeal report and communicate the findings to the Respondent, the Complainant and those parties who have been previously informed of the Inquiry Panel's decision within 10 working days of finalisation of appeal report. A copy of the communication will be provided to the Research Integrity Officer.

In the event that an appeal is successful, NCI will make all reasonable efforts to ensure that the reputation of the Respondent is restored.

4.6 Possible Outcomes and Recommendations for Actions

National College of Ireland will take appropriate actions against individuals when an allegation of misconduct has been substantiated, to uphold research integrity, to ensure accountability, and to protect the interests of the institution and the wider research community.

Any actions taken with respect to NCI's staff and students will be initiated in accordance with the appropriate NCI's regulations and students disciplinary procedure or staff disciplinary procedure.

These actions may vary depending on the severity and nature of the misconduct and may include (but are not restricted to) any of the following:

- The initiation of steps for implementation of the NCI disciplinary procedures for NCI's staff
- The initiation of steps for implementation of the NCI disciplinary procedures for undergraduate and postgraduate students.
- Matters pertaining to Dignity at Work (Bullying, Harassment etc) will be addressed through the relevant disciplinary policies for both staff and students.
- Grievances and/or Protective Disclosures related matters will be managed in line with applicable institutional policies and resolved through the appropriate channels.
- Withdrawal or correction of all pending or published abstracts and papers produced from the research where research misconduct was found
- The person may be required to undergo ethics or research integrity training and may be placed under increased supervision for future research activities.

- Removal of the responsible person from the particular project, letter of reprimand, special monitoring of future work.
- The person may face restrictions on conducting future research, submitting grant proposals, or publishing under the institution's name.
- Notification to research sponsors, external agencies and appropriate authorities as appropriate of the determination of the Inquiry Panel.
- Publication of the final Inquiry Panel's investigation report, in accordance with the Freedom of Information Act 2014.

4.7 Record Retention

All records relating to the case will be maintained for a period of three years, for the purposes of reporting and case evaluation. Relevant data relating to the case may also be maintained in a database to facilitate case evaluation. The Registrar Office will maintain all data relating to allegations of research misconduct.

National College of Ireland is subject to the provisions of the Freedom of Information Act 2014.

The Research Integrity Officer (RIO) shall maintain appropriate confidential records of all stages of any proceedings under these procedures.

Upon the conclusion of the procedure, at whatever stage, the RIO is responsible for the accurate, timely and confidential transfer of information to any relevant parties, including to NCI HR or NCI Registrar (students only) for any disciplinary procedure.

If NCI's disciplinary procedure is to be invoked as a result of the findings of these procedures, the report of the Inquiry Panel shall be included as evidence for the disciplinary procedure. In such a case all of the information relating to these procedures shall be transferred to NCI HR or NCI Registrar (students only) for the purposes of the disciplinary procedure.

The Chair of the Inquiry Panel and the Review Officer shall assume responsibility for keeping accurate records of the activities, deliberation and reporting of their panel and pass these records to the Research Integrity Officer for inclusion in the archive of the case upon the completion of the panels' work.

5 Related Documentation

HR Policies

NCI's Research Integrity Policy

[National Policy Statement on Ensuring Research Integrity in Ireland \(2024\)](#)

[The European Code of Conduct for Research Integrity \(2023\)](#)

6 Version Control

Reference Code	[Domain-Code-Number-DocType-Suffix]	Executive Owner	Vice President of Academic Affairs & Research & EDI
Policy/Procedure Manager	Research Committee	Approval Body	Academic Council
Date Approved	[DD/MM/YYYY]	Effective Date	[DD/MM/YYYY]
Date of Next Review	[DD/MM/YYYY]	Version Number	V1.0
Change Log:			
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Version 1 – 6th of May 2025. Author: Prof Cristina Hava Muntean <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Developed by Research Integrity Policy Development Committee Version 2 – 27th May 2025 Author: Prof Cristina Hava Muntean <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Version 1 was revised and updated based on faculty consultation Version 3 – 11th June 2025 Author: Prof Cristina Hava Muntean <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Version 2 was revised and updated based on Research Committee feedback 			

7 Appendix 1 – Policy Implementation and Indicative Timeline

No	Action	Responsibility	Timeframe (in working days)
1	Acknowledgement of Receipt of a Research Misconduct Allegation	Research Integrity Officer	Issued within 5 working days of receiving the allegation of research misconduct
2	Appointment of Inquiry Panel	Research Integrity Officer	Within 21 working days of initiation of policy.
3	First meeting of Inquiry Panel	Research Integrity Officer	Within 15 working days of the appointment of Inquiry Panel
4	Production of Draft Inquiry Report.	Inquiry Panel	As soon as possible but within a maximum of 60 working days of the first meeting of the Inquiry Panel as part of Stage 1
5	Comments on Draft Inquiry Report	Respondent and Complainant	Within 10 working days of receipt of draft inquiry report.
6	Production of Draft Investigation Report	Inquiry Panel	As soon as possible but within a maximum of 60 working days of the commencement of Stage 2
7	Comments on Draft Investigation Report	Respondent and Complainant	Within 10 working days of receipt of the investigation report.
8	Determination following Final Investigation Report	Research Integrity Officer	Within 10 working days of receipt of Final Investigation Report.
9	Submission of an Appeal	Respondent	Within 10 working days of receipt of the final determination.
10	Determination following Appeal	Review Officer	Within 10 working days of finalisation of appeal report

8 Appendix 2 Research Misconduct Procedures Flowchart

