****

**Good Research Practice (GRP) Champion/Adviser Log**
The role of the School GRP Champion/Adviser is to provide informal advice to researchers (staff and students) who are unsure about a research integrity issue, referring potential misconduct issues to the appropriate person or team (GRP Advisers should escalate potential research misconduct issues to the GRP Champion in the College and the GRP champion should escalate potential research misconduct issues to the central research governance and integrity team research-integrity@glasgow.ac.uk )

No investigations should occur without first discussing with the central research governance and integrity team.

The purpose of the logbook is to detail all of the Good Research Practice initiatives that are happening in the School and College throughout the year. The logbook is also meant to record any issues occurring in the School whether formal or informal regarding bad practice and potential research misconduct. This is to allow the central team to be aware of andy good practices that can be shared more widely and also any potential problematic areas that we can then help address going forward.

***The logbook should be completed and submitted to*** ***research-integrity@glasgow.ac.uk*** ***at the end of June each year.***

**Useful links:**UofG Research Integrity Webpages: https://www.gla.ac.uk/myglasgow/ris/researchpolicies/researchintegrity/

UofG Code of Good Practice in Research:
https://www.gla.ac.uk/myglasgow/ris/researchpolicies/ourpolicies/

UofG Code of Policy and Procedures for Investigating Allegations of Misconduct in Research (and other research policies and procedures):
https://www.gla.ac.uk/myglasgow/ris/researchpolicies/researchintegrity/misconduct/

**How do we define research misconduct?[[1]](#footnote-1)**

Research misconduct includes but is not limited to the doing, planning, or attempting of any of the following whilst proposing, carrying out or reporting the results of research:

* + 1. fabrication: making up results, other outputs (for example, artefacts) or aspects of research, including documentation and participant consent, and presenting and/or recording them as if they were real
		2. falsification: inappropriately manipulating and/or selecting research processes, materials, equipment, data, imagery and/or consents
		3. plagiarism: using other people’s ideas, intellectual property, or work (written or otherwise) without acknowledgement or permission
		4. failure to meet legal, ethical, and professional obligations, for example:
		5. not observing legal, ethical and other requirements for human research participants, animal subjects, or human organs or tissue used in research, or for the protection of the environment
		6. breach of duty of care for humans involved in research whether deliberately, recklessly or by gross negligence, including failure to obtain appropriate informed consent
		7. misuse of personal data, including inappropriate disclosures of the identity of research participants and other breaches of confidentiality
		8. improper conduct in peer review of research proposals, results or manuscripts submitted for publication. This includes failure to disclose conflicts of interest; inadequate disclosure of clearly limited competence; misappropriation of the content of material; and breach of confidentiality or abuse of material provided in confidence for the purposes of peer review
		9. misrepresentation of:
1. data, including suppression of relevant results/data or knowingly, recklessly or by gross negligence presenting a flawed interpretation of data
2. involvement, including inappropriate claims to authorship or attribution of work and denial of authorship/attribution to persons who have made an appropriate contribution
3. interests, including failure to declare competing interests of researchers or funders of a study
4. qualifications, experience, and/or credentials
5. publication history, through undisclosed duplication of publication, including undisclosed duplicate submission of manuscripts for publication
	* 1. improper dealing with allegations of misconduct: failing to address possible infringements, such as attempts to cover up misconduct and reprisals against whistle-blowers, or failing to adhere appropriately to agreed procedure in the investigation of alleged research misconduct accepted as a condition of funding. Improper dealing with allegations of misconduct includes the inappropriate censoring of parties through the use of legal instruments, such as non-disclosure agreements.

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Date** | **School**  | **Parties involved? (**e.g. UofG staff, current research student, staff member etc.). Note that anonymity should be preserved, and names are not required.  | **Area of concern** (e.g. 1-9 in definition of misconduct, as above).  | **Brief description of issue** | **Action taken and outcome** (e.g. informal resolution, advice sought from R&I, referred concern to R&I etc.) | **Comments** (e.g. on the clarity of the policy in order to resolve the issue; any ongoing concerns, need for training) |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

What activities have I undertaken to promote good research practice throughout the year?

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Date** | **Details of activities undertaken**  |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |

What Activities/initiatives/work has been happening within my School/College to promote good research practice throughout the year?

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Date** | **Details of activities undertaken**  |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |

1. Code of Policy and Procedures for Investigating Allegations of Misconduct in Research <https://www.gla.ac.uk/myglasgow/ris/researchpolicies/researchintegrity/misconduct/> [↑](#footnote-ref-1)