

Investigating Allegations of Research Misconduct			
Document type:	Policy		
Document number:	REG-116	Version:	04
Department:	Research and Knowledge Exchange		
Approved by:	Senate	Date approved:	03/06/2026
Effective from:	08/06/2026	Review date:	08/06/2029
Publication:	SOAS website		
Related documents:	SOAS Code of Practice for SOAS researchers: Using personal data in Research SOAS Research Ethics Policy SOAS Whistleblowing		
Documents replaced:	REG-116-03 Investigating Allegations of Research Misconduct		
<p><i>Note: All policies must be read in conjunction with all other SOAS policy, procedure and guidance documents. Printed copies of policies may not be the most up to date, therefore please refer to the policy pages on the SOAS external website or intranet for the latest version.</i></p>			

## 1. Scope

- 1.1. SOAS expects its members to conduct research to the highest ethical standards, in accordance with the principles set out in the Research Ethics Policy. Although allegations of ethical misconduct in research are likely to be rare, SOAS takes them very seriously, and will investigate complaints thoroughly to protect its own reputation and the interests of researchers, research participants and the wider society.
- 1.2. A robust procedure for investigating alleged research misconduct is also necessary to meet the requirements of funding bodies.
- 1.3. The policy defines SOAS's approach to investigating complaints of research misconduct, including allegations submitted from inside and outside the University. Except as specified below, this policy applies to allegations of misconduct involving any research which is subject to SOAS's Research Ethics Policy including (but not limited to) research by SOAS staff and doctoral researchers. It does not apply to allegations of academic misconduct involving research conducted by undergraduate students or taught postgraduate students. These will be dealt with, as appropriate, under SOAS's student disciplinary procedure or the procedures for assessment and examination offences, including Academic Misconduct.
- 1.4. The policy is based on the principle that a procedure for investigating alleged research misconduct should be distinct from, but may interact with other investigative procedures, such as disciplinary processes. The goal of a research misconduct investigation is to determine whether an allegation of research misconduct should be upheld or dismissed.
- 1.5. Any disciplinary or other outcome which follows from that will be the result of a separate process. The adoption of a distinct procedure for investigating research misconduct reflects national standards, and brings the following benefits:

- Allegations of research misconduct which originate in academic disagreements or methodological disputes can be resolved without resort to disciplinary or grievance processes.
- Complaints of research misconduct may be received from a range of sources within and outside SOAS, including academics, students, research funders, research participants, campaigning groups and members of the public. A distinct research misconduct policy and procedure allows allegations to be investigated in a uniform manner, regardless of their origin.
- The preliminary investigation of a complaint, to determine whether a full investigation is necessary, will be carried out in a fair, consistent and equitable manner. Where an allegation is found to have some basis, remedial non-disciplinary alternatives, such as education or training, can be applied where considered appropriate.

## 2. Status

- 2.1. The current policy format (version 4, as amended) was presented before the RKE Committee and approved, thereafter by the Senate and adopted dated above.
- 2.2. The policy may be subject to review and reissuance at scheduled periodic reviews.

## 3. Definitions

- 3.1. In line with the Research Ethics Policy, the following definitions are hereby adopted therein:
  - **Research:** any form of disciplined inquiry that aims to contribute to a body of knowledge or theory. This includes research carried out as part of consultancy or “third stream” activities approved by SOAS, but not other research carried out by researchers in a private capacity. Research conducted collaboratively with other institutions or non-SOAS researchers is covered by this Policy, to the extent that it involves a contribution from a researcher acting under the auspices of SOAS.
  - **Researcher:** any member of SOAS conducting research at any level, including staff and students, and any other person (regardless of their status) engaged in research under the auspices of SOAS or on behalf of or in association with SOAS (for example, independent contractors, consultants, visiting staff, staff from other institutions, emeritus staff, and staff on joint or honorary contracts).
  - **Research Ethics:** the moral principles guiding research, from its inception through to completion, publication of results and beyond. These broad principles are set out in SOAS’s Research Ethics Policy.
  - **Research Misconduct:** conduct or performance by a SOAS researcher which exhibits one or more of the characteristics referred to as being within scope of misconduct. The existence of any of these characteristics is indicative of research which has failed to meet SOAS’s principles of ethical research.
  - **Research Participants:** living individuals who are the focus of, and/or are involved in the research.

- 3.2. These definitions will apply in the place of the definitions for any identical or similar terms in the UKRIO Procedure for the Investigation of Research Misconduct.

#### 4. The Nature of Research Misconduct

- 4.1. SOAS's definition of research misconduct is based on definitions that are used by UKRI, the UK Research Integrity Office (UKRIO) and set out in the revised Concordat to Support Research Integrity.
- 4.2. This policy will be used to investigate allegations of behaviour which fall within the definition of research misconduct set out in the Research Ethics Policy.
- 4.3. Conduct or performance by a researcher which exhibits one or more of the following characteristics (4.4) shall be treated by SOAS as deeming to fall within the scope of research misconduct. The presence of any of these characteristics in a research project will indicate behaviour which falls significantly short of the principles of ethical research that SOAS adheres to, as outlined in the Research Ethics Policy.
- 4.4. Interpretation of these categories will depend on the context of the research project and will reflect the judgement and experience of those charged with investigating whether research misconduct has occurred:
- **Fabrication:** the creation of fictitious data, evidence, documentation or results.
  - **Falsification:** the inappropriate manipulation or selection of data, evidence, imagery or documentation.
  - **Misrepresentation:** this may include:
    - Misrepresentation of data: such as, the undisclosed suppression of evidence or findings, or the deliberate or negligent presentation of a flawed interpretation of data.
    - Misrepresentation by the researcher of their qualifications or experience.
    - Misrepresentation of involvement: e.g. the inappropriate or unjustified claim by a researcher to authorship or attribution, or the denial of others' rights to authorship or attribution.
    - Misrepresentation of publication: e.g. the undisclosed duplication of publication, or undisclosed duplicate submission of works for publication, where this involves deception or the deliberate circumvention of publishers' or funders' policies.
  - **Plagiarism:** the misappropriation or use of the ideas, intellectual property or work (written or otherwise) of others without acknowledgement or permission.
  - **Mismanagement** of research data or results: the failure to ensure that research data, evidence and research results are preserved and accessible for a reasonable period after the completion of research, in accordance with SOAS's records management policies and any particular funder requirements agreed by contract.
  - **Breaching a duty of care:** this may occur where the researcher deliberately, recklessly or negligently:
    - Discloses improperly the identity of research participants, or information provided by research participants, without their consent or in breach of

confidence. Particular care must be taken when conducting research involving human research participants (identifiable living individual/natural person) and their personal data<sup>1</sup>. Researchers must have due regard to the Code of Practice in this regard and complete any mandatory training, where required to do so.

- Places research participants, research staff or others involved in research at risk of harm, and without appropriate mitigating safeguards.
  - Fails to take reasonable care to ensure the informed consent of research participants.
  - Fails to observe legal, regulatory or contractual requirements, and obligations to research funders.
  - Conducts themselves improperly in the peer review of applications or publications: e.g. through the gross misrepresentation of the content of material, inadequate disclosure of limited competence, or the abuse of material provided in confidence for peer review.
- **Deception:** deliberately failing to declare a conflict of interest(s); intentionally providing misleading statements or providing misleading information in order to secure sources of funding.
  - **Collusion:** acting to conceal misconduct in research; falsifying results, deliberately destroying or concealing evidence and research findings and / or participating / colluding with others to do so for that express purpose.
  - Conduct or performance by a researcher which falls into at least one of the above categories will be research misconduct if it involves deliberate intent, negligence or recklessness.
  - Research misconduct includes acts of omission as well as acts of commission and may fall within Questionable Research Practices (QRPs) that include the design, analytic, or reporting practices employed with the purpose of deliberately presenting biased evidence in favour of an assertion.

4.5 For the sake of clarity, research misconduct does not include:

- Genuine academic disagreements, e.g., over research methodology.
- Honest errors or mistakes, where no negligence, recklessness or deliberate intent is involved.

4.5. Researchers who detect errors or mistakes in their research are expected to make all reasonable efforts to rectify them: e.g., by publication of a correction or retraction. Deliberate failure to rectify research errors will be treated as falling within the parameters of misrepresentation.

---

<sup>1</sup> Personal Data being defined as: Information relating to an identified or identifiable living individual/natural person (data subject): one who can be identified directly/indirectly by reference to an identifier (e.g. a name) or, one of certain specific characteristics relating to the individual. See: Data Protection Act (DPA) 2018 Part 1 section 3 (Preliminary) (2), (3).

## 5. Whistleblowing

- 5.1. The present policy shall operate in tandem with the adopted Whistleblowing Policy, in particular where concerns are raised or detailed in accordance with section 2 of that policy.
- 5.2. The present policy does not act as a substitute to (5.1) or any of the wider disciplinary policies and procedures at the University.

## 6. Relationship with National Standards

- 6.1. SOAS will investigate allegations of research misconduct in accordance with the model Procedure for the investigation of misconduct in research published by the UK Research Integrity Office (UKRIO). That procedure, together with revised facets to the process, have been translated into the specific context of SOAS University of London.

## 7. Investigating allegations raised regarding Research Misconduct

- 7.1. The main features of the model procedure (6.1) adopted and modified by SOAS are summarised here.
- 7.2. The process for investigating research misconduct comprises 8 stages:
  - Preliminary (receipt of allegation)
  - Preliminary meeting
  - Pre-Screening Stage (1)
  - Screening Stage
  - Screening Panel
  - Formal Investigation
  - Report and Outcomes
  - Appeals
- 7.3. In contrast to the model procedure, SOAS has adopted an appeals process and has formally revised the timelines for each of the requisite stages. Appeals made against the decision of the Investigation Panel are only heard on the papers.
- 7.4. Further details of the operationalisation of the procedure are set out in the appendices accompanying this policy. Composition of the various panels (as per 7.2 above) has been adapted specifically to reflect the organisational structure at SOAS. Annexes 2 to 7 provide for various template correspondences that the Named Person will utilise; the accompanying annexes in the appendices accompanying this policy set out the determination templates of the Panels.
- 7.5. Allegations of research misconduct that are made if determined as being frivolous, spurious, vexatious or wholly without merit, may precipitate referral of the individual making the allegation to the university disciplinary process and, where appropriate, notification provided to the relevant regulatory body.

- 7.6. SOAS does reserve the right to process data relating to the number and frequency of investigations, including those that are found to be without merit. That reporting may feed into its annual report on Research Integrity.

## 8. Data Protection

- 8.1. Investigations concerning allegations of research misconduct will invariably involve the processing of Personal Data as defined by UK Data Protection legislation.
- 8.2. Formulation of the procedure for the investigation of research misconduct has borne in mind and been designed according to the Data Protection Principles outlined in the current legislation.
- 8.3. SOAS adopts that the lawful basis for processing personal data for investigating allegations of research misconduct is the performance of a specific task carried out in the public interest that is set out in law.
- 8.4. Upon completion of an investigation, personal data will only be retained where it is lawful to do so, as defined by the UK Data Protection legislation and where appropriate, in line with the University's data retention policies.

## Process for Investigating Research Misconduct

### 1. Process stages

1.1 Investigations into allegations raised concerning research misconduct are comprised of eight distinct stages:

- Preliminary (receipt of allegation)
- Preliminary meeting
- Pre-Screening Stage (I)
- Screening Stage (II)
- Screening Panel
- Formal Investigation
- Report and Outcomes
- Appeal

1.2 The reporting timelines for each of the aforementioned stages of the process are detailed below.

### 2. Submission

2.1 An allegation of research misconduct must be submitted to a 'Named Person.' The Named Person is a senior member of staff who will manage the overall investigation and make key decisions at various stages. The Named Person is to declare from the outset any conflict(s) of interest which would require the investigation of the complaint to be passed on to an alternate person. The Named Person must not be the head of human resources (HR) or the Vice Chancellor of the University.

2.2 All complaints in relation to research misconduct must be submitted in writing.

2.3 The complaint must include the name and contact details of the individual raising the complaint – the Claimant. Anonymous complaints will not be investigated.

2.4 The complaint should identify the research which is the subject of the complaint as precisely as possible (e.g. citing the specific publication) and should explain why, in the complainant's view, the research is not in accordance with SOAS's Research Ethics Policy.

2.5 Complaints will only be accepted on the basis that full details of the complaint and the complainant's identity will be provided to the respondent at the appropriate point in the research misconduct investigation.

2.6 Complaints must be submitted for the attention of the Chair of the Research and Knowledge Exchange Committee (RKE) (the Named Person). Each complaint must be sent through to the designated inbox for this which is: [dvcresearch@soas.ac.uk](mailto:dvcresearch@soas.ac.uk).

- 2.7 Complaints presented as allegations of research misconduct may originate in misunderstandings or disputes between individuals. Opportunities to resolve the matter through informal mediation, arbitration or dispute resolution should be considered, where appropriate, by the Named Person before proceeding to the formal stages of the process. The formal process should only be entered if arbitration or mediation is an inappropriate alternate or remedial measure.
- 2.8 An 'alternate person' shall be detailed in the absence, unavailability or delegation from the Named Person set out in (2.6).

### 3. Preliminary (receipt)

- 3.1 The Named Person will provide formal written confirmation of receipt to the individual who has raised the complaint.
- 3.2 The Named Person will formulate a preliminary view as to whether the raised allegation(s) falls within the definition of research misconduct.
- 3.3 If the matter does not fall within the parameters of research misconduct, the Named Person may then refer back to the claimant, setting out in writing:
- Why the matter is not being taken forward under the formal process
  - Why the allegation does not fall within the definition of research misconduct
  - Any alternative remedies (if applicable).
- 3.4 Following on from (3.3), the process may end at this stage. The Named Person may notify the individual to whom the allegation was made against, informing them of receipt and the steps as per (3.3). The identity of the individual who lodged the allegation will not be disclosed.
- 3.5 If the matter does not fall within the parameters of research misconduct, the Named Person will consider and institute any immediate steps to be taken if presented with actual risks or potential illegal activity. Notification may also be considered / provided to any legal or regulatory authorities where it is deemed necessary.
- 3.6 Depending on the nature of the allegation(s), the Named Person may refer the allegation(s) to the institution's disciplinary process thereby suspending or terminating the research misconduct investigation.
- 3.7 In the absence of referral to the University disciplinary process and / or an investigation to be conducted by any legal or regulatory body, the matter will proceed according to this process.
- 3.8 The Named Person in consultation with Research & Knowledge Exchange Directorate (RKED), will seek to identify whether any contractual obligations (e.g., to research funders) may be affected or taken into consideration given receipt of the allegation of misconduct.
- 3.9 The Named Person will then provide formal written confirmation to the individual who is the subject of the allegations (the respondent) that an allegation of research misconduct against them has been formally received.

- 3.10 The Named Person will then provide formal confidential written confirmation that an allegation relating to research misconduct has been received to following:
- Vice Chancellor of SOAS
  - Director of People
  - Secretary to the Research Ethics Panel (REP)
  - Chief Finance Officer
- 3.11 Following on from (3.9), the following details may (where necessary) be outlined:
- Who has raised the complaint
  - Who it is against
  - When the allegation was received
  - That the matter (at the preliminary stage) falls within the remit of research misconduct
  - Notification of the date when the process commenced
- 3.12 The Named Person will also make any relevant enquiries concerning the contractual obligations status of the individual to whom the allegation has been made against in order to discern whether there are any requirements to notify a funder or inform them as set out in a memorandum of understanding.
- 3.13 The total timeframe for steps outlined in (3) is 10 working days. If in exceptional circumstances this timeframe cannot be adhered to, the Named Person shall formally detail this in writing to the relevant parties, setting out what those exceptional circumstances are and the revised timeframe that is being worked to.

#### 4. Preliminary (meeting)

- 4.1 Notwithstanding (3.8) above, the Named Person will formally contact the Respondent in writing in the timeframe as per (3.13) and invite them to a preliminary meeting.
- 4.2 Written notification shall outline the following:
- An allegation of research misconduct has been formally received
  - Invitation to a preliminary meeting (with date, time and venue clearly stated)
  - The nature and detail of the investigation process
  - That the Respondent has a right to be accompanied
- 4.3 The preliminary meeting shall take place no earlier than 7 (calendar) days from the date when formal notification is provided (4.1).
- 4.4 At the preliminary meeting the Named Person shall be in attendance, with an appointed minute taker together with the Respondent and their accompanied representative (if applicable).

4.5 At the preliminary meeting the Named Person will present to the Respondent the details of the allegation of research misconduct that has been received. The Respondent shall thereafter be afforded an opportunity to respond to the allegation that has been made, (including by way of an accompanied representative).

4.6 A written transcript shall be taken and provided to the Respondent within 3 working days.

4.7 The Respondent may provide a written submission of response to the allegation of research misconduct following the preliminary meeting within 7 (calendar) days. The submission must be sent to the Named Person.

## 5. Pre-Screening Stage (I)

5.1 The pre-screening stage shall run in parallel to the steps outlined in (3) to (4) being completed within 7 working days from the date of receipt of the allegation(s).

5.2 The Named Person may undertake any reasonable steps in order to secure relevant information and / or evidence as it relates to the allegation and any subsequent investigation that may ensue. That evidence may take the form of files, information, electronic records or the like.

5.3 In conjunction with HR and the relevant line manager(s), the Named Person will risk assess whether there needs to be any restriction placed upon the Respondent. This may include, but is not limited to, temporary suspension, restriction of access or the like.

5.4 If the Claimant's allegation is withdrawn, and / or if the Respondent leaves/resigns or provides admission, the Named Person shall still continue with the relevant steps set out in the process.

## 6. Screening Stage (II)

6.1 The Named Person shall undertake a screening evaluation upon the totality of evidence / information available at this point.

6.2 Primarily, this will be to determine:

- Whether the allegation is to formally proceed
- Whether the allegation is frivolous, spurious, vexatious or wholly without merit
- Whether the allegation is mistaken

6.3 Should a determination at (6.2) (ii) or (iii) be made, the Named Person will formally notify all parties in writing within 7 working days.

6.4 Further determination shall then be made as to whether any follow-on action(s) will be required, including referral of the Claimant to HR to consider whether the University's disciplinary process shall apply and, where appropriate, notification provided to the relevant regulatory body.

6.5 To reach a determination outlined in (6.2) (ii), the Named Person may, where appropriate seek additional clarification or guidance from senior academics within SOAS. A summation of any advice shall be referred to as per (6.3).

6.6 Should a determination of (6.2) (i) be made, the Named Person will proceed to convene a Screening Panel. Formal notification to all parties will then be submitted in writing within 5 working days.

## 7. Screening Panel

7.1 The Screening Panel will be convened at the request of the Named Person. The Screening Panel's function is to determine whether there is prima facie evidence of research misconduct.

7.2 Composition may be drawn from:

- College Dean
- One academic head of Department
- One senior academic
- Secretary to the Research Ethics Panel (REP)
- (An appointed minute taker not previously privy to the procedure)

7.3 The Panel will receive submission in writing from the Named Person of all the information available / gathered to date.

7.4 The Panel will formalise its report within the given timeframe (7.7) and make a determination upon the following:

- The Claimant's allegation has substance and there is a case to answer.
- Although the allegation contains some substance, the matter does not reach the requisite threshold of Research Misconduct. The matter can therefore be addressed through remedial measures.
- The Claimant's allegation is mistaken
- The Claimant's allegation is frivolous, spurious, vexatious or wholly without merit

7.5 Following a determination made in (7.6) (i), justification will be made for a Formal Investigation to convene.

7.6 Following a determination made in (7.6) (iv), the Panel may recommend the matter to be referred to HR in order to consider whether the University disciplinary process shall apply and, where appropriate, notification provided to the relevant regulatory body.

7.7 The work of the Panel is to be completed within 15 working days.

7.8 A copy of the Panel's report and (any) recommendations will be communicated to all parties by the Named Person within 5 working days from taking receipt.

7.9 Where the Panel makes a determination based upon (7.4) (ii), the Named Person will be responsible for putting those recommendations into effect, based upon any timeframe that the Panel judges deem to be appropriate.

## 8. Formal investigation

8.1 An Investigation Panel will be convened by the Named Person following a determination in (7.4) (i).

8.2 Composition of the Panel may be drawn from the following:

- Head of College
- Associate Dean(s) of Research
- Chair of the Research Ethics Panel (REP)
- One member from outside of the University
- (An appointed minute taker not previously privy to the procedure)

8.3 The Investigation Panel shall not be drawn from those who have sat on the Screening Panel and who are or have been party to the allegation itself.

8.4 The Investigation Panel shall arrange any interviews that are necessary and / or appropriate to the full investigation. Any further allegation or evidence of misconduct that may arise during the course of proceedings shall be formally communicated to the Named Person for consideration, in line with the preliminary procedures outlined above.

8.5 The Investigation Panel shall consider the totality of evidence. The burden of proof adopted is upon a balance of probabilities.

8.6 Where appropriate and necessary, the Panel may convene a formal hearing where the Respondent may give written/oral evidence.

8.7 A directions notice for hearing shall be issued by the Investigation Panel outlining:

- The date when the allegation of research misconduct will be formally heard
- invitation to the hearing (with time and venue clearly stated)
- The nature and detail of the investigation process
- That the Respondent has a right to attend, give evidence and has a right to be accompanied.

8.8 If a hearing is convened as per (8.4), the Respondent shall be afforded a notice period of (a minimum) 7 working days. The Respondent will be required to attend in person and may be accompanied by a representative.

## 9. Report and Outcome(s)

- 9.1 The Investigation Panel shall detail all its findings and any appropriate recommendations in the form of a written report. That report must be prepared within 30 (calendar) days from the date of referral (7.5) and can be served electronically, though a hard copy will also be served.
- 9.2 Within the final report the Investigation Panel shall detail whether the allegation of research misconduct shall be:
- Upheld in full
  - Upheld in part
  - Dismissed
- 9.3 Any further recommendations will also be contained therein, such as whether to refer the matter to the University disciplinary process and notify any regulatory body, or whether any wider recommendations relating to remedial measures, procedural issues / points, or impact upon wider University policies should be taken into consideration.
- 9.4 The Named Person shall communicate copies (served in writing, but may also be served additionally electronically) of the full report of the Panel to:
- The Respondent
  - The Claimant
  - Vice Chancellor of SOAS
  - Director of People
  - Secretary of the Research Ethics Panel
  - Chief Finance Officer
- 9.5 The Named Person shall also follow up areas of recommendation (9.3) and / or actions arising from the decision to ensure they are followed through.

## 10. Appeal

- 10.1 Any appeal lodged against the decision (including ancillary findings) of the Investigation Panel must be set out in writing and addressed to the Named Person (2.6) or alternate person (2.8) where applicable within 28 (calendar) days from the date of issuance of the report.
- 10.2 An extension may only be applied for in exceptional circumstances. An application for extension must be submitted to the Named Person (2.6) or alternate person (2.8) where applicable. The Named Person will consider any mitigating or exceptional circumstances in which to extend the deadline to appeal of up to a maximum of 14 (calendar) days.
- 10.3 An application to extend the deadline for leave to appeal must be submitted within 10 (calendar) days from the date when the report was served.

- 10.4 If a notice of appeal is not lodged within the timeframe outlined in (10.1) and no further extension applied for, the Named Person shall issue a formal letter to the Respondent outlining that the process has come to an end and no further appeal was made.
- 10.5 The Appeal Panel shall consider the final report of the Investigation Panel and review their central finding(s) (9.2). Recommendations that are set out as secondary to the central finding(s) shall not form part of the scope for appeal.
- 10.6 An Appeal Panel will be convened by the Named Person following receipt of notice to appeal. The Named Person shall inform the relevant parties that an appeal against the decision of the Investigation Panel has been received, namely:
- The Respondent
  - The Claimant
  - Vice Chancellor of SOAS
  - Director of People
  - Secretary to the Research Ethics Panel
  - Chief Finance Officer
- 10.7 The Named Person shall convene the Appeal Panel within 10 working days of receipt of an appeal.
- 10.8 Composition of the Appeal Panel may be drawn from:
- College Deans
  - Head of the Doctoral School
  - One member from outside of the University
  - One senior academic
- 10.9 The Appeal Panel shall consider the determination of the Investigation Panel (9.2) and review the central finding(s). The Appeal Panel shall make a determination as to whether, on appeal, the appeal should be:
- Upheld in full
  - Upheld in part
  - Dismissed
- 10.10 Appeals submitted against the decision of the Investigation Panel will be heard on the papers only.
- 10.11 The Appeal Panel shall report their decision within 21 (calendar) days. Thereafter the Named Person shall communicate that decision in writing (which may also be served electronically) to all parties as per (10.6).
- 10.12 The decision of the Appeal Panel is final.

## 11. Summarised timelines

Stage	Activity	Timeframe
i. Preliminary (receipt)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Assessing scope</li> <li>Written confirmation(s)</li> <li>Enquires</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>10-working days</li> </ul>
ii. Preliminary (meeting)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Invitation to meeting</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>7-working days</li> <li>3-working days (meeting transcript)</li> <li>7-working days (additional submissions)</li> </ul>
iii. Pre-Screening (I)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Securing information</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>7-working days (in parallel to [ii] above)</li> </ul>
iv. Screening stage (II)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Determine to proceed</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>7-working days (no case)</li> <li>5-working days (to proceed)</li> </ul>
v. Screening Panel	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Determining whether case for research misconduct exists</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>15-working days</li> <li>5-working days (named person to communicate Screening Panel report)</li> </ul>
vi. Formal Investigation	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Considering totality of evidence</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>7-working days (notice to hearing)</li> </ul>
vii. Report & Outcome(s)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Report of the Investigation Panel</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>30-days to issue</li> </ul>
viii. Appeal	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Lodging appeal against decision of the Investigation Panel</li> <li>Request to extend the deadline to appeal</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>28-days (from the date of issuance of the report)</li> <li>10-days (timeframe to request extension)</li> <li>14-days (max. extendable time)</li> </ul>