



Approved by: UK Committee on Research Integrity  
Author: Claire Henderson

## Minutes of the UK Committee on Research Integrity Business meeting, 11 July 2022

---

<b>Attendees</b>	
Nandini Das, ND	Rachael Goberman-Hill, RGH (Co-chair)
Maria Delgado, MD	Claire Henderson, CH, UK CORI Senior Advisor (Secretariat)
Louise Dunlop, LD	Ralitsa Madsen, RM (joined remotely)
Suzanne Farley, SF	Jil Matheson, JM
Andrew George, AG (Co-chair)	Sophie Robson, SR, Operations Manager, UKRI (Secretariat)
Ian Gilmore, IG	Rebecca Veitch, RV, Head of Research Integrity, UKRI (Remote observer)

**Time:** 15:00 – 16:00

**Location:** Royal Central School of Speech and Drama, Eton Ave, Belsize Park, London, NW3 3HY

### 1. Welcome and introductions

- 1.1. The Committee on Research Integrity was welcomed to the second business meeting.
- 1.2. Apologies had been received from Miles Padgett. Ralitsa Madsen and Rebecca Veitch (UKRI observer) attended the meeting remotely.
- 1.3. Members declared no additional conflicts of interest.
- 1.4. The minutes of the last workshop were approved with minor amendments. The secretariat advised that all actions noted in the last meeting were complete.

## 2. Revised Terms of Reference and Code of Conduct

- 2.1. The terms of reference and code of conduct had been updated following discussion at the first meeting. The committee approved the revised documents with one amendment to the code of conduct, the inclusion of the reference to the devolved nations in relation to the pre-election period in paragraph 6.2.

**Action: Secretariat** to make minor revisions to the Terms of Reference and Code of Conduct as requested

## 3. Workplan

- 3.1. UK Committee on Research Integrity agreed the revised workplan. Overarching workstreams were focused on the development of the annual report, chaired by Andrew George, and on the development of the committee's strategy, chaired by Rachael Goberman-Hill. The committee agreed all members would be involved in these two workstreams.
- 3.2. The committee agreed to set up a smaller project group focused on building the evidence base. This workstream would follow on work to a project that had been commissioned by UKRI, GuildHE and Cancer Research UK looking at indicators of research integrity.
- 3.3. The committee approved the formation of a sub-group focused on research misconduct.
- 3.4. The committee approved the formation of time limited sub projects that would directly feed into other workstreams. These would focus on landscape mapping, communications, and consultation.
- 3.5. The committee agreed the workplan would become a standing item on all future UK Committee on Research Integrity business meeting agendas.

**Action: Secretariat** to add the workplan as a standing item to all future UK Committee on Research Integrity business meeting agendas.

## 4. Universities UK Report on Annual Narrative Statements

- 4.1. The corresponding paper contained the draft annual narrative statement template developed by UKRIO for the signatories of the Concordat to Support Research Integrity. This had been shared with the committee, for comment, in confidence.
- 4.2. The committee is grateful to have been consulted for comment and considered that the template has the potential to provide real evidence of what is happening to promote and encourage high standards in research in the UK. Members welcomed the minimum level of consistency that the introduction of a template would bring.

- 4.3. Members suggested the inclusion of an institutional declaration that funder terms and conditions had been complied with and suggested a section focused on ethical consideration could be positive additions.
- 4.4. The committee did express reservations about whether a generic template would be suitable for all institutions across all shapes and sizes and expressed concerns that increased reporting by smaller institutions could unintentionally identify the researchers involved in the cases reported in some circumstances. Members also emphasised the importance of being more explicit about questionable research practices, not just focusing on research misconduct. The committee was supportive of the template being introduced on an initial pilot basis.

## 5. Research integrity indicators

- 5.1. The corresponding paper contained the research indicators project discussion document, workshop report and response from the project sponsors.
- 5.2. The committee approved the project sponsors' response for publication.
- 5.3. The committee suggested the following changes could be made to improve the document's clarity:
  - clarity on whose role and responsibilities should be mapped at each institution and queried what they should be mapped on to.
  - the prompt for discussion relating to data already being held and new data that could be collected could be separated to form two distinct questions.
- 5.4. Members noted that the size and scale of different institutions should be considered during the development of any research integrity indicators.

## 6. Risk

- 6.1. The secretariat presented the draft risk register to the Committee on Research Integrity. The committee noted the key risks outlined in the report and requested alignment of the wording and scoring. Members advised that risk owners should be identified in line with best practice and requested that the risk register be brought back for discussion and monitoring at the next meeting.

**Action: Secretariat** to make the requested updates to the risk register and bring back to the committee at the next meeting.

## 7. Any other business

- 7.1. The committee discussed ongoing work and engagements that had happened to date. The committee noted this would become a standing item on all future business meeting agendas.
- 7.2. Committee members discussed the feedback they had heard from the sector following various events including, Universities UK's Pro Vice-Chancellors for Research Seminar, the World Conference on Research Integrity and UK Research Integrity Office's Annual Conference.

**Action: Secretariat** to add "Engagements and work to date" as a standing item to all future UK Committee on Research Integrity business meeting agendas.

## 8. Standing items

### 8.1. Equality, diversity and inclusion (EDI)

- 8.1.1. The committee noted the following EDI considerations:
  - *Relating to inclusivity in the annual narrative statement template* - The introduction of a greater level of detail when reporting misconduct figures could risk individuals being more easily identifiable at smaller institutions. The committee cautioned that a duty of care would need to be considered when recommending a reporting standard that would be rolled out uniformly across all institutions.
  - *Relating to accessibility* - The committee emphasised the importance of having a website that was accessible to all and had been tested for accessibility. The secretariat would follow up with the web team.

### 8.2. Communication matters arising

- 8.2.1. The post meeting summary for the newsletter would be authored by Louise Dunlop, who would also chair the reflections agenda item. There were no other communications matters arising required.

### 8.3. Reflections on the meeting and ways of working

- 8.3.1. The committee reflected on the way the meeting had run.
- 8.3.2. The committee thanked the secretariat for the high-quality provision of meeting papers. Members considered the atmosphere and working relationships built within the committee to be ones of great synergy, respect, and support. Members felt safe and able to challenge against consensus.
- 8.3.3. Enhanced hybrid arrangements would be made for all future meetings to enable members of the committee to join formal meetings remotely if necessary.

**Action: Louise Dunlop** to draft the post meeting summary for the UK CORI newsletter.

## 9. Close, and date of next meeting

- 9.1. Members of the committee were thanked for their time and contributions. The next committee meeting would be held on 10th October 2022 in Glasgow.
- 9.2. The co-chairs expressed their sincere gratitude to the Royal Central School of Speech and Drama for their warm hospitality.
- 9.3. Members were reminded to contact the secretariat if their institution had space available in which to host a future meeting.
- 9.4. The co-chairs thanked members for their engagement, energy, and contributions and drew the meeting to a close.

## Actions

- **Secretariat** to make minor revisions to the Terms of Reference/Code of Conduct as requested
- **Secretariat** to add the workplan as a standing item to all future UK Committee on Research Integrity business meeting agendas
- **Secretariat** to add "Engagements and work to date" as a standing item to all future UK Committee on Research Integrity business meeting agendas
- **Secretariat** to make the requested updates to the risk register and bring back to the committee at the next meeting
- **Louise Dunlop** to draft the post meeting summary for the UK CORI newsletter