

# Annual Statement on Research Integrity 2022/23

## Section 1: Key contact information

Question	Response
<b>1A. Name of organisation</b>	University of Glasgow
<b>1B. Type of organisation:</b>  higher education institution/industry/independent research performing organisation/other (please state)	Higher Education Institute
<b>1C. Date statement approved by governing body (DD/MM/YY)</b>	Audit Committee – 1 Nov 2023  RPSC – 26 Oct 2023
<b>1D. Web address of organisation's research integrity page (if applicable)</b>	<a href="https://www.gla.ac.uk/myglasgow/ris/researchintegrity/about/">https://www.gla.ac.uk/myglasgow/ris/researchintegrity/about/</a>
<b>1E. Named senior member of staff to oversee research integrity</b>	Name: Chris Pearce  Email address: <a href="mailto:Chris.Pearce@glasgow.ac.uk">Chris.Pearce@glasgow.ac.uk</a>
<b>1F. Named member of staff who will act as a first point</b>	Name: Sam Oakley

<p><b>of contact for anyone wanting more information on matters of research integrity</b></p>	<p>Email address: <a href="mailto:Samantha.Oakley@glasgow.ac.uk">Samantha.Oakley@glasgow.ac.uk</a></p>
-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

## **Section 2: Promoting high standards of research integrity and positive research culture.**

### **Description of actions and activities undertaken**

<p><b>2A. Description of current systems and culture</b></p> <p>Please describe how the organisation maintains high standards of research integrity and promotes positive research culture. It should include information on the support provided to researchers to understand standards, values and behaviours, such as training, support and guidance for researchers at different career stages/ disciplines. You may find it helpful to consider the following broad headings:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Policies and systems</li> <li>• Communications and engagement</li> <li>• Culture, development and leadership</li> <li>• Monitoring and reporting</li> </ul>
<p><b>Policies and systems</b></p> <p>Our central policy for Research Integrity is the <a href="#">Code of Good Practice in Research</a>. This was extensively revised in 2022-2023 through a consultation process and the revised version was approved in June 2023. We also have a new central team who lead on Research Integrity and manage the misconduct process: the Research Governance and Integrity team within the Research Services Directorate. This team supports our network of Research Integrity Champions and Advisers as well as coordinating the activities of the Named Person and Research Integrity Council. Our mailbox (<a href="mailto:research-integrity@gl.a.ac.uk">research-integrity@gl.a.ac.uk</a>) allows for anonymous reporting.</p> <p><b>Communications and engagement</b></p> <p>We have an extensive Research Integrity training programme for staff and PGRs, and this is a key way we communicate our expectations, policies and values. Our training takes a reflective approach, enabling it to function for staff of all disciplines and career stages. It also encourages awareness of these different perspectives.</p>

Our training initiates further local activities (our central team run bespoke sessions) and helps us learn about local or discipline-specific good practice. Our Integrity Champions and Advisers network are the local points of contact, and their remit includes awareness-raising and local activities for Research Integrity. Further training and communication are done by both our Research Information Management team (data management, open research) and the College Ethics committees.

We engage with the wider sector through membership of UKRIO, UK CORI, the Scottish Research Integrity Network (SRIN) and the Russell Group Research Integrity Forum.

### **Culture, development and leadership**

The university has an extensive and ongoing plan of action for Research Culture, now consolidated with the formation of the Research Culture and Researcher Development Team within our Research Services Directorate, a significant new staff resource for this work.

Our Research Culture Action Plan aims to promote a positive research culture within the ways we: evaluate, support and reward quality; recognise diverse contributions to research; enable colleagues to support each other to succeed in their chosen career path; build an environment in which individuals collaborate in an atmosphere of openness and trust. In 2022-23 (and into 2023-24) we retain our 5 priority areas for action: Careers, Recognition, Collegiality, Open Research, and Research Integrity.

Good practice in Research Integrity is embedded through all current culture projects, such as the development of PGR Supervisors and PIs as the Managers of Researchers, the recognition of Research Professional Staff as essential members of the research community and leaders in their fields, the Talent Lab leadership development strategy for all academic stages, and the imminent launch of the 'Research Culture Commons' – a university-wide community dedicated to distributing leadership of the development of a positive culture.

Our Research Culture work has received external recognition, including from the Royal Society, the UK Research Integrity Office, the Academy of Medical Sciences, the Guardian University Awards and BEIS R&D People & Culture Strategy.

### **Monitoring and reporting**

We monitor the activities of our Integrity Champions and Adviser through a logbook system which is collated annually in August. We also report on our training

internally. 443 staff completed Research Integrity training in 2022-2023; 1481 staff have completed training in the last 5 years (we require a 5-year refresh).

Integrity training is mandatory for PGRs in their first year and 735 completed our PGR training in 2022-2023: this is checked in the student's annual progress review. In the latest PGR Experience Survey 98-100% of PGRs rated their understanding of research integrity as high. Small differences between schools allow us to target future training.

There is a standing report to the university's Research Strategy and Policy Committee on Research Culture, Open Research and Research Integrity. The Research Governance and Integrity team also review quarterly the misconduct cases and any actions or communication needed.

## **2B. Changes and developments during the period under review**

Please provide an update on any changes made during the period, such as new initiatives, training, developments, also ongoing changes that are still underway. Drawing on Commitment 3 of the Concordat, please note any new or revised policies, practices and procedures to support researchers; training on research ethics and research integrity; training and mentoring opportunities to support the development of researchers' skills throughout their careers.

### **Policies and systems**

In this period, we had significant policy revisions. Our Research Misconduct policy was revised to include an appeals process and to reflect the new UKRIO model policy. We also revised our Code of Good Practice in Research, which now includes more extensive guidance on authorship, new governance focus on Trusted Research and other changes. We introduced a new Research Publications and Copyright Policy to support our commitment to Open Research and promotion and monitoring of this will be ongoing. The Terms of Reference for the Integrity Council were also revised.

An Ethics Audit was commissioned and undertaken by KPMG and the actions from that are ongoing. We are also reviewing our internal processes and responsibilities for reporting to funders of any misconduct concerns.

### **Communications and engagement**

Our web pages were updated and revised for Research Integrity, plus a new Research Governance page which brings together all significant areas of activity.

Our integrity training for PGRs was revised and updated, with a new format commencing in 2022-2023. Our satisfaction survey indicates a rise (from 90 to 94% giving it 4 or 5 stars) so this encourages us to continue with the current format. We introduced a webinar series on Research Integrity topics which has proved popular and useful for us (to review policy and support) in terms of the views and questions we capture.

The university is a member of UKRN, and we have been actively engaging with the Open Research Programme. This includes a train the trainer strand, and an evaluation strand that encompasses reward and recognition. We also joined COPE and have been engaging with their forum and other events, benefitting from understanding more about the publisher perspective on Research Integrity.

### **Culture, development and leadership**

Of the many new initiatives around Research Culture, the new Research Staff Induction session provides a space for awareness-raising for Research Integrity topics. We have also commenced a small project to review the alignment of our Research Misconduct and Bullying and Harassment policies and processes. This aims to highlight any issues and promote awareness of the interdependence of these two areas of concern.

### **Monitoring and reporting**

We have formalised our reflections on Integrity queries and cases so that this now takes place quarterly within the team. This enables us to implement any changes in policy or increase communications on a specific topic.

With new teams in place, we standardised our reporting line to the university's Research Policy and Strategy Committee with a new joint report on Culture, Open Research and Integrity.

## **2C. Reflections on progress and plans for future developments**

This should include a reflection on the previous year's activity including a review of progress and impact of initiatives if known relating to activities referenced in the [previous year's statement](#). Note any issues that have hindered progress, e.g., resourcing or other issues.

The Research Integrity Review (2021-2022) completed and reported. One action from that was to initiate an external audit of our Research Ethics systems and policies. Whilst no significant problems were identified, there were several areas that could be improved so this work now commences to action the findings and recommendations. Also following on from the Research Integrity review, our Integrity Champions and Advisers network is under review with changes planned for 2023-2024.

With staffing resource now back to full capacity, we are focussing on better, easier reporting of Research Integrity training completion in order to support the mandatory requirement in a timelier manner. We are also planning to use the reflective staff training responses to refresh and enhance the training, plus systematic review of this information for targeted local support and promotion.

We are also working on providing even better options for anonymous reporting of potential misconduct issues and a decision framework for handling misconduct allegations.

New research culture activities underway include a Research Staff Assembly and a Research Culture Commons, further focussed spaces for awareness raising and responsive support.

## **2D. Case study on good practice (optional)**

Please describe an anonymised brief, exemplar case study that can be shared as good practice with other organisations. A wide range of case studies are valuable, including small, local implementations. Case studies may also include the impact of implementations or lessons learned.

In 2022-2023 the university supplemented its existing PGR Research Integrity training (mandatory for PGRs in Year 1) with a series of themed webinars. These were advertised to all PGRs – and supervisors - as an opportunity to explore

Research Integrity topics in greater depth. We took care to balance the content, so it was suitable for all disciplines.

Four webinars were held covering Open Research, Authorship, Plagiarism and Equitable Partnerships (one had to be cancelled for “Working with personal data” due to staff shortage). The format was either an expert talk or three short talks by researchers, followed by Q&A. Our Staff Integrity training is assessed by reflective responses, and from these we can identify researchers with particular expertise and interests which we could use for these sessions. Padlet was used to capture questions in advance and answers provided both during and after the session. The webinars were recorded to create a reusable bank of materials which cover topics in more depth than the mandatory module. We also shared these resources with PGR Supervisors via our Supervisor Community of Practice.

Sign-ups for the webinars ranged from 33-103 PGRs with attendance ranging from 22-77. PGR participation and feedback from the webinars was extremely positive but also of interest to us were the further positive outcomes that we observed:

1. We learned much from the questions posted on the Padlet: they revealed points of confusion or concern which we could then address either directly or via improvements to training and communications for PGRs.
2. We had some follow-on contact from PGRs who raised a misconduct query with our central team after having participated in the session (e.g., authorship disputes).
3. We generated a bank of resources which we have been able to reference and share. For example, one short talk was on the developments in AI / ChatGPT, at the time this was just emerging. This expert view from colleagues in Computer Science was a useful check on the many negative media stories at the time.
4. Engaging supervisors about the issues being raised by PGRs enabled us to share back some of their responses with the PGRs, creating a more rounded picture of the challenges and solutions.

We will be continuing to integrate our training and researcher communities to build engagement with Research Integrity topics for both PGRs and supervisors.

## Section 3: Addressing research misconduct

### 3A. Statement on processes that the organisation has in place for dealing with allegations of misconduct

Please provide:

- a brief summary of relevant organisation policies/ processes (e.g. research misconduct procedure, whistle-blowing policy, bullying/harassment policy; appointment of a third party to act as confidential liaison for persons wishing to raise concerns) and brief information on the periodic review of research misconduct processes (e.g. date of last review; any major changes during the period under review; date when processes will next be reviewed).
- information on how the organisation creates and embeds a research environment in which all staff, researchers and students feel comfortable to report instances of misconduct (e.g., code of practice for research, whistleblowing, research misconduct procedure, informal liaison process, website signposting for reporting systems, training, mentoring, reflection and evaluation of policies, practices and procedures).
- anonymised key lessons learned from any investigations into allegations of misconduct which either identified opportunities for improvements in the organisation's investigation procedure and/or related policies / processes/ culture or which showed that they were working well.

#### Research Misconduct Policy

The research misconduct policy recently underwent a major review and was approved on the 06 June 2023. This review was completed to align the policy more closely with UKRIO's new policy for misconduct.

The major change to the document has been the inclusion of an appeals policy. No longer do we have appeals only at a disciplinary stage but rather respondents can now appeal on certain grounds at the end of an investigation before any potential disciplinary.

We also made changes to the language used at each stage of investigation so that it better aligns with UKRIO's policy.



To make it simpler for people to follow the research integrity team also constructed a flowchart that documents the process through the policy and makes it easier for anyone involved in misconduct to follow. We made the flowchart open access, and it can be used by others if they find it useful.

Unless other changes come nationally, the policy will be reviewed again next year In May 2024.

This year we have had no formal investigations at the university. There have been a number of issues that we have been able to resolve informally. We have also had two instances where we have had our academics complain about other academics at different institutions, both foreign and domestic. We have been able to work with the responding institutions to bring resolution to these cases.

Key lessons learned from this year are that we should seek additional mechanisms to encourage reporting of misconduct. Going forward we are developing ideas to improve this.

**3B. Information on investigations of research misconduct that have been undertaken**

Please complete the table on the number of **formal investigations completed during the period under review** (including investigations which completed during this period but started in a previous academic year). Information from ongoing investigations should not be submitted.

An organisation's procedure may include an initial, preliminary, or screening stage to determine whether a formal investigation needs to be completed. These allegations should be included in the first column but only those that proceeded past this stage, to formal investigations, should be included in the second column.

Type of allegation	Number of allegations			
	Number of allegations reported to the organisation	Number of formal investigations	Number upheld in part after formal investigation	Number upheld in full after formal investigation
Fabrication	1			
Falsification				
Plagiarism	2			
Failure to meet legal, ethical and professional obligations				
Misrepresentation (eg data; involvement; interests; qualification; and/or publication history)	2			
Improper dealing with allegations of misconduct				
Multiple areas of concern (when received in a single allegation)				
<i>Other*</i>	7			
<b>Total:</b>	<b>12</b>			

**\*If you listed any allegations under the 'Other' category, please give a brief, high-level summary of their type here. Do not give any identifying or confidential information when responding.**

*6 authorship disputes, 1 potential contract cheating*