

Annual Statement on Research Integrity 2023/24

Section 1: Key contact information

Question	Response
1A. Name of organisation	University of Glasgow
1B. Type of organisation: higher education institution/industry/independent research performing organisation/other (please state)	Higher Education Institute
1C Date approved by Governing Body	Audit Committee – 01 November 2024 RPSC – 09 October 2024
1D. Web address of organisation's research integrity page (if applicable)	https://www.gla.ac.uk/myglasgow/ris/researchintegrity/
1E. Named senior member of staff to oversee research integrity	Name: Chris Pearce
	Email address: Chris.Pearce@glasgow.ac.uk
1F. Named member of staff who will act as a first point of contact for anyone wanting more information on matters of research integrity	Name: Sam Oakley
	Email address: Samantha.Oakley@glasgow.ac.uk

Section 2: Promoting high standards of research integrity and positive research culture. Description of actions and activities undertaken

2A. Description of current systems and culture
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: • Policies and systems • Communications and engagement • Culture, development and leadership • Monitoring and reporting
Policies and systems

Our central policy for Research Integrity is the Code of Good Practice in Research. This was extensively revised in 2022-2023 through a consultation process and the revised version was approved in June 2023. Within the Research Services Directorate the Research Governance and Integrity Team promote Research Integrity and manage the misconduct process, coordinating the activities of the Named Person and Research Integrity Council. There is a secure mailbox (research-integrity@gla.ac.uk) for confidential matters and a new anonymous reporting form was introduced in 2024 so allegations of misconduct can be made without identifying the complainant. Regular reflection on cases raised and investigations enable us to continually refine and improve the service for investigating research misconduct and promoting best practice.

We have extensive support for Open Research from the Research Information Management team. Non-clinical Ethical Approval is overseen by our Ethics Committee, with each College having its own Ethics Committee and process. A review of our Ethics Policy has just commenced.

In 2024 a new post was created - Academic Lead for Good Research Practice – to enhance leadership and capacity for promoting good research practice and to oversee the network of Research Integrity Champions and Advisers.

Communications and engagement

We have a mandatory Research Integrity training programme for staff and PGRs which is a key route to communicate our expectations, policies and values. Our staff training is positioned to function for staff of all disciplines and career stages: the training is reflective and offers module options (e.g. “Teaching Research Integrity” for Learning & Teaching staff). It also encourages awareness of different and interdisciplinary perspectives. We monitor feedback closely and the course is revised once a year ensuring it is up-to-date and relevant to all. We engage with our researcher community via the Research Staff Assembly, Research Staff Induction, Respect Advisers Network, PGR Supervisor Community of Practice and other ad hoc events.

Our staff training is also a key way for us to learn best practice and engage further at a disciplinary level. Our Integrity Champions and Advisers 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 (training for ethics reviewers and staff/students).

We engage with the wider sector through membership of UKRIO, the Scottish Research Integrity Network (SRIN) and the Russell Group Research Integrity Forum. We are also institutional members of COPE. We participated in the UK CORI focus group on Indicators for Research Integrity and submitted extensive feedback to the consultation on the Concordat to Support Research Integrity in July 2024, including comments from our research community.

Culture, development and leadership

Our activities for Research Culture, Open Research and Research Integrity are reviewed and discussed at the Research Policy and Strategy Committee, chaired by our Vice-Principal (Research and Knowledge Exchange).

Our five Research Culture priorities are Research Integrity, Research Recognition, Career Development, Collegiality and Open Research. Research Culture activities currently have six workstreams: Pathfinder (Career Awareness for researchers), Developing our Principal Investigators, Recognising Research Professional Staff, Engagement (multiple communities for research-related staff to engage e.g. Research Culture Commons), Research Integrity

and Open Research. Information on all these initiatives is shared with the sector and [on our website](#).

Monitoring and reporting

We monitor the activities of our Integrity Champions and Advisers [s](#) through a logbook system which is collated annually in August, recording issues raised and local activities. Evaluation of the latest submission is driving improvements in 2024-2025.

We also report on our research integrity training courses internally. 2321 staff completed our staff research integrity training course in 2023-24. This was a 5-fold increase compared to the previous academic year, and this increase was a result of stronger monitoring of all mandatory training for staff. The refresher cycle for the course was also reduced from 5 years to 3 years; in the last 3 years 3003 staff completed the course.

Integrity training is mandatory for PGRs in their first year and 606 completed our PGR Training Course in 2023-2024: 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 issues raised to identify 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.

This year within the university we have established the DORA Working Group, chaired by Prof. Lisa DeBruine (Academic Lead for Good Research Practice). The San Francisco Declaration on Research Assessment (DORA) aims to improve the ways in which the output of scientific research is evaluated by funding agencies, academic institutions, and other parties. We can see from our Research Integrity training responses that this is a theme that our researchers highlight as a significant influence on integrity. The working group is conducting a review of progress in implementing DORA and defining and prioritising actions for 2024-2027.

A significant boost to Research Integrity training was a new focus on enforcing mandatory training from Senior Management in January 2024. This saw Staff Research Integrity training completion rates soar, peaking around the enforced deadline of July 2024, and more senior staff completed the training than ever before. Feedback is monitored constantly - and remains strongly positive - so we can inform our yearly review of the training and adapt where required. As we ask staff their views on the Concordat to Support Research Integrity, we were able to include a general summary of themes raised by researchers from all disciplines into our institutional response to the review.

Both the staff and PGR research integrity training courses were updated this year to include guidance on use of AI tools in writing. We also updated our guidance on authorship (training courses, webpages, authorship guide) to raise awareness of technical staff contributions to

research papers. We created an open access resource to help authors understand the authorship criteria from the university, as well as guidance on how to apply the CRediT taxonomy (<https://edshare.gla.ac.uk/1599/>), and we have sent this to NISO for feedback.

In 2024, our Lab for Academic Culture has been relaunched with an expanded membership and updated remit. The Lab convenes a team of experts to provide an expert steer in the maintenance, development and enhancement of our research culture. We develop research leadership (in the widest sense) through our “[Talent Lab](#)” provision: this includes two mentoring programmes, “Thesis Mentoring” and “Catalyst Mentoring”.

Throughout the year we ran a communications campaign to promote our Code of Good Practice - this is described in Section 2D.

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.

Following from the previous year’s activity, we now have an ongoing project to focus on specific enhancements to our Research Ethics process and policy. We concluded a project looking at how Bullying and Harassment reporting aligns with Research Misconduct reporting. This is a challenging issue - and requires two parallel internal investigations - so we ensured that the relevant staff were reminded of the processes and reporting routes. For example, our Integrity Champions and Advisers were reminded how to signpost to report bullying if they recognise this is a factor in a misconduct case, and our Respect Advisers were given a training session on "Research Misconduct" so they can recognise if this is a feature in a bullying case involving a researcher. This will require repeat communication and ongoing evaluation.

Our Research Publications and Copyright policy has been promoted and will under evaluation in Dec 2024.

We have commenced a consultation process leading to a renewed Research Culture Action Plan in 2025. Research Integrity plans will be part of this, as one of the key workstreams. The University of Glasgow is the lead partner for [InFrame, the Wellcome-funded Research Culture Project](#) to develop an inclusive framework for research leadership, testing a new model for creating culture change.

Going forwards, with the appointment of our new Academic Lead for Good Research Practice, there are plans to review and redefine our network of Research Integrity Champions and Advisers as "Good Practice Advisers" to focus activity on local initiatives and themes. This builds on our previous review of these roles and areas for development identified.

Our Open Research team have developed a new course on 'Working with Sensitive Data' which will be available to research students and staff soon. We have been participating in the UKRN open research project and leading on some workflows. In particular, the strand of work looking at data access statements in publications will help support research integrity and will inform how we proceed at Glasgow.

With the newly invigorated enforcement of mandatory training, our set of responses to our Staff Integrity Training has grown dramatically, with a wealth of information on local good practice and discipline-specific issues. We will continue to evaluate and improve our training offer, but also seek to analyse the responses to support our Schools with issues

raised and ideas for Research Integrity promotion. We plan to seek ethical approval to enable us to share this more widely in future. Authorship dilemmas are still a key theme from training responses - and from issues raised informally - so we are running a research project on awareness and attitudes to authorship initially in one School as a pilot. Evaluation of responses to this will enable us to consider if we widen the project and how we might adapt our communications and support for authorship. Our plans are limited by the staff resource we have available and the capacity of researchers to engage with activities. This is highlighted repeatedly in training responses: that practices and activities for Research Integrity require time, and this is often the key challenge they face.
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 the academic year 2023-2024 we ran a rolling communication campaign to promote our newly-revised Code of Good Research Practice. Each month featured a different theme such as "Authorship" or "Open Research" and we promoted key resources, held events (e.g. an Authorship Q&A) and promoted the Research Integrity Champions and Advisers network. The campaign was also useful for involving a wider group of staff in Good Research Practice communications as, for example, Sustainability was led by our "Centre for Sustainable Solutions". The archive for this is on our website and we are evaluating engagements with each theme: some events had low attendance, but sometimes this led to significant developments because we made new contacts. For example, our ongoing project on authorship developed from the webinar we ran. Communication with busy researchers is always a challenge but we were able to partner with some existing events (such as our Research Staff Assembly).

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, whistle-blowing, 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. Our Research Misconduct policy recently underwent a major review and was approved on the 6th 06 of June 2023. We review the policy annually and are currently in the process of doing this now. However, as there is a review ongoing with UKRI Concordat we are delaying the misconduct policy review until the new concordat is published to take into account any new requirements. The new misconduct policy is expected to be published on our web pages before the end of 2024. In 2023, to make our process simpler and more accessible to follow, the Research Governance and Integrity Team created a flowchart that documents the process through the policy. We made the flowchart open access. We have a variety of ways that people can report allegations of potential research misconduct that are listed on our web pages. Within each School and College we have a Research Integrity Champion and Adviser who act as a first point of contact for anyone wishing to discuss all aspects of good research practice or raise any concerns. Our inbox (research-integrity@glasgow.ac.uk) is confidential and accessed only by members of the Research Governance and Integrity Team and after approval last year, we also have a new anonymous reporting form that allows for allegations of misconduct to be made without the need for the complainant to identify themselves. This year we have seen some complex cases which have led us to review our processes for cross-departmental working e.g. when an external allegation of misconduct also contains allegations of bullying and harassment and/or other complaints etc. We are looking to form a working group to address this for the academic year 2024/25.

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				
Falsification				
Plagiarism		1	1	
Failure to meet legal, ethical and professional obligations				
Misrepresentation (eg data; involvement; interests;		1		1

qualification; and/or publication history)				
Improper dealing with allegations of misconduct				
Multiple areas of concern (when received in a single allegation)				
<i>Other*</i>				
Total:		2	1	1
*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.				
<i>[Please insert response if applicable]</i>				