

Annual Statement on Research Integrity 2024/25

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 Institution
1C Date approved by Governing Body	Audit Committee – October 2026 RPSC – October 2026
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. Revised comprehensively in 2023, this continues to be updated with minor changes being approved as needed by the Research Planning and Strategy Committee, most recently in January 2025. A consultation and detailed review will take place in October/November 2025 to ensure it remains fully up to date.

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.

Research Culture is a strongly established area of work and activity at the University of Glasgow. We have a central Research Culture team (part of the Researcher Development and Research Culture portfolio within the Research Services Directorate). This team supports the [Research Culture priorities, Action Plan and produces an institutional Research Culture Annual Statement](#).

We have extensive support for Open Research and publication more generally (e.g. use of CRediT) from the Research Information Management team in the University Library. 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 is nearly complete (final approval pending in October 2025): this has been updated to reflect changes in legislation and practice. Further actions and resource for Ethics are also currently under consideration following the policy update.

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, now renamed “Good Research Practice (GRP) 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, other ad hoc events and Research Culture community channels. Research Integrity is a Research Culture priority area and has therefore been part of the university-wide consultation which has just started to refresh the multi-year Research Culture Action Plan.

Our staff training is also a key way for us to learn best practice and engage further at a disciplinary level. Our GRP 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 attended the UKRIO roundtable discussions and took part in the UKRIO Authorship project (2025), contributing feedback and ideas to the development of their new toolkit for enhancing authorship support. We are also contributing to the RAND Europe study on addressing research misconduct in the UK and are partners on a funded project in 2025-2026 looking at support for those involved in Research Misconduct cases

Culture, development and leadership

Our activities for Research Culture, Open Research and Research Integrity are reviewed and discussed at the Research Planning and Strategy Committee (RPSC), chaired by our Vice-Principal (Research and Knowledge Exchange). The [Lab for Academic Culture](#) co-chaired by the Vice-Principal (Research and Knowledge Exchange) and the Head of Researcher Development and Research Culture acts as a challenge group to support and shape Research Culture work across the university.

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](#). We are currently consulting on an updated Research Culture Action Plan.

Monitoring and reporting

We monitor the activities of our GRP Champions and Advisers through a logbook system which is collated annually in August, recording issues raised and local activities. Beginning this academic year (2025-26) these will be submitted annually to CMG's and will be a formal record of the work undertaken by the Network.

We also report on our research integrity training courses internally to the Research Planning & Strategy Committee and the Early Career Development Programme (ECDP) Subgroup. 553 staff completed our staff research integrity training course in the academic year 2024-25 (status on 1 September 2025). This was a decrease compared to the previous academic year, where we had an unusually large uptake in our training as a result of stronger monitoring of all mandatory training for staff. Since the course was made available in 2020, 3302 current staff have completed the course.

Integrity training is mandatory for PGRs in their first year and 649 completed our PGR Training Course in 2024-2025: this is checked in the student's annual progress review. In 2024-2025, with the data available we calculate the completion rate was 63% of students

where the training is mandatory – we continue to improve reporting data and completion targets next year. Overall, 3083 of enrolled PGRs have completed Research Integrity training at the university since 2021.

In 2024-2025 a standing report to the university's Research Planning and Strategy Committee detailed developments for Research Culture, Open Research and Research Integrity. The Research Governance and Integrity team also review quarterly the misconduct cases and informal queries 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.

PGR Integrity Training

In 2024-25, we renewed our focus on the PGR research integrity webinar series. We invited guests from across the university to host talks and discussions, allowing PGRs to learn more about some of the key themes that we cover in the mandatory PGR research integrity training course. To close the series, our Library colleagues also provided an in-person session on reproducibility with Lego, which provided another forum for PGRs to meet and collaborate with peers. A key part of this work was learning from the sessions – we reviewed the feedback from PGRs (all attendees need to rate the sessions, with optional feedback) and this has informed our planning for the next series in 2025-2026. On average PGRs rated the webinars 4.7 / 5 for satisfaction.

Due to changes in internal data management systems, we re-focussed on PGR training completion report data improvements, exploring the current reporting options for our PGR research integrity course to improve the granularity and accuracy of the data. The university introduced a new dashboard with live data of the PGR student population that gave us access to data that was previously unavailable.

Staff Integrity Training

We carried out a substantial evaluation of our staff research integrity training provision in 2024-2025 to check that our course was fit for purpose and to identify improvements. We found that the UKCORI Research Integrity indicators report was a valuable reference point, using criteria they recommend for the evaluation framework. The evaluation provided a range of benefits: it gave us robust evidence that staff value our course, that it aligns with university strategy and policy, and that it is meeting its objectives. In our dataset of staff comments about the course, 79% were positive, 10% were negative and 11% were mixed (positive and negative, or positive and a suggestion). We have created an implementation plan to identify priorities for the course development over the next year. The study included looking at the accessibility of the course, and we consulted a specialist in e-learning platforms as part of this.

The evaluation also generated a range of examples where staff had taken (or were planning to take) positive action as a result of the course. These are highly useful and we can draw on these as examples to showcase how research integrity can be strengthened by relatively small measures that can still have an impact locally. We are also exploring the potential for these results to be used more widely to support Research Culture work at the university.

For further training development, we are working on supporting our Good Research Practice network with local activities to promote research integrity. This aligns with the recent changes to the role profile of the GRP champions and advisers. Advice on using GenAI with integrity was one area that will need regular attention and updates to our training materials to reflect current policy and recommendations in the sector.

Authorship

We maintain our guidance on good Authorship practice and share this with the sector on the EdShare repository (<https://edshare.gla.ac.uk/1599/>)

In order to develop our understanding of authorship practice and issues, we partnered with an academic to devise a pilot survey-based project which would look at the following in their particular School:

- Awareness of University authorship guidelines and ICMJE criteria
- Experience of authorship criteria applications
- Perceptions of adherence to the guidelines in the School/University
- Barriers to reporting issues with authorship
- Personal views and experiences on Authorship culture (open questions)

Results illustrated areas of concern and improvement: to take this forward we will be presenting at an all- School meeting and to the School's Senior Management Group in order to co-create solutions to trial and evaluate. The intention is to re-run the survey in 2 years' time to evaluate success. We will consider re-running the survey elsewhere within the University.

Funder Notifications

Since 2018 a growing number of funders have introduced new policies relating to Bullying and Harassment and/or Trusted Research/Research Misconduct which form part of their Grants Conditions. These new policies differ in requirements, but in general, they all require Research Organisations to inform the funders if an individual involved in any of their research projects, applying for funding or otherwise playing a role for the funder, has an active investigation or sanction against them relating to allegations of bullying and harassment, or research misconduct. At the end of 2024 we developed a policy in collaboration with our four College Research Support Offices and People and Organisational Development to ensure we were compliant with the complexity of these funder requests. This policy was completed and took effect in February 2025

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.

Research Culture activities have been given a significant boost by the £3m [InFrame project](#) award from Wellcome. This project launched in September 2024, led by the University of

Glasgow with the University of Edinburgh and University of St Andrews. The project aims to create a new framework for research leadership, address the paucity of systematic knowledge on how collegiality can be fostered, recognised and rewarded. It also aims to expand the definition of who can be viewed as a research leader to a wider set of role types, and individuals in the research ecosystem. Five Research Culture projects led by the University of Glasgow have been funded for 2025-2026 by InFrame.

We have continued to develop our alignment of Research Misconduct and allegations of bullying and harassment. We are now reviewing our internal processes to see where improvements and efficiencies can be made, particularly around communication and information for those involved.

In June 2025 we joined the RAND EUROPE study on addressing research misconduct in the UK. This is a UKCORI funded project and involves interviews and focus groups designed to reflect on misconduct in the UK with a goal to improve policy, support and guidance in this area of research integrity. The project is currently ongoing with a timeline set for the final report to be available on UKCORI's website in November 2025.

Significant activity is still underway for Research Ethics with an updated policy imminent and requirements on local ethics committees for standard operating procedures and consistency across terms of reference. There will also be enhanced internal reporting through use of a new template for review by the central University Ethics Committee. A new internal Ethics committee was launched in 2025 to provide a dedicated approval route for the [Scholarship of Learning and Teaching Ethics Applications](#).

Within the University's Research Governance and Integrity team, Research Integrity work has been structured into six workstreams to enable better reporting and tracking. These are: Research Misconduct, Staff RI Training, PGR RI Training, Policy and Process, Good Research Practice and Research Culture. Our current year has projects defined under these workstreams.

As mentioned in the previous year, our plans are limited by staff resource and the capacity of researchers to engage with activities. This is highlighted in our integrity training responses: that promoting and championing Research Integrity requires time and this is a significant challenge for researchers everywhere.

PGR Training

We are developing robust systems for reporting on the PGR completions centrally and we share this with our College Graduate Schools so that they have access to the current data for their local student population.

Staff Training

We continue to benefit from the reflective responses to our staff research integrity training course which have a wealth of considerations and good practice that is discipline-specific. We are exploring options for analysing the training form data from the course, trialling a process and implementing ethical approval / consent. The goal would be to create a local report for the GRP Advisers at the School level, where they could benefit from seeing examples of best practice happening locally and any issues mentioned in the responses.

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.

Evaluation of Research Integrity training (mentioned above in Section 2B) is a common theme for many institutions. Whilst our training has a distinctive format (online self-paced resources, completed via the submission of short reflective responses which we review), we have shared some resources for the sector.

In the planning phase of our evaluation, we developed a set of question that we wished to address and then mapped these to the recommendation in UKCORI's report on Research Integrity indicators, specifically indicator 7: to evaluate research integrity training based on 4 criteria: appropriateness, quality, impact and accessibility. We also reference the Kirkpatrick model for training evaluation. Our evaluation questions are available via the EdShare repository (<https://edshare.gla.ac.uk/3085/>).

The data we used for the evaluation came partly from our training response set which captured a rich set of responses at the moment of completing the training. In particular, with reference to Kirkpatrick's model for training evaluation, this gave us data on reaction, learning and behaviour change (for example, some stated they had already shared resources or implemented ideas from the course). We also had anonymous course feedback and further consultation was undertaken with our Research Planning & Strategy Committee and members of our Good Research Practice Network.

In the analysis phase, we applied a simple coding scheme referencing the evaluation questions. This helped us to categorise the comments in our large dataset of feedback from staff and identify main themes and sub-themes, categorised under "Appropriateness", "Format", "Quality", "Impact", "Accessibility" and "unexpected themes". Our coding scheme that we used is available in our EdShare repository (<https://edshare.gla.ac.uk/3086/>).

In our dataset of staff comments about the course, 79% were positive, 10% were negative and 11% were mixed (positive and negative, or positive and a suggestion). We were able to extract key themes and present these via a summary report to the Research Planning & Strategy Committee who commended the training as a positive asset and meeting the needs of the university's ambitions for Research Integrity. We will be developing our skills and method for future evaluations and seeking to learn from best practice in this area.

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.

The University of Glasgow remains committed to ensuring that our standards of research practice remain high and that when standards fall short, we have robust, fair and transparent processes in place to address these.

As a large research institution, we have several options for our staff and students to disclose problematic issues. We have an online reporting system for instances of bullying and harassment where those requiring support are paired with a [respect adviser](#) who can signpost to places that can help resolve the issue while also providing pastoral support. Informal and formal procedure for addressing concerns of bullying and harassment can be found in our [dignity at work policy](#).

Within the research integrity space, we have a network of [GRP Champions and Advisers](#) who serve as a first point of contact for anyone wishing to discuss any issues involving research misconduct. They also help to promote areas of good research practice throughout the year. [Our webpages](#) keep updated information with contact information for them.

Our inbox (research-integrity@glasgow.ac.uk) is confidential and accessed only by members of the Research Governance and Integrity Team. We also have an [anonymous reporting form](#) that allows for allegations of misconduct to be made without the need for the complainant to identify themselves.

Currently our integrity inbox remains the most popular way for individuals to report issues to us.

Our Research Misconduct Policy is reviewed annually with the next review commencing in October 2025. This review will consider the new Concordat to Support Research Integrity, language that is used in the policy, and lessons learnt from this year's cases. We will be reviewing each stage of the process to ensure that it is fit for purpose in terms of efficiency and rigour, and we will then develop supporting documents to ensure clarity on the process for those involved at each stage.

In order to ensure we are compliant with the Concordat to Support Research Integrity and to help facilitate investigations, this year we have been developing training for panel members and investigators. The training will explain process and outcomes: it will shortly be piloted for 2025-2026.

In terms of case work, this year we have seen more and increasingly complex cases involving multiple strands of complaint. Working through these complexities we have discovered areas where we can improve both our policies and processes. We have also seen an increase in both retaliatory complaints and counter complaints. Review of the mechanisms for dealing with such issues will also be addressed through the development plans for 2025-2026.

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	0		
Falsification	2	2	0	0
Plagiarism	4	1	0	1
Failure to meet legal, ethical and professional obligations	1	0	0	0
Misrepresentation (eg data; involvement; interests; qualification; and/or publication history)	4	0	0	0
Improper dealing with allegations of misconduct				
Multiple areas of concern (when received in a single allegation)	2	2	Ongoing	Ongoing
Other*				
Total:	14	5	0	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.**

[Please insert response if applicable]