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Context – the concordat

» “All those engaged with research have a duty to consider how the work they undertake, host or support impacts on the research community and on wider society”

» Published in 2012.

» Five commitments.

» One of the most downloaded documents on the UUK website.
Context – the concordat

» Single, coherent policy statement on research integrity at the national level.

» Works within existing systems and structures.

» Applicable to all academic disciplines.

» Established link between compliance with the concordat and the receipt of research funding.
Purpose of the concordat

» Essentially two fold:
  » to ensure that research produced by or in collaboration with the UK research community is underpinned by the highest standards of rigour and integrity.
  » and, critically – to demonstrate that this is the case.

» Has the concordat met these aims?
Development of the concordat

» The concordat was developed by funders, employers of researchers, government and other stakeholders.

» The concordat has benefited from the support of government (and continues to do so).

» Development was influenced by work going on elsewhere – and work has continued to develop elsewhere.

» How might the concordat develop in the future?
Research integrity inquiry

» You will already have heard from the Rt Hon Norman Lamb MP, this morning.

» Science and Technology Committee inquiry is underway, and we expect the report to be published soon.

» Clear from the oral evidence session that the committee feels more action is needed to ensure that the concordat is effectively implemented.

» UUK’s view: progress has been made towards implementation, but there is still work to do.
Progress on implementation

» Most obviously – the 2016 progress report.

» But not the only activity – a further website survey was undertaken in February 2018.

» UUK has also engaged with its members directly.
Progress on implementation

» The number of institutions which have provided at least one annual narrative statement has doubled from 26% in 2016 to 54% of the sector in 2018, accounting for just over 80% of public funding for research in the sector.

» In addition, 76 institutions are now voluntarily going beyond the commitments of the concordat by publishing information on the numbers of allegations and investigations into research misconduct, accounting for over 80% of research funding.

» The numbers of institutions providing a named contact has also nearly doubled since 2016, to 85 institutions, accounting for approximately 78% of research funding.
The extent of provision of public research integrity-related information is strongly positively correlated with the scale of research activity at each university.

For example, a university meeting the all three ‘public information commitments’ listed above receives on average 6.4 times the amount of research funding – and a university meeting any two receives 3.2 times the amount – as an institution meeting none.

How do we ensure that institutions with relatively low levels of research activity receive the support they need to meet their commitments?
## Progress on implementation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Public information element</th>
<th>Number providing (as % research funding)</th>
<th>Number not providing (as % research funding)</th>
<th>Change in numbers providing since 2016</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Dedicated webpage</td>
<td>104 (92.9%)</td>
<td>31 (5.1%)</td>
<td>+2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Statement</td>
<td>74 (81.7%)</td>
<td>63 (16.7%)</td>
<td>+38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Investigations data *</td>
<td>76 (80.5%)</td>
<td>59 (17.5%)</td>
<td>(not gathered in 2016)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Named contact</td>
<td>85 (78%)</td>
<td>50 (20%)</td>
<td>+40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contact email</td>
<td>85 (82.9%)</td>
<td>50 (15.1%)</td>
<td>+35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Separate whistleblower contact *</td>
<td>40 (28.4%)</td>
<td>95 (69.6%)</td>
<td>(not gathered in 2016)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Progress on implementation: HEFCE/Research England case study

» The former HEFCE monitored HEIs’ compliance with the concordat annually.

» Engagement with non-compliant institutions to produce and monitor progress against action plans for compliance.

» Research England has assumed responsibility for this area from the former HEFCE.
Progress on implementation

» Improvement suggests that the Concordat continues to serve as an effective stimulus for the support of research integrity in the UK.

» Awareness-raising activities of the signatories and other organisations – such as UKRIO – are having an impact.

» There’s still room for improvement.

» The sector must not be complacent.
Next steps

- UK Research Integrity Forum convened on 26 March 2018.
- Signatories have met to consider the proceedings of the Forum.
- The signatories will meet again in mid-June to consider the findings and recommendations of the Committee report.
- UUK is committed to ensuring that all UUK members meet the commitments of the concordat by the time it undertakes a further survey in early 2019.
- Organisations signed up to the concordat extend beyond UUK’s membership.
Sector level governance and reporting mandates

The three key priority areas for the signatories are:

» Clarification over the recommendations of the Concordat

» Identification of guidance and other useful resources that encourage enhancement activities

» Clarity over sector leadership for research integrity
The three key priority areas for the signatories are:

- Reemphasise the value of research integrity – which is much more than just an issue of compliance.
- Explore and encourage the use of independent panel members in investigations into misconduct.
- Pastoral support
The three key priority areas for the signatories are:

- Promote case studies of institutions that have embedded research integrity into practice.
- Inculcate a culture of research integrity over the longer term.
- Identify senior leaders within the sector who are prepared to act as champions for research integrity.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Item</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>June 2018</td>
<td>Signatories of the Concordat meet to consider the recommendations of the Committee’s report.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>September/October 2018</td>
<td>Annual statement published by the signatories of the Concordat. The statement will provide a report on progress and full response to the recommendations of the Committee report.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>October 2018</td>
<td>Consultation on draft supplementary guidance on compliance with the Concordat.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>December 2018</td>
<td>Revised guidance published, alongside a revised statement that sets out the expectations of the signatories.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>April 2019</td>
<td>Research Integrity Forum to assess progress against the Concordat.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Questions