



RESEARCH INTEGRITY OFFICE

Promoting integrity and high ethical standards in research  
Providing confidential, independent and expert support

# Self-Assessment Tool for the Concordat to Support Research Integrity

**Version No.:** 3.0

**Publication Date:** 29/07/2025

**DOI:** <https://doi.org/10.37672/UKRIO.2025.07.self-assessment>

# Table of Contents

Introduction .....	1
Footnote to the third edition .....	4
Principles of research integrity .....	6
Five themes of the Concordat .....	8
Self-assessment questions: policies and systems.....	10
Self-assessment questions: communication .....	28
Self-assessment questions: culture, environment and leadership .....	35
Self-assessment questions: addressing breaches of research integrity .....	51
Self-assessment questions: monitoring and reporting .....	65
Annual research integrity statements: suggested content .....	71
Acknowledgements.....	79
Further reading .....	81

# Introduction

---

## Aim

This self-assessment tool has been developed to help organisations identify areas of their research practices, systems and policies, researcher development and monitoring that may need to be revised in order to adhere to the requirements and recommendations of The Concordat to Support Research Integrity (2025). While the Concordat addresses four key stakeholders involved with research – researchers and research-enabling staff, employers and funders – this self-assessment tool focuses on the responsibilities of organisations that employ researchers and research-enabling staff.

All involved in research must meet the highest standards of good practice and ethical conduct. Research integrity is an inherent part of professional conduct. It goes beyond meeting regulatory and contractual requirements. The Concordat recognises this and was not created to encourage a ‘tick box’ approach to these issues. Accordingly, UKRIO believes strongly that individual and organisational responses to the Concordat should not focus solely on fulfilling statutory, contractual and other obligations. While these obligations must be met, the aim should be the broader implementation of the Concordat and its overarching Commitments.

This self-assessment tool will allow organisations to consider how they might carry out such a broad

implementation, building on their existing activities, in order to fulfil the Concordat’s aim of improving research integrity and to meet the specific organisational responsibilities listed within each of its Commitments. Particular attention has been paid to areas where UKRIO has most often been approached for guidance, in the hope of passing on lessons learned to the research community.

Use of the self-assessment tool will not only help with the implementation of the Concordat but also enhance an organisation’s overall approach to research integrity and help ensure that important issues have not been overlooked.

## Thematic approach

The Concordat sets out five high-level commitments which all involved in research must meet. This document identifies five key themes which cut across those commitments. Taking each of these key themes in turn, this document poses self-assessment questions for organisations, each mapped onto one or more commitments of the Concordat (summarised in the next section). For each question, this document also introduces practical ways in which they might be met under the heading ‘possible evidence’.

This approach groups related issues together, allowing a focus on strong recommendations and broad areas for action. It also reduces duplication, as there is a degree of overlap between the broad commitments of the Concordat.

### Advisory, not prescriptive

A national, high-level framework such as the Concordat must be implemented with regard to local research environments and conditions. Our aim is not to suggest a 'one size fits all' approach or to prescribe inflexible solutions. Rather, we hope that this self-assessment tool will help organisations consider how the revised Concordat can best be implemented in their particular settings, and how it might be used to promote and sustain research integrity.

### An opportunity for review and reflection

The Concordat was developed to sustain and enhance the integrity of UK research in the long term, and to make current organisational assurance more visible. The 2012, 2019 and 2025 editions build upon existing standards and guidance for research practice and, consequently, much of what the Concordat says may appear familiar. However, organisations should not assume that they are already adhering to its commitments.

Not only does the revised 2025 Concordat contain new requirements and expectations, but UKRIO has observed that there can often be gaps in existing organisational provisions for research integrity. Organisations might fall short of meeting certain standards or lack information on

whether all their provisions are effective. In our experience, a strong professional ethos drives most research in the UK, but it is important to sustain and improve this. The research community must work together to safeguard and enhance good research practice in the long term, support a healthy research culture, and correct systemic problems and negative incentives.

Organisations must satisfy themselves that their existing measures are effective. The Concordat also provides organisations with an opportunity to consider how these measures might be built upon, to ensure a more visible and joined-up approach to supporting research integrity.

Safeguarding and enhancing research integrity is a process, especially when addressing matters such as strategic and operational leadership and ensuring a healthy research culture. Even organisations with a longstanding and comprehensive approach to research integrity can benefit from reflecting periodically on what they do and how it can be improved.

### Annual statement

The final commitment of the 2025 Concordat requires that organisations make an annual statement on research integrity to their governing body. It also requires that this statement be made public.

The final section of this Self-Assessment Tool (also available as a [standalone document](#)) discusses what might be included in the annual statement. It is intended as a guide to inform the content and drafting of an annual statement – supplementing

the annual statement reporting template which UKRIO produced for the Research Integrity Concordat Signatories (RICS) Group – rather than instructions that ‘must’ be followed.

### A ‘living document’

As organisations develop their research practices to implement the Concordat, and funding bodies develop processes to assess the extent to which organisations have engaged with the Concordat and implemented its requirements, we expect this self-assessment tool to evolve. The intent is that it will be a ‘living document’, subject to periodic review and revision to reflect: emerging best practice in this area; any updates made to the Concordat and other activities by the RICS Group; new initiatives relating to research integrity and research culture; and wider changes to the way research is conducted, for example as a result of emerging technologies. UKRIO welcomes feedback on the content and use of this document.

Please submit any comments or suggestions via our website [www.ukrio.org](http://www.ukrio.org).

# Footnote to the third edition

## 2025 refresh of the Concordat

In April 2025, the RICS Group published a refreshed edition of [The Concordat to Support Research Integrity](#). The Concordat is periodically updated to ensure it remains relevant and effective in addressing emerging challenges in research integrity. Revisions reflect developments in the research landscape, align with policy and regulatory changes, enhance clarity, and incorporate feedback from the research community. The last revision took place in 2019.

## What's new in the 2025 Concordat?

UKRIO has published a [briefing document](#) providing a practical overview of the changes introduced in the 2025 Concordat. This resource:

- Outlines the key updates.
- Compares the 2025 edition with the 2019 version.
- Helps readers to quickly identify how the document has evolved and what new requirements have been introduced.

Given the Concordat's role in setting out the UK's principles for research integrity and in shaping the terms and conditions of many research grants, it is essential that researchers and organisations familiarise themselves with these changes.

Organisations have until April 2026 to meet the expectations of the 2025 Concordat, but they should continue

adhering to the 2019 edition in the meantime.

## Implementation of the Concordat

UKRIO remains committed to supporting the research community in implementing the updated Concordat. This guidance, including this updated Self-Assessment Tool, is intended to help organisations and researchers navigate these changes.

We encourage readers to review our briefing note (see above) for a summary of the key updates and compliance requirements.

If you have any questions about your responsibilities under the revised Concordat, please contact us at [info@ukrio.org](mailto:info@ukrio.org).

Our charity holds an Observer role on the RICS Group, and the updated Concordat was developed with our input. We will continue to work with the signatories of the Concordat to help implement its requirements and provide feedback to inform its future development.

## UK Committee on Research Integrity: Indicators of Research Integrity

In 2024, the UK Committee on Research Integrity (UK CORI) published its report entitled '[Indicators of Research Integrity](#)' proposing a set of 16 potential indicators that can be used by Higher Education Institutions to understand and support research

integrity, though in UKRIO's view they are also relevant for other types of research organisation. These priority indicators have also been incorporated into the development of the revised Self-Assessment Tool.

### A revised Self-Assessment Tool

This third edition of UKRIO's Self-Assessment Tool for The Concordat to Support Research Integrity provides guidance for the implementation of the refreshed 2025 Concordat to Support Research Integrity, taking as a starting point the previous two editions of this Self-Assessment Tool (2014 and 2019).

This new edition of the Self-Assessment Tool includes [updated self-assessment tables](#), reflecting the new content and requirements of the 2025 edition of the Concordat. It also contains [in-depth discussion](#) of the possible content of organisational annual research integrity statements, in line with Commitment 5 of the Concordat and the associated annual statement reporting template.

If you would like our support in meeting the requirements of the revised Concordat and embedding its Commitments in the systems and practices of your research or your organisation [please contact us](#).

### An independent perspective

**Please note** that this self-assessment tool was developed independently by UKRIO. It does not necessarily represent the views of the RICS Group or other persons or organisations involved in its development, nor is it endorsed or warranted by them and/or their employers.

# Principles of research integrity

To inform the use of this Self-Assessment Tool, below we reproduce the **principles of research** integrity set out in Commitment 1 of the Concordat (2025 edition) with a comparison to the principles of the 2019 edition.

New or significantly changed text is listed in **red**, minor textual changes or edits have not been marked. If a requirement from the 2019 edition does not feature in the 2025 edition, it has been shown in ~~grey-strikethrough~~. For further information on how the 2025 Concordat differs from the previous edition, please see this [UKRIO briefing document](#).

2025 edition	2019 edition
<b>Research integrity:</b> Research has integrity when it's carried out according to the principles of the Concordat, and in a way that is trustworthy, ethical, and responsible.	<b>Research integrity:</b> There is no universal definition of research integrity. This concordat identifies five core elements of research integrity, and these are described under Commitment 1. The Singapore Statement on Research Integrity (2010), referenced within this Concordat, provides a further definition. In addition, the UKRIO has set out principles of research integrity in its Code of Practice (UKRIO, 2009).
<b>Honesty</b> is crucial, from the presentation of research ideas and goals, through to authorship and financial contributions, and on to findings. Examples include honesty in reporting research methods and procedures; gathering data and information; referencing work; representing and acknowledging the work of others; conveying interpretations; and making justifiable claims based on research findings.	<b>Honesty</b> in all aspects of research, including in the presentation of research goals, intentions and findings; in reporting on research methods and procedures; in gathering data; in using and acknowledging the work of other researchers; and in conveying valid interpretations and making justifiable claims based on research findings.
<b>Rigour</b> is demonstrated by behaviour that is in line with prevailing disciplinary norms and standards, including the use of appropriate methods. It may be evidenced through adherence to procedures, standards of practice and agreed protocols, as appropriate, and is	<b>Rigour</b> , in line with prevailing disciplinary norms and standards, and in performing research and using appropriate methods; in adhering to an agreed protocol where appropriate; in drawing interpretations and



<p>expected when drawing interpretations and conclusions from research, including when communicating findings. <b>The integrity of the research record should be protected through secure and rigorous approaches.</b></p>	<p>conclusions from the research; and in communicating the results.</p>
<p><b>Transparency and open communication</b> provide the foundation for the actions taken when conducting or communicating about research. Examples may include declaring potential competing interests; reporting research data collection methods; <b>acknowledging the use of tools such as emerging technologies</b>; analysing and interpreting data; and publishing or otherwise sharing findings. <b>This may include appropriate open research practices. It permits humility in the process, acknowledging errors committed in good faith and ensuring honest mistakes are seen as productive elements of research.</b></p>	<p><b>Transparency and open communication</b> in declaring potential competing interests; in the reporting of research data collection methods; in the analysis and interpretation of data; in making research findings widely available, which includes <del>publishing or otherwise sharing negative or null results to recognise their value as part of the research process</del>; and in presenting the work to other researchers and to the public.</p>
<p><b>Care and respect</b> are expected for everyone and everything involved in the research system, and for the protection of the integrity of the research record. They should be extended to everyone involved in the research process, all participants in research, and for the subjects, users and beneficiaries of research, including humans, animals, the environment and cultural objects. Those engaged with research must also show care and respect for the integrity of the research record.</p>	<p><b>Care and respect</b> for all participants in research, and for the subjects, users and beneficiaries of research, including humans, animals, the environment and cultural objects. Those engaged with research must also show care and respect for the integrity of the research record.</p>
<p><b>Accountability</b> is expected of everyone individually and collectively to create a research environment in which <b>diverse</b> individuals and organisations are empowered and enabled to own the research process <b>and be accountable for their contributions to the research record. This includes being accountable to participants involved in research</b>, and a responsibility to hold individuals and organisations to account when behaviour falls short of the standards set by the Concordat.</p>	<p><b>Accountability</b> of funders, employers and researchers to collectively create a research environment in which individuals and organisations are empowered and enabled to own the research process. Those engaged with research must also ensure that individuals and organisations are held to account when behaviour falls short of the standards set by this concordat.</p>

# Five themes of the Concordat

This document identifies five key themes, colour-coded in the tables that follow, which cut across the commitments of the Concordat, grouping related issues together and allowing a focus on strong recommendations and broad areas for action.

The five key themes we have identified in the Concordat are:

1. Policies and systems
2. Communication
3. Culture, environment and leadership
4. Addressing breaches of research integrity (including questionable research practices)
5. Monitoring and reporting

Taking each of these key themes in turn, this document poses self-assessment questions for commitments of the Concordat. For each question, the document also introduces practical ways in which they might be met under the heading ‘possible evidence.’

It should also be noted that the ‘possible evidence’ is for use by organisations as part of the self-assessment process. It is **not** suggested that this level of information must be collated and provided to external bodies. Rather, it can be used to inform organisational statements on the implementation of the Concordat and, indeed, other internal and external requirements for assurance about research integrity.

## Summary of the Concordat's five commitments (2025 edition)

1. **Maintaining the highest standards of research integrity – the principles:** Responsible research practice is grounded in high standards of integrity in all aspects and fields of research, from ideation through to publication and public engagement. The UK recognises five key principles necessary to maintain the highest standards of research integrity.
2. **Maintaining the highest standards of research integrity – expectations and compliance:** Research should be conducted according to appropriate ethical, legal, regulatory and professional frameworks, obligations, and standards.
3. **Embedding a culture of research integrity:** Creating the conditions, grounded in the principles of research integrity, for individuals and organisations to engage in research responsibly supports the maturing of a positive research culture and environment.
4. **Questionable research practices and potential research misconduct:** ...the quality of the research environment and robustness of the research record also depend on the effective management of questionable research practices when they occur. This requires a commitment to continuous reflection, learning, and improvement to support the research system to drive positive change.
5. **Accountability and continuous improvement in research integrity:** Upholding, rewarding, and continuously improving responsible research practice is a collective endeavour.

# Self-assessment questions: policies and systems

Relevant Commitment(s)	Self-assessment questions	Possible evidence
<b>1. Maintaining the highest standards of research integrity – the principles</b> <b>2. Maintaining the highest standards of research integrity – expectations and compliance</b> <b>4. Questionable research practices and potential research misconduct</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Do you have an organisational policy or statement for research integrity?</li> <li>How regularly is this updated?</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Relevant policy or policies (including when these were last updated).</li> <li>Publicly accessible web link to policy or policies.</li> </ul>
<b>1. Maintaining the highest standards of research integrity – the principles</b> <b>2. Maintaining the highest standards of research integrity – expectations and compliance</b> <b>4. Questionable research practices and potential research misconduct</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Do the research integrity policy and other related policies include: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Principles which describe the values and responsibilities relevant to research?</li> <li>Standards required for the conduct of research, also known as accepted or ‘good’ practice?</li> </ul> </li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Relevant sections of research integrity policy or related policies.</li> </ul>

Relevant Commitment(s)	Self-assessment questions	Possible evidence
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ A definition of research misconduct and all other unacceptable research practices?</li> </ul>	
<p><b>1. Maintaining the highest standards of research integrity – the principles</b></p> <p><b>2. Maintaining the highest standards of research integrity – expectations and compliance</b></p> <p><b>4. Questionable research practices and potential research misconduct</b></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Does the research integrity policy or statement:             <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Apply to anyone conducting research under the auspices of the organisation? For example: research students, employees, independent contractors and consultants, visiting or emeritus staff, staff on joint clinical or honorary contracts, or anyone conducting research using organisational facilities, funding or on organisational premises?</li> <li>○ Apply to all research projects conducted under the auspices of your organisation, regardless of whether they are externally funded or not (e.g. student research or non-</li> </ul> </li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Relevant provisions in research integrity policy or statement or related policies.</li> </ul>

Relevant Commitment(s)	Self-assessment questions	Possible evidence
	<p>externally funded research by staff)?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ If not, what provisions or arrangements cover any research that falls outside of the policy?</li> </ul>	
<p><b>1. Maintaining the highest standards of research integrity – the principles</b></p> <p><b>2. Maintaining the highest standards of research integrity – expectations and compliance</b></p> <p><b>4. Questionable research practices and potential research misconduct</b></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• How applicable is the research integrity policy or statement to all disciplines of research? Is it sensitive to different disciplinary norms?</li> <li>• Does the research integrity policy make it clear that its principles and standards apply to all stages of a research project, from beginning to end?</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Relevant provisions in research integrity policy or statement.</li> <li>• Sources of advice, training and resources available to researchers.</li> </ul>
<p><b>1. Maintaining the highest standards of research integrity – the principles</b></p> <p><b>2. Maintaining the highest standards of research integrity – expectations and compliance</b></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Does your research integrity policy (or related policies) address the following broad areas (where relevant to your organisation)? <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Research involving human participants, human tissue or remains, or personal data, including</li> </ul> </li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Relevant provisions in research integrity policy or related policies/ guidance or related templates (for example, consent forms).</li> <li>• Sources of advice, training and resources available to researchers.</li> </ul>

Relevant Commitment(s)	Self-assessment questions	Possible evidence
<b>4. Questionable research practices and potential research misconduct</b>	<p>provisions for vulnerable participants.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>o Clinical trials, including medicinal and device trials that fall under UK and EU legislation.</li> <li>o Other types of health and social care research.</li> <li>o Research involving animal subjects/ animal materials, both those are covered by UK legislation and those which are not covered.</li> <li>o Data management and protection.</li> <li>o Off-site and lone working.</li> <li>o Research outside the UK.</li> <li>o Internet-mediated research, including research involving social media platforms.</li> <li>o Research involving the use of artificial intelligence.</li> </ul>	

Relevant Commitment(s)	Self-assessment questions	Possible evidence
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Environmental protection.</li> <li>Research involving cultural objects.</li> <li>Conflicts of interest/ competing interests (including an organisational due diligence process).</li> <li>Signposting to the internal and external ethical review requirements.</li> <li>Publication and authorship.</li> <li>Open research.</li> <li>Research misconduct: reporting and investigation.</li> <li>Reproducibility.</li> </ul>	
<p><b>1. Maintaining the highest standards of research integrity – the principles</b></p> <p><b>2. Maintaining the highest standards of research</b></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Do your research integrity policy and related policies (e.g. policy for ethical approval, procedure for investigating breaches of research integrity) set out:</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Relevant provisions in research integrity policy and other policies/ guidance.</li> <li>Sources of advice, training and resources available to researchers.</li> </ul>



Relevant Commitment(s)	Self-assessment questions	Possible evidence
<b>integrity – expectations and compliance</b> <b>4. Questionable research practices and potential research misconduct</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Acceptable conduct for research involving: human participants; human tissue, material or remains; personal data, animal research subjects and animal materials; and any other types of research as required by your organisation?</li> <li>○ What conduct is unacceptable in the above types of research, taking into account the definition of research misconduct in the 2025 Concordat?</li> </ul>	
<b>1. Maintaining the highest standards of research integrity – the principles</b> <b>3. Embedding a culture of research integrity</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Does your organisation have policies/ guidance on issues which can affect research integrity? For example: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Bullying and harassment, safeguarding and other student/ staff welfare issues.</li> <li>○ Collaborative (+/- international) research.</li> </ul> </li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Relevant policies/ guidance and/ or information on how research integrity is addressed in these areas by other means.</li> <li>• Publicly accessible web link to policies/ guidance where they exist.</li> <li>• Sources of advice, training and resources available to researchers.</li> </ul>

Relevant Commitment(s)	Self-assessment questions	Possible evidence
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Data protection and security for collection, retention and sharing of (sensitive) data.</li> <li>○ Environmental impact of research and sustainability.</li> <li>○ Equality, diversity and inclusion.</li> <li>○ Financial management and due diligence in relation to research projects.</li> <li>○ Incentives in research.</li> <li>○ Intellectual property.</li> <li>○ Mentoring.</li> <li>○ Open research.</li> <li>○ Peer review (grants and project proposals or publications).</li> <li>○ Possible future use and dual use.</li> <li>○ Public engagement and impact, recognising the value of presenting</li> </ul>	

Relevant Commitment(s)	Self-assessment questions	Possible evidence
	<p>work to other researchers and to the public?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Publication and authorship, including improper practices in dissemination (e.g. authorship disputes, predatory journals, image manipulation).</li> <li>○ Recognising the value of dissemination of all results (to include publishing or otherwise sharing negative or null results)?</li> <li>○ Research assessment.</li> <li>○ Researcher recruitment, development, assessment and promotion.</li> <li>○ Research design.</li> <li>○ Risk management processes, e.g. health and safety.</li> <li>○ Societal impact of research.</li> </ul>	

Relevant Commitment(s)	Self-assessment questions	Possible evidence
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Workload models for research and other staff (including research ethics or integrity committee members, or research integrity champions)</li> </ul>	
<b>2. Maintaining the highest standards of research integrity – expectations and compliance</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Do you have a policy and system for the ethical review and approval of research projects?</li> <li>Are your policies on ethical review and approval available to all researchers?</li> <li>Are researchers given support relating to ethics, legal and professional requirements?</li> <li>Do your policies on ethical review and approval apply to:               <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Anyone conducting research under the auspices of the organisation, including but not limited to: research students; employees; independent contractors and consultants; visiting or emeritus staff; staff on joint clinical or</li> </ul> </li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Policy for ethical approval and associated systems.</li> <li>Publicly accessible web link to policy.</li> <li>Relevant provisions in ethics policy.</li> <li>Description of the organisation's system for seeking ethical approval.</li> <li>Ethics policy includes information on relevant external systems for ethical review and when they apply. For example, NHS and social care.</li> <li>Structure and remit of organisational ethics committees.</li> <li>Sources of advice, training and resources available to researchers.</li> </ul>

Relevant Commitment(s)	Self-assessment questions	Possible evidence
	<p>honorary contracts; or anyone conducting research using organisational facilities, funding or on organisational premises?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Research involving: human participants; human tissue, material or remains; personal data, animal research subjects; and any other types of research as required by your organisation (i.e. that might not involve humans or animals)?</li> </ul> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Do your policies on ethical review and approval apply to undergraduate research? If so, what provisions exist to ensure that the process is proportionate? <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ How do you ensure that ethical issues are appropriately considered in undergraduate research projects?</li> </ul> </li> <li>• Do your policies on ethical review and approval set out:</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Research Ethics Committee members training.</li> </ul>

Relevant Commitment(s)	Self-assessment questions	Possible evidence
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Principles underpinning the ethical conduct of research? For example: autonomy, beneficence, confidentiality, integrity and non-maleficence.</li> <li>A process for the objective and rigorous ethical review of research which falls within the scope of the ethics policy?</li> <li>Principles which inform that review process? For example: competence, facilitation, independence and openness.</li> <li>The various approaches to ethical review which are in use at your organisation and when they are relevant to a research project? For example, university ethics approval, NHS or social care settings, prison and probation, research involving vulnerable populations or</li> </ul>	

Relevant Commitment(s)	Self-assessment questions	Possible evidence
	<p>requirements for international research.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ An overview of your organisation's ethics committees and their relationship?</li> <li>○ Sources of help and training available to researchers?</li> <li>○ Appeals process?</li> <li>○ Annual reporting and review?</li> <li>● Do your policies on ethical review and approval take account of the requirements of different external bodies, depending on the discipline of research in question?</li> </ul>	
<b>2. Maintaining the highest standards of research integrity – expectations and compliance</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● Does your organisation have specific policies or guidance on: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Studies that require a review under the HRA <i>Governance Arrangements for Research Ethics Committees</i> (GAfREC) (e.g. human</li> </ul> </li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● Relevant policies or guidance.</li> <li>● Publicly accessible web link to policies/ guidance.</li> </ul>

Relevant Commitment(s)	Self-assessment questions	Possible evidence
	<p>clinical trials or research involving human tissue)?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Other health and social care research?</li> <li>Research involving animal subjects and animal materials, including implementation of the '3Rs' – Replacement, Reduction and Refinement; PREPARE (Planning Research and Experimental Procedures on Animals: Recommendations for Excellence); ARRIVE (Animal Research: Reporting of In Vivo Experiments) guidelines?</li> </ul>	
<p><b>1. Maintaining the highest standards of research integrity – the principles</b></p> <p><b>4. Questionable research practices and potential research misconduct</b></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Has your organisation considered whether guidance on research integrity is needed for research-related areas such as service evaluation, consultancy and knowledge exchange/ transfer?</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Relevant policies and/ or information on how research integrity is addressed in these areas by other means. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>For example, responsible consultancy and innovation, ethical licensing, review of funding sources.</li> </ul> </li> </ul>



Relevant Commitment(s)	Self-assessment questions	Possible evidence
<p><b>1. Maintaining the highest standards of research integrity – the principles</b></p> <p><b>2. Maintaining the highest standards of research integrity – expectations and compliance</b></p> <p><b>3. Embedding a culture of research integrity</b></p> <p><b>4. Questionable research practices and potential research misconduct</b></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• How do you ensure that your various policies on research integrity and related issues cross-reference each other?</li> <li>• Do they contain consistent expectations and avoid contradicting each other?</li> <li>• How do they fit in with student regulations? Are they consistent, and do policies and regulations use the same definitions for expected standards and unacceptable behaviours? Are they aligned with what is expected by the Office of the Independent Adjudicator and the Office for Students?</li> <li>• Are your policies on research integrity consistent with other organisational policies such as a whistleblowing policy?</li> <li>• Are your research integrity policy and related policies recognised in the organisation's research strategy?</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Relevant cross-referencing in research integrity policy and other policies/ guidance.</li> <li>• Wording checked during design and revision of policies to ensure clarity and avoid contradictions.</li> <li>• Relevant cross-referencing and recognition in organisational research strategy.</li> </ul>
<p><b>1. Maintaining the highest standards of research integrity – the principles</b></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Have you reviewed your policies and systems against external standards and guidance? For example:</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Information on how policies were developed and how they will be reviewed.</li> </ul>

Relevant Commitment(s)	Self-assessment questions	Possible evidence
<p><b>2. Maintaining the highest standards of research integrity – expectations and compliance</b></p> <p><b>3. Embedding a culture of research integrity</b></p> <p><b>4. Questionable research practices and potential research misconduct</b></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ <i>The Concordat to Support Research Integrity.</i></li> <li>○ Requirements of regulatory and statutory bodies, and any other legal requirements.</li> <li>○ Higher education funding bodies.</li> <li>○ Research funders.</li> <li>○ Learned societies and professional bodies.</li> <li>○ UK Policy Framework for Health and Social Care Research.</li> <li>○ NHS Health Research Authority (e.g. <i>HRA Governance Arrangements for Research Ethics Committees</i>).</li> <li>○ <i>An Organisational Framework for the 3Rs.</i></li> <li>○ <i>The Concordat on Openness on Animal Research in the UK.</i></li> </ul>	

Relevant Commitment(s)	Self-assessment questions	Possible evidence
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Committee on Publication Ethics (e.g. <i>Cooperation Between Research Organisations and Journals on Research Integrity Cases</i>).</li> <li>○ UK Research Integrity Office (e.g. <i>Code of Practice for Research, Procedure for the Investigation of Misconduct in Research and Research Integrity-a primer on research involving animals</i>).</li> <li>○ Association for Research Managers and Administrators/ UK Research Integrity Office <i>Research Ethics Support and Review in Research Organisations</i>.</li> <li>○ <i>The Concordat to Support the Career Development of Researchers</i>.</li> <li>○ <i>The Concordat on Open Research Data</i></li> </ul>	

Relevant Commitment(s)	Self-assessment questions	Possible evidence
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>UK Reproducibility Network (e.g. <i>Open Research Resources</i>, <i>Primers</i>).</li> <li>International bodies for research integrity (e.g. <i>European Code of Conduct for Research Integrity</i>, <i>Singapore Statement on Research Integrity</i> and <i>Montreal Statement on Research Integrity</i>) and for discipline-specific research standards (e.g. <i>World Medical Association Declaration of Helsinki</i>).</li> </ul>	
<p><b>1. Maintaining the highest standards of research integrity – the principles</b></p> <p><b>2. Maintaining the highest standards of research integrity – expectations and compliance</b></p> <p><b>4. Questionable research practices and potential research misconduct</b></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Have you liaised with appropriate stakeholders in your research organisation, i.e. Human Resources, Staff / Student Development, Doctoral Training Centre, Registry, Insurance, Health and Safety, Library/ Information centre, Data Protection, Governance etc. as necessary, to ensure research integrity policies are in line with relevant legislation, statutes and</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Information on how policies were developed, in consultation with whom and how they will be reviewed.</li> </ul>

Relevant Commitment(s)	Self-assessment questions	Possible evidence
	<p>ordinances, and other organisational policies and systems?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Have you liaised with researchers, research students, professional services staff, technicians and other similar roles to inform the design, rollout, ongoing support and periodic revision of research integrity policies and systems?</li> <li>• Have you set a review cycle (e.g. at least every three years) to ensure that research integrity policies are subject to ongoing review?</li> </ul>	

# Self-assessment questions: communication

Relevant Commitment(s)	Self-assessment questions	Possible evidence
<p><b>1. Maintaining the highest standards of research integrity – the principles</b></p> <p><b>2. Maintaining the highest standards of research integrity – expectations and compliance</b></p> <p><b>3. Embedding a culture of research integrity</b></p> <p><b>4. Questionable research practices and potential research misconduct</b></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>How have you publicised the standards and ethos which your organisation wishes to underpin its culture of research?</li> <li>How have you publicised your research integrity policy and related guidance to all staff, students and others who conduct research under the auspices of your organisation?</li> <li>Have you publicised the following to all staff, students and others who conduct research under the auspices of your organisation? <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Policy for ethical approval and associated systems, and that it applies to all research involving: human participants; human tissue, material or remains; personal data,</li> </ul> </li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Central organisational web page(s) on research integrity and/ or links to research integrity resources from College/ Faculty/ School/ Departmental website areas. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Includes publicly accessible links to research integrity policy, policy and systems for ethical approval, and procedure for investigating breaches of research integrity.</li> </ul> </li> <li>Presentations at inductions, PGR committees, Faculty/ School/ Departmental committees and meetings.</li> <li>Lectures and workshops for research staff and students, including any recordings put on organisational website.</li> </ul>

Relevant Commitment(s)	Self-assessment questions	Possible evidence
	<p>animal research subjects and animal materials; and any other types of research as required.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Research misconduct policy.</li> <li>○ Policies on human clinical trials; health and social care research; research involving human tissue, material or remains; and research involving animal subjects and animal materials.</li> <li>○ Policies on issues which can affect research integrity (<a href="#">see 'Policies and systems', above, for examples</a>).</li> <li>○ Sources of help, training and advice (organisational and external) available on issues of research integrity.</li> </ul> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Formal or informal networks to share information, resources and support to researchers and professional services staff,</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Provision of online and in-person research integrity training (possibly mandatory).</li> <li>• Research integrity component of organisational e-learning package.</li> <li>• Promotional material, such as leaflets, summarising the organisation's approach to research integrity and available policies and resources.</li> <li>• A suite of resources such as templates and available support for research practitioners, including students.</li> <li>• Local research integrity leads/ champions/ advisers and information on their work and awareness-raising activities.</li> </ul>

Relevant Commitment(s)	Self-assessment questions	Possible evidence
	and/ or to encourage them to support each other and share best practice.	
<b>1. Maintaining the highest standards of research integrity – the principles</b> <b>2. Maintaining the highest standards of research integrity – expectations and compliance</b> <b>3. Embedding a culture of research integrity</b> <b>4. Questionable research practices and potential research misconduct</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Do you make information on your organisation's approach to research integrity, research culture, the organisation's requirements in these areas, and sources of guidance and support available to researchers (including research students) when they join the organisation?</li> <li>How do you make sure that this information is communicated to experienced/ senior researchers when they join the organisation, and is not limited to early-career researchers?</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Research integrity component of staff inductions: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>For early-career researchers.</li> <li>For Principal Investigators, supervisors, managerial and other senior positions.</li> </ul> </li> <li>Research integrity component of research student inductions.</li> </ul>
<b>3. Embedding a culture of research integrity</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Do you refresh the awareness of staff in leadership and supervisory positions (at whatever level) that they have a responsibility to raise awareness of research integrity, research culture, the organisation's requirements in these</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Presentations, circulars, and promotional material which highlight this responsibility.</li> <li>Examples of the training and support accessible by staff in leadership positions to help them develop their skills.</li> </ul>



Relevant Commitment(s)	Self-assessment questions	Possible evidence
	<p>areas, and sources of guidance and support?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Do you provide staff with management/ supervisory responsibilities access to management training and support in developing their managerial and communication skills within a clearly set out framework of expectations?</li> <li>Does your organisation provide infrastructure and staff with the appropriate expertise to support open research?</li> <li>Do your HR processes include expectations for research integrity?</li> <li>Do you circulate research culture resources to staff and students, in particular staff with management/ supervisory responsibilities (e.g. UKRIO- <i>Royal Society Integrity in Practice Toolkit</i>, UK Reproducibility Network <i>Open Research Primers</i>)?</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Examples of the material and resources that are made available to staff in leadership positions to assist them in raising awareness.</li> <li>Examples of the material and resources that are made available to researchers to encourage peer-led discussions.</li> <li>Examples of how open research is supported, including uptake by staff.</li> <li>Evidence of research integrity in HR processes (e.g. research-related job descriptions, recruitment, annual review and promotion processes) Regular meetings when integrity issues can be raised and discussed.</li> <li>Dedicated time at senior committee meetings for leaders to discuss policy and approaches to promoting research integrity and advancing research culture.</li> </ul>

Relevant Commitment(s)	Self-assessment questions	Possible evidence
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Do you make research culture resources available to encourage researchers (at all career stages/ levels, not just management/ supervisory) to engage in discussions of research integrity with their peers (e.g., UKRIO-Royal Society <i>Integrity in Practice Toolkit</i>, ReproducibiliTea, UK Reproducibility Network’s Local Network Leads)?</li> </ul>	
<p><b>1. Maintaining the highest standards of research integrity – the principles</b></p> <p><b>2. Maintaining the highest standards of research integrity – expectations and compliance</b></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Do you encourage researchers to familiarise themselves with the legal, ethical and other frameworks relevant to their work?</li> <li>Do you signpost key developments in legal, ethical and other frameworks to researchers? Are channels available for researchers to highlight such developments and their impact on particular disciplines/ types of research undertaken at the organisation to organisational research integrity specialists?</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Relevant provisions in research integrity policy and ethical approval policy; guidance from Faculties/ Schools etc. on this issue.</li> <li>Communications highlighting revisions or other changes to legal, ethical and other requirements for research.</li> </ul>

Relevant Commitment(s)	Self-assessment questions	Possible evidence
<p><b>1. Maintaining the highest standards of research integrity – the principles</b></p> <p><b>2. Maintaining the highest standards of research integrity – expectations and compliance</b></p> <p><b>3. Embedding a culture of research integrity</b></p> <p><b>4. Questionable research practices and potential research misconduct</b></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Can members of the public, participants in research, external researchers and representatives of other organisations access policies and contact points for research integrity and breaches of research integrity?</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Research integrity policies, including those on research misconduct and ‘whistleblowing’ (public interest disclosure), accessible on the organisation’s external website.</li> <li>Named contacts for research integrity and breaches of research integrity identified on the organisation’s external website and other appropriate places (e.g. <a href="#">UKRIO website</a>).</li> <li>Institution’s annual research integrity statement.</li> </ul>
<p><b>1. Maintaining the highest standards of research integrity – the principles</b></p> <p><b>2. Maintaining the highest standards of research integrity – expectations and compliance</b></p> <p><b>3. Embedding a culture of research integrity</b></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>What information on research integrity is provided to research participants, including patients and trial participants?</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Examples and exemplars of information provided to research participants.</li> <li>Public engagement activities conducted by your organisation, particularly involving research participants or patients, which included coverage of research integrity.</li> </ul>

Relevant Commitment(s)	Self-assessment questions	Possible evidence
<p><b>4. Questionable research practices and potential research misconduct</b></p> <p><b>1. Maintaining the highest standards of research integrity – the principles</b></p> <p><b>2. Maintaining the highest standards of research integrity – expectations and compliance</b></p> <p><b>3. Embedding a culture of research integrity</b></p> <p><b>4. Questionable research practices and potential research misconduct</b></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• How is your research integrity policy implemented? Who or which part of your organisation is responsible for ensuring that its provisions are carried out within the organisation?</li> <li>• Are there appropriate staff and other resources within the organisation to do this effectively?</li> <li>• Do you integrate your communication activities with other organisational communications/ activities, so research integrity is not seen as something in isolation or an ‘add-on’?</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Examples of how awareness-raising about research integrity has been incorporated into other organisational communications and activities.</li> <li>• Specific activities or tailored communications to capture the interest of researchers in research integrity, from students and early-career researchers to senior researchers and organisational leaders.</li> <li>• Specific activities or surveys to seek feedback on the organisation’s support for research integrity and research culture, including the views of researchers and others involved in its research.</li> </ul>

# Self-assessment questions: culture, environment and leadership

Relevant Commitment(s)	Self-assessment questions	Possible evidence
<b>3. Embedding a culture of research integrity</b>  <b>5. Accountability and continuous improvement in research integrity</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>How is research integrity addressed in your organisation's research strategy?</li> <li>How are the standards and ethos which your organisation wishes to underpin its culture of research recognised in your organisation's research strategy?</li> <li>How are issues that can affect research integrity recognised in your organisation's research strategy? E.g. equality, diversity and inclusion; incentives in research; research assessment; promotion criteria; workload models; impact of bullying and harassment, etc. (<a href="#">see 'Policies and systems', above, for more examples</a>).</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Relevant provisions in organisational research strategy with an action plan and clear lines of responsibility.</li> <li>Relevant provisions in organisational risk management matrix or risk register.</li> </ul>

Relevant Commitment(s)	Self-assessment questions	Possible evidence
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Does research integrity feature in your organisation's risk management matrix or register (i.e. is there oversight of this at senior level)?</li> </ul>	
<p><b>1. Maintaining the highest standards of research integrity – the principles</b></p> <p><b>2. Maintaining the highest standards of research integrity – expectations and compliance</b></p> <p><b>3. Embedding a culture of research integrity</b></p> <p><b>4. Questionable research practices and potential research misconduct</b></p> <p><b>5. Accountability and continuous improvement in research integrity</b></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Does a senior group or committee within your organisation have strategic responsibility for the promotion and monitoring of research integrity (including research culture) and co-ordination of different responsibilities across the governance structure? For example, research committee, ethics committee, governance and audit committee.</li> <li>Does a senior group or committee within your organisation participate in an annual monitoring exercise to demonstrate that the organisation has met the commitments of <i>The Concordat to Support Research Integrity</i>?</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Terms of reference for the group include responsibility for research integrity.</li> <li>Group listed in research integrity policy and related organisational policies.</li> <li>Examples of how you have publicised its remit and contact information.</li> <li>Regular review of all policies and systems to identify shortcomings in relation to the commitment to the Concordat, and where necessary describe future amendments and planning</li> </ul>
<b>1. Maintaining the highest standards of research integrity – the principles</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Has your organisation identified a senior member of staff to act as the operational lead on matters of research integrity?</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Senior members of staff listed in research integrity policy and related organisational policies.</li> </ul>

Relevant Commitment(s)	Self-assessment questions	Possible evidence
<b>2. Maintaining the highest standards of research integrity – expectations and compliance</b> <b>3. Embedding a culture of research integrity</b> <b>4. Questionable research practices and potential research misconduct</b> <b>5. Accountability and continuous improvement in research integrity</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Has your organisation identified a senior member of staff to act as the first point of contact for anyone wanting more information on matters of research integrity (with the option of this role being taken on by the same person as the operational lead, above)?</li> <li>If your organisation has a collegiate or other devolved structure, do you also have other named points of contact at appropriate levels? For example, at college or divisional level. Do you publicise their role and contact information?</li> <li>Is their information kept up to date and publicly available on your website?</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Examples of how you have publicised their role and contact information, internally and externally.</li> <li>URL of a publicly accessible web page listing relevant contact information.</li> <li>Similar information for any other named points of contact.</li> </ul>
<b>1. Maintaining the highest standards of research integrity – the principles</b> <b>2. Maintaining the highest standards of research integrity – expectations and compliance</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Have you assessed: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>If the standards and ethos which your organisation wishes to underpin its culture of research are reflected in its research policies, practices and decision-making?</li> </ul> </li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Snapshot survey of colleges/ faculties/ schools/ central research departments and committees/ professional services departments etc.</li> <li>Mapping exercise.</li> <li>Internal monitoring exercises.</li> </ul>

Relevant Commitment(s)	Self-assessment questions	Possible evidence
<b>3. Embedding a culture of research integrity</b> <b>4. Questionable research practices and potential research misconduct</b> <b>5. Accountability and continuous improvement in research integrity</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ If central research offices and committees are working with colleges, faculties, schools, professional services departments and others to support good research practice and embed a healthy research culture?</li> <li>○ If organisational research integrity standards are seen as practical and relevant by colleges/ faculties/ schools/ etc. or if they view them as burdensome, 'one size fits all' or irrelevant?</li> <li>○ If policies, sources of help, development opportunities etc. are sensitive to, and support, the working practices and disciplinary norms of colleges/ faculties/ schools/ etc.?</li> <li>○ How equality, diversity and inclusion has been supported in</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Feedback and 'lessons learned' from reporting of concerns, whether in relation to research misconduct/ questionable practices or otherwise) and how they were subsequently addressed.</li> <li>• Any activities or surveys to seek feedback on the organisation's research culture, including the views of researchers and others involved in its research.</li> <li>• Any revision of policies, communication and training activities, sources of help etc. made following the above.</li> </ul>



Relevant Commitment(s)	Self-assessment questions	Possible evidence
	<p>your research integrity strategy and activities?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ How sustainability has been addressed in your research integrity strategy and activities?</li> <li>○ The impact of issues that can affect research integrity on research and researchers at your organisation (e.g. incentives in research; research assessment; promotion criteria; workload models; impact of bullying and harassment, etc.)? (<a href="#">see 'Policies and systems', above, for more examples</a>).</li> <li>● How confident are you that researchers have access to the skills and resources they need to meet required standards?</li> <li>● How confident are you that any concerns about research integrity (<b>not</b> limited to those about research misconduct and questionable practices) are being raised</li> </ul>	

Relevant Commitment(s)	Self-assessment questions	Possible evidence
	<p>with the organisation and properly addressed?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>How confident are you that researchers, especially early-career researchers, feel reassured that they can raise any concerns about research integrity and without any stigma attached/ suffering any detriment?</li> </ul>	
<p><b>3. Embedding a culture of research integrity</b></p> <p><b>5. Accountability and continuous improvement in research integrity</b></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>How has your organisation engaged the interest of researchers in research integrity? Especially senior researchers?</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Engage senior researchers/ managers as 'champions' or 'local leads' to promote a culture of research integrity within their local research environment and to assist with the implementation plan.</li> <li>Incentivise engagement with research integrity through recognition in performance review, workforce/ workload model planning and other relevant staff development processes, including continuing professional development (CPD).</li> <li>Use of annual staff development reviews to assess senior researchers' engagement</li> </ul>

Relevant Commitment(s)	Self-assessment questions	Possible evidence
		<p>at this level, and the use of annual staff surveys to enable issues around research culture to surface and be addressed.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Incentivise engagement with research integrity through implementation and communication of clear policies, e.g. on authorship and publication, data management, open data etc.</li> <li>• Presentations on the importance of research integrity by speakers who hold senior research or leadership roles at other organisations.</li> <li>• Highlighting of good practice in relation to research integrity and the benefits it can bring to researchers. For example, increased value of research and impact, improved openness and transparency, support with addressing questionable research practices, 'making sure you're all on the same page' in collaborative research with different teams, organisations or countries.</li> </ul>

Relevant Commitment(s)	Self-assessment questions	Possible evidence
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Similarly, highlighting of poor or unacceptable practices and the harm it can cause to a researcher's career, regardless of seniority, and how researchers and employing organisations can prevent or avoid these practices from happening</li> </ul>
<p><b>1. Maintaining the highest standards of research integrity – the principles</b></p> <p><b>2. Maintaining the highest standards of research integrity – expectations and compliance</b></p> <p><b>3. Embedding a culture of research integrity</b></p> <p><b>4. Questionable research practices and potential research misconduct</b></p> <p><b>5. Accountability and continuous improvement in research integrity</b></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Does your organisation provide senior staff, PIs, PhD supervisors, research managers, etc. with information and resources to help them promote research integrity and the organisation's requirements in this area, the standards and ethos which your organisation wishes to underpin its culture of research, and sources of guidance and support to their colleagues?</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Examples of the material and resources that are made available to assist such staff in raising awareness.</li> <li>Share resources and best practice from other organisations as examples of either good research practice or supporting research culture/ integrity.</li> </ul>

Relevant Commitment(s)	Self-assessment questions	Possible evidence
<b>1. Maintaining the highest standards of research integrity – the principles</b> <b>2. Maintaining the highest standards of research integrity – expectations and compliance</b> <b>3. Embedding a culture of research integrity</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Do you encourage staff to support each other informally and share their perspectives and experiences?</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Information on mentoring.</li> <li>Working groups, conferences, case study discussions at workshops, seminars, panel discussions, networking events.</li> <li>Informal or formal networks or initiatives active at your organisation, including those with cross-organisational scope.</li> </ul>
<b>1. Maintaining the highest standards of research integrity – the principles</b> <b>2. Maintaining the highest standards of research integrity – expectations and compliance</b> <b>3. Embedding a culture of research integrity</b> <b>4. Questionable research practices and potential research misconduct</b> <b>5. Accountability and continuous improvement in research integrity</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Does your organisation provide (and evaluate) training to your researchers to help them achieve the following broad aims? <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Understanding of the required standards and what is considered ‘best practice’ for their research.</li> <li>Recognition that research integrity is relevant to all research and all researchers.</li> <li>Encouraging reflection on the challenges involved in conducting</li> </ul> </li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Information on: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The training and educational resources available to researchers (particularly via UKRIO if your organisation is a subscriber).</li> <li>The external sources of advice that you make your staff and students aware of (e.g. regulators, professional bodies, UKRIO).</li> <li>The audiences that have been reached by your education and training activities.</li> </ul> </li> </ul>

Relevant Commitment(s)	Self-assessment questions	Possible evidence
	<p>ethical and high-quality research, and how they might be addressed.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ The important of a healthy research culture and how individuals and organisations can support this.</li> <li>○ The impact, both positive and negative, of incentives in research, and what the organisation is doing to mitigate against negative impacts.</li> <li>○ Understanding that researchers should speak out if they require support or have concerns about research misconduct, the sources of help available to them and how to access them, and how to report any concerns, including whistleblowing policies.</li> </ul> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• How have you promoted training and development opportunities?</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Data on uptake of training.</li> <li>○ Evidence of quality, impact, appropriateness and accessibility of training (from training evaluation, staff survey or equivalent).</li> </ul> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Samples of training materials, case studies etc.</li> <li>• Online research integrity training, or research integrity component of organisational e-learning package.</li> <li>• Online self-assessment tools, for both early-career and more experienced researchers.</li> <li>• Training materials hosted on organisational web page(s) on research integrity and/ or linked to from College/ Faculty/ School/ Departmental website areas.</li> <li>• Any training with a particular focus, for example:</li> </ul>

Relevant Commitment(s)	Self-assessment questions	Possible evidence
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Have you encouraged research staff, research students and professional services staff to attend training and development opportunities?</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The value of ethical review and the process of seeking ethical approval.</li> <li>Discipline-specific training (e.g. methodology, statistics).</li> <li>College, faculty- or school-level activities.</li> <li>Specific types of research (e.g. clinical trials; research involving animal subjects; covert research).</li> <li>Specific aspects of the research process, such as publication and authorship.</li> </ul>
<p><b>1. Maintaining the highest standards of research integrity – the principles</b></p> <p><b>2. Maintaining the highest standards of research integrity – expectations and compliance</b></p> <p><b>3. Embedding a culture of research integrity</b></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>How do you incorporate research integrity training and understanding of relevant policies and guidelines into teaching / development / other activities for: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Research students?</li> <li>Research staff, including early-career researchers?</li> </ul> </li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Information, modules and workshops for: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Students</li> <li>Postgraduate researchers.</li> <li>Post docs.</li> <li>Professional services staff.</li> <li>Technical staff.</li> </ul> </li> </ul>

Relevant Commitment(s)	Self-assessment questions	Possible evidence
<b>4. Questionable research practices and potential research misconduct</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Supervisors and established researchers?</li> <li>○ Senior staff, including research leaders and other managerial positions?</li> <li>○ Professional services staff?</li> <li>○ Technical staff?</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Staff inductions.</li> <li>○ New PhD supervisors.</li> <li>○ New Principal Investigators.</li> <li>○ Principal Investigators undertaking large and/ or international collaborative projects for the first time.</li> <li>○ New members/ chairs of ethics committees.</li> <li>○ New Heads of Departments.</li> <li>● 1-2-1 training or coaching when appropriate (e.g. for more senior staff).</li> <li>● Refresher courses for staff and students.</li> <li>● The audiences that have been reached by these education and training activities.</li> </ul>
<b>2. Maintaining the highest standards of research integrity – expectations and compliance</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● Do you provide training for researchers involved in: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Experimental design?</li> </ul> </li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● Information on:</li> </ul>



Relevant Commitment(s)	Self-assessment questions	Possible evidence
<b>3. Embedding a culture of research integrity</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Research data management?</li> <li>○ Data protection?</li> <li>○ Human participant research, including clinical trials?</li> <li>○ Managing conflicts of interest?</li> <li>○ Collaborative (including trusted) research?</li> <li>○ Other health and social care research?</li> <li>○ Research involving human tissue, material or remains?</li> <li>○ Research involving personal data?</li> <li>○ Animal subject research, including implementation of the '3Rs'?</li> <li>○ Research engagement and impact?</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ The training and educational resources available to these researchers.</li> <li>○ Audiences reached by these education and training activities.</li> <li>○ Data on uptake of training and feedback received about the training.</li> </ul>
<b>1. Maintaining the highest standards of research integrity – the principles</b> <b>2. Maintaining the highest standards of research</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● Do you provide training, continuing professional development and support for</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● Information on: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ The training and educational resources available to such staff.</li> </ul> </li> </ul>

Relevant Commitment(s)	Self-assessment questions	Possible evidence
<b>integrity – expectations and compliance</b> <b>3. Embedding a culture of research integrity</b> <b>4. Questionable research practices and potential research misconduct</b>	<p>staff involved undertaking the following roles:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Chairs or members of ethical review committees?</li> <li>○ Research governance?</li> <li>○ Research integrity officer or equivalent role?</li> <li>○ Professional services staff (whether research integrity officers or otherwise) responsible for the operation of procedures for the investigation of alleged research misconduct?</li> <li>○ ‘Named Person’ roles?</li> <li>○ Members of research misconduct panels?</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Audiences reached by these education and training activities.</li> </ul>
<b>1. Maintaining the highest standards of research integrity – the principles</b> <b>2. Maintaining the highest standards of research</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Do you integrate your training and development with the activities of other groups responsible for staff and research student development, so research</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Examples of how research integrity training has been incorporated and embedded into other organisational development activities.</li> </ul>

Relevant Commitment(s)	Self-assessment questions	Possible evidence
<b>integrity – expectations and compliance</b> <b>3. Embedding a culture of research integrity</b> <b>4. Questionable research practices and potential research misconduct</b>	<p>integrity is not seen as something in isolation or an 'add-on'?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>For example, staff development, central student support departments, PGR tutors, support programmes for postdocs and new PI/ CIs.</li> </ul>	
<b>1. Maintaining the highest standards of research integrity – the principles</b> <b>2. Maintaining the highest standards of research integrity – expectations and compliance</b> <b>3. Embedding a culture of research integrity</b> <b>4. Questionable research practices and potential research misconduct</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Have you assessed the required level and content of your training and development, and how it could best be provided? For example: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>What is provided centrally and what is done at discipline level?</li> <li>What expertise exists in your organisation to deliver the training at either central or local level?</li> <li>How does the organisation obtain expertise if it does not have it?</li> </ul> </li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Outcome of this assessment reflected in your training content and delivery.</li> </ul>

Relevant Commitment(s)	Self-assessment questions	Possible evidence
<p><b>1. Maintaining the highest standards of research integrity – the principles</b></p> <p><b>2. Maintaining the highest standards of research integrity – expectations and compliance</b></p> <p><b>3. Embedding a culture of research integrity</b></p> <p><b>4. Questionable research practices and potential research misconduct</b></p> <p><b>5. Accountability and continuous improvement in research integrity</b></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Does your organisation liaise effectively with peer organisations or external networks to promote consistency and good practice between organisations, in supporting, promoting and managing research integrity?"</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Examples of such work, whether informal or formal collaborations.</li> <li>Collaborations with external organisations and networks to support and strengthen understanding and application of research integrity issues, whether UK-based organisations or those from other countries.</li> <li>Regional, national or international initiatives on research integrity which your organisation has contributed to or participated in.</li> <li>Membership of, or collaborations with, organisations with a particular interest in research integrity and related issues, such as the UK Research Integrity Office.</li> </ul>

# Self-assessment questions: addressing breaches of research integrity

Relevant Commitment(s)	Self-assessment questions	Possible evidence
<b>1. Maintaining the highest standards of research integrity – the principles</b>  <b>4. Questionable research practices and potential research misconduct</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Do you have an organisational procedure for the reporting and investigation of allegations of breaches of research integrity?</li> <li>Does it align with your research integrity and other relevant policies, and with your statutes and ordinances, and not conflict with them?</li> <li>Does it align with relevant external guidelines and requirements (e.g. UKRIO <i>Procedure for the Investigation of Misconduct in Research</i>, <i>The Concordat to Support Research Integrity</i>, contractual requirements from research funders relating to the investigation of alleged</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Research misconduct procedure and policy on whistleblowing (public interest disclosure), including links on a publicly accessible web page.</li> <li>Relevant provisions in procedure for investigating breaches of research integrity.</li> <li>References to procedure for investigating breaches of research integrity in other organisational policies and in statutes and ordinances.</li> <li>Information on how you have publicised the procedure for investigating breaches of research integrity and the process for</li> </ul>

Relevant Commitment(s)	Self-assessment questions	Possible evidence
	<p>research misconduct and/ or the review of such investigations)?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Does it include: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>A clear and up-to-date definition of research misconduct?</li> <li>A clear and up-to-date definition of questionable research practices (QRPs)?</li> <li>A process for reporting concerns about the conduct of research?</li> <li>An initial investigation stage?</li> <li>A full investigation stage?</li> <li>A review or appeals process?</li> <li>A reporting and outcomes stage.</li> <li>Standards to ensure that investigations are objective, thorough and fair, and carried out in a transparent and timely manner.</li> </ul> </li> </ul>	<p>reporting concerns about research misconduct.</p>

Relevant Commitment(s)	Self-assessment questions	Possible evidence
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Principles to inform the operation of the procedure.</li> <li>○ Provisions for appropriate confidentiality.</li> <li>○ Clarification on the skills, knowledge, experience and authority which should be possessed by the persons responsible for the operation of the procedure.</li> <li>○ Provisions for involved parties to access necessary support, e.g. practical/ specialist help/ advice for panel members and those operating the procedure, pastoral care for complainants, respondents and others.</li> </ul>	
<b>1. Maintaining the highest standards of research integrity – the principles</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● Does your procedure for investigating breaches of research integrity apply to: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ All disciplines of research?</li> </ul> </li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● Scope/ remit of procedure for investigating breaches of research integrity.</li> </ul>

Relevant Commitment(s)	Self-assessment questions	Possible evidence
<b>4. Questionable research practices and potential research misconduct</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Anyone conducting research under the auspices of the organisation, including but not limited to: research students; employees; independent contractors and consultants; visiting or emeritus staff; staff on joint clinical or honorary contracts; or anyone conducting research using organisational facilities, funding or on organisational premises?</li> <li>• Does your procedure for investigating breaches of research integrity explain if and under what circumstances the procedure applies to research students? Does it also note any other mechanisms that may be used to investigate the conduct of research students, such as exam or other student regulations? <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Does your procedure for investigating breaches of research integrity explain what process is</li> </ul> </li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Links between procedure for investigating breaches of research integrity and relevant student regulations.</li> <li>• Wording checked during design and revision of policies to ensure clarity and consistency, and avoid contradictions, including exam or other student regulations.</li> <li>• Relevant cross-referencing in procedure for investigating breaches of research integrity and other policies/ guidance, including exam or other student regulations.</li> </ul>



Relevant Commitment(s)	Self-assessment questions	Possible evidence
	<p>used to address allegations involving academic staff and research students and/ or other types of staff?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Do your procedure for investigating breaches of research integrity, research integrity policy and related guidance use the same definitions for expected standards and unacceptable behaviours? Do they avoid contradicting each other? Do they cross-reference each other?</li> </ul>	
<p><b>1. Maintaining the highest standards of research integrity – the principles</b></p> <p><b>3. Embedding a culture of research integrity</b></p> <p><b>4. Questionable research practices and potential research misconduct</b></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Does your organisation have a named point of contact (or recognise an appropriate third party) to act as confidential liaison for whistleblowers or anyone wishing to raise concerns about the research being conducted under your auspices?</li> <li>Is this ‘named person’ identified in your procedure for investigating breaches of research integrity, your organisational whistleblowing policy and on your</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>‘Named person’ listed in procedure for investigating breaches of research integrity and related organisational policies.</li> <li>Examples of how you have publicised their role and contact information, including to external collaborators and the public.</li> <li>URLs of a publicly accessible web page listing relevant contact information and any additional sources for this information (e.g. <a href="#">UKRIO website</a>).</li> </ul>

Relevant Commitment(s)	Self-assessment questions	Possible evidence
	<p>website? Do you publicise their role and contact information?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>If your organisation has a collegiate or other devolved structure, do you also have other named points of contact at appropriate levels? E.g. college or divisional level? Do you publicise their role and contact information?</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Similar information for any other named points of contact.</li> </ul>
<p><b>1. Maintaining the highest standards of research integrity – the principles</b></p> <p><b>3. Embedding a culture of research integrity</b></p> <p><b>4. Questionable research practices and potential research misconduct</b></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Are disclosures relating to alleged research misconduct included within the scope of your organisational whistleblowing (public interest disclosure) policy?</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Relevant provision in organisational whistleblowing (public interest disclosure) policy.</li> </ul>
<p><b>1. Maintaining the highest standards of research integrity – the principles</b></p> <p><b>3. Embedding a culture of research integrity</b></p> <p><b>4. Questionable research practices and potential research misconduct</b></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>To encourage the reporting of concerns, especially by students, early-career researchers, research participants and the public, does your procedure allow for concerns to be raised with the named person via, or with the assistance of, an intermediary? For example, a line</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Relevant provisions in procedure for investigating breaches of research integrity.</li> <li>Relevant provisions in related organisational policies, e.g. whistleblowing policy.</li> </ul>

Relevant Commitment(s)	Self-assessment questions	Possible evidence
	<p>manager, tutor/ supervisor, head of school, trade union representative, officer of the Students' Union, colleague or a third-party organisation which has been recognised by an employer to act as a confidential liaison for whistleblowers?</p>	
<b>4. Questionable research practices and potential research misconduct</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Does your procedure for investigating breaches of research integrity allow the possibility of initiating an investigation, at your organisation's discretion, where the complainant is anonymous or where there is no specific complainant?</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Relevant provision in procedure for investigating breaches of research integrity, with any decision to initiate such an investigation taking into account: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The seriousness of the concerns raised.</li> <li>The amount of information provided.</li> <li>The feasibility of confirming the concerns or allegations with credible sources.</li> <li>The ability to investigate the concerns using alternative sources of information.</li> </ul> </li> </ul>

Relevant Commitment(s)	Self-assessment questions	Possible evidence
<b>4. Questionable research practices and potential research misconduct</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Does your procedure for investigating breaches of research integrity allow your organisation to follow an investigation through to completion if the individual concerned leaves the organisation? Does the procedure allow you to investigate the conduct of individuals who have already left the organisation?</li> <li>Does your procedure for investigating breaches of research integrity allow you to continue an investigation if the complainant/ initiator withdraws from the process?</li> <li>Does your procedure for investigating breaches of research integrity permit you to take appropriate action if an allegation is deemed to be frivolous or malicious following an investigation?</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Relevant provision in procedure for investigating breaches of research integrity.</li> </ul>
<b>4. Questionable research practices and potential research misconduct</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Does your research misconduct policy include the provision to pass a matter to a regulator, other statutory body or professional body for consideration?</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Relevant provision in procedure for investigating breaches of research integrity.</li> </ul>

Relevant Commitment(s)	Self-assessment questions	Possible evidence
<b>4. Questionable research practices and potential research misconduct</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>As well as considering the conduct of individuals, does your procedure for investigating breaches of research integrity include the following within its scope? <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Any actions necessary to safeguard research participants, patients and any other involved parties.</li> <li>Correcting the record of research.</li> <li>Addressing and remedying any research misconduct that may have taken place.</li> <li>Making relevant reports, with appropriate confidentiality, to regulators, professional bodies, funders, collaborators, editors/ journals/ publishers/ others responsible for the research record, research participants and others.</li> </ul> </li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Relevant provisions in procedure for investigating breaches of research integrity.</li> </ul>

Relevant Commitment(s)	Self-assessment questions	Possible evidence
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Reporting on any procedural or organisational issues which should be reviewed by the organisation.</li> <li>○ Initiating further investigations of alleged research misconduct.</li> <li>○ Remedial training, mentoring and monitoring when an allegation of research misconduct was upheld but the person(s) involved continue to work or study at the organisation.</li> <li>○ Non-disciplinary approaches to resolve matters which are of a relatively minor nature or involve honest error (i.e. there was no intent to deceive). For example, mediation between involved parties, training, mentoring, guidance and monitoring.</li> </ul>	

Relevant Commitment(s)	Self-assessment questions	Possible evidence
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Safeguarding/ restoring the reputations of respondents who have been exonerated.</li> <li>○ Safeguarding/ restoring the reputations of whistleblowers/ complainants/ initiators who are found to have acted in good faith/in the public interest, whether their concerns were upheld or not?</li> </ul>	
<b>4. Questionable research practices and potential research misconduct</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Does your procedure for investigating breaches of research integrity have the option, at your organisation's discretion, for the screening/ initial assessment stage (or the equivalent) to be carried out by a small panel rather than a single person?</li> <li>• If so, does this panel have the option of including a member from outside your organisation?</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Relevant provision in procedure for investigating breaches of research integrity. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ For example, when an allegation is deemed to be particularly complex or contentious; the field of research is new, particularly specialised, or has been the subject of considerable debate in the academic, scientific or medical communities; or the field of</li> </ul> </li> </ul>

Relevant Commitment(s)	Self-assessment questions	Possible evidence
		research has been the subject of public debate and concern.
<b>4. Questionable research practices and potential research misconduct</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Does your procedure for investigating breaches of research integrity require Formal Investigation Panels (or the equivalent) to include a member from outside your organisation?</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Relevant provision in procedure for investigating breaches of research integrity.</li> </ul>
<b>4. Questionable research practices and potential research misconduct</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>What steps do you take to ensure that the procedure is followed when an allegation is received? How do you ensure a proper transfer to a different internal or external process when necessary? How would you investigate a complaint that an investigation had not been conducted in accordance with due process (as distinct from an appeal against the outcome of the investigation)? How would you handle allegations which are found to be vexatious?</li> <li>As in <a href="#">‘Policies and systems’</a>, above, have you:</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Information on how policies were developed, in consultation with whom and how (including how regularly) they will be reviewed.</li> <li>Feedback and ‘lessons learned’ from reporting of concerns, whether in relation to research misconduct/ questionable practices or otherwise) and how they were subsequently addressed.</li> <li>Any activities to seek feedback on the organisation’s research culture, including the views of researchers and others involved in its research.</li> </ul>



Relevant Commitment(s)	Self-assessment questions	Possible evidence
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Reviewed your procedure for investigating breaches of research integrity against external standards, including UKRO guidance, The Concordat to Support Research Integrity and requirements of research funders?</li> <li>○ Liaised with other professional services (e.g. Human Resources, etc.) to ensure that your procedure for investigating breaches of research integrity is in line with relevant legislation and with other organisational policies and systems, and with your statutes and ordinances?</li> <li>○ Ensured that your procedure has appropriate provision for documentation and record keeping?</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Evidence of support, training and professional development provided to staff conducting investigations of potential breaches of integrity.</li> </ul>

Relevant Commitment(s)	Self-assessment questions	Possible evidence
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Do you avoid using inappropriate use of legal instruments towards whistle-blowers and others involved in investigations, e.g. non-disclosure agreements?</li> <li>Do all involved in the operation of your procedure, including ‘named persons,’ Screeners/ Screening Panels and Formal Investigation Panels, declare competing interests and are competing interests managed appropriately?</li> <li>Do you provide support, training or professional development for those conducting investigations of potential breaches of integrity?</li> </ul>	

# Self-assessment questions: monitoring and reporting

Relevant Commitment(s)	Self-assessment questions	Possible evidence
<p><b>1. Maintaining the highest standards of research integrity – the principles</b></p> <p><b>2. Maintaining the highest standards of research integrity – expectations and compliance</b></p> <p><b>4. Questionable research practices and potential research misconduct</b></p> <p><b>5. Accountability and continuous improvement in research integrity</b></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>How regularly do you review the following policies and systems, bearing in mind revisions to The Concordat, changes to legislation and other important updates? <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Research integrity policy.</li> <li>Policy for ethical approval and associated systems.</li> <li>Research misconduct policy.</li> <li>Policies on issues which can affect research integrity (see ‘Policies and systems,’ above, for examples).</li> </ul> </li> <li>How often do you seek feedback from researchers, research students and professional services staff on policies and</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Information on when policies were last updated.</li> <li>Proposed future review cycle (at least every three years or sooner, depending on major funder or legislative changes).</li> <li>Information on how feedback is sought on policies.</li> <li>‘Frequently asked questions’ drawn from common or notable issues raised in feedback and listed on organisational website.</li> <li>Annual survey of all researchers and other members of staff to assess how aware they are of training, as well as the relevant</li> </ul>

Relevant Commitment(s)	Self-assessment questions	Possible evidence
	associated systems, their communication and associated training?	contacts and procedures for making allegations of research misconduct.
<b>2. Maintaining the highest standards of research integrity – expectations and compliance</b>  <b>5. Accountability and continuous improvement in research integrity</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>What is your reporting structure from local research ethics committees to your organisation's central research ethics committee (or equivalent body)? <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>For example, local ethics committees might make an annual report to the central committee. It could contain summary data on the projects reviewed (number, discipline/ type, outcome of review process); information on any strengths, issues or trends identified; and a random sample of approved applications and monitoring reports.</li> </ul> </li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Information in your organisation's policy for ethical approval on what information is shared, how and when.</li> <li>Examples of information shared, and any actions taken further to the summary information, all anonymised as appropriate.</li> </ul>
<b>2. Maintaining the highest standards of research integrity – expectations and compliance</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Do you have review meetings between central ethics committee members and local ethics committees and officers?</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Information on the regularity of meetings.</li> <li>Minutes of meetings.</li> </ul>

Relevant Commitment(s)	Self-assessment questions	Possible evidence
<b>5. Accountability and continuous improvement in research integrity</b>		
<b>1. Maintaining the highest standards of research integrity – the principles</b> <b>2. Maintaining the highest standards of research integrity – expectations and compliance</b> <b>4. Questionable research practices and potential research misconduct</b> <b>5. Accountability and continuous improvement in research integrity</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Do you have systems for monitoring compliance with organisational and external requirements? For example: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Clinical trial model.</li> <li>A model for projects that have been determined to be high risk by a clearly defined criterion.</li> <li>Proportionate model for lower risk (or less ethically complex) projects.</li> <li>Self-monitoring when appropriate.</li> </ul> </li> <li>Do you carry out: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Monitoring of a random sample of research projects?</li> <li>Internal audits?</li> <li>Annual risk review?</li> </ul> </li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Information on systems for monitoring and audit.</li> <li>Summary data from monitoring and audit of research projects.</li> <li>Anonymised reports on specific projects. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Reports from relevant external inspections. For example, Medicines and Healthcare products Regulatory Agency, Human Tissue Authority and the Home Office.</li> <li>Monitoring reports (particularly of long-term, or higher risk projects).</li> </ul> </li> </ul>

Relevant Commitment(s)	Self-assessment questions	Possible evidence
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Do you incorporate outcomes of external inspections (e.g. Medicines and Healthcare Products Regulatory Agency, Human Tissue Authority and the Home Office) into your own monitoring of compliance with research integrity standards?</li> </ul>	
<p><b>4. Questionable research practices and potential research misconduct</b></p> <p><b>5. Accountability and continuous improvement in research integrity</b></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Is anonymised summary information on allegations of research misconduct received or (formally) investigated by your organisation made available to relevant organisational bodies and relevant external bodies? For example, your governing body, research committee, central and other ethics committees, human resources/ student services and, where required, research funders.               <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li><b>Please note that</b> thresholds vary. Some organisations may share anonymised summary information concerning all allegations received; others concerning allegations</li> </ul> </li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Relevant provisions in your organisation's procedure for investigating breaches of research integrity.</li> <li>Confirmation that the organisation fulfilled any requirements to make reports to external bodies, including regulatory and professional bodies, regarding the initiation or completion of a formal investigation.</li> <li>Information on what material is shared and how, plus anonymised examples.</li> <li>Information on how appropriate confidentiality is maintained in relation to this information.</li> </ul>

Relevant Commitment(s)	Self-assessment questions	Possible evidence
	<p>which progressed to the screening stage; while some may only share information on allegations which underwent formal investigation.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Are anonymised learning points from completed investigations made available to relevant organisational bodies and included in training for research staff and students? Learning points can include improvements and positive change and should not be limited to preventative measures.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Information on any actions taken further to the summary information.</li> <li>What provisions have been made to prevent the same type of incident re-occurring?</li> <li>Any improvements to reporting mechanisms or investigation processes relating to allegations of misconduct.</li> <li>The information above is included in the annual statement and reviewed by a senior group/ committee on behalf of the organisation.</li> </ul>
<p><b>4. Questionable research practices and potential research misconduct</b></p> <p><b>5. Accountability and continuous improvement in research integrity</b></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>If research misconduct investigations are carried out at a devolved level (i.e. College / Faculty/ School, etc.), are confidential reports on allegations of research misconduct received or investigated at the devolved level made to your organisation's 'named person'?</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Relevant provisions in your organisation's research misconduct policy.</li> <li>Information on what information is shared and how, including provisions for confidentiality.</li> <li>Information on any actions taken further to the summary information.</li> </ul>

Relevant Commitment(s)	Self-assessment questions	Possible evidence
<b>5. Accountability and continuous improvement in research integrity</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Have you made an annual statement on research integrity to your organisation's governing body? <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li><a href="#">See later in this document for discussion of what an annual statement might contain.</a></li> </ul> </li> <li>Have you made it public?</li> <li>Have you made a similar annual statement/ report to any external funders or other bodies which require one (e.g. US Office of Research Integrity)?</li> <li>Have you sent a link to the statement to the secretariat of the signatories of the Concordat?</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Publication of annual statement.</li> <li>Information on how you have publicised the annual report, including URL of publicly accessible web page. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Web page also holds links to previous annual statements for purposes of comparison.</li> </ul> </li> <li>Annual statements/ reports that have been submitted to relevant external funders and other bodies.</li> </ul>



# Annual research integrity statements: suggested content

---

Commitment 5 of the Concordat (2025) requires that organisations publish: *“on their organisation’s website, an annual statement, approved by their own governing body, reporting progress on meeting the Concordat principles and commitments. This statement must include a summary table of the number and types of research misconduct allegations reported to the organisation and investigations undertaken.”*

It further states that *“Organisations are encouraged, but not required, to use the [Concordat Annual Statement template](#)”* – a template developed by UKRIO with the RICS Group.

The annual statement is a valuable opportunity for internal review and reflection. Equally, it is an opportunity to demonstrate publicly a commitment to high quality and ethical research, by declaring the practical measures which an organisation has undertaken to enhance research integrity and its research culture. When read as a series, an organisation’s annual statements should illustrate how it has continually developed its support for good research practice over time.

Drawing on UKRIO’s extensive experience, and feedback from organisations, researchers and research-enabling staff, this section suggests possible content for the annual statement. As noted earlier, the

self-assessment tool should not be seen as prescriptive. Accordingly, this section is intended as a guide to inform the content of an annual statement in line with the requirements of the Concordat.

UKRIO welcomes enquiries from organisations seeking advice on the content of their annual statements and is happy to assist its subscribers in drafting them.

## Writing the annual report

**Structure:** in general terms, it is recommended that the annual statement should use the format of the Concordat [annual statement reporting template](#). This is divided into three sections.

### **Section 1:** Key Contact Information

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

Section 2 (*“a description of actions and activities undertaken...”*) covers supporting research integrity and positive research culture in general terms and relates to Commitments 1, 2, 3 and 5. It includes sub-sections covering:

- A description of current systems and culture.
- Changes and developments during the period under review.

- Reflections on progress and plans for future developments.
- A case study on good practice (optional).

### **Section 3:** Addressing research misconduct

This section covers how the organisation addresses research misconduct. It includes sub-sections covering:

- A statement on processes that the organisation has in place for dealing with allegations of misconduct.
- Information on investigations of research misconduct that have been undertaken.

Within that broad structure, organisations have considerable scope to describe activities undertaken, ‘lessons learned’ and plans for the future. Some suggestions on content are made later in this section, but these should be seen as a starting point rather than prescriptive.

Annual statements should include a summary of any actions taken to safeguard and support research integrity relating to researchers and projects supported by particular funding bodies. These can either be included in the suggested structure given above or in an additional section specifically for funder-related activities.

**Essential information:** annual statements should state the date on which the organisation’s governing body approved the document and the date on which it was made publicly available. For version control purposes, the dates of any amendments to the statement and a brief description

should be listed at the end of the document.

Each annual statement should include a link to the previous statement and to any earlier ones referred to in the text. This could either be direct links or a link to a web page that hosts all previous annual reports.

As readers may have questions about the statement, it should also include contact details for persons who can receive requests for clarification or further information. This could be direct email links or a link to the research integrity section of the organisation’s website.

**Period covered:** 12 months. Neither the Concordat nor the template mandates the use of the calendar year, academic year or financial year; it is up to the organisation to decide its preferred approach

**Scope:** the annual statement should provide a brief, but wide-ranging summary of activities undertaken to support research integrity, including addressing any allegations of misconduct.

The report should **not** be limited to activities which relate specifically to the implementation of the Concordat. The scope should be wider, covering all organisational activities to safeguard and enhance good research and demonstrate a broader commitment to the promotion of research integrity and a positive research culture.

If for any reason a contractual or other required standard is not being met, the report should contain a brief summary of what is being done to address this and a proposed completion date. For example: “The

publicly accessible web link to our research integrity policies and the named person for receiving allegations of misconduct is not yet in place. This will be rectified by the beginning of the next semester.”

It may be challenging to summarise a year’s worth of research integrity support in a brief and accessible form. However, merely listing activities undertaken should be avoided. It would be helpful to say not only what has been done, but also the reasons for actions taken, the outcome and potential or planned next steps. For example: “Drawing on lessons learned from a recent investigation of research misconduct, we have undertaken additional activities to raise awareness of the sources of help on research practice and ethics available to researchers. Downloads of relevant policies and visits to our organisational research integrity web pages subsequently increased. We will follow up with further promotion of relevant training resources and sources of advice.”

The annual statement is also an opportunity to highlight how existing measures and previous actions are being built upon or further developed. As successive annual statements are published by an organisation, we feel it would be helpful if they had a strong focus on new measures and significant changes to existing measures, rather than simply echoing what has gone before.

Previous statements should remain available on the organisation’s website and be linked to in new statements. We recommend that organisations check periodically how easy it is to find and access their statements on their

website. For example, can it be found easily when using an internet search engine and search terms that a member of the public with no research experience might use? How easy is it to find the statement using such search terms in the organisational website’s search facility? Is the statement itself presented in an accessible format and with the option to be downloaded?

### Suggested content: promoting high standards of research integrity and positive research culture

Evidence of how your organisation is implementing the commitments of the Concordat, including compliance with its ‘responsibilities of employers of researchers’. For example:

- An overview of your organisation’s strategy and objectives to strengthen understanding and support of research integrity.
- How research integrity is recognised in the organisation’s research strategy and who has strategic and operational responsibility for putting this into practice.
- How does the organisation communicate the standards and ethos which it wishes to underpin its culture of research?
- How does the organisation ensure that those standards and ethos are reflected in its research policies, practices and decision-making?

- How do the central research departments and committees work with faculties, schools, professional services departments and others to embed a healthy research culture?
- Introduction or revision of research integrity policies and procedures, requirements, process reviews or support mechanisms.
- Revision of related organisational systems (e.g. financial audit process or whistleblowing policy).
- Inclusion of relevant external requirements and guidance into organisational processes.
- Any activities to capture the interest of researchers in research integrity, from students and early-career researchers to senior researchers and organisational leaders.
- Any activities to seek feedback on the organisation's research culture, including the views of researchers and others involved in its research.
- Any formal and informal initiatives and networks to provide information, resources and support to researchers and professional services staff, and/or to encourage them to support each other and share best practice.
- A summary of your education and training provision, including the audiences that have been reached and any new activities.
- Information about how open research is supported and resourced.
- Any activities to mitigate the negative impact of incentives in research on their researchers and research projects, and on the organisation's policies, practices and research culture.
- Any activities relating to mitigating negative impacts on research integrity from: how researchers are recruited, assessed and promoted; research assessment; workload models; staff development; staff welfare and the impact of bullying and harassment.
- How equality, diversity and inclusion has been supported in your research integrity strategy and activities.
- How sustainability has been taken account of in your research integrity strategy and activities.
- A description of your processes and actions relating to continuing improvement and revision relating to research integrity, including summary information from any relevant internal monitoring or audit processes.

- Summary of outcomes of any external inspections/ audits relating to research integrity.
- Any other activities undertaken to fulfil your organisation's strategy and objectives to support research integrity and a healthy research culture.
- Public engagement and impact activities conducted by your organisation, particularly involving research participants or patients, which included coverage of research integrity.
- External conferences, workshops or other events on research integrity to which your organisation has contributed.
- Information on any academic research into research integrity or related fields, such as research ethics or research culture, undertaken by researchers from your organisation.
- Collaborations with external organisations to support and strengthen understanding and application of research integrity issues, whether UK-based organisations or those from other countries.
- Regional, national or international initiatives on research integrity which your organisation has contributed to or participated in.
- Membership of, or collaborations with,

organisations with a particular interest in research integrity and related issues, such as the UK Research Integrity Office.

**Please note that** activities listed should not be limited to those covering the entire organisation and its researchers. Those which focus on particular sections of the organisation, particular types of research or researchers, and so on, are just as relevant.

### [Suggested content: addressing research misconduct](#)

Confirmation that:

- Your organisation has processes for the reporting and investigating of allegations of research misconduct.
- Mechanisms for the reporting of allegations are clear, well-articulated and confidential, and include a named point of contact and/ or a recognised appropriate third party to act as confidential liaison for those raising concerns.
  - Any additional measures taken to encourage the reporting of concerns by students, early-career researchers, research participants and the public should also be listed.
- The process has appropriate principles and mechanisms to ensure that investigations are thorough and fair, carried out in a transparent and timely manner, and protected by appropriate confidentiality provisions.
- There is appropriate support and training available for those involved

with the investigation of breaches of integrity.

Brief, anonymised summary data on any formal investigations conducted by your organisation into allegations of research misconduct. UKRIO defines a 'formal investigation' as *"...that part of the [research misconduct investigation] Procedure which is intended to examine the allegations of misconduct in research, hear and review the evidence and determine whether the alleged misconduct occurred, take a view on who was responsible, and which may make recommendations as to any response that the Organisation might make. The Formal Investigation will be preceded by [a] Screening Stage"*. (Source: UKRIO Procedure for the Investigation of Misconduct in Research)

- Number of allegations received during the past year and how many then proceeded to a formal investigation.
- Number of formal investigations undertaken in the past year, including:
  - How many allegations were upheld in full or in part?
  - How many allegations were dismissed?
  - The number of ongoing investigations.
- A breakdown of the number of formal investigations undertaken in the past year:
  - By discipline.
  - By the broad type of misconduct that was

alleged. For example, fabrication/ falsification, plagiarism or failure of duty of care to research participants.

- For allegations relating to research that is externally funded, a breakdown by funding body.

#### Please note that:

- Specific allegations/ investigations and the individuals and research projects concerned should not be identifiable from this data. This may be particularly challenging in some circumstances, e.g. for small and/ or specialist organisations, and it may be helpful to seek advice from UKRIO.
- Regarding the number of allegations received, formal investigations undertaken, how many allegations were upheld or dismissed, and the breakdowns by discipline, type and funder, it is UKRIO's view that there is no 'right' or 'wrong' answer if the data provided is accurate. This has been echoed by other bodies with interests in this area.

A note confirming that the organisation fulfilled any requirements to make reports to external bodies, including regulatory and professional bodies, regarding the initiation or completion of a formal investigation. In our view, there is no need to provide additional information in the annual statement, simply to confirm that the organisation has met its obligations. External bodies may require additional



confirmation separately from the annual statement, for example via their assurance or audit processes.

A short summary of key learning points from concluded investigations and subsequent actions taken. For example: revision of systems or policies, training on particular aspects of the research process, improvements to communication of expected standards, and other actions to improve research standards or help prevent misconduct from occurring.

An overview of any improvements to reporting mechanisms or investigation processes relating to allegations of misconduct should also be given. It should be noted that 'lessons learned' can include improvements and positive change and are not limited to preventative measures.

- **Please note that** it is not suggested that disciplinary or other actions taken in relation to specific individuals are listed. However, if the organisation has previously made any public statements that mentioned such actions, these could be linked to.

## A note on funder-specific activities

As part of their annual statement, organisations should provide a summary of any actions taken to safeguard and support research integrity relating to researchers and projects supported by particular funding bodies.

These may relate to supporting and strengthening research integrity, including research culture and leadership; and/ or addressing breaches of research integrity.

- **When considering the structure of their annual statements,** organisations should decide whether they will list funder-specific activities in their own section or as subsets of relevant general activities. As an example of the latter approach, a description of 'generic' training and development activities could be followed by a summary of training provided for researchers supported by a particular funder.

## Closing thoughts

While the Concordat sets out mandatory content for annual statements, this section has set out ideas for potential content which you may wish to consider including in your organisation's statement.

Annual statements are about reflecting on the positive steps you have taken to support good research practice and a healthy research culture at your organisation, as well as being open about any lessons learned from challenges and problems. Supporting research integrity is long-term work; it is ok to state that initiatives are still ongoing or delayed, and outputs from smaller activities are just as worth highlighting as those from huge projects.

While drafting an annual statement for the first time might seem somewhat daunting, they are a valuable opportunity for both internal review and reflection, and to demonstrate publicly a commitment to good research practice and a healthy research culture. UKRIO welcomes enquiries from organisations seeking advice on the content of their annual statements and is happy to assist its subscribers in drafting them.



# Acknowledgements

## Authors

The original 2014 self-assessment tool was conceptualised and written by Kathryn Mecrow, James Parry and Dr Andrew Rawnsley on behalf of UKRIO. All authors are listed in alphabetical order. Subsequently, the tool has been revised twice (in 2021 and 2025, respectively).

We describe contributions to this project as follows:

2014 version	2021 version	2025 version
<i>Conceptualisation, writing, reviewing and editing:</i> Kathryn Mecrow, James Parry and Dr Andrew Rawnsley	<i>Writing, revising and editing:</i> James Parry, Nicola Sainsbury and Dr Josephine Woodhams	<i>Writing, revising and editing:</i> Kathryn Dally, James Parry and Dr Josephine Woodhams  <i>Copyediting:</i> Jasper Scott

## Competing interests

**James Parry, Nicola Sainsbury, Josephine Woodhams, Kathryn Dally and Jasper Scott** are employees of UKRIO.

## Funding

This work was funded by UKRIO.

## Reviewers

### 2014 edition:

- Jamie Arrowsmith, Universities UK
- Richard Hudson, University of Sheffield
- Nicola Sainsbury, King's College London
- Gail Seymour, University of Exeter
- Dr Elizabeth Wager, UKRIO Advisory Council member

- Dr Birgit Whitman, University of Bristol.

### 2021 edition:

- Dr Jane Alfred, Catalyst Editorial Ltd.; UKRIO Advisory Council member.
- Dr Natasha Awais-Dean, King's College London.
- Dr Pablo Fernandez, UKRIO Advisory Council member.
- Dr Irene Hames, Independent advisor on research integrity, research publication and publication ethics; UKRIO Advisory Council member.
- Dr Peter Hedges, University of Cambridge; UKRIO Advisory Council member.
- Dr Neil Jacobs, UK Research and Innovation.
- Rowena Lamb, University College London.
- Marice Lunny, King's College London.
- Dr Richard Malham, Integrity and Governance, University of St Andrews.
- Isla-Kate Morris, UKRIO Advisory Council member.
- Professor Margaret Rees, University of Oxford; UKRIO Advisory Council member.

- Chris Shaw, Cardiff University / Prifysgol Caerdydd.

**Please note** that reviewers commented in their individual capacities and therefore this listing does not necessarily indicate that these organisations endorse this publication.

### Further acknowledgements

We would also like to thank the many individuals and organisations who have given feedback on the Self-Assessment Tool since its original publication in 2014.

UKRIO would also like to thank [its Trustees](#) and [Advisory Council](#), and [The Concordat Signatories Group](#) for their assistance with this document.

'The Concordat to Support Research Integrity' is © UK Committee on Research Integrity (UKCORI) 2025. Used with permission. Available from: <https://ukcori.org/research-integrity-concordat/>

**Please note** that this self-assessment tool was developed independently by UKRIO. It does not necessarily represent the views of the Concordat's authors or signatories, nor is it endorsed or warranted by them and/or their employers.

# Further reading

---

ALLEA - All European Academies, 2023. *The European Code of Conduct for Research Integrity: Revised Edition*. Available from: <https://allea.org/code-of-conduct>

Association of Research Managers & Administrators and UK Research Integrity Office, 2020. *Research Ethics Support and Review in Research Organisations*. Available from: <https://ukrio.org/publications/>

Committee on Publication Ethics, 2012. *Cooperation between research organisations and journals on research integrity cases: guidance from COPE*. Available from: [https://publicationethics.org/files/Research\\_organisations\\_guidelines\\_final\\_0\\_0.pdf](https://publicationethics.org/files/Research_organisations_guidelines_final_0_0.pdf)

Declaration on Research Assessment, 2012. *San Francisco Declaration on Research Assessment*. Available from: <https://sfdora.org/read/>

NHS Health Research Authority et al., 2020. *UK Policy Framework for Health and Social Care Research*. Available from: [https://www.hra.nhs.uk/planning-and-](https://www.hra.nhs.uk/planning-and-improving-research/policies-standards-legislation/uk-policy-framework-health-social-care-research/)

[improving-research/policies-standards-legislation/uk-policy-framework-health-social-care-research/](https://www.hra.nhs.uk/planning-and-improving-research/policies-standards-legislation/uk-policy-framework-health-social-care-research/)

Nuffield Council on Bioethics, 2014. *The Culture of Scientific Research in the UK*. Available from: <https://www.nuffieldbioethics.org/publications/the-culture-of-scientific-research>

Office of the Independent Adjudicator for Higher Education, 2016. *The Good Practice Framework: Handling Complaints and Academic Appeals*. Available from: <https://www.oiahe.org.uk/media/1859/oia-good-practice-framework.pdf>

Royal Society and UK Research Integrity Office, 2018. *Integrity in Practice*. Available from: <https://ukrio.org/publications/>

Science Europe, 2015. *Research Integrity: What it Means, Why it Is Important and How we Might Protect it*. Available from: <https://www.scienceeurope.org/media/>

[dnwbwau/briefing\\_paper\\_research\\_integrity\\_web.pdf](https://dnwbwau/briefing_paper_research_integrity_web.pdf)

UK Research Integrity Office, 2009 and 2021. *Code of Practice for Research*. Available from: <https://ukrio.org/ukrio-resources/publications/code-of-practice-for-research/>

UK Research Integrity Office, 2023. *Procedure for the Investigation of Misconduct in Research*. Available from: <https://ukrio.org/ukrio-resources/publications/misconduct-investigation-procedure/>

UK Research Integrity Office, 2025. *Embracing AI with Integrity*. Available from: <https://ukrio.org/ukrio-resources/embracing-ai-with-integrity/>

UK Research Integrity Office, 2024. *Whistleblowing and Breaches of Good Research Practice*. Available from: <https://ukrio.org/ukrio-resources/whistleblowing-and-breaches-of-good-research-practice/>

UK Research Integrity Office, 2024. *Enablers and Inhibitors of Research Integrity*. Available from: <https://ukrio.org/ukrio-resources/enablers-and-inhibitors-of-research-integrity/>

UK Research Integrity Office, 2024. *Barriers to Investigating and Reporting Research Misconduct*. Available from: <https://ukrio.org/ukrio-resources/barriers-to-investigating-and-reporting-research-misconduct/>

Universities UK et al., 2025. *The Concordat to Support Research Integrity*. Available from: [The Concordat to Support Research Integrity – UKCORI](https://www.ukcori.org.uk/the-concordat-to-support-research-integrity-ukcori)

Vitae, 2019. *The Concordat to Support the Career Development of Researchers*. Available from: <https://www.vitae.ac.uk/policy/concordat>

Vitae, UK Research Integrity Office and UK Reproducibility Network, 2020. *Research Integrity: A Landscape Study*. Available from: <https://www.ukri.org/wp-content/uploads/2020/10/UKRI-020920-ResearchIntegrityLandscapeStudy.pdf>

Wellcome Trust, 2020. *What Researchers Think About the Culture They Work In*. Available from: <https://wellcome.org/reports/what-researchers-think-about-research-culture>

World Conferences on Research Integrity, 2010. *Singapore Statement on Research Integrity*. Available from: <https://wcrif.org/guidance/singapore-statement>

World Conferences on Research Integrity, 2013. *Montreal Statement on Research Integrity in Cross-Boundary Research Collaborations*. Available from: <https://wcrif.org/documents/354-montreal-statement-english/file>

World Conferences on Research Integrity, 2017. *Amsterdam Agenda*. Available from: <https://wcrif.org/guidance/amsterdam-agenda>

World Conferences on Research Integrity, 2019. *Hong Kong Principles for Assessing Researchers*. Available from: <https://wcrif.org/guidance/hong-kong-principles>

World Medical Association, 1964–2013. *Declaration of Helsinki – Ethical Principles for Medical Research Involving Human Subjects*. Available from: <https://www.wma.net/policies-post/wma-declaration-of-helsinki-ethical-principles-for-medical-research-involving-human-subjects/>



Promoting integrity and high ethical standards in research  
Providing confidential, independent and expert support

The UK Research Integrity Office (UKRIO) is an independent charity, offering support to the public, researchers and organisations to further good practice in academic, scientific and medical research. We pursue these aims through a multi-faceted approach:

- Education via our guidance publications on research practice, training activities and comprehensive events programme.
- Sharing best practice within the community by facilitating discussions about key issues, informing national and international initiatives, and working to improve research culture.
- Giving confidential expert guidance in response to requests for assistance.

Established in 2006, UKRIO is the UK's most experienced research integrity organisation and provides independent, expert and confidential support across all disciplines of research, from the arts and humanities to the life sciences. We cover all research sectors: higher education, the NHS, private sector organisations and charities. No other organisation in the UK has comparable expertise in providing such support in the field of research integrity.

UKRIO welcomes enquiries on any issues relating to the conduct of research, whether promoting good research practice, seeking help with a particular research project, responding to allegations of fraud and misconduct, or improving research culture and systems.

#### **UK Research Integrity Office**

Impact Hub London Euston, 1 Triton Square, London NW1 3DX

Email: [info@ukrio.org](mailto:info@ukrio.org) Web: [www.ukrio.org](http://www.ukrio.org)

Registered Charity No: 1147061 Registered Company No: 7444269



© **UK Research Integrity Office 2025**

This material may be copied or reproduced provided that the source is acknowledged and the material, wholly or in part, is not used for commercial gain. Use of the material for commercial gain requires the prior written permission of the UK Research Integrity Office.

For the full list of UKRIO publications, visit [www.ukrio.org](http://www.ukrio.org)