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As signatories to and supporters of the concordat to support research integrity, we are committed to:

» maintaining the highest standards of rigour and integrity in all aspects of research
» ensuring that research is conducted according to appropriate ethical, legal and professional frameworks, obligations and standards
» supporting a research environment that is underpinned by a culture of integrity and based on good governance, best practice and support for the development of researchers
» using transparent, timely, robust and fair processes to deal with allegations of research misconduct when they arise
» working together to strengthen the integrity of research and to reviewing progress regularly and openly
Revisions to the Concordat - timeline

- **2012**: First Concordat to Support Research Integrity published on UUK website
- **2018**: "Update and strengthen the Concordat by making the requirements and expectations clearer, and produce a route map and timetable for reaching 100% compliance." – STC report
- **2019**: Signatories re-convene to begin re-drafting the Concordat to Support Research Integrity.
- **2019**: Revised Concordat goes out for consultation, February-April 2019
- **2019**: New Concordat to Support Research Integrity published in October 2019
Continuous improvement cycle

- Publish annual statements
- See good practice and lessons elsewhere
- Try / adopt good practices locally
- Reflect on progress and next steps
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Process

» Response Recording
  » Emailing the RI Secretary Account
  » Presence of named contact
  » whistle-blower contact
  » Annual statement

» Statement Evaluation
Response Rate

» Response Rate - 52%
  » Statement – 92%
  » Named Contact - 93%
  » Whistle-blower Contact – 88%

*Response rate includes those who may have emailed in requesting extension and not submitting the above mentioned requirements
General thoughts

» Timing of Statement/Submission Deadlines
» Location of information
  » Email
  » Website
  » Statement
» Whistle-blower contact
  » Difficult to locate
Statement Key Features

» Structure
  » Two types
    » 1. Following the concordat commitments
    » 2. Following the requirements of the statement

» Period Covered

» Governing Body Approval
» Actions/Activities undertaken
» Misconduct
» Covid-19
  » 30% submitted statements included reference to Covid-19
» Updated Concordat
Thank you for listening!
The British Academy is the UK’s national academy for the humanities and social sciences. We mobilise these disciplines to understand the world and shape a brighter future.
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UKRI and research integrity

Our mission is to **convene, catalyse and invest** in close collaboration with others to build a thriving, inclusive research and innovation system that connects discovery to prosperity and public good.
“a thriving, inclusive research and innovation system”

Research and innovation culture

Research integrity

Equality, diversity and inclusion

Public engagement

Talent and skills

Open research
The landscape – incentives

TOP FIVE INCENTIVES FOR EACH CATEGORY AS RATED FOR THEIR POTENTIAL IMPACT ON RESEARCH INTEGRITY*

**Strongly positive perceived impact:**
- Data sharing policies and requirements
- Open access publishing
- Interdisciplinary research
- Professional development and training opportunities
- Research leadership and management

**Positive and negative perceived impact:**
- Media coverage and public perception of research
- Research leadership and management
- How funding for specific projects is awarded
- How researchers are assessed for promotion during their careers
- Institutional research strategy

**Strongly negative perceived impact:**
- Incidents of bullying and harassment
- Use of journal impact factor (JIF), h-index and other metrics
- League tables of institutions
- Institutional workload models
- How researchers are assessed for promotion during their careers

*Incentives phrased as asked in the survey. To some extent negatively perceived incentives can be caveated with ‘poor’ or ‘inappropriate’ (e.g. ‘poor workload models’ or ‘inappropriate use of league tables’) but not entirely.
UKRI and research integrity

Convening the community
UKRI Early Career Researcher Forum
Research Integrity Forum
Partnership roundtables
Support for UK Reproducibility Network
Workshops on priorities in research integrity

Investing in high integrity
Principles of peer review assessment and decision-making
Résumé for Researchers, a narrative CV format
“Governance of Good Research Conduct policy” and FAQs
Assurance processes related to our T+Cs

Catalysing improvements
Evidence, eg the 2020 landscape report
Subject-specific guidance, eg:
• Safeguarding good scientific practice (life sciences), research integrity, rigour and reproducibility (medical)
Signing / implementing DORA
Initiating a new national research integrity committee
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