

## Committee on Open Research and Research Integrity

22/01 A meeting of the Committee on Open Research and Research Integrity was held on Tuesday 8 March 2022 at 14.00 remotely via Microsoft Teams.

Present:

Professor Parveen Yaqoob, Deputy Vice Chancellor [*Chair*]  
Professor Philip Beaman (Psychology), Academic Representative  
Dr Cristiana Bercea, (Pharmacology) Open Research Champion  
Dr Maria Broadbridge, Academic Computing Software Engineer  
Dr Robert Darby, Research Data Manager  
Marcello De Maria, Open Research Champion – *item 22/02 only*  
Dr Nathan Helsby, Head of Planning and Reporting  
Kirsty Hodgson, Open Research Champion – *item 22/02 only*  
Dr Phil Newton, Research Dean  
Dr Etienne Roesch (Psychology), Academic Representative  
Louise Sharman, Head of Governance  
Alison Sutton, Research Engagement Manager  
Dr Anne-Marie Van Dodeweerd, Head of Research Services  
Chrissie Willis-Phillips, Associate Director (Scholarship and Planning)  
Jenna Gardner, Executive Administration Officer [*Secretary*]

Apologies were received from:

Caroline Knowles, Head of Research Communication & Engagement  
Dr Mike Proven, Head of Quality Assurance in Research  
Katie Smith, Senior Governance Officer

### 22/02 Results of Open Research Survey

The Committee extended their thanks to the Open Research Champions for attending the meeting to present the preliminary results of the Open Research Survey and their wider work.

The Open Research Champions delivered a PowerPoint presentation to the Committee and highlighted the following key findings and recommendations:

- The survey was the first attempt to understand more about open research and associated perceptions, as well as any key opportunities and challenges experienced by participants when trying to conduct open research.
- The survey received 376 valid responses from staff and students. This included 14 schools and 41 departments. The sample size was calculated based on the total population of the University in 2020. The number of responses received were just one short of a 95% confidence interval and 5% area margin.
- Confidence over the results lowered after analysing sub-groups due to large variances in engagement.
- Preliminary results had been presented at the Open Research Forum, and highlighted a number of important gaps in engagement with open research,

particularly for women, business-orientated disciplines, and students. Semantic themes identified included dominance, accessibility, transparency, reproducibility, collaboration, and accountability. It was evident that a lack of information, training, and funding were the biggest obstacles for participants.

- Concrete actions had already been identified, including further qualitative analysis of the preliminary results, equality and diversity considerations, advice and guidance for researchers, additional training, and further surveys and research.
- Colleagues were in agreement that the Open Research Champions were best placed to drive these actions forward. The Open Research Champions wanted to explore avenues for funding and to implement a solution-orientated focus study, with the aim to identify how gaps in practice could be reduced.
- The importance of aligning this work with other efforts within the Research and Innovation Strategy was noted, such as with the Open Research Action Plan, and the Open Research Champion programme.
- The idea of an Open Research Intelligence Project was also discussed, due to the large talent pool that existed both internal and external to the University. The project could facilitate networking, increase expertise and enable open research to become more organic as a product.

The following queries were noted from colleagues:

- The Committee praised the Open Research Champions for their voluntary efforts and proactivity, as well as the successful reach and implementation of the survey both within UoR, but also within the broader sector survey. A repeat of information across surveys was unlikely, as colleagues were concerned about stakeholder fatigue.
- Colleagues agreed that further intersectional gender analysis within groups was required, as some Schools and disciplines within the University were more heavily dominated by males or females.
- The interaction effect and differences between open research practices was highlighted, as some disciplines likely had greater access and exposure to open research in all of its forms. More research would be beneficial to understand these interactions and differences.
- Colleagues queried whether a University-wide open research module could be explored. It was noted that there was already ample training available on open research, but the lack of uptake suggested that further investigation was needed into possible miscommunication and reasons for the imbalance of supply and demand.
- In line with the University Research Strategy, a follow-on survey every 2-3 years was recommended as a tool to track process and changes to open research culture.
- Colleagues highlighted the challenges and sensitivity that the Open Research Champions could encounter if they were to explore competitive areas, such as Henley Business School.
- Exploring the design of specific solution-orientated case studies for Schools was recommended as it would ensure positive action is taken at a local level and would provide a better understanding of any barriers.

- Colleagues agreed that more investigation into research culture would be required, as real barriers to engagement may be far wider than open research and the preliminary declarations that had been drawn.
- There was appetite to try and find more effective ways of embedding open research within the curriculum as this would directly target students.
- The Open Research Champions confirmed that the survey results would be shortly published at both a local and University level. This would allow the Open Research Champions to gain input from both research division leads, as well as School research contacts. The upcoming addition of a research administrator role within the library would add momentum and provide additional resource.
- Colleagues sought clarification as to whether reference to the use of open research related to the production or publication of code, or the using and reading of code (and similar for open access publishing). This was an important distinction that needed to be clarified as it was not clear from the way the questions were worded in the survey and accessing open research is by nature much easier than producing it.

*The Open Research Champions and the Associate Director (Scholarship and Planning) left the meeting.*

#### 22/03 Minutes of the meeting held on 12 October 2021

The minutes of the meeting held on 12 October 2021 were agreed as a correct record.

#### 22/04 Matters Arising

1. Minute 21/26 *Memorandum on Disclosure of Interests, Terms of Reference and Risk*

Feedback in regards to Risk 1 - Research & Innovation (Reputation) within the Corporate Risk Register had been shared with the Risk Management Group.

2. Minute 21/29 a) *UKRI open access policy*

The Director of ULCS & University Librarian had shared the UKRI open access policy with the UBRI Committee.

3. Minute 21/15 d) (20/02 j, 20/37a) *Update on CSRI*

The Head of Research Services confirmed that the progress of the work relating to visiting researchers was still ongoing.

4. Minute 21/22 *SCFP pilot on use of Electronic Lab Notebooks*

A verbal update would be provided within the meeting.

5. Minute 21/29 f) *New self-assessment tool in relation to the Concordat to Support Research Integrity (CSRI);*

The new self-assessment tool for the Concordat would be discussed within the meeting.

6. Minute 21/29 h) *Responsible metrics and open research in recruitment and promotion*

A paper had been received by the Committee and would be discussed within the meeting.

7. Minute 21/31 *Draft Communications Plan*

The Deputy Vice-Chancellor would provide the Committee with a verbal update on behalf of the Head of Research Communication & Engagement.

8. Minute 21/35 Reporting Committees a) *Research Ethics Committee*

The Committee asked for clarification as to whether bi-annual sign off from CORRI on the 'Policies, governance, procedures and guidance' document was twice annually, or every two years and the latter was confirmed.

9. Minute 21/36 *Any Other Business*

Dr Roesch had now created a spreadsheet on the CORRI Team, which was being populated with all known open research activities, so others could add to this.

a) Update on research integrity training

Dr Roesch informed the Committee that UKRIO had worked with UoR to produce an online training video, now in the editing phase. The launch date had been anticipated pre-Christmas, but unfortunately there had been some delays due to staff availability. The proposed launch date was now due to take place in the autumn, and it was confirmed that UKRIO would not be producing any generic training content for subscribers in the interim, as had been anticipated.

Dr Roesch also worked with the European VIRT2UE project to complement this introductory training with a series of in-depth online modules (15 in total); these will be launched in conjunction with the above two modules. The final phase is to design tailored training based on five exercises developed by VIRT2UE, adapted for specific research areas. The model is based on a train-the-trainer approach, where trainers complete the five exercises over three days. To date, 12 researchers have been trained as trainers and they have subsequently trained a total of 68 research students and staff.

Dr Roesch indicated that a summary of open research activities, including training, across the University, would be shared with members via Microsoft Teams. It was noted that the growth of the training and administrative workload involved could not be managed by Dr Roesch in the long-term and consideration of sustainability and resource was required. It was agreed that the Deputy Vice-Chancellor and Head of Governance would discuss this outside the meeting.

**Action: Deputy Vice-Chancellor [Chair]/Head of Governance**

b) Responsible metrics and open research in recruitment and promotion

The Committee received and noted a paper from the Deputy Vice-Chancellor providing an update on the working group to incorporate responsible metrics and open research into recruitment and promotion. The Deputy Vice-Chancellor confirmed that the working group had now been initiated after some delays, and would be meeting for the first time this month. The paper included proposed terms of reference and key areas of work. It was agreed for the Deputy Vice Chancellor to provide the Committee with a written update on the working group at the next meeting.

Open Research Action Plan

a) SCFP pilot on use of Electronic Lab Notebooks

The Open Research Champion provided the Committee with an update on the Electronic Lab Notebook pilot within the School of Chemistry, Food and Pharmacy (SCFP).

This was a small pilot to explore the pros and cons of – and appetite for – switching from regular to electronic Lab Notebooks. Participants completed a feedback form against criteria. The average score was 7.5, which indicated that participants were generally happy. As a result of the pilot, 4 out of 7 lab groups had now swapped to electronic Lab Notebooks, with the remaining 3 having chosen not to swap - in the main due to their current use of electronic systems associated with lab equipment making it difficult to work to a single electronic platform.

Discussions were ongoing with the School of Biological Sciences (SBS), who had expressed interest in conducting their own pilot. It was agreed that the pilot could be extended further if there was more promotion and engagement.

Phil Newton noted that a number of verbal reports on ORAP progress had been received by CORRI, and a written report on progress against milestones was overdue. A written report was offered for the next CORRI meeting.

**Action: Research Dean**

The Open Research Champions were praised by CORRI for their achievements during the first year. The Committee was informed that a call for the next round of recruitment of Open Research Champions was in progress, along with a further call out for internal open research projects. 16 Champion applications had been received so far. An open research forum meeting was scheduled for the next day to try and broaden engagement.

For weaker applications, the Deputy Vice Chancellor recommended trying to harness the applicants' enthusiasm and interest by offering an Open Research Associate role, whereby applicants would have the opportunity to build on their skills and experience in preparation for successfully securing a Champion role. It was agreed that the feasibility of this process would require further consideration.

**Action: Research Data Manager**

b) Research software engineering

Since last October, a south-regional network had been established, open to all in the region bar London. The Academic Computing Software Engineer was the lead organiser for networking and would be advertising this network more widely. The aims of the network were to share good practice across institutions, strengthen community networks, and engage people who were interested in the topic, or were involved in software-focussed projects. The Academic Computing Software Engineer would provide an update at the next CORRI meeting.

**Action: Academic Computing Software Engineer**

c) Training

A 101 open research training session had been delivered, which was well attended and had received positive feedback. Colleagues were keen to run the training session again and to incorporate the training into the UoR Learn programme.

d) Software carpentry

20 participants had attended the first software carpentry workshop last summer. Experience of holding the training online over 3 days was found to be intense. There are now 5 certified trainers, but further workshops have not yet been organised. The aim was to produce content that could be made available through RSE or the DTS website, by embedding carpentry on a recurring basis.

e) Other

UCRI had produced a personal research plan template, and colleagues were to decide whether a question on open research would be introduced into the personal research plan process. The Data Research Manager had inputted into the review of these plans being undertaken by Professor Gibbs, and commented on how open research could be actioned and supported through these planning processes on a personal and operational level

It was noted that the UKRN REDF project also had the potential to supercharge some of the above activities to increase engagement amongst the Open Research Champions, and to influence the way research was being conducted more widely.

22/06 Research Culture: workshop and plans

The Deputy Vice-Chancellor advised the Committee that the University had been allocated £320K of research culture funding from Research England. A project was underway in collaboration with Henley Business School to understand the senior leadership's vision of research culture, including what researchers understood as current and desirable features of research culture. This piece of work would take the form of focus groups over the next six months in consultation with a wide range of stakeholders. There could be scope to extend this piece of work further into next year, depending on continuation of funds. This year's funds could also be used to offset the costs of ongoing relevant activity.

22/07 Strategy

There were no strategy discussions for update.

22/08 Projects and programmes portfolio

a) Update on Concordat to Support Research Integrity

i. Progress against action plan

The following updates to the action plan were discussed below and the updated action plan list is included at the end of this document.

*3) Review the research integrity element of all relevant policies within the normal review cycle of 3 years*

The review of research integrity within relevant policies was a continuing and ongoing task. Relevant colleagues had been provided with the new UKRI assessment tool, which highlighted key considerations, such as strong policy content and alignment, and policies would be updated accordingly by Governance when next due for review.

The Committee also received a written update on action number four and five from the Head of Research Communications and Engagement, as follows:

*4) Make relevant policies easier to find and embed appropriate links between them*

- The Head of Research Communications and Engagement had reviewed and updated the research integrity page of the external website and links to relevant internal pages and guidance was clear.
- The internal pages hosted by the Governance Team were currently being migrated to the new SiteCore system. That process had involved the updating and cleaning of pages. Once completed, internal links would be reviewed with new URLs in place.
- The Head of Quality Assurance would assist in the review of the research ethics pages (the guidance notes were updated in October 2021). This would include a clear listing of all relevant documents and policies, and links to research integrity, open research and the relevant UoR Learn course pages.
- The A to Z lists on the staff portal were currently being rebuilt, as part of the migration. All-important pages be included in the Research A to Z listing had been requested, but they had been added to the overall A to Z by mistake, which was not specific to research. This error was currently being rectified.

*5) Deliver a communications plan, which will include information about the concordat, legal/ethical frameworks, responsibilities and training*

- The plan delivered to the October CORRI meeting had been shortened to outline some preliminary communications activities which could be undertaken while discussions about research culture were ongoing.
- The shape and scope would be discussed with the PVC outside of the committee.
- A communications plan for open research had been developed with the Research Data Manger, after consultation with the open research steering group who had provisionally agreed with its proposed activities and scope.
- Steering group members were involved in the review of the open access policy and would provide communications following UKRI changes to its policy and funding.

*16) Implement training for staff involved in investigating and hearing cases of research misconduct*

- A broad investigations training course had been designed which was suitable for a range of roles and processes. The training would run for half a day and would involve a series of case studies. It was hoped to that this would be offered in-person this academic year; date yet to be confirmed.

*17) Seek guidance on appointment of external panel members for formal investigation of research misconduct by students or staff*

- The appointment of external panel members for formal investigation of research misconduct was on hold and dependent on the the broad investigations training.

*18) Establish Community of Practice for central and local ethics committees*

- Committee members noted that the Head of QAR had been asked for a paper to be submitted to the summer CORRI meeting to consider implications of the relevant areas highlighted by the new self-assessment tool and further actions required in the area of ethical review.

*23) Confirm a timescale for the availability of UKRIO online training on research integrity*

- The launch of UKRIO online training for research integrity was imminent, but a launch date was yet to be confirmed.

*25) Consider any bespoke training needs identified as part of the consultation with RDLs and following the pilot exercise*

- The identification of any bespoke training needs identified as part of the consultation with RDLs would be revisited at a future date.

Following discussion on the action plan, colleagues made recommendations for the format of this year's annual statement and asked for a draft statement to be submitted for the summer meeting, ahead of approval by UEB and Council in July.

**Action: Deputy Vice-Chancellor [Chair]**

The Head of Governance highlighted that there was reference to 'visitors' throughout the action list, which required clarification. It was confirmed that this was an ongoing piece of work being undertaken by HR and would involve the implementation of a compliance checklist.

j. ii) Consideration of the new UKRIO self-assessment tool

Colleagues had reviewed the new UKRIO self-assessment tool and provided the following queries:

#### Policies and Systems

- Page 8 – It was queried whether the research integrity policy applied to anyone conducting research e.g. consultants, visiting, emeritus.
- It was noted that further work was required on the regulations non-members of the institution were expected to follow, which likely linked into the piece of work HR were conducting on academic visitors. A possible checklist was suggested.



- Page 12 – more investigation may be needed into the Environmental impact of UoR’s research and sustainability, as there was nothing specifically on research within the UoR Environmental policy.
- Page 14 – clarification was needed on the definition of ‘visitors’ within ethical review policies.
- Page 18 – It was queried whether policies and systems had been reviewed against external standards and guidance. This would be a substantial piece of work if UoR needed to be robustly assured that all checks had been completed against everything on the list, and to continue normal review

#### Communications

- Page 20 – not all policies were available externally, apart from whistleblowing and research integrity, which would require checking after the SiteCore migration. The SCAM policy for students was only available within Essentials once students had logged in using their University details.

#### Addressing research misconduct

- The requirements against SCAM had been reviewed and there was confidence that those requirements had been met. Any further updates would be made following the larger policy update.
- Clarification was required on the definition of ‘visitors’
- Page 42 – reference to ‘anonymous’. This could be investigated but may be difficult.
- Page 43 – investigation training was very nearly ready to be launched once practical issues had been confirmed
- Page 45 – externals were not included on any student panels, but this may not be the case for HR grievance appeals.

#### Monitoring and reporting (from the Head of QAR)

- Page 47 – “*How often do you seek feedback from researchers?*” – if ‘soundings’ from UREC count then this occurred all the time. However, formal systematic canvassing of stakeholders was never gathered.
- Page 48 – “*Do you have review meetings between central ethics committee members and local ethics committees?*”. It was confirmed that this did not take place. Beyond the annual reporting requirement, there was no formal review meetings between UREC and School RECs. The current system afforded Heads of School considerable flexibility in terms of how they organised School review procedures. ‘School REC’ was not a term that all Schools would recognise. During the last annual plenary meeting, UREC had discussed ways in which links between SRECs and UREC could be strengthened to encourage common practice.
- Page 48 – “*Do you have systems for monitoring compliance with institutional and external requirements?*”. It was confirmed that the UREC policies and procedures permitted audit/review (without specifying how this would be done), but in practice, during the last 10 years, UREC had not undertaken any monitoring/auditing. This would be easy to conduct in practice, but was not a ‘resource neutral’ activity.

#### b) UKRN update

The Research Dean advised that to support the REDF Open Research project, the recruitment of a part-time post based in the Library Engagement team was ongoing. It was noted that the appointment had been uplifted from a Grade 5

(0.6FTE) to a Grade 6 (1.0FTE), to broaden the skills and resource base in this area.

There had been a UKRN submission to the House of Commons Select Committee enquiry on research reproducibility, to which UoR contributed. This submission has been separately published in Biomed Central, with UoR (Phil Newton) as a co-author.

The Research Dean reported that there had been good exchange between UKRN partners on information and practice. The annual meeting was due to take place on Friday.

c) UKRI open access policy and other open access matters

The Research Engagement Manager advised the Committee that, as outlined within the UKRI Open Access policy, 1<sup>st</sup> April 2022 was the point at which the policy would become effective for journal articles, but UKRI communications to researchers had been last minute. Support for researchers had been introduced by the Library's Research Engagement team, which included a new Open Access LibGuide with information on compliance and open access funding, which would shortly replace the Library open access webpages. A newly designed request form to request open access funding had been published, along with the addition of two new staff development courses on the UKRI policy. Training dates had been set between March and May, but it was hoped that further availability would be secured.

JISC were in negotiations with AMS (American Meteorological Society) to find a compliant publishing solution by the end of March 2022. The page charge element applied to both the green and gold routes, but could not be funded from the UKRI block grant. Colleagues would need to pay this from other funds, even though the open access element could be paid from the block grant. Clarification on funding availability for the gold open access route was required.

Issues surrounding the identification of current journal compliance was discussed. A further compliance tool was being developed by JISC, which was due to be implemented and ready for the introduction of the policy. Another compliance tool 'Sci-Free', developed across universities in Sweden, was being considered by the Library which would allow users to access information on compliant journals. The SciFree compliance tool would cost in the region of £5-7K a year, and purchase would proceed once a trial version had been tested by the Library. UoR had been in contact with the University of Southampton for feedback as they were already in the process of implementing the new SciFree tool.

It was noted that the University's Open Access policy required review, as it had not been reviewed since 2017, following its first introduction in 2013. Conversation with Chris Jones (Copyright Officer) was required in regards to IP codes and potential copyright issues.

The Committee was advised that the amount of the BHF Open Access block grant for 2022-23 had been announced, but information regarding conditions and terms were yet to be confirmed. Although the UKRI block grant funding had increased, UKRI had indicated that it may be insufficient to fund open access publishing for all articles.

Despite the readiness of the Research Engagement team, there was still some concern from the Committee about the volume of work involved at the point of submission, and the likelihood that lack of understanding on the part of authors submitting papers would place pressure on the team to rectify mistakes post-acceptance.

22/09 Policy

a) Relevant policy matters

The Committee noted and received the paper on Trusted Research from the Head of Research Services. The Head of Services highlighted the problematic nature of the wording of the paper, and advised that 'risk management of research' was more suitable than 'trusted research', due to the number of new pieces of legislation which were published most weeks. Some communications had been sent out to researchers regarding the implementation of a working group to analyse the gaps in national security. It was noted that there had been no mention of chemical weapons, so there was uncertainty as to whether the University was required to complete a declaration each year.

Universities had received advice on their collaborations by the Research Collaboration Advice Team, who were due to visit by the end of April 2022.

UKRI were currently working on the publication of research integrity indicators by the end of July 2022. Colleagues were advised that the indicators would feature as a quantitative tool that the University would be measured on.

22/10 Any Other Business

None

22/11 Date of next meeting

Tuesday 14 June 2022 14.00-16.00 via Teams

**Concordat to Support Research Integrity action list**

|   | <b>Action</b>  | <b>Lead Responsible</b> | <b>Timeline</b> |
|---|--|-------------------------|-----------------|
| 1 | Update Code of Good Practice in Research, taking into account matters raised by the implementation group and noted in the self-assessment and the minutes. | Mike Proven             | Complete        |
| 2 | Make the updated Code of Practice available on the website following approval at the next CSRI   | Caroline Knowles        | Complete        |
| 3 | Review the research integrity element of all relevant policies within the normal review cycle of 3 years   | Louise Sharman          | Ongoing         |

|    |   |                                |  |
|----|---|--------------------------------|--|
| 4  | Make relevant policies easier to find and embed appropriate links between them  | Caroline Knowles               | Ongoing  |
| 5  | Deliver a communications plan, which will include information about the concordat, legal/ethical frameworks, responsibilities and training  | Caroline Knowles               | Ongoing  |
| 6  | Improve availability of existing guidance and resources relating to research integrity  | Lynn Moore                     | Complete                                       |
| 7  | Report on training and resources available via our subscription to UKRIO  | Lynn Moore                     | Complete                                       |
| 8  | Conduct an audit of current provision of all training touching on research integrity (including ethics)   | Lynn Moore                     | Complete                                       |
| 9  | Clarify training provided to members of ethical review committees, research governance committees and research integrity officers or equivalent   | Lynn Moore                     | Complete                                       |
| 10 | Conduct an analysis of research integrity training available (online or otherwise), with indication of discipline specificity, target audience and costs. Produce a paper for CORRI's autumn term meeting making proposals for a whole package of training, including what already existed and what could be supplemented from other sources. | Lynn Moore                     | Complete                                       |
| 12 | Distinguish research misconduct from academic misconduct within SCAM and include PGR Director for such cases rather than SCTL   | Rachel Willis & Louise Sharman | Complete                                       |
| 13 | Incorporate UKRIO recommendations as part of the SCAM policy review, ensure SCAM mentions whistleblowing, indicate how students reporting misconduct are supported and consider anonymous reporting for students. (Refer to self-assessment)  | Rachel Willis & Louise Sharman | Complete                                       |
| 14 | Modify staff disciplinary procedures to make explicit reference to research integrity/misconduct  | Alan Twyford                   | Complete                                       |
| 15 | Review procedures for visitors and all other non-staff and non-students to clarify how research misconduct applies to them  | Alan Twyford                   | Complete/has gone on to be developed elsewhere |
| 16 | Implement training for staff involved in investigating and hearing cases of research misconduct   | Louise Sharman                 | Ongoing  |
| 17 | Seek guidance on appointment of external panel members for formal investigation of research misconduct by students or staff   | Parveen Yaqoob                 | On hold (dependent on training above)          |
| 18 | Establish Community of Practice for central and local ethics committees   | Mike Proven                    | Summer 2022 CORRI meeting                      |

|    |   |  |                                       |
|----|---|--|---------------------------------------|
| 19 | Collate anonymised summary information on allegations of research misconduct. Audit Schools to ensure that the summary captures any allegation of research misconduct investigations which may have been conducted at a devolved level. | Parveen Yaqoob                               | Complete<br><br>(To be done annually) |
| 20 | Prepare annual statement on research integrity, submit for approval by UEB and Council, make public and submit to external bodies as appropriate  | Parveen Yaqoob                               | Complete<br><br>(To be done annually) |
| 21 | Survey researchers to assess understanding and practicalities of the concordat implementation and feedback on training, dissemination etc. Incorporate as part of the research culture project  | Parveen Yaqoob                               | Summer/autumn 2022                    |
| 22 | Confirm whether action needed to reinstate UKRIO subscription   | Parveen Yaqoob                               | Complete                              |
| 23 | Launch online training on research integrity, developed in collaboration with UKRIO   | UKRIO in partnership with People Development | Summer/autumn 2022                    |
| 24 | Seek information from UKRIO regarding exactly what the various workshops offered would look like, who they were for and what input would be required from the University  | CORRI in partnership with People Development | Complete                              |
| 25 | Consider any bespoke training needs identified as part of the consultation with RDLs and following the pilot exercise   | CORRI in partnership with People Development | On hold                               |
| 26 | Roll out VIR2TUE Train the Trainer programme, evaluate its impact and establish a sustainable model for continuity.   | Etienne Rosch                                | Ongoing                               |
| 27 | Create a research integrity training plan for the University  | CORRI in partnership with People Development | Summer 2022                           |
| 28 | Align a communication plan with the research culture project.   | Caroline Knowles                             |                                       |
| 29 | Clarify arrangements for visitors and external researchers with respect to research integrity.  | Anne-Marie van Dodeweerd                     |                                       |
| 30 | Consider policies and systems against external standards and guidance.  | Substantial piece of work                    | ?                                     |
| 31 | Systems for monitoring compliance with institutional and external ethics requirements and seeking researcher feedback. UREC has not undertaken any monitoring/auditing over the last 10 years.  | ?  |                                       |
| 32 | Consider whether there are any EDI or sustainability matters relevant to research integrity   | CORRI  |                                       |

|    |   |                |  |
|----|---|----------------|--|
| 33 | Consult with HR on additional information relating to investigating research misconduct, including new UKRI guidance. | Parveen Yaqoob |  |
|----|---|----------------|--|