

Committee on Open Research and Research Integrity

21/25 A meeting of the Committee on Open Research and Research Integrity was held on Tuesday 11 October 2021 at 09.00 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
Dr Nathan Helsby, Head of Planning and Reporting
Stuart Hunt, Director ULCS & University Librarian – *for item 21/29 a) only*
Caroline Knowles, Head of Research Communication & Engagement
Dr Phil Newton, Research Dean
Dr Mike Proven, Head of Quality Assurance in Research
Dr Etienne Roesch (Psychology), Academic Representative
Louise Sharman, Head of Governance
Dr Anne-Marie Van Dodeweerd, Head of Research Services
Chrissie Willis-Phillips, Associate Director (Scholarship and Planning)
Katie Smith, Senior Governance Officer [*Secretary*]

21/26 Memorandum on Disclosure of Interests, Terms of Reference and Risk

Committee members were asked to declare any disclosures of interest.

It was noted that the feedback provided by CORRI the previous year in relation to the Risk Register had not been incorporated into the latest iteration, although no objection appeared to have been raised by the Risk Management Group. The Committee remained in agreement that the amendments previously requested to Risk 1 - Research & Innovation (Reputation) - were required and it was decided to raise these points again.

Action: Secretary

21/27 Membership and Terms of Reference

The Membership and Terms of Reference were approved.

21/28 Minutes of the meeting held on 15 June 2021

The minutes of the meeting held on 15 June 2021 were agreed as a correct record.

21/29 Matters Arising

a) UKRI open access policy

The Director ULCS & University Librarian advised the Committee that UKRI had published its long-awaited Open Access Policy in August. Key points of note were as follows:

- Peer-reviewed articles funded by UKRI research councils which were submitted for publication on or after 1 April 2022 must be made immediately available via open access.

- Monographs, book chapters and edited collections funded by UKRI research councils submitted for publication on or after 1 January 2024 must be made open access within 12 months of publication.

The policy defined two routes for compliant open access articles – the Gold and Green routes. It was highlighted that there had been a change to the Green route, whereby a publisher-requested delay or ‘embargo period’ between publication of the Version of Record and open access of the deposited version was no longer permitted. It was confirmed that single author and edited monographs were both in scope; however, this would not be the case if contracts had already been signed with publishers, which was often done well in advance. The Committee was advised that consideration would need to be given to the process around open access monographs; the Library had a small fund to support the University’s own open access monographs but monograph funding would be held centrally by UKRI – it would therefore be necessary to have an administrative system in place to ensure the Library was kept apprised of communications between researchers and the UKRI. It was suggested that the University work on the principle that open access would be in scope for the next REF and consider how this should be managed. The necessary use of appropriate licences was noted and it was added that discussions were expected to be ongoing regarding rights retention.

It was queried what these implications would mean for the University in terms of supporting open access publishing for non-UKRI funded research in the future. The Committee was advised that there was growing recognition across the sector of a need for a strategic change in emphasis regarding the procurement of content, whereby there would likely be an emphasis on publishing (i.e. publishing the University’s own content externally) rather than simply buying. It was noted that there were already a number of universities attempting to launch their own institutional publishing. Further clarity was requested regarding monographs and the Committee was advised that there was approximately £40k allocated to support the publication of monographs. It was highlighted that the academic in question (or editor of works) was likely to be undertaking negotiations with the publisher themselves and in future, as the policy is implemented, it would be important for the University to be involved in such discussions to ensure conformance. In relation to the requirement for articles to be published open access from April 2022, it was queried how the University was going to ensure this was the case. It was confirmed that the Research Engagement Team had established an Open Access Policies working group and colleagues were working on progressing a change in culture.

It was agreed that this paper would be submitted to UBRI and further thought would be given to next steps in terms of communications.

Action: Director ULCS & University Librarian

b) Minute 21/15 a) *Update on research integrity training*

It was confirmed that any overlap between the research integrity training and existing training for the Code of Good Practice had been reviewed and the research integrity training pilot had subsequently taken place.

c) Minute 21/15 c) (21/02b) *Update on research integrity training*

The previous action to include an agenda item at the annual Research Division Leads Community of Practice meeting to understand any additional, more tailored, training needs was discussed. It was suggested that it would be more timely to undertake any such consultation at the spring meeting, following the training pilot, and it was noted that this matter was also being addressed through the Open Research action plan (via a question included in operating plans). The Chair added that they would be discussing research culture with RDLs during the autumn term

and it was concluded that there would be many upcoming opportunities to raise this subject with them.

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

The holding action for the Head of Research Services to continue to update on the progress of the work relating to visiting researchers was noted.

Action: Head of Research Services

e) Minute 21/22 *SCFP pilot on use of Electronic Lab Notebooks*

It was noted that the outcome of the pilot study on the use of electronic lab notebooks (ELNs) would be presented to the spring meeting of CORRI.

Action: Open Research Champion

- f) The Committee was informed that UKRIO had recently published a new self-assessment tool in relation to the Concordat to Support Research Integrity (CSRI); it was suggested that it might be pertinent to review this again as there had been various additions, including in areas of equality, diversity and inclusion. It was agreed that the new self-assessment would be considered at the next meeting, where the Committee would review areas which had been added to the self-assessment and decide whether to address all new aspects included or a key selection of these.

Action: Secretary & Chair/Deputy Vice-Chancellor

g) Update on research integrity training

The Committee was advised that Dr Roesch and Lynn Moore (Learning and Development Officer - Leadership and Research Staff Development) had been invited by UKRIO to trial research integrity training over the autumn term. This would include both the shorter online video training and also the longer training facilitated by members of staff. The trial would be undertaken with a variety of Schools/set-ups and would result in a formal recommendation by December. Over the summer, Dr Roesch had trained 28 staff on the VIR2TUE 'train the trainer' platform, with the result that there were now 15 fully trained staff at UoR available to provide the longer face-to-face training. The first of these training sessions had taken place the previous week for PhD students at HBS and several other sessions were planned. Discussions were also taking place with the Graduate School regarding providing this training to PhD students; due to the large numbers, the current intention was to train first years only and potentially make this mandatory. In terms of the shorter training to be made available on UoRLearn, James Parry (Chief Executive of UKRIO) would be delivering this in a form that would be recorded and then made available. It was confirmed that no details had yet been provided regarding online modules produced by UKRIO for use by subscribers, although subsequent to the meeting, the Chair was able to confirm that the UKRIO is now planning to launch modules for subscribers in January 2022.

It was queried what commitment was expected from the 15 colleagues trained by Dr Roesch and it was clarified that they had been trained in the context of a virtual project (ending in November); however, they had the option to finalise their training and become accredited, which required training at least 10 other people, and many were keen to do this. Dr Roesch was supporting them in this and would provide an introduction to the start of any training sessions. Feedback would be captured from these sessions to inform how many hours the training should last, whether this should be disciplinary or across Schools etc. It was added that PhD students and a colleague from RES had also expressed interest in being trained and the Committee noted that this had the potential to become a sustainable process.

The Committee discussed the inclusion of Research Integrity Champions in the draft Communications Plan and whether those who were trained would be candidates for this, although it was noted that some appropriate colleagues might already hold formal roles within Schools. It was clarified that Research Integrity Champions had been included in the Communications Plan without specific plans regarding these having been confirmed. Concern was expressed that there was a risk of overusing the term of 'champion' and that the fundamental nature of research integrity could be undervalued by this. It was agreed that further consideration was needed for a term for these trainers. It was clarified that the shorter online training would be mandatory for all relevant members of the University, whereas the longer training was intended to be mandatory for all first year PhD students and also open to staff. In relation to the virtual project which had trained the initial cohort, the Committee was advised that Dr Roesch would be speaking at a conference regarding his experience of organising this training at an institutional level and several trainees had been invited to be interviewed as part of a testimony video.

h) Responsible metrics and open research in recruitment and promotion

The Committee was advised that the University already had a policy in place for using responsible metrics when assessing research and it had been agreed that it would also be important to consider open research in recruitment and promotion. The intention was to reach a position where responsible metrics for research would be used rigorously during all recruitment and promotion activities, taking open research achievements into account and potentially accepting use of narrative CVs. CORRI was asked to approve the establishment of a working group to investigate the practical implications of implementing these recommendations, modifying these as necessary and undertaking their implementation and evaluation. It was highlighted that any implementation would require complex stakeholder engagement as well as changes to processes, training, monitoring and evaluation. It was noted that a RES working group had already been established to explore the potential use of narrative CVs in recruitment and promotion and 11 recommendations from this group had been included in the paper.

The Committee agreed the need for a focused effort and supported the idea of a working group and a consultation-first approach but queried who would lead this work. It was discussed how responsible metrics should sit within other aspects of research culture and it was suggested that research culture stretched across the whole piece, that research integrity sat below this as a large part of research culture (but not everything), with open research and responsible metrics beneath that. The Chair advised that Research England would be allocating specific funds for promoting research culture this year of an estimated £300-500k for UoR, which could potentially contribute towards this work. It was queried who the training would be offered to, noting that a significant number of colleagues sat on recruitment panels and it might not be feasible to undertake this offline. It was clarified that this matter would be considered by the proposed working group and it was suggested that it might be appropriate to target lead individuals (e.g. Heads of School) in the first instance who, then understanding what was required, could take responsibility for this. It was queried whether this would include PIs recruiting for specific projects; the intention to include use of responsible metrics in standard HR guidelines for recruitment was confirmed and it was suggested that there was already mandatory training on matters such as bias and it might be possible to include content on responsible metrics alongside this. The timeframe for forming the working group was discussed and it was agreed that it would be important to coordinate with both the professorial review and expectations framework and their associated timelines to enable the opportunity to influence these.

The Chair agreed to raise this matter at UBRI and request feedback on the constitution of the working group, as well as suggestions for who might lead this.

21/30 Open Research Action Plan

The Research Dean informed the Committee that the Open Research Action Plan working group was meeting monthly to monitor progress and had been pleased to note at its last meeting that work was on or ahead of target for 80% of actions.

The Committee was advised that the Open Research Champions initiative was progressing positively with a number of champions taking the lead on various projects, such as an open research survey to establish the needs of staff and students across the University. Open Research Forum meetings were continuing to be held for discussion of various topics and the sharing of knowledge and experience. A meeting in September had been well attended by approximately 40 colleagues (both Open Research Champions and others) and had featured an external speaker from the University of Aberdeen. The intention was to recruit Open Research Champions again in spring 2022 and spring 2023. It was queried whether existing Champions would be able to nominate others for this role; it was agreed that it would be appropriate for Champions to encourage suitable colleagues to apply (and potentially supply short testimonials for applications) but recruitment was still intended to incorporate expressions of interest to enable any colleague to convey their enthusiasm. It was agreed that it would be beneficial to include existing Champions on the panel assessing applications for the next intake.

The Open Research Champion provided an update on the pilot of electronic lab notebooks (ELNs) within the School of Chemistry, Food and Pharmacy and the Committee was advised that, due to delays in receiving approval for software, the decision had been made to restrict the pilot to OneNote. There were seven participants, some of whom had already committed to moving to digital notetaking permanently. Once feedback had been received this would be discussed with Open Research Champions and next steps would be considered e.g. it was hoped to expand this pilot to the School of Biological Sciences. It was confirmed that the open research survey was live until November, with a cash prize incentive, and over 100 responses had already been received. The intention was to conclude the survey with a report and/or publication to be presented at the Open Research Forum in December.

In relation to research software engineering, the Committee was advised that much progress had been made over the past year, including growth of the community generally and an increase in engagement at the University. Demand for software and resources was growing and invitations were being received to present at undergraduate classes on subjects such as coding. There had also been significant improvement in the area of training and it was hoped to run a number of events involving researchers at other universities. With regards to software carpentry, the first training workshop had been held online over four days in July and had been very successful. Attendance had been capped at 20 trainees and much had been learnt from this initial run. Consideration was being given to potentially holding a second workshop in week six and also developing the University's own set of materials.

21/31 Draft Communications Plan

The Committee received the draft Communications Plan. The Head of Research Communication & Engagement highlighted the need to ensure awareness of the CSRI and the fact that training would play a significant part in staff engagement. It was suggested that focusing communications on research integrity might now feel out of date considering the current focus on research culture in the sector. It was commented that if Research England funds were received to be spent within a year on the subject of research culture it would be preferable to begin by communicating the whole context of research culture rather than just the narrower area of research integrity, which could diffuse the message. The structuring of aspects such as good practice, research culture and research integrity were discussed and it was noted that the University of Glasgow had produced a good example of this, having invested funding

in their leadership of this area. Ownership of this at UoR was discussed and it was queried who would be the point of contact with day-to-day responsibility for coordinating activities relating to research culture, noting that some aspects would fall between different departments. It was suggested that a sustained resource would be required to support this work.

It was agreed that a short paper setting out key questions and considerations relating to communications around research culture would be submitted to the next UCRI for an open discussion/brainstorming session and a revised plan subsequently worked up. Depending on timing, this would likely be brought back to CORRI when it was hoped further information regarding funding would be available.

Action: Head of Research Communication & Engagement

21/32 Strategy

This was covered elsewhere in the meeting.

21/33 Projects and programmes portfolio

a) Update on Concordat to Support Research Integrity

- i. Progress against action plan, including consideration of the new UKRIO self-assessment tool

The action plan was discussed briefly elsewhere in the meeting and the updated version is included at the end of this document.

b) UKRN update

The Committee was advised that the Research Dean continued to attend monthly meetings as the institutional lead for UKRN and Dr Roesch participated in monthly meetings intended to coordinate the actions of local leads. The University was both contributing to and benefitting from the sharing of good practice as part of this network. The Research Data Manager had produced a checklist for creating an Open Research action plan, which would be included as part of a UKRN toolkit (and had received an invitation to Oxford Brookes to discuss this work), while work done by other institutions in terms of recruitment and promotions had fed into the paper discussed previously in the meeting. The UKRN proposal to the Research England Development Fund had been successful, meaning that UoR would receive a part time post to work in the Library Engagement team.

- i. UKRN submissions to the STC Inquiry on Reproducibility and Research Integrity

The Committee noted the submissions to the STC Inquiry on Reproducibility and Research Integrity circulated. In terms of next steps, it was expected that UKRN would be called to give evidence; it was not known whether all evidence submitted would be published.

c) Update on Plan S, other open access matters and supporting open access monograph chapters not covered in 5a

The Committee was advised that a further £10k block grant from BHF had been received to support open access. The Open Access Week would shortly take place and feature a programme of activities. Negotiations with Elsevier were ongoing, with the current deal set to expire on 31 December, following JISC's advice to the sector to reject the third deal offered on 6 September. UoR would be participating in a consultation regarding this and it was clarified that if no deal was reached the University would be covered by post-

cancellation access for the first year. The Committee received a brief update on other deals and was advised that the open access limit had been reached with Wiley and consideration was being given to how open access could continue to be supported beyond UKRI funded papers.

21/34 Policy

- a) Feedback on ROCG workshop on plans for revising UKRI policy and guidelines on governance of good research conduct

The Head of Quality Assurance in Research advised that the workshop held by ROCG was part of a consultation undertaken by UKRI and had resulted in a revised draft policy being proposed. Revisions were particularly focused on misconduct, including providing more detail on what was meant by this and what action was expected from institutions in relation to these procedures – in particular, the requirement to inform UKRI of informal misconduct investigations had been removed. The revised guidance would only apply to UKRI researchers but was expected to be applicable to other funders.

- b) Other relevant policy matters

The Head of Research Services advised that the UKRI policy on the governance of research conduct increased the focus on expectations around positive research culture. This included aspects such as systems and organisations, including clear arrangements for management, and there would be increasing expectations on the availability of that certain documentation/policies. The Committee was also advised that UKRI had recently published its next terms and conditions which contained the obligation to ensure the requirements in the CSRI (and any subsequent amendments) were met. In relation to the UKRI's policy on preventing harm in research and innovation, it had been clarified that bullying and harassment would only need to be reported at a formal stage – revised guidance would be published later in the year. The draft UoR guidance note on preventing harm (safeguarding) in research and innovation activities had been submitted to the Committee of University Policies and Procedures over the summer. CUPP had observed that it would take a significant amount of time and resource to support a 'gold standard' approach, which was not consistent with the approach taken for any other policies and was not necessarily warranted at this time. Work was therefore proceeding on an internal approach, including guidance documents, training, further advertising of reporting routes and more guidance on risk assessments. The Head of Research Services had also liaised with the Health and Safety Auditor/Advisor regarding the inclusion of safeguarding in any relevant codes of practice. It was noted that modules were being developed for areas such as lone working, which would also support the work on preventing harm. It was clarified that UKRI were likely to monitor compliance through funding assurance visits and funding assessments.

21/35 Reporting Committees

- a) Research Ethics Committee

- i. 'Policies, governance, procedures and guidance' document, revised following internal audit

The Committee noted the revised document and was informed that biannual sign off from CORRI and UBRI was now proposed, with any more urgent approvals to be provided by the respective Chairs. The Head of Quality Assurance in Research suggested that including reference to the intended ethics community of practice might be appropriate, as per the CSRI action, and Committee members agreed that this should be added.

Action: Head of Quality Assurance in Research

21/36 Any Other Business

The Committee was advised that the University of Amsterdam was now selling its research integrity training for 550 euros and it was suggested that consideration could be given to the University also delivering such training to others for a cost.

It was suggested that it would be helpful to create a database of activities undertaken in relation to CORRI to enable easier communication regarding, and evidence of, the good work being done. Dr Roesch was asked to create a spreadsheet on the CORRI Team, containing any activities he was aware of, so others could then add to this. It was also suggested that relevant documentation (e.g. PDFs of blogs) could be kept in the same place.

Action: Academic Representative (Dr Roesch)

21/37 Date of next meeting

The date of the next meeting was confirmed as Tuesday 8 March 2022.

Concordat to Support Research Integrity action list

	Action	Lead Responsible	Timeline
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 SDTL	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 (dependant on restrictions on in-person training)
17	Seek guidance on appointment of external panel members for formal investigation of research misconduct by students or staff	Parveen Yaqoob	On hold (dependant on training above)
18	Establish Community of Practice for central and local ethics committees	Mike Proven	Spring 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 (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
21	Survey researchers to assess understanding and practicalities of the concordat implementation and feedback on training, dissemination etc.	Parveen Yaqoob	Summer 2022
22	Confirm whether action needed to reinstate UKRIO subscription	Parveen Yaqoob	Complete
23	Confirm a timescale for the availability of UKRIO online training on research integrity	CORRI in partnership with People Development	January 2022 (interim solution in place – James Parry recording)
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	Spring 2022

26	Consolidate package of existing and new training and develop appropriate accompanying communications and support	CORRI in partnership with People Development	Spring 2022
27	Create a research integrity training plan for the University	CORRI in partnership with People Development	Spring 2022