

## Context

This statement provides the University's response to the UK *Concordat for Research Integrity* (2012) previously issued by Research Councils UK (RCUK) (now UK Research and Innovation) and endorsed by the Minister for Universities and Science. The statement is intended to inform UK Research and Innovation, Research England, the academic community, other funders of our research, and the public more broadly, about how the University of Sussex addresses matters of Research Integrity and seeks to foster a culture of professional integrity.

The Concordat seeks to provide a comprehensive national framework for good research conduct and its governance. As signatories to, and supporters of, the *Concordat to Support Research Integrity*<sup>1</sup>, the University of Sussex is 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, robust and fair processes to deal with allegations of research misconduct should they arise
- working together to strengthen the integrity of research and to reviewing progress regularly and openly

The principles and governance arrangements are elaborated in the statement.

## A message from Professor Adam Tickell

Throughout our history, academics and researchers at the University of Sussex have made transformational interventions in their fields and created new ones. Our research has enhanced understanding and improved lives. Great research depends upon the highest standards of integrity in its design, execution and governance. The University is fully committed to the UK Concordat to Support Research Integrity and our Research Integrity statement is an important codification of our values.

---

Professor Adam Tickell, Vice-Chancellor  
University of Sussex  
November 2019

---

<sup>1</sup> As published in 2012

Document Control					
<b>Document No</b>	1.0	<b>Version</b>	1.0	<b>Date Issued</b>	September 2019
<b>Author</b>	Antony Walsh	<b>Reviewed by</b>	RGQAC, RKEC	<b>Department</b>	R&ES

## Annual Research Integrity Policy Statement

The University of Sussex is committed to promoting and upholding the highest quality academic and ethical standards in all its activities. The University's approach to Research Integrity has been to develop Research Governance policies and procedures that recognise the importance of addressing matters of ethics and integrity, while supporting the achievement of its collective research objectives. To this end, robust Research Governance policies and procedures underpin all research at the University, which is supported by training and guidance.

The Research Governance and Quality Assurance Committee (RGQAC), previously the University Research Governance Committee (URGC) is responsible for approving policies and guidelines for the conduct of activities with implications for compliance with research governance. As of 2019-20, a second committee, reporting directly to Senate, the Research Ethics and Integrity Committee (REIC), will provide oversight of the activities of the University's ethical review committees and institutional initiatives to strengthen research integrity.

From April 2014, Research Councils UK (RCUK) has incorporated assurance questions into the standard RCUK Assurance Programme of Research Organisations in receipt of RCUK funding. These questions have been informed by the UK Concordat for Research Integrity (2012).

This Research Integrity statement provides the University's response to UK Research and Innovation. The statement is intended to inform not only UK Research and Innovation but also the academic community, other funders of our research, and the public more broadly, about how the University of Sussex addresses matters of Research Integrity and seeks to foster a culture of professional integrity.

**The statements below are in direct response to the RCUK assurance questions:**

**1. Please confirm that you have policies and procedures in place that meet Research Integrity and Ethics requirements, including processes for dealing with allegations of misconduct. How often are these reviewed and when were they last reviewed?**

**i. Procedure for governing good research practice**

The University fully endorses the UK *Concordat to Support Research Integrity* by promoting research excellence and ensuring that research reflects the highest standards. The University has issued a Research Integrity Policy Statement which it reviews and updates annually:

<https://www.sussex.ac.uk/research/about/standards/research-integrity-policy-statement>

The University has a robust Research Governance and Ethical Review Framework underpinned by the following institutional statements and policies (last review date in parentheses)

Document Control				
Document No		Version		Date Issued
Author		Reviewed by		Department

- *Research Governance Standard Operating Procedures* (June 2019)
- *Procedure for the Investigation of Allegations of Misconduct in Research* (June 2019)
- *Code of Practice for Research* (June 2019)
- *Equality and Diversity Policy* (July 2019)
- *Research Integrity Policy Statement* (November 2018)
- *Policy to Prevent Harassment and Bullying at Work* (September 2014)
- *Grievance Procedure* (February 2012)
- *Financial Regulations* (March 2018)
- *Anti-Bribery Policy* (March 2018)
- *Public Interest Disclosure Policy* (November 2017)
- *Health, Safety and Wellbeing Policy* (May 2015)
- *Lone Working Policy* (October 2012)

These policies were last updated as indicated above and are reviewed on a rolling basis.

The University underwent a two-day UK Research and Innovation Funding Assurance Programme visit in June 2019. No concerns were expressed in relation to policies and procedures for the oversight of research integrity and research governance.

ii. **Process for dealing with Allegations of Research Misconduct**

The process is detailed in the ‘*Procedure for the Investigation of Allegations of Misconduct in Research*’ The Research Ethics and Integrity Committee (REIC) is responsible for the policy and the Provost, Professor Saul Becker, is responsible for the procedure.

iii. **Investigating and reporting unacceptable research conduct (that meets requirements set out in the Concordat to Support Research Integrity (2012) and the RCUK’s code of conduct and policy on the governance of good research conduct (2009))**

The *Procedure for the Investigation of Allegations of Misconduct in Research* (June 2018) (the ‘*Procedure*’ is linked to the University’s disciplinary procedures, with the operation of the Procedure being the responsibility of the Provost supported by the Research Governance Officer. The policy acknowledges the RCUK’s *Policy and Guidelines on Governance of Good Research Conduct* (2012) and the Universities UK *Concordat to Support Research Integrity* (2012).

2. **Please provide the publicly accessible web links to these policies and the name of the senior officer responsible for dealing with cases of misconduct.**

**Publically accessible web-links**

The web-links for the relevant policies are the following:

- [Procedure for the Investigation of Allegations of Misconduct in Research](#) (June 2019)

Document Control				
Document No		Version		Date Issued
Author		Reviewed by		Department

- [The Code of Practice for Research](#) (June 2019)
- [Research Governance Standard Operating Procedures](#) (June 2018)
- [Public Interest Disclosure Policy](#) (November 2017)

**The senior officer responsible for dealing with cases of misconduct is Professor Saul Becker, Provost.**

Section D of the *Procedure for the Investigation of Allegations of Misconduct in Research* (June 2019) states that:

*...initial allegations of misconduct in research should be made to the Provost. If the Complainant is not a member of the University, he/she should still make an initial allegation of misconduct in research to the Provost. The Complainant must provide as detailed a statement as possible in writing in support of the allegation.*

It is not mandatory for the initial allegation to be directly communicated to the Provost. The complainant may raise a concern, in the first instance, with a Head of School or Unit, line manager, a trade union representative, a member of the Students Union or a colleague and ask that person to bring the matter forward on their behalf.

In the event that there is a conflict of interest for the Provost, the allegation can be directed to the Director of Planning, Governance and Compliance.

The policy states which individuals within the University, relevant funder(s) and statutory bodies are informed by receiving documentation of the initial allegation, investigation (preliminary and formal) and subsequent action.

**3. How are these policies disseminated to staff? Please indicate if any special provision is made for new employees (including post-graduate students) and also how staff awareness is maintained.**

*The Code of Practice for Research* (June 2019): Observance of the Code (Item 1.2.1) states:

*All staff and students engaged in research, and any others engaged in research within and/or for the University, must familiarise themselves with the Code and ensure that its provisions are observed. Heads of School, Directors of Research & Knowledge Exchange, and Principal Investigators have a responsibility to ensure that the highest standards of research integrity, governance and ethical practice are met, that research activities are undertaken in compliance with the Code amongst staff and students under their supervision, and to seek to foster a culture of openness and professional integrity in research practice. The University will draw attention to the Code in its induction processes for newly appointed teaching and research faculty. Supervisors of students engaged in research will seek to ensure compliance with the Code on the part of such students and will direct students to any additional training or support that may be required.*

The University of Sussex *Research Governance Standard Operating Procedures* (2018, p.36) states that “regular communication with Cross School Research Ethics Committee Chairs and

Document Control				
Document No		Version		Date Issued
Author		Reviewed by		Department

*support staff will ensure that new developments/requirements in ethical review are effectively disseminated*". Staff are required to keep up-to-date with policy. Policy updates are communicated to all staff through Heads of School and Directors of Research and Knowledge Exchange in each school. The standard letter of appointment for academic and research staff includes reference to the *Code of Practice for Research* (2019).

A Researcher Development Programme is led by the Doctoral School. The Research Governance Officer provides termly workshops on Ethical Review and 'Ethical issues in research' which covers research conduct.

**4. Please outline any actions and activities that have been undertaken to support and strengthen understanding and application of research integrity issues (for example, postgraduate and researcher training, or process reviews).**

The University implemented a University-wide mechanism for a light-touch audit of ethically reviewed research projects in 2018-19. Each Cross-School Research Ethics Committee (C-REC) undertook audits of a small number of previously approved studies and reported findings to URGC.

In the course of the academic year, the University saw the launch of a Joint Clinical Research Office, an initiative resulting from cooperation between the universities of Sussex and Brighton, Sussex Partnership Health Trust and Brighton and Sussex University NHS Health Trust. The Office serves to facilitate research activity across academia and the NHS including supporting sponsorship processes

The University undertakes an annual review of ethical review processes undertaken both at individual School level and by the three Cross-Schools Research Ethics committees that report directly to the Research Ethics and Integrity Committee (REIC). Through reviewing individual reports, the REIC considers the extent to which adequate arrangements exist for effective and efficient ethical review of research for all types of research.

The Brighton and Sussex Medical School reported that throughout the academic year bespoke training and support was given to students and staff for specific stages of the research life-cycle. The School has embedded requirements for maintaining up to date training in Good Clinical Practice and NHS Information Governance training through agreements with Brighton and Sussex University NHS Health Trust. Good Clinical Practice training is compulsory for all researchers working on projects involving NHS patients. Compliance with training requirements is assessed and followed up as part of staff appraisals. Currently the School is considering options for introducing appropriate proportionate risk-based ethical review processes for approval by URGC.

In the School of Education and Social Work, a number of three hour ethics workshops were arranged during the academic year for MSc and PhD students including as specific session on 'Researching Childhood'.

Document Control				
Document No		Version		Date Issued
Author		Reviewed by		Department

The School of Media, Film and Music continue to develop mechanisms that ensure that ethical reflection occurs across research and professional practice activities within the School. In the course of the year a working group was convened to ensure consistency across Media, Film and Music in interpreting requirements for ethical review by SREO/C-REC, the use of 'blanket' ethical approval and other types of evaluation of ethical questions that occur in teaching and research.

The School of Psychology introduced training to guide researchers in the ethical review process at undergraduate and PGR level.

**5. The Research Councils expect that the research they support will be carried out to a high ethical standard. Please explain the arrangements you have in place for reviewing that any research funded by the Councils is planned and conducted in accordance with such ethical standards.**

Robust research governance procedures and policies underpin all research conducted by staff and students at the University. This is supported by ethical review, the issuing of guidance by RGQAC, the provision of training and support for research integrity across the University.

Individuals with responsibility for undertaking ethical review (School Research Ethics Officers and Research Ethics Committee members) are invited to receive annual training and are able to request expert guidance from the Research Governance Officer in Research and Enterprise Services as and when queries arise or support is required.

The Cross-School Research Ethics Committees (C-RECs) report to the Research Ethics and Integrity Committee (REIC). The REIC oversees the ethical review process, reviews and develops policies and procedures, and considers research integrity and ethical issues.

In the context of externally-funded research proposals, applications for ethical review will normally be made once external funding has been approved, rather than at the point of application. However, as a matter of good practice, all bids for external funding are subject to internal peer review prior to submission; this should include consideration of ethics. The Research Governance Officer is available for pre-award queries from researchers for example around methodology or research design to support a funding application.

If a project raises new ethical concerns or amends its methodology, a revision or substantive amendment of the ethics application is submitted to the Committee that provided initial ethics approval.

The ethical approval process is specifically supported by training on research governance, ethics and integrity and by university guidance and policies, procedures and templates/examples to encourage best practice. Researchers are also encouraged to comply with and follow their professional code of ethical practice in addition to the University's *Code of Practice for Research*.

The University has standard operating procedures and policies that cover procedures for reporting adverse and unexpected events and monitoring of ethical review processes. The University has a clear and robust policy and process for allegations of research misconduct

Document Control				
Document No		Version		Date Issued
Author		Reviewed by		Department

together with clear guidance and policy on data protection and research data management. The implementation of a light touch monitoring and audit process is under development.

Ethical review at the University takes into account the level of risk associated with any project in order to ensure that the review process is proportionate:

- Low-Risk Undergraduate (UG) and Postgraduate Taught (PGT) student research projects are reviewed at School level by their Supervisor and their School Research Ethics Officer.
- All Staff and Postgraduate Research (PGR) student projects are reviewed by a Cross-Schools Research Ethics Committee (C-REC). Higher risk UG and PGT student projects also go to a C-REC for review.
- Research from the Brighton and Sussex Medical School (BSMS) (all student and staff projects from the Medical School and projects that require ethical review from a clinical perspective e.g. a psychology project that involves fMRI scanning healthy volunteers, that require ethical review) is considered by the BSMS Research Governance and Ethics Committee (BSMS RGEC). The BSMS RGEC uses a specific online ethical review application form, which is appropriate for clinical research, public health research and the collection, use and storage of human tissue and materials under the University's Human Tissue Authority (HTA) licences.

In addition to the three C-RECs, the HTA Coordination Group oversees the governance of research with human tissue and biological material and coordinates operational issues at an institutional level. This group, with representation from each of the University's four HTA licences, provides an advisory function to ethical reviewers assessing new applications proposing research that may fall under the relevant legislation.

There is a specialised Committee, the Animal Welfare and Ethical Review Board (AWERB), that considers and reviews any research that involves non-human animal subjects (Animals Scientific Procedures Act (2012) (ASPA) and non-ASPA). An operational review group with a specialist membership meet regularly, in addition to the Committee, to resolve operational issues and promote best practice. The University is a signatory of the *Concordat on Openness in Animal Research (2014)*, a multi-disciplinary initiative led by Understanding Animal Research (UAR).

The Sponsorship Sub-Committee provides oversight to all research that falls under the UK Policy Framework for Health and Social Care (research with NHS patients, staff, tissue and data) fulfilling the expectations of the Health Research Authority (HRA) for Sponsorship. The Committee receives regular reports from clinical trials (CTIMPs)

The Research Governance website gives a comprehensive overview of the ethical review system at the University. For more information, visit the University's Research Governance [webpage<sup>2</sup>](http://www.sussex.ac.uk/staff/research/governance) or contact the University's Research Governance Officer: [rgoffice@sussex.ac.uk](mailto:rgoffice@sussex.ac.uk) ; 01273 872748.

<sup>2</sup> <http://www.sussex.ac.uk/staff/research/governance>

Document Control				
Document No	Version	Date Issued		
Author	Reviewed by	Department		

**6. How many formal investigations of research misconduct have been completed in the past three academic years which relate to researchers funded by or responsible for funding from Research Councils (including supervisors of postgraduate awards)?**

The University first published a summary of research misconduct allegations in 2013. The aggregated record keeping of research misconduct allegations began in 2010. As required by UK Research and Innovation and Research England, *figures are provided for the past 3 completed academic years with year 1 representing the most recently completed year* (Year 1: 2018-19, Year 2: 2017-18, Year 3: 2016-17). 'Academic years' refers to the period 1 October to 31 September.

There were 5 completed investigations into allegations of research misconduct in the 2018-19 academic year. Where and when required, external funders were notified of the cases in line with the Procedure.

Document Control					
Document No		Version		Date Issued	
Author		Reviewed by		Department	



## Research and Enterprise Services

RC	Year	Fabrication		Falsification		Plagiarism		Misrepresentation		Breach of duty of care		Improper dealing with allegations of misconduct		Other	
		Completed	Upheld	Completed	Upheld	Completed	Upheld	Completed	Upheld	Completed	Upheld	Completed	Upheld	Completed	Upheld
AHRC	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
	3	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
BBSRC	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
EPSRC	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
ESRC	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
MRC	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
NERC	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
STFC	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
<b>Total</b>		<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>

Table 1 – Formal investigations of research misconduct (RCUK funded research 2016-2018)

Year 1 – 2016-17 Year 2- 2017-18, Year 3 – 2018-19

## Research and Enterprise Services

The following table shows instances of allegations of research misconduct *irrespective* of funding source.

	Number of formal investigations completed (academic years*)			Number of allegations upheld (in whole or in part) (academic years)		
	<b>2016</b>	<b>2017</b>	<b>2018</b>	<b>2016</b>	<b>2017</b>	<b>2018</b>
Fabrication	0	0		0	0	0
Falsification	1	0		0	0	0
Plagiarism	0	0	4	0	0	2
Misrepresentation	0	0	0	0	0	0
Breach of duty of care	1	0	1	0	0	0
Improper dealing with allegations of misconduct	0	0	0	0	0	0
Other (please specify)	3	0	0	1b	0	0
(Details of any allegations upheld in part)		0		1d	0	
<b>Total</b>	<b>5</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>5</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>2</b>

\*Academic year – 1 October to 30 September

Table 2 – Formal; investigations of research misconduct (all research- 2016-2018)

\*Academic year – 1 October to 30 September

**Key:**

- a. i) Intentional non-compliance with (...) legal or ethical requirements for the conduct of research
- ii) Self-referral to the Procedure following formal retraction of a journal article
- iii) Personation (related to a PhD examination)
- b. i) Partially upheld - as there was no attempt to deceive, no further action would taken
- c. Upheld – journals requested to retract articles
- d. Upheld – respondent requested to formally correct attribution of authorship

Document Control					
<b>Document No</b>	1.0	<b>Version</b>	1.0	<b>Date Issued</b>	September 2019
<b>Author</b>	Antony Walsh	<b>Reviewed by</b>	RGQAC, RKEC	<b>Department</b>	R&ES

A copy of the Procedure can be found on the Research and Knowledge Exchange [web-pages](#)<sup>3</sup>.

**Approved by Council, 27 November 2019**

---

<sup>3</sup> [http://www.sussex.ac.uk/staff/research/rqi/rqi\\_information\\_and\\_support/rqi\\_strategy\\_policy/research-policies](http://www.sussex.ac.uk/staff/research/rqi/rqi_information_and_support/rqi_strategy_policy/research-policies)

Document Control					
Document No		Version		Date Issued	
Author		Reviewed by		Department	

<b>Review / Contacts / References</b>	
Title:	Annual Research Integrity Policy Statement
Date approved:	November 2019
Approving body:	Council
Last review date:	November 2018
Revision history:	Annual statement
Next review date:	November 2020
Related internal policies, procedures, guidance:	<a href="https://www.sussex.ac.uk/research/about/standards/research-integrity-policy-statement">https://www.sussex.ac.uk/research/about/standards/research-integrity-policy-statement</a>
Policy owner:	<i>Research and Enterprise Services</i>
Lead contact / author:	<i>Research Governance Officer</i>

<b>Document Control</b>					
<b>Document No</b>		<b>Version</b>		<b>Date Issued</b>	
<b>Author</b>		<b>Reviewed by</b>		<b>Department</b>	