Minutes of the UK Committee on Research Integrity inaugural business meeting, 20 May 2022

Attendees	
Nandini Das, ND	Claire Henderson, CH, UK CORI Senior Advisor (Secretariat)
Maria Delgado, MD	Ralitsa Madsen, RM
Louise Dunlop, LD	Jil Matheson, JM
Suzanne Farley, SF	Miles Padgett, MP
Andrew George, AG (Co-chair)	Sophie Robson, Operations Manager, UKRI
Ian Gilmore, IG	Rebecca Veitch, Head of Research Integrity, UKRI (Observer)
Rachael Gooberman-Hill, RGH (Co-chair)	

Time: 15:00-16:00
Location: 58 Victoria Embankment, Temple, London, EC4Y 0DS

1. Welcome

1.1.   Co-chairs, Andrew George and Rachael Gooberman-Hill welcomed members of the UK Committee on Research Integrity (UK CORI) to the meeting.

1.2.   No apologies had been received.

1.3.   The co-chairs gave committee members an opportunity to declare any previously undeclared conflicts of interest, of which there were none.

2. Terms of reference: for changes and approval

2.1.   The committee requested the following amendments to the Terms of Reference:

- Define how UK Committee on Research Integrity defines the scope of "the sector"
- Adapted language about the future governance of the UK Committee on Research Integrity
- Broaden and adapt language to show how the committee will liaise effectively with stakeholders
- Ensure accountability and transparency are adequately reflected

2.2.   The committee agreed the terms of reference would be revised accordingly by the secretariat and then circulated to the committee for comments and approval.

Action: Secretariat to make suggested amendments to Terms of Reference and circulate for comments and approval.

3. Overall workplan

3.1.   AG explained there would be two core workstreams focused on strategy development and the annual report, these would be managed by working groups. Rachael Gooberman-Hill would chair the strategy development working group and Andrew George would chair the annual report working group. The whole committee would be involved in both core workstreams. All other workstreams would be run by smaller working groups chaired by members of the committee. The groups would also involve external members from stakeholder groups. The committee agreed with this approach.

3.2.   The committee noted and discussed the proposed workstreams presented. Two additional areas of consideration suggested for discussion were a focus on systemic pressures and on confidence in research. Members agreed it would be beneficial to have a dedicated space to develop and share ideas for innovative workstreams.

3.2.   The committee agreed in principle with the proposed approach and recommended that the workplan be developed further and brought to the next meeting for comment.

Action: Co-chairs and secretariat to develop more detailed workplan to be brought back to the committee for discussion

4. Engagement and communications workplan

4.1.   RGH introduced the potential for a working group to develop the communications workplan. The working group could look at different options to ensure that the plan was appropriate and proportionate for the committee's needs. This was agreed by the committee.

4.2.   The committee discussed engagement, members noted the need for clarity about the purpose and potential outcomes that may follow from consultation. The committee would also wish to be mindful of any consultation fatigue in the sector.

4.3.   The committee also discussed internal routes for communication and noted that a committee chat function would be beneficial. The secretariat agreed to explore available options.

Action: RGH to set up a communications working group
Action: Secretariat to explore options for a committee chat function

5. Evaluation plan

5.1.   AG introduced the proposed approach to committee evaluation. The evaluation framework would be underpinned by the committee's objectives. Key business questions (KBQs) would be ascertained from the objectives and these would be temperature checked by senior stakeholders from across the sector. AG suggested the committee should seek feedback from a wide range of stakeholders on its objectives and KBQs before they are finalised. Quantitative and Qualitative key performance indicators (KPIs) would be identified to measure the committee's progress against its objectives, and these would be RAG rated at each formal committee meeting against progress made.

5.3.   Continuous improvement by reflecting on the way the committee was operating internally was also discussed. It was proposed that feedback would be collected from members after each meeting on the functionality and effectiveness of the committee and the meeting. This section could be chaired by a committee member and comments would be considered by the committee as a group, with suggestions for changes discussed, agreed, implemented, and evaluated.

5.2.   The committee approved the two approaches to evaluation.

6. Any other business

6.1.   RGH invited the committee to raise any other business.

6.2. Members suggested that it would be useful to invite a representative from the UK Reproducibility Network to a future meeting. It was suggested that the committee could also invite guest speakers from international bodies to future meetings.

6.3. The committee agreed that rotating meeting locations around the country would be good practice. Members noted that a national engagement programme could be planned around the formal committee meeting locations.

6.4. The committee noted the inclusion of "due regard to environmental sustainability" in the committee Code of Conduct and considered how "due regard" could be assessed. The secretariat agreed to consider how to address this.

6.5. It was noted that a committee risk register would be helpful and necessary. The secretariat would put risk on the agenda of the next meeting.

Action: All to consider how greater environmental sustainability can be achieved and assessed
Action: Committee to discuss risk at the next meeting

7. Standing items

7.1. Equality, diversity and inclusion considerations

7.1.1. RGH invited members to consider equality, diversity and inclusion in relation to the matters discussed today. The committee discussed the following observations where equality, diversity, and inclusion could be considered:
- Committee members could be mindful of personal biases when approaching their networks.
- Members could be mindful of, and acknowledge, potential power imbalances in research, including in relation to international research. Members acknowledged that there is a diversity of institutions and that universities come in a spectrum of shapes and sizes, all of which should be engaged.
- The committee acknowledged the importance of avoiding assumptions when considering what "good" research looks like, for instance in how reproducibility may be understood or look in different disciplines.

7.2. Communication matters arising

7.1.2. AG invited members to suggest required communications that had arisen from this meeting. In the interest of transparency, the committee agreed to produce a summary note of each meeting within two weeks of the formal meeting as members

acknowledged that the official meeting minutes would take time to be approved and published.

7.3. Reflections on the meeting, ways of working

7.3.1. The co-chairs invited members to reflect on the meeting approach. Members were happy with the way the meeting was chaired and suggested that the co-chairs might like to defer chairing to different committee members for the reflections discussion to enable them to also reflect on how the meeting went.

8. Close and date of next meeting

8.1. The co-chairs thanked members for their engagement, energy and contributions and confirmed the next meeting would take place on Monday 11 July 2022 in London, hosted by MD's institution the Royal Central School of Speech and Drama.

Actions

- **Secretariat** to make suggested amendments to Terms of Reference and circulate for comments and approval
- **Co-chairs and secretariat** to develop a more detailed workplan to be brought back to the committee for approval
- **RGH** to set up a communications working group
- **Secretariat** to explore options for a committee chat function
- **All** to consider how greater environmental sustainability can be achieved and assessed
- **Committee** to discuss risk at the next meeting