Minutes of the UK Committee on Research Integrity Business meeting, 30 January 2024

Time: 3pm to 4pm
Location: British Academy, 10-11 Carlton House Terrace, London SW1Y 5AH

Attendees	
Jane Alfred	Jil Matheson
Nandini Das	Miles Padgett (virtual)
Maria Delgado	Jeremy Watson
Louise Dunlop (virtual)	Tolulope Ayanbola, UK Committee on Research Integrity strategy advisor
Andrew George (Co-chair)	Claire Henderson, UK Committee on Research Integrity senior advisor
Ian Gilmore	Gillian Rendle, UK Committee on Research Integrity secretariat lead
Rachael Gooberman-Hill (Co-chair)	Elizabeth Saunders, UKRI Senior strategy advisor
Ralitsa Madsen	Rebecca Veitch, UKRI Head of research integrity

1. Welcome

1.1.   The UK Committee on Research Integrity was welcomed to the business meeting.

1.2.   There had been apologies received from Chris Graf.

1.3.   The meeting objectives were to:
- reflect on how best to take forward the work with the National Academies
- approve any revisions to the committee's five-year strategic plan
- agree principles for when the committee would provide formal endorsement of an external programme or statement

1.4.   The meeting minutes from October were approved without corrections. The action log was reviewed.

Month of meeting	Assigned to	Action	Progress
October 2023	Secretariat	List the membership of the committee on the Zenodo hosting page for the 2023 statement and to all statements going forward	To start
October 2023	AI working group	Draft a position paper/set of questions about AI to share with the committee in the first instance	In progress
October 2023	Secretariat	Add change arrows to the risk register	Complete
October 2023	Members	Update stakeholder engagement and success logs	In progress
October 2023	Co-chair RGH	Finalise blog guidance and series of blogs topics/authors.	Complete
October 2023	Secretariat	Ask UKRI whether the European Code of Research Integrity had been mapped against the requirements of the UK's Concordat to Support Research Integrity	Complete
October 2023	Members	Consider three questions in relation to the workstreams as follows: 1. Who is involved in the workstreams? 2. Who might benefit from the outputs of the workstreams? 3. What negative unintended consequences might be generated from the workstreams?	To start
October 2023	Committee	Add an item about the meeting to the Queen's University Belfast newsletter	In progress

2. Working with the UK National Academies

2.1.   The committee reflected upon the useful workshop that had taken place with colleagues from the National Academies. Committee members expressed their gratitude to all that attended for the stimulating discussion. Members articulated unanimous appetite to engage further with the Academies in their work on existing committee workstreams and also to continue to collaborate to further explore how research integrity can be articulated at a discipline level.

3. Enablers and inhibitors of research integrity

3.1.   The committee discussed the commissioned report which had been produced by Circlera, a partnership between UKRN, UKRIO and the Science Policy Research Unit (University of Sussex).

3.2.   The committee made the following observations:

- The addition of a conflicts of interest section would be welcome.
- The committee would be happy to include a foreword and a response to the report.

3.3.   Members were requested to provide final comments on the draft report within one week. Subject to the above suggestions being met, plus any additional comments, the committee was delighted to approve the report for publication.

Action: All members to provide final comments on the draft enablers and inhibitors report by 6 February.

4.   Strategic plan 2023 to 2025

4.1.   The committee reviewed its five-year strategic plan. Members agreed it remained fit for purpose with no proposed amendments. The plan would be reviewed again in 12 months.

5.   Principles for committee endorsement

5.1.   Members noted that on several occasions, the UK Committee on Research Integrity had been approached to provide formal endorsement for programmes, campaigns, and initiatives, such as becoming a signatory of a statement, or joining a coalition. The committee agreed that any decision to provide committee endorsement should be reached with consistency, transparency, and neutrality.

5.2.   Members noted that becoming a signatory, or providing endorsement, often comes with resource or action-based implications that the committee may not be able to fulfil and as such, each request should be considered on a case-by-case basis against simple and pragmatic criteria. The committee agreed that where requests meet the criteria, they will be brought to the full committee for further discussion and a decision.

Action: Secretariat and co-chairs to develop criteria to support decision making for giving committee endorsement.

6.   Artificial intelligence

6.1.   The committee working group had been considering how to add value to the debate on artificial intelligence, recognising the complexity of the area and the plethora of activity already taking place in the sector. It was agreed that the committee's 2024 annual statement would highlight key issues.

7.   Any other business

7.1.   The committee co-chairs informed the committee of a useful introductory meeting that took place with colleagues from GO-Science. There was an appetite from members of the committee to engage further with government groups.

7.2.   The Indicators of Research Integrity working group informed the committee of a meeting with colleagues from The Strategic Council for Research Excellence Integrity, and Trust (United States), who agreed that there were opportunities to convene international conversations around indicators and the synergies from the global projects that are happening concurrently. It was noted that the World Conference on Research Integrity in Athens in June 2024 could provide an appropriate opportunity for international engagement on indicators.

Action: Committee members attending the world conference on research integrity to schedule meeting together.

8.   Standing items

8.1.   Equality, diversity and inclusion (EDI)
The committee noted the following EDI considerations:
- *Relating to the workstreams* – The committee was asked to consider who is involved in the workstreams, who might benefit from the work, and potential unintended negative consequences. Members involved in committee workstreams were asked to consider these questions and reflect on them at the April 2024 meeting.

Action: All members to consider three questions in relation to the workstreams as follows and reflect on them at the April 2024 meeting:
  1. Who is involved in the workstreams?
  2. Who might benefit from the outputs of the workstreams?
  3. What negative unintended consequences might be generated from the workstreams?

Action: Secretariat to create space on the April 2024 committee meeting agenda to discuss the workstream EDI impact questions.

8.2.   Communication matters arising
There were no matters arising.

8.3.   Reflections on the meeting and ways of working

The committee thanked The British Academy for their generous hospitality and conveyed its appreciation for the workshop session that took place earlier in the day and the value that it added.

Committee members recognised the value of building momentum by discussing tangible outputs with national bodies and organisations. Members emphasised the importance of having an open door for organisations to be able to talk to them about important topics.

9. Close, and date of next meeting

9.1.   Members of the committee were thanked for their time and contributions. The next committee meeting will be held on 25 April 2024 hosted by UKRI at Caxton House in London.

9.2.   The co-chairs thanked members for their engagement, energy, and contributions and drew the meeting to a close.

Actions

- **All members** to provide final comments on the draft enablers and inhibitors report by 6 February 2024.
- **Secretariat and co-chairs** to develop criteria to support decision making for giving committee endorsement.
- **Committee members attending the world conference on research integrity** to schedule a meeting together.
- **All members** to consider three questions in relation to the workstreams as follows and bring back reflections to the April meeting:
  1. Who is involved in the workstreams?
  2. Who might benefit from the outputs of the workstreams?
  3. What negative unintended consequences might be generated from the workstreams?
- **Action: Secretariat** to create space on the April 2024 committee meeting agenda to discuss the workstream EDI questions.