

Minutes of the UK Committee on Research Integrity Business meeting 29 April 2026

Time: 3pm – 4pm

Location: 4th floor, Boardroom, STEaPP, Faculty of Engineering Sciences, University College London, Shropshire House, 11–20 Capper Street London, WC1E 6JA

Attendees	
Rachael Goberman-Hill (Co-chair)	Ralitsa Madsen
Miles Padgett (Co-chair)	Jil Matheson
Jane Alfred	Jeremy Watson
Maria Delgado	Tolulope Ayanbola, UK Committee on Research Integrity Strategy Advisor
Nandini Das	Claire Henderson, UKRI Senior Strategy advisor
Louise Dunlop (remote)	Irene Fernow, UK Committee on Research Integrity
Ian Gilmore	Elizabeth Saunders, UKRI Senior Strategy advisor
Chris Graf	Rebecca Veitch, UKRI Head of Research Integrity Strategy

1. Welcome

- 1.1. The UK Committee on Research Integrity was welcomed to the business meeting. Louise Dunlop joined online.
- 1.2. Members were invited to declare any interests in relation to items on the agenda. None were raised.
- 1.3. The meeting objectives were to:
 - discuss and approve next steps for workstreams
 - ratify next steps for the committee's 2026 annual statement
- 1.4. The minutes of the 22 January 2026 committee meeting were approved. The action log was reviewed.

Assigned to	Action	Status
Members	Committee to review Research Misconduct in the UK study outputs and consider emerging findings.	Completed
Secretariat	Secretariat to oversee the copy-editing of Research Misconduct in the UK study outputs.	On-going
Secretariat	Secretariat to develop a publication schedule for the annual statement 2026 and the ongoing programme of work, considering resource constraints.	Completed
Co-chairs	Co-chairs to revise the provisional contents list for the annual statement 2026 to reflect discussion.	Completed

2. Next steps for emerging recommendations and model options

Research misconduct

- 2.1. The working group co-chairs and secretariat team were completing a round of copy-editing on the final reports on national and international approaches to management of research misconduct. The working group co-chairs and secretariat team were now considering how to best present the information in an accessible way to enable maximum reach.
- 2.2. Draft recommendations that were developed in the workstream were presented to the committee. Members endorsed these recommendations.
- 2.3. The committee noted that the outputs from the work would consider the feasibility of the recommendations and implications for their implementation. The committee agreed that the outputs need to be positioned alongside the committee's recommendations about the wider research integrity landscape and that appraisal of model options for UK research integrity should include assessment of the likelihood that the models would deliver on recommendations provided by the workstream on research misconduct.
- 2.4. The committee extended gratitude to the co-chairs and members of the working group for driving forward this important work.

Action:

- **Models' development working group** to ensure insights from the research misconduct workstream inform the testing of model options.

Artificial Intelligence (AI)

- 2.5. The working group outlined the next steps for the AI workstream, which includes considering how the work would complete refinement and launch of the recommendations. It was agreed that engagement activities relating to recommendations could be coordinated with work to engage about other

recommendations, including the models work. This activity will enable consideration to be given to the timing, content, and overall approach to stakeholder engagement.

- 2.6. Members reflected on how the recommendations could be embedded effectively within the sector and remain practical, accessible and usable over time. The potential value of case studies and worked examples in supporting understanding and adoption was suggested as one potential way to enable uptake. It was agreed that a summary of the work of the AI working group, including mapping of research integrity principles across different international guidelines, would be useful.

Action:

- **Secretariat** to look at how to join up the engagement activities for the AI working group and engagement about models
- **AI working group** to publish principles mapping and to produce a summary of the AI group's work for publication when ready.

Model development

- 2.7. The committee had been charged by UKRI with developing a new leadership and governance model for research integrity in the UK. A set of requirements and drivers were developed on the basis of evidence from across the sector and the committee's work over its term to date.
- 2.8. The eight requirements are:
- Policy, law, regulation and standards
 - Visible assurance
 - Expert people and support for skills
 - Checks and balances
 - Learning system
 - Distributed leadership
 - Networked system
 - Adaption and response to future challenges and opportunities
- 2.9. The four drivers are:
- Leadership and governance
 - Monitoring and analysis
 - Horizon scanning
 - Communication and convening
- 2.10. Three potentially feasible model options have been developed by the committee. To consider the likelihood that each model would deliver on the requirements and drivers, the committee are undertaking options appraisal.
- 2.11. The committee has recently undertaken first stages of an options appraisal process to assess the likelihood that the models would deliver on each of the requirements and drivers. A further stage of options appraisal would involve assessing the

candidate models on the likelihood that they would be able to deliver on the selected recommendations from the committee's workstreams. To enable this further stage to take place, chairs and members of the AI and Research Misconduct Working Groups agreed to select recommendations to be tested.

Members were invited to provide any further reflections about the ongoing model options appraisal work. The committee noted that the model options built on existing and growing strengths in the UK system, with stronger leadership for research integrity and an emphasis on removing barriers to enable progress.

- 2.12. The committee discussed the importance of taking an evidence-led approach to the development of leadership and governance models for the UK, with the options appraisal drawing on the committee's expertise and use of the known evidence base. The committee discussed the important role of research integrity in underpinning trust in the research environment and its outputs, including as a driver of investment in research and the impact that research makes. Members were invited to share with the co-chairs and secretariat any further reflections about the model options and processes for their appraisal.

Action:

- **Chairs and members of the AI and Research Misconduct working groups** to select recommendations to be tested in the Model Options appraisal
- **Members** to share any further reflections with the co-chairs and secretariat team, including reflections about the model options and their assessments of the options

3. Programme and stakeholder updates

Stakeholder updates

- 3.1. Members were thanked for their continued engagement with stakeholders. The secretariat informed members that the provider Marketbridge has been appointed, through a competitive tender process, to develop the committee's engagement strategy.
- 3.2. Members reflected on the ways in which debate and discussion about the value of research integrity were underway across the sector.
- 3.3. The committee co-chairs and Rebecca Veitch, Head of Research Integrity Strategy, met with Ian Chapman, CEO of UKRI, in April 2026. At the meeting they discussed the work of the committee, the evidence about UK research integrity as contained in the committee's annual reports, and the importance of research integrity, including its value.

Programme updates

REF

- 3.4. Members highlighted continued engagement with the REF team on the importance of integrity as a fundamental element of research assessment, to share sector insights and committee developments.

Research Integrity Concordat Signatories (RICS) Group

- 3.5. Members were advised that the RICS Group continues to work on revising the annual statement reporting template.
- 3.6. Public summaries of the RICS Group meetings are published on the Concordat section of the Committee's website.

4. Annual statement 2026

- 4.1. The committee's 2026 annual statement will be written in the months ahead and published in autumn 2026. The committee agreed that the statement will contain time series data about UK research integrity. The committee agreed that this should include analysis of Retraction Watch data and that this should be commissioned.
- 4.2. In 2025, the Committee published an analysis of annual statements of research integrity, produced by Research Consulting. This work was commissioned jointly with the Research Integrity Concordat Signatories Group. Following further searches and continued engagement with universities whose annual statements could not initially be located, the proportion of available 2023/24 annual statements included in the 2025 analysis has increased from 75% to 91%.

Actions:

- **Secretariat** to commission an analysis of Retraction Watch data.

5. Any other business

- 5.1. No other business was raised.

6. Standing items

6.1. Equality, diversity and inclusion (EDI) considerations

Ongoing programme of work: The committee reflected on its efforts to embed care and respect throughout its work. The research misconduct working group co-chairs shared how EDI considerations had been woven into the workstream, including through engagement with early career researchers. The importance of maintaining engagement with stakeholders across various career stages was highlighted, alongside the importance of ensuring that any visuals or communications are inclusive and take accessibility into account. There was also emphasis on the need to remain mindful of wider system pressures and their impact on different groups and institutions.

6.2. Communication matters arising

External provider Marketbridge will be working to refine of the committee's key messages, develop a comprehensive engagement strategy, and support delivery of

communications and engagement activities. The committee looks forward to working closely with the Marketbridge team over the coming months.

6.3. **Reflections on the meeting, ways of working**

The committee thanked the hosts, Science, Technology, Engineering and Public Policy (STeAPP), University College London, for their generous hospitality.

Members reflected on the items discussed, including the focus on translation of principles and values into systems and practical approaches. Members also emphasised the importance of transparency both in research and its own work.

7. **Close, and date of next meeting**

- 7.1. The chairs thanked committee members for their time and contributions. The next committee meeting would be held in London on 22 July 2026. Members were invited to suggest locations for the next meeting to the secretariat.

Actions

- **Models' development working group** to ensure insights from the research misconduct workstream inform the testing of model options.
- **AI working group** to group to publish principles mapping/summary work covering four years of activity in this area.
- **Chairs and members of the AI and Research Misconduct Working Groups** to select recommendations to be tested in Stage 3 of the Model Options appraisal.
- **Members** to share any further reflections with the co-chairs and secretariat team, including reflections about the model options and their assessments of the options.
- **Secretariat** to commission an analysis of Retraction Watch data.