Research Councils’ Management of UK Research Integrity

Research Councils UK Context

Glyn Davies
Chair, RCUK Good Research Conduct Group
(Director, International Affairs, ESRC and formerly Deputy Chief Executive)

www.rcuk.ac.uk

What are the Research Councils UK

We Spend £3 Billion Sterling

Total budget:
08/09 £3.11 billion
09/10 £3.24 billion
10/11 £3.39 billion

STFC, 19.6%
NERC, 12.7%
MRC, 20.2%
EPSRC, 25.2%
ESRC, 5.2%
BBSRC, 13.9%
MRC, 3.2%
Researchers We Support

- Some 8,000 staff directly employed (including technical and support)
- Over 30,000 funded in Universities and other Research Organisations (ROs)
- Up to 20,000 PhD Students
- All “Sciences” from Arts & Humanities to Astro-Physics

Developments in Research Conduct and Integrity in the Last Decade

- DGRC Guidance 1998
- MRC Policies Survey 2004
- CSA / COST Universal Ethical Code for Scientists 2005
- UK Research Integrity Panel in Health and Bio-Medical Sciences 2005
- RCUK Compliance Surveys 2006 & 2007

Some Key Issues in the UK

- Many different codes and approaches
- No overall policy or supervisory responsibility
- No great awareness of major problems
- No Schön, Hwang or Sudbø
RCUK Compliance Annual Surveys
2006 and 2007

This raised issues of:

- Can information be passed from one employer to another
- Can information be passed to external agencies
- Do appointment references cover any issues of research mis-performance
- What constitutes misconduct or poor performance

Consultation with Wider Bodies

- Research Integrity Panel in Bio-Medical Sciences
- Universities UK
- Academies (Royal Society and British Academy)
- University Funding Bodies
- AMRC and the Wellcome Trust
- The Department of Health

Need for A Consistent Code of Conduct

- Not Just PFF: Plagiarism, Fabrication and Falsification
- Good Management to Avoid Poor Performance and Misconduct
- Misrepresentation: Data, Interests, Authorship
- Duty of Care: Risk, Confidentiality, Peer Review, the Environment, Subjects
- Data Preservation and Access
Issues in Misrepresentation

- Misrepresentation of data: suppression of findings or data, or flawed interpretation of data
- Undisclosed duplication of publication
- Failure to declare interests of either the researcher or the funders of the research
- Misrepresentation of qualifications and/or experience,
- Inappropriate claims to authorship / attribution of work, or the denial of the same to others

Good Management

- Starts with Policies, Training and Mentoring
- Stewardship Responsibilities of Heads of Department and Labs
- Positive Reporting Upwards and Annual Review of Continuous Improvement
- Research Governance Systems

But Can Single Employers Manage Alone?

- Is the UK System Too Reliant on “Gentleman and Ladies” (The Rules of the Club)
- Very limited data available: Is low level of reported occurrence in UK credible?
- No standard reporting or oversight by a Research Integrity body
- When People Move?
Data Issues

- Preservation of relevant primary data and research evidence
- Accessibility to others for reasonable periods after the completion of the research.
- Shared responsibility between researcher and the research organisation
- But individual researchers should always ensure that primary material is available to be checked
- Data should normally be preserved for not less than 10 years, and for some projects up to 20 years.
- Permanently within a national collection, or as required by the funder’s data policy.

Duty of Care

- Breaches of confidentiality
- Taking all reasonable care to ensure that the risks and dangers are known
- Ensuring appropriate informed consent, obtained explicitly and transparently
- Observing ethical requirements of care for animal subjects and the environment
- Avoiding improper conduct in peer review
- Ensuring proper representation of material, and disclosure of clearly limited competence

Other Key questions

- Relationship to UK RIO / National Advisory Body
- Procedures for Good Management (Not just investigating failures)
- Differentiating Levels of Poor Performance and Misconduct
Initial response to consultation

- Only closed 24 October 2008
- Over 120 responses
- Thoughtful and detailed responses
- Still being reviewed – can only give an initial indication

On the Code of Conduct

From sample of responses so far, Over 80% support but –

- More work needs to be done on the preservation of data, periods for data retention, etc.
- Issues re: interpretation (flawed or disputed) vs. improper data
- Clarification about whether code should apply to undergraduate work
- More definition in areas such as conflict of interest
- Need to distinguish statutory duties and liabilities
- Need to distinguish between unacceptable conduct and poor performance

Management and investigation procedures

Majority support (little opposition) but key issues on:

- Distinction between misconduct and that below acceptable professional standards
- Procedures should not be overly complicated
- An advisory code on sanctions welcomed
- Priority attached to training and development needs: some central role and resources supported
- Query over central reporting of proven cases, but also support for this
A national advisory body?

Possibly half supportive, third doubtful.
- Should primarily be advisory: best practice, training and development, national standards
- Advantage of providing one national benchmark, if that were accepted as desirable
- Concern and confusion about how this would relate to UK RIO (What is this existing role?)
- Relation to the NHS and other sector organisations

Could collate appropriate evidence and research
- Provide training resources and materials
- Promote stronger management approaches
- Should not be regulatory or take responsibilities from employers
- Should not have an investigatory role
- However might be able to advise and assist on investigations in smaller organisations

Next steps?
- Analyse and review all responses
- Discuss responses with key stakeholders
- Can we build on UK RIO?
- Move from being overly dominated by bio-medical science issues, BMS prescriptive procedures
- Move emphasis to good conduct not just misconduct
- Ensure strong leadership and management
- Build a coalition to take this forward
But Be Aware!

- Concerns that bureaucracy leads to cover-up not exposure
- Also leads to avoiding problems not addressing them
- Research organisations must have lead responsibility
- Room for a national framework but it must be plausible and effective

There is a Real Debate

- However it is positive and addressing the issues
- Awareness of issues has increased enormously
- Our systems are being strengthened
- There will be positive moves in the coming year
- All key research funders are essentially signed up to moving forward
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