

# Annual statement on research integrity

## Section 1: Key contact information

Question	Response
1A. Name of organisation	University of Winchester
1B. Type of organisation:  higher education institution/industry/independent research performing organisation/other (please state)	Higher Education Institution
1C. Date statement approved by governing body (DD/MM/YY)	17/12/2025
1D. Web address of organisation's research integrity page (if applicable)	<a href="#">Research Environment - University of Winchester</a>
1E. Named senior member of staff to oversee research integrity	Name: Professor Emile Bojesen
	Email address: <a href="mailto:Emile.Bojesen@winchester.ac.uk">Emile.Bojesen@winchester.ac.uk</a>
1F. Named member of staff who will act as a first point of contact for anyone wanting more information on matters of research integrity	Name: Professor Emile Bojesen
	Email address: <a href="mailto:Emile.Bojesen@winchester.ac.uk">Emile.Bojesen@winchester.ac.uk</a>

## Section 2: Promoting high standards of research integrity and positive research culture.

### Description of actions and activities undertaken

#### 2A. Description of current systems and culture

Please describe how the organisation maintains high standards of research integrity and promotes positive research culture. It should include information on the support provided to researchers to understand standards, values and behaviours, such as training, support and guidance for researchers at different career stages/ disciplines. You may find it helpful to consider the following broad headings:

- Policies and systems
- Communications and engagement
- Culture, development and leadership
- Monitoring and reporting

#### Policies and systems

##### Ethics in research and evaluation

Expectations regarding ethics are set out in the University Research Ethics Policy and Procedures documents which are available through the University document store on the externally facing website and via the research ethics pages on the intranet. These documents were updated at the close of the 2024-25 academic year to align with the updated *Concordat to Support Research Integrity* (UKCORI 2025) which sets the five key commitments for maintaining the highest standards of research integrity. The Policy and Procedures apply to academic and professional services staff, doctoral students, postgraduate and undergraduate students. There are three levels of scrutiny detailed in the policy: by the University Ethics Committee for complex projects, at Faculty level for less complex projects and there is a self-declaration route for straightforward projects (e.g. concerning publicly available documents, literary criticism etc.). Applicants are guided to the most appropriate route by completing the checklists in Form 1, which then signpost the appropriate form and scrutiny process. The Committee scrutinises matters monthly (except for December and August), working virtually via TEAMs. The Committee meets virtually three times in an academic year to discuss matters of policy and process and to review its approach to working. Faculty scrutiny is managed by an Ethics Lead within each Faculty, running either an ad hoc or monthly process depending on the volume of matters typically seen. The self-declaration route is overseen by the Chair of the Committee.

#### Communications and engagement

Ethics in research and evaluation

Engaging staff and students in matters of research ethics and understanding the place of ethics in research /evaluation practice is a key priority for the Committee.

Each month there are bespoke live, online one-hour workshops for doctoral students /supervisors as well as general workshop sessions primarily for staff (academic and professional services) which are also open to students. The Doctoral School requires that all new supervisors undertake the training, and existing supervisors are required to undertake a refresher every three years. In addition, there are monthly half-hour drop-ins open to all. New to semester two in 2024-25 were bespoke sessions on Supporting Responsible Research, aimed at REF Unit of Assessment, Impact Case Study and Research Centre Leads.

The total training available for 2024-25 was 31.5 hours. This comprised:

- Doctoral School: 11 hours + induction x 1 hour
- General staff sessions: 8 hours [1 cancelled for personal reasons]
- UG-PG dissertation sessions: 3 hours
- Q&A drop ins: 5.5 hours
- SRR sessions: 3 hours

In addition, the Chair ran bespoke sessions for Masters students (MRes, creative writing and practice education students). The Chair is also available to speak to courses /departments if requested. There is a dedicated email address for submitting projects for scrutiny as well as general queries. This is overseen by the Chair.

**Culture, development and leadership**Ethics in research and evaluation

Ensuring there is representation from across the University on the Committee helps to ensure diversity in research perspectives and experience. The Chair actively encourages staff to consider joining the Committee to support their own development. The leadership and management of the Committee is undertaken in an 'open' style to promote a culture of discussion of matters to do with ethics and an 'enabling' approach to research. Where an aspect of a project raises a risk in the context of ethics, then researchers are encouraged to consider ways to manage or mitigate it. The Chair also recognises the value of engaging with colleagues in wider research groups and networks, such as the special interest group into emotionally demanding research. Areas of current interest are decolonising research ethics and supporting participatory approaches.

Research integrity training and development

Staff and research students are directed towards and encouraged to participate in events run by the UKRIO, for example their annual conference on aspects of

research integrity and their 'expert webinar series' (free to attend as part of the institutional subscription). Details of training events and courses are circulated to REF Unit of Assessment and Research Centre Leads.

In 2024-25 the institution continued to be signed up for the UKRIO Introduction to Research Integrity online training course, with free places offered for researchers to participate in the pilot.

Support was provided to researchers in the context of professional development courses designed to enhance research and leadership capabilities. Topics included project management techniques and effective teambuilding and leadership techniques.

### **Monitoring and reporting**

#### Ethics in research and evaluation

The Committee provides an annual report at the start of the academic year to Senate Research and Innovation Committee summarising the Committee and Faculty scrutiny activity over the last academic year, an overview of training/development provided, changes in Committee membership and whether there have been any reports of concerns linked to research ethics. No concerns were raised in 2024-25 in relation to ethics.

#### Research integrity and the concordat

Units of Assessment integrate the Researcher Development Concordat in their Research Strategies, with annual monitoring of strategic objectives.

#### EDI impact reporting

Data was collected on employee characteristics and the outcomes of workplace initiatives (training, events, panels), in the interests of advancing the objective of fostering a healthy research culture that is perceived as open and inclusive.

## **2B. Changes and developments during the period under review**

Please provide an update on any changes made during the period, such as new initiatives, training, developments, also ongoing changes that are still underway. Drawing on Commitment 3 of the Concordat, please note any new or revised policies, practices and procedures to support researchers; training on research ethics and research integrity; training and mentoring opportunities to support the development of researchers' skills throughout their careers.

#### Ethics in research and evaluation

The University Research Ethics Policy and Procedures documents were updated at the close of the 2024-25 academic year to align with the updated Concordat to Support Research Integrity (UKCORI 2025). Additional training sessions to support REF2029 activity were added to the training schedule.

#### Research integrity training and development

Following external review in 2023 the University successfully retained the European Commission HR Excellence in Research award. The HREiR Action Plan (2022-25) is driven by the ambition to create an inclusive and resilient research and innovation culture.

The Research and Innovation Academy was launched, with a full programme of training and development workshops, courses and resources. Mapped to the Vitae Researcher Development Framework, the Academy incorporated a pathway in Research Integrity, alongside pathways in Research Leadership, External Funding, Knowledge Exchange, Impact, Public Engagement, Open Research and Communicating Research.

The Chief Innovation Officer at UKRI delivered a keynote presentation on Good Research Practice and a Healthy Research Culture at the University's Research and Innovation Day in September 2024, part of a week of training and development workshops.

#### People, culture and environment (PCE)

The Head of Research Environment and Impact was a member of the History sub-panel for the REF 2029 Pilot PCE Exercise (February – July 2025). The exercise involved assessing institutional submissions against a proposed framework, structured around five factors which enable positive research culture: strategy; responsibility; connectivity; inclusivity, and development.

An internal PCE pilot was undertaken, with Units of Assessment completing draft templates and engaging in peer review.

## **2C. Reflections on progress and plans for future developments**

This should include a reflection on the previous year's activity including a review of progress and impact of initiatives if known relating to activities referenced in the previous year's statement. Note any issues that have hindered progress, e.g. resourcing or other issues.

### **Reflections on Progress**

The University of Winchester submitted its first annual Research Integrity

Statement to UKRIO in 2022-23. Positive progress has been made since then including, in 2024-25:

The development and approval in June 2024 of the institution's *Research Code of Practice*. The Code builds upon, and is in accord with, the UKRIO *Code of Practice for Research* (2023). The Code covers the principles of good practice in research, including integrity; transparency; collaboration; legal and compliance considerations, and trusted research. It brings together the relevant internal and external policies and outlines the institution's responsibilities, its procedures for handling allegations of research misconduct, and its mechanisms for monitoring and reporting.

Meetings of the Research Concordat Steering Group, established in the previous year with membership representing various career stages, Faculties and including HR representatives. In 2024-25 the group monitored progress made against the principles of the Concordat as part of the drive to enhance research culture.

To foster transparency and enhance communication, actions were taken to ensure that research staff are represented and have opportunities to engage directly in policy development.

Positive engagement with the development opportunities offered by the Research and Innovation Academy.

### **Plans for future developments**

#### Ethics in research and evaluation

The provision of support workshops for staff and doctoral students will continue. Bespoke sessions to support those involved with REF 2029 will continue (in relation to integrity and ethics in research). This year a small number of targeted areas in relation to ethics will be included (e.g. authorship).

#### Research integrity training and development

The commitment to support training and development in research integrity as an integral aspect of an inclusive and resilient research and innovation culture will continue, through the following:

Ensure researchers and their managers are aware of, and act in accordance with, the highest standards of research integrity and professional conduct, through:

- a) provision of a University level event on research integrity and professional conduct for managers and dissemination of key aspects to postgraduate students and all staff engaged in research;
- b) integration of research integrity and professional conduct standards into research-related strategies (for example, REF Unit of Assessment strategies); and
- c) Research and Innovation monitoring of exceptions and ensuring any interventions are effective.

Working with members of the Ethics Committee, ensure managers report and address incidents of poor research integrity, through:

- a) training on research integrity and appropriate professional conduct for managers;
- b) managers of researchers working with them to ensure they are attending relevant training and maintaining the highest standards of research integrity and professional conduct.

Ensure researchers act in accordance with employer and funder policies related to research integrity.

Ensure researchers use available mechanisms to report staff who fail to meet the expected standards of behaviour in relation to research misconduct.

Training and development sessions on research integrity will be developed working with the UKRIO and in the context of the Research and Innovation Academy.

A workshop focused on the PCE aspect of the REF will be held, aimed at Unit of Assessment Leads. Insights gained from both the external pilot and the internal exercise will be shared.

## **2D. Case study on good practice (optional)**

Please describe an anonymised brief, exemplar case study that can be shared as good practice with other organisations. A wide range of case studies are valuable, including small, local implementations. Case studies may also include the impact of implementations or lessons learned.

## Section 3: Addressing research misconduct

### 3A. Statement on processes that the organisation has in place for dealing with allegations of misconduct

Please provide:

- a brief summary of relevant organisation policies/ processes (e.g. research misconduct procedure, whistle-blowing policy, bullying/harassment policy; appointment of a third party to act as confidential liaison for persons wishing to raise concerns) and brief information on the periodic review of research misconduct processes (e.g. date of last review; any major changes during the period under review; date when processes will next be reviewed).
- information on how the organisation creates and embeds a research environment in which all staff, researchers and students feel comfortable to report instances of misconduct (e.g. code of practice for research, whistle-blowing, research misconduct procedure, informal liaison process, website signposting for reporting systems, training, mentoring, reflection and evaluation of policies, practices and procedures).
- anonymised key lessons learned from any investigations into allegations of misconduct which either identified opportunities for improvements in the organisation's investigation procedure and/or related policies / processes/ culture or which showed that they were working well.

For the period under review, the following policies were in place to inform the action to take:

**Student Academic Integrity Procedures**  
**University Research Ethics Policy**  
**Student Complaints Policy**  
**Public Complaints Policy**

#### **Student Academic Integrity Procedures**

The University, its students and staff, work as a community with collective responsibility for maintaining and promoting a culture of practice of honesty and ethical behaviour in scholarship. We acknowledge the importance of fair and equal assessment processes where all scholarship is assessed on its own merit, and our academic integrity processes exist to uphold that principle for the benefit of all students, to ensure that allegations of unfair practice, cheating, plagiarism and other academic misconduct are investigated and, where proven, sanctioned appropriately.



The *Student Academic Integrity Procedures* describe the basic principles of academic integrity that the University follows, provide examples of breaches of academic integrity and Poor Academic Practice and detail the process that the University follows when potential academic misconduct has been identified within the work of a student.

The University's Academic Integrity procedures are overseen by the Conduct and Complaints team within Registry and Academic Quality. An annual report summarising the cases of misconduct is drafted each year by the Student Conduct and Postgraduate Records Officer and received by Senate.

### **University Research Ethics Policy**

The University takes all allegations of misconduct relating to research ethics seriously, by both staff and students. The University handles such allegations using existing appropriate policies and disciplinary procedures.

Concerns about the conduct of research carried out under the auspices of the University should be made in the first instance in writing to the Director of Research and Innovation, Professor Emile Bojesen, as the named point of contact. This information is given in the policy and on the externally facing website. The named point of contact to act as confidential liaison for whistle-blowers or any person wishing to raise concerns about the ethics of research practice is Dr Samantha Scallan (Chair of the University Research Ethics Committee).

The Director of Research and Innovation will then liaise with the Chair of Ethics Committee and the relevant Dean of Faculty, as appropriate, in recommending further action which may invoke the University Complaints Policy and procedures.

Where significant concerns have been raised about the ethical conduct of a study, the Ethics Committee can request a full and detailed account of the research for further ethical review. Where the Committee considers that a study is being conducted in a way which is not in accord with the conditions of its original approval, consideration will be given to approval withdrawal and requirements that the research be suspended or discontinued. It is the duty of the Chair of Ethics Committee to inform the Director of Research and Innovation in writing and the appropriate funding body (if an externally funded project) that ethics approval has been withdrawn.

The Committee provides an annual report at the start of the academic year to Senate Research and Innovation Committee summarising the Committee and Faculty scrutiny activity over the last academic year, an overview of training /development provided, changes in Committee membership and whether there have been any reports of concerns linked

to research ethics. No concerns were raised in 2024-25 in relation to ethics.

**Student Complaints Policy and the Public Complaints Policy**

The University defines a complaint as ‘an expression of dissatisfaction about the University’s action or lack of action, or about the standards of service by or on behalf of the University’.

Current (or recent) students are directed to the Student Complaints Policy, which details a three-stage complaint process, including an early resolution stage, a formal complaint and a review stage. Once students have been through all internal stages, if they remain dissatisfied with the outcome or any resolutions being offered, they can take the matter externally to the Office of the Independent Adjudicator (OIA).

Non-students, including applicants, are directed to the Public Complaints Policy, which also follows the three-stage process, but public complainants are not eligible for OIA review.

Both policies cover complaints relating to programmes of study, services or facilities provided by the University and actions/lack of actions by the University or any member of the University community. An appeal against a decision concerning academic progress, assessment or award is not a complaint, and students wishing to raise concerns about these areas would be directed to the academic appeals procedures, detailed in the Appeals Regulations. Concerns about the quality of supervision or teaching which the complainant considers contributed to a failure to achieve a required academic standard would be aspects considered under the Student Complaints Policy.

Complaints are overseen by the Conduct and Complaints team within Registry and Academic Quality. An annual report summarizing the formal complaints received from both students and members of the public is drafted each year by the Head of Complaints and Casework and received by Senate and the Board of Governors.

### 3B. Information on investigations of research misconduct that have been undertaken

Please complete the table on the number of **formal investigations completed during the period under review** (including investigations which completed during this period but started in a previous academic year). Information from ongoing investigations should not be submitted.

An organisation's procedure may include an initial, preliminary, or screening stage to determine whether a formal investigation needs to be completed. These allegations should be included in the first column but only those that proceeded past this stage, to formal investigations, should be included in the second column.

Type of allegation	Number of allegations			
	Number of allegations reported to the organisation	Number of formal investigations	Number upheld in part after formal investigation	Number upheld in full after formal investigation
Fabrication	0	0	0	0
Falsification	0	0	0	0
Plagiarism	0	0	0	0
Failure to meet legal, ethical and professional obligations	0	0	0	0
Misrepresentation (eg data; involvement; interests; qualification; and/or publication history)	0	0	0	0
Improper dealing with allegations of misconduct	0	0	0	0
Multiple areas of concern (when received in a single allegation)	0	0	0	0
<i>Other*</i>	0	0	0	0
<b>Total:</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>

**\*If you listed any allegations under the 'Other' category, please give a brief, high-level summary of their type here. Do not give any identifying or confidential information when responding.**