

Template: annual statement on research integrity

If you have any questions about this template, please contact:
RIsecretariat@universitiesuk.ac.uk.

Section 1: Key contact information

Question	Response
1A. Name of organisation	University of Greenwich
1B. Type of organisation: higher education institution/industry/independent research performing organisation/other (please state)	Higher education
1C. Date statement approved by governing body (DD/MM/YY)	14 October 2025
1D. Web address of organisation's research integrity page (if applicable)	https://www.gre.ac.uk/research/governance-and-awards/research-integrity
1E. Named senior member of staff to oversee research integrity	Name: Peter Garrod, University Secretary
	Email address: researchethics@greenwich.ac.uk
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: Peter Garrod, University Secretary
	Email address: researchethics@greenwich.ac.uk

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

The University of Greenwich is committed to the principles outlined in the Concordat to Support Research Integrity.

Policies and systems

Public visibility of the University's research integrity policies and processes is provided by the University [Research Integrity webpage](#) which links to the following key documents:

- The University's [Code of Practice for Research](#), which presents the guiding principles and standards of good practice in research across all subject disciplines and fields of study in the University;
- Staff and student policies for investigating research misconduct (see below);
- The University's [Research Ethics Policy](#);
- The [Ethical Research Collaboration Policy](#), which sets out how the University will manage research collaborations to ensure these are consistent with the University's values; and
- The [Academic Regulations for Research Awards](#).

The [Research Ethics webpage](#) links to the Research Ethics Policy and the University's [Research Ethics Guidance](#), and provides information about the University's research ethics committees (see below) and the research ethics applications process.

The Research Ethics Policy clarifies which procedures should be followed when investigating allegations of research misconduct:

- Allegations against staff are investigated under the Procedure for Investigating Research Misconduct;
- Allegations against postgraduate research students are investigated under the Postgraduate Student Research Misconduct Procedure;
- Allegations against undergraduate and taught postgraduate students are investigated under the Assessment Misconduct Procedure.

Communications and engagement

The University's key policies on research integrity are available to staff and students on the University's website, and any significant changes are communicated to staff via web articles in the staff e-newsletter. During 2024/25, academic staff were also reminded of requirements through emails from the University Secretary explaining the deadlines and processes for submitting research ethics applications to the University Research Ethics Board (UREB). The Postgraduate Research Students' and Supervisors' Handbook includes information on Research Integrity, including the Code of Practice, the UK Research Integrity Office (UKRIO) Research Integrity Checklist, plagiarism and how the University handles allegations, as well as explaining the University's Research Ethics procedures.

Culture and development

All staff who are undertaking or supervising research which requires ethical approval are required to complete two online ethics training courses, which must be refreshed every three years. Termly workshops on research ethics for staff and PGR students led by the chair and vice-chair of the University Research Ethics Board are organised through Greenwich Research and Innovation. Staff are also able to complete the new UKRIO online training course Introduction to Research Integrity, which the University subscribes to. Research integrity and research ethics are included in the mandatory core training provided by Greenwich Research and Innovation to postgraduate research students, which includes completing UKRIO's research integrity course. All applicants to the University Research Ethics Board are required to demonstrate that they have completed the online ethics training before their applications will be approved.

Governance, leadership and reporting

The committee with primary responsibility for oversight of research integrity is the University Research Ethics Board (UREB). Each faculty has a Faculty Research Ethics Committee reporting to UREB. UREB consults over policy changes with the University Research and Knowledge Exchange Board.

As required by the Concordat to Support Research Integrity, cases of research misconduct and any lessons learnt are summarised in anonymised form in an annual report approved by the University's Academic Council which is provided to the University's Governing Body.

Research ethics is reviewed periodically by the University's internal auditors, with the results reported to the University's Audit and Risk Committee. The last review in 2021 had overall ratings of 'substantial' (the highest rating) for design and 'moderate' (the second highest rating) for operational effectiveness, with one medium and two low risk recommendations, all of which were subsequently implemented. An internal audit review during 2025/26 is underway.

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.

2024/25 saw the approval by the Governing Body's Finance Committee of the business case for a Research and Knowledge Exchange (R&KE) Digital Transformation project which will see a significant investment in the systems that underpin R&KE over the following three years. This will include an online ethics system which is scheduled for implementation in 2027/28.

To prepare for the new system, a major review was carried out to streamline the research ethics approval process overseen by the University Research Ethics Board (UREB). Revisions to the Research Ethics Policy were approved by UREB in December 2024, reported to the University's Academic Board in January 2025 and fully implemented in spring 2025. The main change is that ethics applications submitted to UREB are now classified as 'low risk' or 'higher risk' based on agreed criteria, which determines the nature of the approval process. Low risk applications are reviewed by UREB's Research Ethics Officer and approved by chair's action once any queries and issues have been resolved by the applicant. Higher risk applications are normally circulated for feedback to a subset of UREB members, and applicants must respond to the collated feedback before the application is approved by chair's action. This has led to a more dynamic rolling approval process which has significantly reduced the volume of applications going to UREB meetings, allowing more time for policy discussion.

Coupled with the changes to the approval process, the University's research ethics guidance was significantly revised and expanded, and the ethics application form was given a major overhaul. A template was introduced for participant information sheets and the consent form template was also updated. More minor changes to

the Research Ethics Policy were approved by UREB in July 2025, including changes to reflect the Office for Students' new guidance on freedom of speech as it relates to research ethics. Minor amendments were also approved during the year to the Ethical Research Collaboration Policy to better align with sustainability requirements.

Greenwich Research and Innovation reviewed its training offer for staff and PGR students to include the new UKRIO online training course in research integrity, which is available to staff and is now part of the core training for PGR students (see above).

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.

As indicated, 2024/25 saw major changes to UREB's ethical approval process. We also want to make sure that Faculty Research Ethics Committees (FRECs) are also operating as effectively as they can be. The operation of FRECs and the new UREB approval process are currently being considered in an internal audit review as part of the 2025/26 internal audit plan.

Greenwich Research and Innovation (GRI) intend to continue to review the policies underpinning research integrity and research ethics in 2025/26. This will include a review of the Code of Practice for Research, the Ethical Research Collaboration Policy and the procedures for investigating research misconduct. The policy review will take account of the 2025 revision of the Concordat to Support Research Integrity, considered by UREB at its meeting in May 2025.

2025/26 will also see the continued roll out of the Greenwich Doctoral College as part of GRI, replacing the Research and Enterprise Training Institute. The Doctoral College will enhance the leadership and management of PGR students across the university, the coordination of the PGR student journey from application to graduation, and the coordination and delivery of training for PGR students.

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.

For the past four years, the University Research Ethics Board (UREB) has required applicants to demonstrate that they have completed the University's two online research ethics courses before their application will be approved. This is now universally accepted and ensures that the University's training requirements are met.

The changes to the ethical review process in 2024/25 have significantly reduced the volume of applications being considered at UREB meetings, allowing applications to be dealt with on a rolling basis in between meetings, reducing delays to researchers and allowing more time at meetings for policy discussion. For example, the July 2024 UREB meeting dealt with 16 applications in a meeting pack of 641 pages; in July 2025, the Board dealt with one application in a meeting pack of 110 pages, most of it focussed on policy discussion.

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.

Policies and processes

As indicated (see 2A), the University has three procedures for investigating allegations of research misconduct. Allegations against staff are investigated under the Procedure for Investigating Research Misconduct while allegations against postgraduate research students are investigated under the Postgraduate Student Research Misconduct Procedure; allegations against undergraduate and taught postgraduate students are investigated under the Assessment Misconduct Procedure. The Postgraduate Student Research Misconduct Procedure and the Assessment Misconduct Procedure are reviewed every three years or as required, while the Procedure for Investigating Research Misconduct is reviewed as required.

While not specifically related to research misconduct, the University provides a Public Interest Disclosure (Whistleblowing) Policy and Procedure for the reporting of 'whistleblowing' concerns. Students and staff may report concerns related to

harassment, bullying, sexual misconduct, hate crime and discrimination through the University's [Report + Support](#) portal.

The research environment

As indicated (see 2A), training on research ethics is mandatory for postgraduate research students and research staff. The University's procedures for investigating research misconduct are available on the University's website. Any changes to policies are communicated to staff via the University's e-newsletter. The Research Ethics Policy and [guidance](#) for staff explain which procedure should be used depending on whether the allegation concerns a staff member, a postgraduate research student or an undergraduate or postgraduate taught student.

Lessons learnt

Following a case relating to ethics (see 3B), whilst the case was not upheld, the investigating panel identified that University communications relating to appropriate email use may require review. The University has since increased efforts to communicate to postgraduate research students about the use of staff emails for recruiting to research studies. Internal policies are brought to the attention of students at induction and links to key documents around research integrity and ethics are made available in key postgraduate research communication channels. This information will clearly include the need to set out proposed recruitment communications in ethics applications and adhere to the stated approach throughout their research.

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				
Falsification	1	1	0	1
Plagiarism				
Failure to meet legal, ethical and professional obligations	1	1	0	0
Misrepresentation (eg data; involvement; interests; qualification; and/or publication history)				
Improper dealing with allegations of misconduct				
Multiple areas of concern (when received in a single allegation)				
<i>Other*</i>				
Total:	2	2	0	1

***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.**

The data in table 3B represents two investigations under the Postgraduate Research Student Misconduct Procedure in 2024/25. There were no investigations under the Procedure for Investigating Research Misconduct (covering staff).