



Annual Research Integrity Statement – 2020

The Concordat to Support Research Integrity¹ requires employers of researchers to provide a short annual (publicly available) statement that must include:

- a summary of actions and activities that have been undertaken to support and strengthen understanding and the application of research integrity issues
- a statement to provide assurance that the processes the institution has in place for dealing with allegations of misconduct are transparent, timely, robust and fair, and that they continue to be appropriate to the needs of the organisation
- a high-level statement on any formal investigations of research misconduct that have been undertaken, which will include data on the number of investigations
- a statement on what the institution has learned from any formal investigations of research misconduct that have been undertaken, including what lessons have been learned to prevent the same type of incident re-occurring
- a statement on how the institution creates and embeds a research environment in which all staff, researchers and students feel comfortable to report instances of misconduct

This statement was prepared and coordinated by Research Services, with contributions to specific sections provided by Personnel Services, the Proctors' Office, Reproducibility Research Oxford, Biomedical Services and IT Services.

It summarises how the University of Oxford ensures compliance with the terms of the Concordat and meets the expectations outlined within this for both research institutions and individual researchers.

It was considered and approved at a meeting of the University's Research and Innovation Committee² on 4th March 2021

¹ [Concordat to Support Research Integrity](#)

² As set out in [Council Regulations 15 of 2002](#), Research and Innovation Committee has delegated authority to “approve on behalf of Council the annual statement of compliance with the national Concordat to Support Research Integrity”.

Pre-amble

The excellence of research produced by the University of Oxford is intrinsically linked to the integrity of its researchers. As set out in its Academic Integrity in Research: Code of Conduct and Procedure¹, the University expects all its members, including staff and students and those who are not members of the University but who are conducting research on University premises or using University facilities or funding for their research, to observe the highest standards of ethics and integrity in the conduct of their research.

The University's commitment to research integrity is reflected and embedded in its institutional systems and culture.

The University's Research and Innovation Committee² (chaired by the Pro-Vice-Chancellor for Research, and which reports directly to Council) has central responsibility for advising on policies which promote research integrity (also termed good practice in research). Its members include senior academic representatives from all the Academic Divisions, from Colleges as well as student representatives.

Research and Innovation Committee is supported by officers in Research Services and considers related developments and policy updates. The Head of the Research Ethics and Integrity Team, acts on a day-to-day basis as the named contact point for anyone within or outside the University with queries about research integrity or concerns about research at the University.

1. Supporting and strengthening understanding of research integrity

A summary of the University's policies and procedures for supporting and promoting research integrity is included as Annex A. These are subject to ongoing review and update.

i. Training and professional development offered

There is a wide variety of training and other professional development related to supporting good practice in research, available to research staff and students. The Research Services ['Integrity and Ethics Training' webpage](#) provides summary information and links to online and in-person training available which includes:

a. Online training

Online research integrity training modules are available³ (licensed from the company Epigeum Limited, part of Oxford University Press) which provide an introduction to research integrity (or 'the responsible conduct of research'). A separate online Epigeum course in avoiding plagiarism is also available⁴, as is online accredited training in Good Clinical Practice⁵ and other training for clinical researchers⁶.

All of these courses are freely available to any University researcher or student and are widely promoted to researchers and students by Research Services, the University's ethics committees, departments, faculties and Doctoral Training Centres, including at induction and related training events.

The online research integrity courses were substantially updated and relaunched in July 2020. The new core course has been designed to support researchers from all disciplines through some of the key issues that need to be considered when planning, conducting and reporting research. Amongst other topics, the course covers professional responsibilities, designing and conducting research, relationships (both with

¹ [Academic Integrity in Research: Code of Conduct and Procedure](#)

² [Terms of reference](#)

³ [Online discipline-specific training courses in research integrity](#)

⁴ [Online Epigeum course in avoiding plagiarism](#)

⁵ [Online accredited training in Good Clinical Practice](#)

⁶ [Other training for clinical researchers](#)

other researchers and the broader community and the public), scholarly publication, research dissemination and impact, issues in research governance and what to do if research misconduct is suspected. Other supplemental modules are available (which will only apply to certain types of research) covering:

- research involving human participants
- research involving animals
- conflicts of interest
- intellectual property
- export controls

Given the importance of training in research integrity (as emphasised in the [Concordat to support research integrity](#) and by major research funders when auditing the University), Research and Innovation Committee agreed at its March 2020 meeting that this should be compulsory for all University of Oxford researchers.

Consequently, as well as at induction, researchers are now prompted at various points in the research life cycle to complete research integrity training, such as:

- when transferring status (i.e. from Probationer Research Student (PRS) to, for example, DPhil, MLitt or MSc status) postgraduate students are specifically reminded about this. In 2020, the Research Degrees Panel agreed to update the various forms required of students to ensure that evidence of having undertaken the core research integrity training module (in the form of a certificate of course completion) must be provided at transfer.
- when applying to a University ethics committee for ethics review and approval of their research
- when submitting an application for research funding (as part of the undertakings included within X5, the University's costing and pricing tool to support the costing of externally-funded research).

Since the updated online research integrity courses were introduced in July 2020, 1060 users have taken the new core course. It is expected that these numbers will increase as the courses become more formally embedded into formal research processes.

b. In-person training

There is also a wide variety of in-person training and other professional development available broadly related to research integrity (e.g. Good Clinical Practice (GCP), human research ethics, animal research ethics, research data management, research methodology, research skills training) organised and delivered by the University's Academic Divisions, Departments and Faculties, Doctoral Training Centres, People and Organisational Development, IT Services, Biomedical Services and Research Services.

From March 2020 onwards, in-person training was delivered online due to the COVID-19 pandemic but uptake and demand for training continued to be high.

ii. [Research Integrity web pages](#)

These pages, sited within the Research Support website, provide guidance on research ethics and research integrity, including more information about the University's ethical review processes for research. This section has been designed as a gateway for anyone seeking further advice and guidance about research integrity, signposting users to related policies, procedures and training as well as downloadable leaflets with further information about research ethics and integrity.

iii. [Research integrity checklist](#)

This [checklist](#), structured in relation to different aspects of research integrity was designed to assist supervisors and students not only to abide by the principles set out in the [University's Academic Integrity in Research: Code of Practice and Procedure](#) but also to engage in a broader dialogue about research integrity and good practice in research.

It has been designed for use by supervisors and students at the start of a student's research, and for discussion and review periodically throughout the project. It can also be used as a checklist for all involved in research who need to be aware of and abide by the principles of research integrity set out by the University, research funders, regulators, professional associations and the law.

2. Reviews of policy, processes and guidance

i. Academic Integrity in Research: Code of Practice and Procedure

This Code sets out the University's expectations and standards for research conduct for all its staff, students and anyone using the University's premises, facilities or funding for their research. The Code (available via [the University's webpages on Research Ethics and Integrity](#)) also sets out the University's definition of misconduct in research and sets out the procedure which will apply in the event of suspected misconduct in research. This procedure includes the timelines that will apply when formal allegations of misconduct in research are assessed and investigated,

Within the University, individuals are encouraged to challenge misconduct or poor practice in research and, before making a formal allegation of misconduct in research, to discuss concerns within their department or faculty as appropriate. Sources of advice and support for University members include:

- supervisors
- senior tutors
- directors of graduate studies
- heads of department
- research ethics committees
- Clinical Trials and Research Governance team
- UK Research Integrity Office (of which the University is a subscribing member)

The Code of Practice and Procedure was reviewed and updated in 2020 to ensure that it continues to work effectively and reflects evolving research practice, as well as the expectations and requirements of research funders and the 2019 Concordat to Support Research Integrity. The main changes to this included:

- revisions to the University's definition of research misconduct
- clarification that third-parties (e.g. research funders) may require notification of allegations of research misconduct reported at an earlier stage
- updating information around possible outcomes of any preliminary review of an allegation received (allowing for concerns to be resolved by the Head of Department if the alleged misconduct is relatively minor) rather than necessarily proceeding to a more formal investigation
- ensuring that any panel formed to investigate allegations of misconduct in research must include a member external to the University.

ii. Human research ethics committees

The University's policy on the ethical conduct of research involving human participants and personal data requires that all such research be subject to appropriate review

In 2020, a total of 1,711 research projects were reviewed via the Central University Research Ethics Committee (CUREC): 1,281 by the Social Sciences and Humanities Inter-divisional Research Ethics Committee (SSH IDREC) and its associated Departmental Research Ethics Committees (DRECs); 305 by the Medical Sciences Inter-divisional Research Ethics Committee (MS IDREC); 125 by the Oxford Tropical Research Ethics Committee (OxTREC). The numbers of applications reviewed by the MS IDREC and OxTREC increased in 2020 (partially due to the number of COVID19-related research studies undertaken). Applications to the SSH IDREC and its DRECs decreased in 2020, largely due to the restrictions placed by the pandemic on conducting fieldwork and in-person research.

All committees reviewed and approved an unprecedentedly large number of amendments to existing studies as, where possible and due to the pandemic, researchers modified their research to move from in-person to remote engagement with human participants.

In 2020, CUREC:

- undertook a review of the appeal procedure used in cases where ethical approval for a research study is not granted;
- reviewed and updated its Best Practice Guidance on researcher safety (also to include guidance on measures to take to protect the safety of third parties involved in research);
- reviewed and updated its Best Practice Guidance on elite and expert interviewing;
- reviewed and updated its Best Practice Guidance for researchers on the implications of the Prevent Duty;
- reviewed and updated its Best Practice Guidance on data collection, protection and management.

CUREC also approved new Best Practice Guidance on the following topics, in response to frequent queries and requests for advice from researchers:

- **Ethnographic and other types of qualitative research** – guidance to help researchers identify and address ethical issues relating to qualitative research, and to help researchers explain their approach via their ethics application;
- **Payments and incentives in research** – guidance to clarify good practice and CUREC expectations when making payments (financial or otherwise) to research participants;
- **Conducting research interviews** – guidance to help researchers identify and address ethical issues relating to research interviews, including when the interviews are taking place remotely or online.

Following approval, all of the above documents were subsequently published on the CUREC website¹.

¹ [CUREC website](#)

iii. Clinical Trials and Research Governance (CTRG)

In the case of clinical trials or research involving National Health Service (NHS) patients, ethical review and approval must be provided via the NHS Research Ethics Committees (further information is available [on the HRA website](#)). Dedicated support is provided to clinical researchers through Research Services' Clinical Trials and Research Governance Team (CTRG).

In 2020, CTRG provided sponsorship for 111 new clinical research studies, of which 18 are Clinical Trials of Investigational Medicinal Products (CTIMP). This included fast-track review of 26 COVID-19 studies (of which 9 are CTIMPs). An additional 20 existing studies were amended to include COVID-19 in their objectives. Close work with the Health Research Authority facilitated approval at unprecedented speed.

The Team processed approximately 743 amendments. There have been 45 monitoring events, one CTU level audit and one portfolio wide audit covering all active sponsored CTIMPs and their change management processes during COVID-19.

Two key challenges were addressed in 2020:

a. COVID-19

COVID-19 work was prioritised, but this did not lead to undue delays in other work, in part because the volume of non-COVID clinical research applications reduced as a result of the pandemic.

b. BREXIT

The end of the transition period introduced changes to clinical research, on which CTRG continues to provide advice to researchers. These include

- **End of access to Eudravigilance and the Common European Submission Portal**

The MHRA submission platform has now gone live as from 1st January 2020.

- **Sponsor's Legal Representative in the EU**

It is a statutory requirement for sponsors to appoint a legal representative based in the European Economic Area (EEA) for a CTIMP with sites in the EEA. A contract has now been signed with Oxford in Berlin to act as legal representative for all CTIMPs with sites in the European Economic Area (EEA) in the future.

- **Personal data**

The EU has not yet deemed the UK's data protection provisions to be adequate but a bridging mechanism is in place for up to 6 months that allows the continued free flow of personal data from EU/EEA to the UK until adequacy decisions are made. Regardless of arrangements, the EU will now have third party status in respect of personal data sent to the EU, and transparency information will be updated to reflect this.

iv. Research involving human tissue

2020 saw Research Services' Human Tissue Governance Team further their collaborative approach not just to compliance with the Human Tissue Act 2004, but to human tissue governance in general:

- They expanded their remit of support to the Designated Individuals of all six of the University's Human Tissue Authority Licences. The aim of this change is to ensure a more consistent approach to the University's compliance with the Human Tissue Act 2004.
- They worked with the Clinical Trials and Research Governance (CTRG) team and Oxford University Hospitals NHS Foundation Trust (OUH) to make substantial improvements to the tracking of human tissue samples at the end of a study; including updates to the University's 'Studyline' system.
- They undertook a horizontal audit of risk assessments across the University's largest Human Tissue Authority Research Licence. This has resulted in colleagues taking a more proactive approach to the governance and compliance requirements of storing human tissue samples.
- They produced a comprehensive risk assessment 'heatmap' of the University's compliance with the Human Tissue Act 2004. This was presented at the University's Audit and Scrutiny Committee.
- In collaboration with the Medical Sciences Division's IT Team, they facilitated the purchase and initial implementation of a new tissue tracking system.

v. Research data management

IT Services, the Bodleian Libraries, Research Services, and the Information Security team continued to work closely together to provide advice and support to researchers regarding research data management.

Activities included:

- offering a single point of contact for researchers to request advice and support on a range of issues, for example formulating a research data management plan (often required as part of a research funding proposal), protecting confidential data, setting up secure collaborative projects, and preparing data for publication and long-term archiving;
- courses delivered termly via the IT Learning Centre and iSkills programme, and on request for departments and research groups. From spring 2020 onwards these courses were adapted so they could be delivered online, allowing them to continue even with many staff working from home;
- training and briefings for librarians and research support staff;
- maintaining the Research Data Oxford¹ website, a central source of information, advice, and details of resources relevant to research data management. Work is also ongoing to overhaul and comprehensively update the site and migrate it to a new platform;
- with the assistance of external consultants, conducting a comprehensive review of research data management support in Oxford, looking at the adequacy of current provision, user requirements, and governance. The final report from the review was completed in November 2020 and will inform future work and development in this area.

In 2020, IT Services continued to work on a number of projects to help researchers manage their data more effectively:

¹ [Research Data Oxford website](#)

- the funding model previously agreed for the LabArchives electronic laboratory notebook service¹ was implemented, securing service provision for the foreseeable future: the platform provides a highly secure collaborative environment for research laboratories to maintain online laboratory notebooks, protecting the provenance of ideas in case of patent defence or publishing disputes;
- the Research File Service (RFS) project, which aims to provide 'live' data storage for research projects, continues to build a model that will work across the University's numerous divergent use cases;
- the DigiSafe service², which offers secure long-term archiving for sensitive material (including both administrative and research data), was launched.
- Additionally, work continued on the Digital Humanities Sustainability project³, which aims to deliver a collection management solution, to be known as the Sustainable Digital Scholarship (SDS) service. Day-to-day management of the project transferred from IT Services to the Humanities Division, with the launch of the SDS planned for early 2021.

vi. Research involving animals

The University of Oxford's Animal Use Policy requires that anyone involved in research that includes the use of animals is proactive in pursuing refinement, reduction and replacement (usually referred to as the 3Rs) in procedures involving live animals wherever possible. In addition, all researchers and animal care staff must ensure they engage fully in the approved ethical process of review and monitoring of animal-based research. The Animal Use Policy also commits the University to providing standards of accommodation and care that exceed, wherever possible, the minimum standards required by UK national legislation.

The Animal Care and Ethical Review Committee (ACER) is required to report annually to Council on all activities concerned with research management and compliance with licensing. It produced a comprehensive annual report to Council for 2019-2020, summarising the work of the Committee, its six Animal Welfare and Ethical Review Bodies (AWERBs) and a further sub-committee (that considers the application of the 3Rs in research), as well as training and public engagement work undertaken. This report also covered the support measures in place to ensure compliance with the Animals (Scientific Procedures) Act 1986, revised in 2012 and commonly referred to as A(SP)A, and the requirements of the Home Office Animals in Science Regulation Unit. The report was published (and is available online without restrictions) in the Supplement to the *University Gazette* of 17 February 2021.⁴

vii. Reproducible Research⁵

Reproducible Research Oxford (RROx), was originally established in October 2016 and expanded in January 2019 into the local node of the [UK Reproducibility Network](#) (UKRN). RROx was officially launched in January 2020 and a full-time coordinator joined the project in December 2019 to coordinate and further develop RROx activity.

¹ [LabArchives electronic lab notebook service](#)

² [DigiSafe web pages](#)

³ [Digital Sustainability at Oxford web page](#)

⁴ [Gazette Supplement, 17 February 2021](#)

⁵ [RROx website](#)

RROx organised many events and coordinated several grassroots initiatives, with the aim of engaging researchers in multidisciplinary group discussions around topics, such as: how to improve research culture (#ReimagineResearch Wellcome Trust café culture); how to embrace free and open source software (FOSS discussion group, webinars); how to improve the computational reproducibility of research workflows (book clubs); and how to plan and report robust research. RROx co-organised a week-long Oxford-Berlin summer school, featuring lectures and workshops aimed at early-career researchers in the biomedical and social sciences. For the past few years RROx has supported the establishment and organisation of weekly [ReproducibiliTea journal clubs](#), centred around informal discussion of different open research practices (currently one is hosted by experimental psychologists, and one is hosted by clinical researchers).

RROx also contributed to the development of graduate curricula by (i) delivering training on various open research practices (e.g. with respect to planning reliable research, and maintaining a reproducible and transparent workflow) as part of programmes run via Divisional Skills Training and Doctoral Training Centres, (ii) providing consultations for graduate programme coordinators to improve existing curricula, and (iii) creating entirely new syllabi (e.g. for the EPSRC Sustainable Approaches to Biomedical Science: Responsible and Reproducible Research Centre for Doctoral Training).

3. External engagement

The University recognises the importance of collaborating with partner institutions, at a national and international level, to facilitate networking and good practice in how to support and encourage research integrity.

i. Russell Group Research Integrity Forum

The University's Research Ethics and Integrity Team continue to be active members of the Russell Group Research Integrity Forum, which seeks to share good practice and provide training, guidance and networking opportunities in research integrity matters. Due to the pandemic, the group was unable to meet in 2020, but continued to operate virtually.

ii. League of European Research Universities (LERU)

The Head of the Research Ethics and Integrity Team continues to work closely with the LERU Research Integrity Policy Group. This group was similarly unable to meet in 2020, but remained in contact virtually and is now planning a programme of activity for 2021.

iii. UK Research Integrity Office (UKRIO)

The University has had a longstanding annual subscription to UKRIO and, via this, has access to additional training assistance, UKRIO guidance documents, a register of UKRIO advisors for misconduct investigations, and assistance in developing and enhancing University guidelines, procedures and training. It also provides confidential advice and assistance to Oxford staff and research students with questions and concerns about the design, conduct and reporting of academic research.

From March 2020 onwards, UKRIO expanded its training and conference programme, moving this online and since then has organised monthly webinars on a range of research integrity-related topics (e.g. publication ethics; consent; clinical trials and reporting; research culture etc.). Unlike UKRIO's in-person conferences, these have been openly available without charge and have been well attended by members of the University.

4. Investigations of allegations of misconduct in research undertaken in 2020

As set out in the Academic Integrity in Research: Code of Practice and Procedure¹, the Registrar is the senior officer designated within the University with responsibility for responding to allegations of misconduct in research. The Head of the Research Ethics and Integrity Team is designated as a named contact point for those wishing to raise, in confidence, concerns about the conduct of University research, before any formal allegation is made². In cases of allegations of misconduct in research which involve students, the Registrar may refer these allegations to the University Proctors³ for further investigation (the Proctors having responsibility for the investigation of possible breaches of University disciplinary codes and bringing charges against students accused of infringing these codes).

i. Allegations notified to the Registrar's Office

In 2020, the Registrar's Office received a number of allegations of misconduct in research, which were considered under the procedures set out in the above-referenced Code. These are summarised below and include details of two allegations which were received in 2019, but where the ensuing review was concluded in 2020. Although cases have necessarily been anonymised, the table also includes brief information about further action taken (even if there was no evidence of proven misconduct in research).

No	Nature of alleged research misconduct	Outcome
1.	Alleged falsification of data - all on PubPeer (Allegations received in 2019; investigation concluded in 2020)	Dismissed at preliminary review stage – no evidence of research misconduct
2.	Unacknowledged appropriation of work of others (received in 2019; investigation concluded in 2020)	Addressed at preliminary review stage, as this followed panel findings from an earlier case. Allegation upheld. Research funder and journal were notified. (Researcher has since left the University)
3.	Unacknowledged appropriation of work of others	Dismissed at preliminary review; no evidence of research misconduct

¹ [Academic Integrity in Research: Code of Practice and Procedure](#)

² [Research misconduct guidance](#)

³ [Proctors' Office](#)

4.	Misrepresentation of involvement in a research project / denial of authorship	Dismissed at preliminary review – no evidence of research misconduct
5.	Unacknowledged appropriation of work of others – failure to give proper citations	Dismissed at preliminary review – no evidence of research misconduct, but poor research practice. Certain changes will be required to a book. Publisher has confirmed that these will be made in subsequent editions.
6.	Misrepresentation. of involvement in a research project / denial of authorship	Dismissed at preliminary review – no evidence of research misconduct
7.	Misrepresentation of research data	Dismissed at preliminary review – no evidence of research misconduct
8.	Failure to declare conflict of interest / failure to follow accepted procedures in research	Dismissed at preliminary review – no evidence of research misconduct
9.	Misrepresentation of research data	Dismissed at preliminary review – no evidence of research misconduct
10.	Unacknowledged appropriation of work and falsification of data	Dismissed at preliminary review – no evidence of research misconduct
11.	Unacknowledged appropriation of work of others (lack of appropriate citation)	Dismissed at preliminary review – no evidence of research misconduct
12.	Alleged withholding publication of research results	Investigation ongoing
13.	Duplicate submission of manuscript / failure to follow existing good practice in research	Investigation ongoing

In cases where the allegations of misconduct were upheld or poor research practice was identified, feedback and learning on these has been provided to the departments in question to identify concerns and assist with future training, mentoring and induction processes for researchers.

ii. Allegations considered by the Proctors' Office

In 2020, the Proctors' Office investigated a number of student cases relating to research work submitted for examination (i.e. theses and dissertations, as well as extended 'research' projects or essays). These are summarised below (there were five 'carry forward' cases from 2019: numbers 1-5).

Those allegations which were 'not upheld' were regarded, after investigation, as being cases which were unfounded or poor academic practice, not warranting disciplinary action. These cases were therefore returned to the examiners for finalising in the normal way.

No	Nature of allegation	Outcome
1	Plagiarism	PGDip final project - Student Disciplinary Panel - upheld - mark of 0, no resubmission, failure of degree
2	Plagiarism	PGDip final project - Proctor - withdraw & resubmit
3	Plagiarism	PGDip extended essay - Proctor - withdraw & resubmit
4	Plagiarism	MSc dissertation - Proctor - withdraw & resubmit
5	Plagiarism	MSc dissertation - Proctor - upheld - mark of 0, training, resubmission, cap at pass
6	Plagiarism	PGDip extended essay - Proctor - upheld - mark of 0, resubmit, cap at pass
7	Plagiarism	PGDip extended essay - Proctor - upheld - mark of 0, resubmit, cap at pass
8	Plagiarism	PGDip extended essay - Proctor - not upheld
9	Plagiarism	PGDip extended essay - Proctor - not upheld
10	Plagiarism	PGDip extended essay - Proctor - upheld - mark of 0 - training - resubmit - cap at pass
11	Plagiarism	PGDip extended essay - Proctor - upheld - mark of 0 - training - resubmit - cap at pass
12	Plagiarism	MSc dissertation - Proctor - not upheld
13	Plagiarism	DPhil thesis - ongoing
14	Plagiarism	MSc research project - ongoing

New cases received after 1 October 2019 follow amended regulations which allow the Proctors to make decisions previously made by the Academic Conduct Panel (with a right of appeal to an Academic Conduct Appeal Panel) – University Statute XI: Part C, s 35/36 -

<https://governance.admin.ox.ac.uk/legislation/statute-xi-university-discipline-0>

The University's Research Ethics Committees, the Clinical Trials and Research Governance Team and the Head of the Research Ethics and Integrity Team have all advised on the resolution of various additional concerns relating to research integrity which did not require assessment and investigation under the framework of the Academic Integrity in Research: Code of Practice and Procedure.

Policies and procedures for supporting and promoting research integrity

The University's [Academic Integrity in Research: Code of Practice and Procedure](#) (updated in 2020) sets out the University's expectations and standards for research conduct for all its staff, students and anyone using the University's premises, facilities or funding for their research. This Code also includes the University's definition of misconduct in research and the procedure which will apply in the event of suspected misconduct in research. The Code states that it operates in conjunction with a range of other policies relating to research integrity. These include:

- [Policy on the ethical conduct of research involving human participants and personal data](#)
- [Policy on the use of animals in scientific research](#)
- [Policy and procedure on conflict of interest](#)
- [Public interest disclosure \(whistle-blowing\) code of practice](#)
- [Policy on the management of data supporting research outputs](#)
- [Open Access publications policy](#)
- [Financial Regulations](#)
- [University statement of health and safety policy](#)
- [Intellectual property policy](#)
- [Harassment Policy](#)
- [Anti-bribery Policy](#)
- [Anti-fraud policy](#)
- [Information Security policy](#)
- [University policy on data protection](#)
- [Export control – guidance on export control legislation](#)
- [Safeguarding Code of Practice](#)

These policies are subject to ongoing review to reflect changes in legislation, regulatory and funder requirements as well as evolving research practice. Links to a more comprehensive list of University research-related policies and procedures is available [on the Research Support website](#).