**ᵿUCL**

## Research Governance Committee
Thursday 26th November 2020 at 10:00am

### Minutes

Video-conferencing meeting via MS Teams

**Present members:**
Professor David Price (Chair); Professor Lynn Ang; Ms Wendy Appleby; Mr Jeremy Barraud; Dr Helene Burningham; Mr Andrew Cooper; Dr Ivana Drobnjak; Dr Sarah Edwards; Professor Michael Heinrich; Professor Phil Jones; Ms Rowena Lamb; Mr Robert Maughan; Dr Magda Morawska; Dr Nick McNally; Mr Jim Onyemenam; Professor David Shanks; Professor Cheryl Thomas; Dr Kathryn Walsh; Professor Ian Zachary

**In attendance:**
Dr Paul Ayris, Pro-Vice-Provost Library Services

**Apologies:**
Dr Matthew Blain
Professor Janet Darbyshire CBE
Professor Catherine Law

**Officer:**
Ms Rachel Port

## Part I: Preliminary Business

1.  **Declaration of Interests**

1.1.  No interests were declared.

2.  **Research Governance Committee Terms of Reference, Constitution and Membership (Paper 1-01)**

2.1  Research Governance Committee (RGC) approved its terms of reference and constitution and membership for 2020-21 session.

**3.      Minutes**

3.1     RGC approved the minutes of the meeting held on 2nd July 2020 [Minutes 15-25, 2019-20].

**4.      Matters Arising**

4.1.    Exempt from publication, please see confidential minutes.

# Part II: Items for Discussion

**5.      Chair's Business**

5.1     The Chair reported the following items to RGC:

   a.   RGC was continuing to operate as normal within UCL's current Crisis Management Structure, that had been set up to deal with the impact of Covid-19 on UCL's activities, to ensure UCL was properly governed in the area of research governance.
   b.   Research-related activities were referred to the Research Operations Group that was focussing on the challenges to the institution in relation to its research operations processes in light of Covid-19.

**6.      The Hong Kong Principles for Assessing Researchers: Fostering Research Integrity (Paper 1-02)**

6.1     The Pro-Vice-Provost Library Services introduced the paper that looked at the Hong Kong Principles for assessing researchers in the context of UCL's existing statements and policies on research integrity and career progression. The key points made were:

   a.   The Hong Kong Principles were developed as part of the 6th World Conference on Research Integrity with a specific focus on the need to drive research improvement through ensuring that researchers were explicitly recognised and rewarded for behaviours that strengthened research integrity.
   b.   The 5 Principles covered: responsible research practices; transparent reporting; open science (open research); valuing a diversity of types of research; and recognising all contributions to research and scholarly activity.
   c.   One of the Principles covered the reporting of all research results including negative ones. This was in line with the principle of Open Science in that both positive and negative results be shown.

    d.   A full analysis of the Hong Kong principles was available in PLOS at [https://journals.plos.org/plosbiology/article?id=10.1371/journal.pbio.3000737](https://journals.plos.org/plosbiology/article?id=10.1371/journal.pbio.3000737).

    e.   The article noted that the Principles did not address gender and other forms of diversity, inclusiveness and related issues.

    f.   Comments had been received from some Faculty Deans on the Principles who considered that research funding bodies as well as HEIs should be invited to adopt them, and noted the importance of teamwork.

    g.   It was proposed that the Principles should be explicitly referenced in the UCL Research Integrity Statement and in the UCL Research Staff Code of Practice in the first instance.

6.2    The following points were made in discussion:

    a.   The wording of the Principles could not be altered.

    b.   It was noted that research ethics was not explicitly mentioned in the Principles and it was important that all unseen work undertaken by researchers such as ethical review was highlighted as without that institutions would not have good research.

    c.   Careful consideration would be required to translate the Principles across to relevant HR guidance and in the communications to colleagues to ensure they were not disadvantaged.

    d.   In terms of assessing researchers, members queried the relevance of teamwork and suggested it could be linked to the work around the responsible use of metrics.

    e.   There was a need to differentiate between the individual Principles and noted that implementation of them would be difficult.

    f.   The diversity issues surrounding the Principles were problematic and need to be taken on board when interpreting them.

    g.   The implementation implications would need to be recognised with different types of funders, including mainstream research funders, philanthropic/donor funders and industry funders.

    h.   RGC supported the Principles and considered that they were necessary but insufficient.

    i.   It was noted that the UK Concordat to support research integrity was the national framework for UCL and so the Principles should be considered against the Concordat.

    j.   It was proposed that a Task and Finish Group be formed to develop a paper in consultation with colleagues about the Principles and how to integrate them with UCL policies. Professor Phil Jones expressed an interest in being involved in the Group.

    k.   Academic Committee would be the final approval body for the paper.

6.3    RGC:

    a.   Proposed that a Task and Finish Group be formed by the Pro-Vice-Provost Library Services, in collaboration with the Head of Research

Integrity, to develop a paper to consider the implications of adopting the Principles and how to integrate them with UCL policies, for consultation and discussion with Academic Board.


**7.     CRediT Taxonomy (Paper 1-03)**

7.1     The Pro-Vice-Provost Library Services introduced the paper that outlined the principles of the Contributor Roles Taxonomy (CRediT). The key points made were:

a.   The CRediT taxonomy described 14 roles that could be used to represent the parts typically played by contributors to a scholarly output. These roles, developed mainly with science disciplines in mind, allowed all members of a team to be credited with their respective part in each output.

b.   For those who were encouraging wider uptake of CRediT across the sector, the emphasis was the increased opportunities for recognising all contributions to research from funding acquisition to data processing, though to writing and editing the paper itself.

c.   Over 30 publishers including Elsevier, PLOS, BMJ, Wiley and Springer had added the option for their journals to use CRediT

d.   One HEI, University of Glasgow, had actively adopted CRediT and added it to their systems.

e.   A number of suppliers, including Worktribe and F1000, had already begun adding support for CRediT but no current UCL suppliers were included as yet.

f.   RGC was invited to endorse adoption of the CRediT taxonomy, and champion necessary changes to UCL systems.

7.2     The following points were made in discussion:

a.   It was considered that care needed to be taken around endorsing contributorship and it was closely linked to authorship.

b.   This was considered to be a complex area as different disciplines placed different values on authorship and contribution while journal requirements also varied. Therefore a one-size-fits-all approach to taxonomy would be difficult and some minimal standards needed to be defined.

c.   The quality and integrity of data sources that fed into the taxonomy was crucial.

d.   In terms of determining authorship, it was suggested that publishers might be best placed to take the lead on verifying validity. Handling shared first or shared senior authorships also required consideration.

e.   It was suggested that CRediT could help in situations concerning complaints from students or staff about authorship not being credited correctly.

f.  It was discussed that this be considered from the view of contribution overall, as CRediT was concerned with contribution in respect of publications, which in turn stemmed from contribution to the research. Therefore, by establishing what contribution is overall, this would assist any discussion regarding what format it used later, such as CRediT.

g.  It was proposed that a Task and Finish Group be formed to develop a paper in consultation with colleagues about the implications of adopting the CRediT taxonomy.

7.3  RGC:
a.  Endorsed the direction of travel set out in Paper 1-03.
b.  Proposed that a Task and Finish Group be formed by the Pro-Vice-Provost Library Services, in collaboration with the Head of Research Integrity, to develop a paper to consider the implications of adopting the CRediT taxonomy, for consultation and discussion with Academic Board.

## 8.  Research Operations Group – Update Report (Paper 1-04)

8.1.  Exempt from publication, please see confidential minutes.

## 9.  Information Security Update (Paper 1-05)

9.1.  Exempt from publication, please see confidential minutes.

## 10.  Research Integrity Annual Statement and Update Report (Paper 1-06)

10.1.  Exempt from publication, please see confidential minutes.

## 11.  New UCL Code of Conduct for Research - Update Report (Paper 1-07)

11.1.  Exempt from publication, please see confidential minutes

## 12.  Annual Report on UCL's Research Misconduct Procedure (Paper 1-08)

12.1.  RGC received the Annual Report on the operation of UCL's Research Misconduct Procedure 2019-20 and noted that it would also be submitted to Audit Committee for information.

## 13.  UCL Research Misconduct Procedure – Update Report (Paper 1-09)

13.1.  Exempt from publication, please see confidential minutes.

**14.   Proposed revisions to the UCL Research Misconduct Procedure (Paper 1-10)**

14.1.   Exempt from publication, please see confidential minutes.

# Part III: Other Business for Approval or Information

**15.   Report from UCL Research Ethics and Governance Committees (Papers 1-11, 1-12)**

15.1.   RGC received the following reports:

a.   Update report on UCL Animal Welfare and Ethical Review Bodies.
b.   Update report on any matters of interest contained in the minutes submitted to the RGC Secretary since the last meeting.

**16.   Research Ethics Governance**

16.1   Exempt from publication, please see confidential minutes.

**17.   UCL Disclosure of Conflicts and Declarations of Interest – Policy and Training Update**

17.1.   Under 'Any Other Business', the Director of Knowledge Exchange Policy and Practice noted:

a.   The revised policy was approved by Council in June and could be found at: https://www.ucl.ac.uk/enterprise/about/governance-and-policies/ucl-disclosure-conflict-and-declaration-interest-policy.
b.   The associated online system and training would shortly go live in MyHR.
c.   It was considered that there was still some way to go about changing the culture in this area but individuals were becoming more aware of the issues.

**18.   Dates of Next Meetings**

18.1.   The dates for RGC meetings in 2020-21 session were as follows:

- Tuesday 16th March 2021[1], 10:00am
- Tuesday 29th June 2021, 10:00am.

---

[1] Subsequent to the meeting, the March meeting was rescheduled and would be held on Thursday 18th March 2021 at 10:00am.

Ms Rachel Port
Secretary to Research Governance Committee
February 2021