

Schedule 2

Specification

- 1 The Suppliers shall provide the Goods and/or Services in accordance with this Schedule 2.

1. Background

While the contracting authority for this project is UKRI, the project is a collaboration between UKRI, Cancer Research UK and GuildHE.

Research integrity

Based on international statements, the UK Concordat to Support Research' Integrity notes five principles of research integrity being honesty, rigour, openness and transparency, care and respect, and accountability. At present there is no agreed set of indicators by which to assess how these principles are being applied in practice. Such agreement would be useful for the new UK Committee on Research Integrity to meet its commitment to improve the evidence base and produce an annual state of the nation report. Agreed indicators would also be useful as a basis for stakeholders (e.g. funders, research organisations, journals) to better evaluate current practice, and to plan and evaluate activities to improve research integrity

Indicators

There is a lot of attention on responsible research assessment and the use of indicators. Following the Metric Tide report², the Forum for Responsible Research Metrics³ has led discussion in the research sector on the use of indicators, and is reconvening in Autumn 2021 to consider its role in the context of the Future Research Assessment Programme⁴. In addition, the Global Research Council has convened an international working group to drive action based on the principles agreed at its 2020 conference on responsible research assessment⁵

Indicators relevant to research integrity

The following examples may be relevant in considering indicators of research integrity, as defined by the principles outlined in the Concordat

- Validated questionnaires have been developed on matters relevant to research integrity, such as the Publication Pressure Questionnaire (and revision)⁶ and the Survey of Organizational Research Climate⁷.
- Ad hoc surveys have also found evidence relevant to research integrity, such as those by UKRI/Vitae⁸, the Wellcome Trust⁹, and the Dutch NSRI survey¹⁰

¹ Concordat to Support Research Integrity: <https://www.universitiesuk.ac.uk/policy-and-ana-lvsj s/reports/Pages/he-concordat-for-research-integrity.aspx>

² Metric Tide report: <https://re.ukri.org/sector-guidance/publications/metric-tide/>

³ Forum for Responsible Research Metrics: <https://www.universitiesuk.ac.uk/topics/research-and-innovation/uk-forum-responsible-research-metrics>

⁴ Future Research Assessment Programme: <https://re.ukri.org/research/future-research-assessment-programme/>

⁵ GRC Responsible Research Assessment: <https://www.globalresearchcouncil.org/news/responsible-research-assessment/>

⁶ See, for example, Haven, T., de Goede, M.E.E., Tijdink, J. et al. Personally perceived publication pressure: revising the Publication Pressure Questionnaire (PPQ) by using work stress models. Res Integr Peer Rev 4, 7 (2019). <https://doi.org/10.1186/s41073-019-0066-6>

⁷ Survey of Organizational Research Climate: <https://ethicscenter.csl.illinois.edu/source/>

⁸ Vitae et al/ UKRI (2020) Research integrity, a landscape study: <https://www.ukri.org/wp-content/uploads/2020/10/UKRI-020920-ResearchIntegrityLandscapeStudy.pdf>

⁹ Wellcome Trust (2019) What researchers think about the culture they work in: <https://wellcome.org/sites/default/files/twh-at-researchers-think-about-the-culture-they-work-in.pdf>

¹⁰ National survey on research integrity (2021): <https://www.nsri2020.nl/>

- The regular Culture, Employment and Development in Academic Research Survey (CEDARS)¹¹ includes questions about the culture and environment in **which** researchers work, and has questions relating to raising concerns about and investigating research misconduct
- For specific Concordat principles there may be a wide range of potential indicators, for example those related to open research¹² could indicate phenomena relevant to 'openness and transparency', and those related to levels of implementation of the ARRIVE Guidelines¹³ indicate phenomena relevant to both 'rigour' and 'care and respect'.
- The numbers of research misconduct investigations conducted by research organisations is monitored in several ways, for example via publication in their annual statements, or reported to funders on both a routine basis and as part of funders' assurance procedures.
- The UK Research Integrity Office (UKRIO) has published a revised self-assessment **checklist**¹⁴ highlighting specific questions **to help** research organisations address the Concordat commitments, which may indicate the situation within an organisation

2. Aims and Objectives of the Project

This project forms part of a larger overarching programme. The overarching programme is a preliminary scoping exercise. It is not intended to develop a full set of indicators or consensus on issues related to them. The overall programme aim is to set out the landscape in the UK and internationally for research integrity indicators and, where possible, identify some points where progress might be made. Indicators may be quantitative or qualitative. This will inform UKRI, the community including other funders, and the new Committee on Research Integrity¹⁵ (UK CORI), in particular, its role in collecting and reporting onevidence.

The overarching programme has four phases, and this project will contribute to phases one and two. Phase one is the creation of briefing material on current and potential indicators of research integrity. Phase two is an international expert workshop that will draw from the outputs of phase one. For contextual information (not part of this procurement), phases three and four will be undertaken by UKRI staff and comprise a wider engagement on the outcomes from phases one and two, and write-up of a report.

The aim of this project is to enable a group of UK and international experts to identify tractable points where progress might be made toward indicators for research integrity and to highlight particularly challenging areas. The objectives are (i) to provide high quality briefing material (which will be published) for a workshop of UK and international experts and (ii) to support UKRI in planning, facilitating, supporting and write-up the workshop.

The Concordat gives an agreed high-level description of five principles¹⁶ that define research integrity, which will serve as the basis for this project. The Concordat notes specific commitments for stakeholders which put these principles into practice, but in fact the principles are broader than those commitments and this breadth should be reflected in indicators. The

¹¹ CEDARS Survey: <https://www.vitae.ac.uk/impact-and-evaluation/cedars/culture-employment-and-development-in-academic-research-survey>

¹² There are many sets of indicators for open research; one example would be the EU Open Science Monitor project: https://ec.europa.eu/info/research-and-innovation/strategy/strategy-2020-2024/our-digital-future/open-science/open-science-monitor_en

¹³ See, for example, Hair, K., Macleod, M.R., Sena, E. et al. A randomised controlled trial of an Intervention to Improve Compliance with the ARRIVE guidelines (IICARus). Res Integr Peer Rev 4, 12 (2019). <https://doi.org/10.1186/s41073-019-0069-3>

¹⁴ UKRIO Self-assessment tool for the Concordat to Support Research Integrity: <https://ukrio.org/Website/Content/uploads/UKRIO-Self-Assessment-Tool-for-The-Concordat-to-Support-Research-Integrity-V2.pdf>

¹⁵ UK Committee on Research Integrity: <https://www.parrettlayer.com/campaigns/uk-committee-research-integrity>

¹⁶ Honesty, rigour, openness and transparency, care and respect, and accountability.

project should not be limited to quantitative metrics or to indicators for which data are readily available.

Examples of how indicators might be used include to

- provide national bodies and other relevant stakeholders (e.g. funders, UK CORI, university representative bodies, journals) with evidence on which they can plan interventions to improve research integrity
- enable the evaluation of such interventions, against baseline and, where possible, against other interventions including those in other countries
- inform the design of relevant sections in wider monitoring instruments, such as any national surveys related to research people and culture or 'balanced scorecard' performance monitoring by national bodies such as UKRI
- enable research organisations to benchmark themselves and their research against their peers

Objective (i): to provide high quality briefing material (which will be published) for a workshop of UK and international experts.

Specific questions to be answered in the briefing material are:

- a. what is current practice in designing and using indicators of research integrity? What relevant indicators are currently used, by whom, for what, in the UK and internationally
- b. what suggestions for new indicators might be made, drawing from expert opinion, meta-research, etc?
- c. what are stakeholder and expert views on existing and potential indicators, in particular on the extent and range for which they are: useful; valid; reliable and acceptable across a wide range of research disciplines¹⁷ and settings; ethical, including respect for privacy; transparent and reproducible; aligned with good practice principles¹⁸; low or zero burden.
- d. what gaps exist? What are important aspects of research integrity for which indicators seem difficult, with a commentary on the likely reasons for this

UKRI will manage any relationship to UK CORI, the signatories of the Concordat, the Future Research Assessment Programme, the Forum for Responsible Research Metrics, and other key stakeholders as part of this project

Objective (ii): to support UKRI in planning, facilitating, supporting and write-up the workshop.

UKRI will work with the contractor to convene a workshop of selected UK and international experts (both in research integrity and in research indicators) to consider the discussion paper, identify tractable points where progress might be made toward indicators and highlight particularly challenging areas. Clear criteria will be drawn up to select the experts to be invited. Specifically, the project will provide:

- advice to UKRI on workshop planning
- advice to UKRI on workshop participants
- input into discussion at the workshop, including a presentation
- co-lead (with UKRI) write-up of the workshop sufficient to be the basis for wider engagement on this issue with the wider and diverse research community.

3. Suggested Methodology

¹⁷ The project will need to address this explicitly and, for example, may wish to work closely with the Wellcome-funded UK Reproducibility Network project on responsible research practices across disciplines to identify, develop and/or test indicator proposals. <http://www.bristol.ac.uk/psychology/research/brain/target/news/2021/58.html>

¹⁸ For example, principles noted in:

- the Metric Tide report and related advice from the Forum for Responsible Research Metrics: <https://www.universitiesuk.ac.uk/topics/research-and-innovation/uk-forum-responsible-research-metrics/>
- DORA: <https://sfidora.org/>
- Leiden Manifesto: <http://www.leidenmanifesto.org/>

If applicable:		Insert numbers:
Total number of Participants (experimental design)		0
Total number of Interviews (survey)		0
Total number of Interviews (qualitative)		20
Total number of Focus Groups		0
Total number of Case Studies		0
Any other specific requirements	A review of relevant literature, including both formal academic and "grey" literature such as reports from funders, publishers and institutions, and commentary by recognised experts.	

Meeting objective (i) to provide high quality briefing material (which will be published) for a workshop of UK and international experts, should involve

- a review of relevant literature, including both formal academic and "grey" literature such as reports from funders, publishers and institutions, and commentary by recognised experts;
- interviews or discussions with both stakeholders (including those working in research funding and performing organisations, and in publishers) and experts (both in research integrity and in research indicators), based in the UK and internationally.

There is no expectation that the project will involve confidential or sensitive data

4. Deliverables

Deliverables

1. Briefing material that will be published and act as an input for the next phases of the programme.
2. Workshop support, comprising:
 - a. advice to UKRI on workshop planning
 - b. advice to UKRI on workshop participants
 - c. input into discussion at the workshop, including a presentation
 - d. co-lead (with UKRI) write-up of the workshop sufficient to be the basis for wider engagement on this issue with the wider and diverse research community.
3. Weekly updates on emerging findings and project progress

Quality assurance

The senior owner for the programme is Dr Karen Salt, UKRI Deputy Director for Research Culture and Environment. The project will be managed by Dr Neil Jacobs and Claire Symeonides from the UKRI Strategy Directorate. A review group will be established with members from UKRI, Cancer Research UK and GuildHE, which will review the draft deliverable from phase one (discussion document) and planning for phase two (expert workshop).

Terms and Conditions

Bidders are to note that any requested modifications to the Contracting Authority Terms and Conditions on the grounds of statutory and legal matters only, shall be raised as a formal clarification during the permitted clarification period

Schedule 3

Charges

- 1 The Charges for the Goods and/or Services shall be as set out in this Schedule 3.
- 2 The contract charges are as seen in the AW5.2 Price Schedule below;
- 3 The total contract value shall not exceed £29,970.00 excluding VAT.

Payment schedule

[REDACTED]

Schedule 4

Bidder Proposal

[illegible]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]



