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	Guildhall School of Music & Drama
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)	21/11/24: Approved by Research and Knowledge Exchange Committee
1D. Web address of organisation's research integrity page (if applicable)	
1E. Named senior member of staff to oversee research integrity	Name: Professor Cormac Newark
	Email address: cormac.newark@gsmd.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: Dr Karen Wise
	Email address: karen.wise@gsmd.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

1. Commitment to Research Integrity

1.1. The Guildhall School expects all staff and students to act professionally and ethically, and is committed to the five principles of the UUK *Concordat to Support Research Integrity*:

- upholding the highest standards of rigour and integrity in all aspects of research.
- ensuring that research is conducted according to appropriate ethical, legal and professional frameworks, obligations and standards.
- supporting a research environment that is underpinned by a culture of integrity and based on good governance, best practice, and support for the development of researchers.
- using transparent, timely, robust and fair processes to deal with allegations of research misconduct should they arise.
- working together to strengthen the integrity of research and to review progress regularly and openly.

1.2. This commitment is manifest in, and supported by, policies and procedures detailed in the following documents:

- Ethics Policy
- Governance Framework for Good Practice in Research

- Research Data Management Policy
- Academic Regulatory Framework
- PGR Programme Handbook
- Music Therapy Programme Handbook
- Research Ethics Guide
- Ethics Approval Forms

2. Activities and Responsibilities

2.1. The School aims to support and actively develop a working environment that is conducive to good research practice. The Head of Research and the Research & Knowledge Exchange Committee (RKEC) are responsible for supporting and encouraging research activity within the context of the School's strategy, and for defining, implementing and monitoring policies on research.

2.2. The Research & Knowledge Exchange Committee, via its delegated Peer Review College, is responsible for awarding School research grants, approving grant applications to external funders, approving research proposals and monitoring the progress and conduct of all research undertaken by members of the School's staff. Ethics is a standing item on the agenda, ensuring a forum for discussing practices and policies across all levels and departments in the School.

2.3. The Research Ethics Committee (REC) reports to the RKEC, and reviews ethics applications primarily from staff and PGRs.

2.4. The School provides mandatory Research Integrity and Ethics training for all doctoral students, which is delivered by the Chair of the Research Ethics Committee. Ethical issues are also woven in throughout doctoral training, and all doctoral training sessions are open to all staff.

2.5. At Master's and undergraduate level, departmental directors and programme leaders are responsible for embedding research integrity awareness and practices into their students' learning. They are also responsible for risk-assessing students' research and deciding whether it needs to be approved by the REC.

2.6. The Chair of the REC, Dr Karen Wise, is the main point of contact for staff and students seeking advice.

2.7. Dr Matt Kaner provides additional training for composers on ethical considerations, and also acts as a point of contact for advice.

2.8. Regular ethics drop-in 'clinics' are run by Dr Karen Wise and by Dr Matt Kaner to support research students and staff and provide a forum for discussion.

2.9. Members of the Research Ethics Committee benefit from access to training events held by the Conservatoires UK Research Ethics Committee.

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.

Actions in 2022/23

Future actions identified in the 2022/23 statement that were completed:

- A new 'Researcher Development' programme was initiated by the School, to support professional development of research-active and research-interested staff. The programme includes sessions on ethics and other aspects of research practice, knowledge exchange, funding and governance (2022-23 aim: Work to better integrate policies, guidelines and practices to support research integrity and ethics across the school: delivering training sessions for researchers.)
- Strengthen support/mentoring for researchers applying for internal and external funding by working closely with the Research Support Officer
- Introduced a yearly standing item in RKEC to discuss the wider ethical landscape (sector-wide, and in the context of the extensive EDI work within the School) to ensure the School's research integrity and ethics policies and procedures remain in touch with these.
- Increased representation from across the School community in the Research Ethics Committee, for the benefit of applicants and to enable greater access to the professional development that committee membership provides:
  - Financial compensation for hourly-paid colleagues, for time spent reviewing applications.
  - PGR student members
  - Open advertisement for recruitment to the committee
  - Previously unrepresented departments are now represented (including the Junior School and Academic Studies)

Future actions identified in the 2022/23 statement that are in progress:

Work to better integrate policies, guidelines and practices to support research integrity and ethics across the school, including:

- Strengthen the presence of research integrity issues and awareness in staff induction processes
- Review Governance Framework for Good Practice in research.
- Review doctoral supervisor induction in collaboration with existing supervisors, with a view to bringing research integrity and ethics to the forefront.
- Continue to review ethics procedures and training at Masters and undergraduate level.

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.

The previous statement identified "challenges include fostering a positive research culture among a staff body who are on hourly-paid and fractional contracts, and who carry out research activities outside of formal contractual arrangements. This affects their ability to participate in and contribute to a research community, for example, by restricting their participation in activities that would support their development as researchers and provide spaces for reflection". Activities carried out this year have been successful in engaging staff in research-related professional development, and in increasing representation across different parts of the school and career stages on the Research Ethics committee. We recognise that there is more work to do to increase representation across protected characteristics. Evidence of growing awareness and participation can be seen in new staff-led initiatives proving spaces for discussion and sharing of practice-as-research.

Actions planned for 2023/4

In addition to the 'in progress' actions noted above:

- Appointment of Research Residents for the 2024-25 academic year, expanding the research community. We will ensure research ethics and integrity are part of induction in line with stated aims
- Further recruitment and training for the Research Ethics Committee
- Guildhall School will continue to engage with research integrity issues across the wider sector, by participating in the planned new Research and Integrity Committee of Conservatoire's UK. This committee will support enhanced resources, training and leadership for member institutions.
- Continued review of the School's research ethics documentation and processes

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.

[Please insert response]

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.

1.1. The School's Research Misconduct procedures, and information on how to report suspected misconduct, are set out in the Governance Framework for Good Practice in Research, and follow information and advice from UKRIO as well as City, University of London (which validates the School's doctoral programme).

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

***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.**
[Please insert response if applicable]