

UNIVERSITY OF LEICESTER

**COUNCIL AND RESEARCH AND ENTERPRISE COMMITTEE AND  
UNIVERSITY ETHICS AND INTEGRITY COMMITTEE**

October 2025

## Annual Research Integrity Statement

The [Concordat to Support Research Integrity](#) 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 (for example postgraduate and researcher training, or process reviews)
- 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. If no formal investigation has been undertaken, this should also be noted
- 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 is drafted by the University Ethics and Integrity Committee and addresses the above points.

## Investigations of allegations of misconduct in research

This report covers 01/08/2024-31/07/2025

During the reporting period six complaint of research misconduct was received and investigated formally.

Case Reference/Title	Date Received	Outcome
CLS-24-2 Poster	26/09/2024	It was alleged that a researcher's scholarly contribution was not appropriately acknowledged on a poster. This was investigated by a formal Panel. The Panel found that there were differing interpretations of the facts presented. The Respondent provided a justification for the criteria applied to authorship, and the Panel concluded that the cited poster did not meet the threshold for Research Misconduct. However, the Panel identified broader concerns related to research practices, research culture, and the appropriate acknowledgment of individuals' contributions.
CLS-24-4 Employment Fraud	30/01/2025	It was alleged that a researcher breached a number of university policies linked to the employment of the

		<p>their wife. The funding for which comes from a research grant. This would fall under section 8.2.7. of the Code of Conduct – Misconduct Definition: Failure to meet ethical, legal and professional obligations. This matter was investigated through the Disciplinary Ordinances as it related to non-research specific policy and appropriate disciplinary action taken.</p>
CLS-24-3 Travel Fraud	25/02/2025	<p>It was alleged that there had been spending against a research grant that did not comply with the University's financial regulations. The costs were allocated to external grant funding leading to this activity meeting the description of Research Misconduct under 8.27 of the Code of Conduct. This matter was investigated through the Disciplinary Ordinances as it related to non-research specific policy. Appropriate action was taken in line with the Disciplinary Ordinances.</p>
CLS-25-1 Plagiarism	12/03/2025	<p>It was alleged that the Respondent had reused research ideas and analysis plans from i) a joint application led by the Complainant and ii) plans developed together, now under the Respondents name only in an application to an external organisation.</p> <p>This allegation was reviewed by a Screening Panel and the outcomes were:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. There is no evidence of research misconduct by the Respondent. There was no evidence to suggest that the Respondent was either using or planning to use research ideas and analysis plans from a joint application with the Complainant to develop them into a new project under their name only.</li> <li>2. There is no evidence that the allegations made by the Complainant were of vexatious or of malicious intent.</li> </ol> <p>This did not progress to a formal investigation.</p>
CLS-25-2 TB	28/03/2025	<p>A publisher contacted the University to request an institutional review of the data for a paper published in one of their publications. They had received an inquiry regarding undeclared protocol deviations and erroneous reporting of baseline samples. The issues were investigated by a Screening Panel and although there were deviations noted from the protocol, the issues with the data did not meet the threshold for research misconduct. The conclusion of the panel was that the conclusions drawn in the publication were not materially affected by the issues</p>

		investigated although there were lessons learnt by the Chief Investigator.
--	--	--