

Annual statement on research integrity

If you have any questions about this template, please contact:
Rlsecretariat@universitiesuk.ac.uk.

Section 1: Key contact information

Question	Response
1A. Name of organisation	Royal Conservatoire of Scotland
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)	27 October 2023 TBC
1D. Web address of organisation's research integrity page (if applicable)	N/A
1E. Named senior member of staff to oversee research integrity	Name: Professor Stephen Broad, Director of Research and Knowledge Exchange
	Email address: directorofresearch@rcs.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: Mrs Elaine Hook, Research and Knowledge Exchange Office Manager
	Email address: E.Hook1@rcs.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.

Policies and systems

At the Royal Conservatoire of Scotland, the principles of Research Integrity build upon and are supported by a wider culture of artistic integrity: the value system that underpins every action of the Conservatoire and its community. A commitment to integrity underpins decisions at all levels. This is reflected in policies that range from those setting out expectations for Dignity at Work and Study, to our Performance Ethics policy; this wider context of integrity is reflected in our current strategic plan, which includes a supporting plan for Research and Ethical Practice that sets out projects to support and enhance our standards of ethical practice across the institution. Such is the context for our approach to Research Integrity specifically.

Research Integrity at the Conservatoire is overseen by the Ethics Committee, which is itself overseen directly by the Academic Board. The Ethics Committee is convened by the Director of Research and Knowledge Exchange ex officio, who has overall responsibility for research integrity. Integrity is underpinned by clear Ethics policies, setting out expectations for practice in the spheres of research and performance. The Performance Ethics policy sets out expectations for ethical practice in the context of performance, recognising that all participants in a performance (from performers, to audiences, to stage management, to authors and composers) should be treated with respect, and given the information they need to make an informed decision on their participation. It sets out protocols for ensuring good practice, including a complaint resolution and appeals process. The Research Ethics policy likewise establishes expectations for research that involves human participants, or a foreseeable risk to the researcher, and proceeds from the same fundamental principles of respect and informed consent. It also sets out the process whereby a researcher will seek and gain formal approval for proposed work from the Ethics Committee of the Conservatoire, or one of its delegated

authorities.

All research undertaken at the Conservatoire which involves human participants or a foreseeable risk to the researcher is subject to review by the Ethics Committee or its delegated authorities. Recognising the significance of research-based learning in our programmes, and the particular issues of research projects in teacher-education programmes where participants are usually under the age of 18, all undergraduate and taught postgraduate research projects are subject to ethical approval, as well as doctoral and staff projects. Such an approach is philosophically consistent and means that ethical considerations form part of the learning at an early stage. It also has the advantage that all those teaching and/or supervising research projects on taught programmes are aware of the requirements of good ethical practice.

In practice, the Ethics Committee delegates some approvals to specially constituted Programme Ethics Committees, which approve individual projects according to the same criteria as the main Ethics Committee. All research involving children and/or vulnerable people, all research that involves a foreseeable risk to the participant, and all research that poses particular ethical problems (for example, research involving sensitive material, or a procedure that involves deception) are referred directly to the main Ethics Committee. Each devolved Ethics Committee keeps records that are reviewed annually by the main Committee.

In view of the Conservatoire's particular status as a community of artists, we receive many requests for students and/or colleagues to participate in research programmes conducted by researchers in other institutions. The Conservatoire takes the view that by advertising for participants on behalf of a third party, or in any other way promoting the research of a third party, it is effectively sponsoring that research. Mindful of its duty to uphold high ethical standards, all such requests are reviewed as applications to the Conservatoire's Ethics Committee and require approval. In practice, the Committee will normally receive the application that the researcher(s) submitted in their home institution and will make a judgement based on that information, unless it is deemed incomplete or insufficient. In all cases, research by a third party proceeds only on the basis of a formal approval from the Conservatoire's Ethics Committee.

Other ethical issues are also passed to the Ethics Committee from time to time for consideration. The outcome of such consideration can include, where relevant, a decision on behalf of the institution, a recommendation to a particular body (such as the Academic Board or Development and Fundraising Committee), or advice to an individual manager or Director.

The operation of the Ethics Committee, including consideration of any instances of

research misconduct and any other matters referred to it, is overseen by the Academic Board of the Conservatoire, chaired by the Principal. The Academic Board receives summary updates from the Ethics Committee at each of its meetings.

Communications and engagement

The Conservatoire's approach to Research Integrity is underpinned by the same values-based approach that supports all our policies, and close alignment with our overall Strategic mission. This is especially clear in the close relationship between our Research Ethics Policy and the policies for Performance Ethics and Dignity at Work and Study. Such synergies underpin our approach to communication and staff engagement in matters of integrity.

The Director of Research and Knowledge Exchange, and other members of the Ethics Committee, engage directly with senior and school management teams, programme teams, research supervisors and students on both taught and doctoral research programmes. Communication strategies include annual policy reminders, development sessions for staff and students, and active engagement of staff with policy development in research integrity. In this work, we are strongly assisted by our small scale, which allows staff at all levels to be directly engaged in matters of research integrity, and by the strong values-based approach that places research integrity in a wider institutional ethos. The decision to undertake ethical review of all relevant research (and proto-research) undertaken by taught students also supports communication and understanding of research integrity.

Members of the Ethics Committee are readily on-hand to offer support to staff undertaking and/or supervising research that requires ethical review. Support is strongly integrated into a number of taught programmes that include a compulsory proto-research component where ethical review is required, and the feedback loop to student applicants for ethical review always includes their supervisor, further building a common understanding of good practice across the Conservatoire community.

The ethics@rcs.ac.uk email box acts as a single point for contact for all matters of ethics and research integrity, and this is monitored to ensure that all issues raised are logged and actioned.

Culture, development and leadership

The membership of the Ethics Committee is drawn from across the institution, recognising that diverse expertise is necessary in the process of ethical review, and

the fact that participating in the Committee is an important strand of professional development for selected staff. This supplements the wider development of staff and students mentioned above.

Policies and practice around ethics and wider integrity are kept under continuous review by the Ethics Committee, overseen directly by the Academic Board of the Conservatoire, which approves changes to formal policy and holds the institutional leadership for research integrity, overseeing the Ethics Committee and directing the work of the Director of Research and Knowledge Exchange in discharging their responsibilities for research integrity. The Academic Board includes representation from across the institution, with elected members from the staff and student body alongside ex officio senior staff.

Monitoring and reporting

The reporting of the Ethics Committee to the Academic Board (and not, for example, the Research and Knowledge Exchange Committee) reflects its wider responsibilities for ethical practice and integrity seen, for example, in its locus in the Performance Ethics Policy.

In all matters of research ethics and integrity, there are clear lines of reporting. Programme Teams with devolved authority for the review of taught students' research report all outcomes of review and all breaches of research integrity to the main Ethics Committee. The Ethics Committee, in turn, reports a summary of reviews, and all substantive matters of policy, to the Academic Board, which receives a summary at each of its meetings and, in turn, approves this annual statement for consideration by the Board of Governors of the Conservatoire.

There is, therefore, a direct line of reporting that ensures that all matters of research integrity can be dealt with at the appropriate level and with the appropriate oversight, with formal registration of actual and potential breaches of research integrity at all levels.

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.

In the course of AY 2022-23:

The Conservatoire's Strategic Plan to 2030 was finalised, and 'Research and Ethical Practice' identified as one of the five supporting plans that will underpin our strategic developments. This supporting plan is now in development.

A new first-year core module 'Creative Citizenship', which will be taken by all undergraduate students at the Conservatoire, was developed with specific content around ethics and integrity, linking practice to our institutional ethos.

The Research Ethics, Performance Ethics and Dignity at Work at Study policies were reviewed for consistency and clarity.

Additional training was provided to doctoral students at their request, and a new member of the Ethics Committee inducted with individualised training and support. Members of the Ethics Committee have provided training across the institution, to students and staff, in both formal and informal sessions.

The use of Moodle as a 'letter box' for managing applications for ethical approval was trialled and adopted.

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 Conservatoire's approach to ethics, specifically, is strong, with robust procedures in place, wide understanding of the centrality of ethical practice, and a philosophically consistent approach across research undertaken by staff, students, and researchers from outside the Conservatoire, which locates research ethics within a wider ethical framework. The supporting plan for 'Research and Ethical Practice' will further support this positive culture. Three members of the RCS Ethics Committee also sit on the Conservatoires UK (CUK) Ethics Committee; CUK is a central body representing eleven UK conservatoires. Applications approved by the CUK Ethics Committee are accepted by all eleven institutions, and the organisation provides ethics training as part of the general aim of promoting best practice.

More work needs to be undertaken on the understanding of wider issues of

research integrity. This is particularly important given our particular context as a monotechnic institution that works mainly in the arts and humanities. Plagiarism in its various forms is the most obvious area for potential breaches of research integrity that are not already covered in our robust processes for ethical review and, although there are robust mechanisms for dealing with student plagiarism, we need to give further consideration to how we handle any instances of staff plagiarism. There are also particular issues around practice research, where fabrication, falsification and misrepresentation are likely to take different forms from those that might be found in empirical research (for example). This is an underdeveloped area of understanding in the sector more widely, and we will look at how sectoral groups can support our developing thinking and processes in this area. As an example of work in this area, RCS is a member of the Scottish Research Integrity Network, which draws its members from HEIs throughout Scotland.

Related to this, we will consider whether a specific Research Misconduct Policy and Procedure would assist in raising further awareness of research integrity at the Conservatoire, drawing together the different policies referred to in section 3 below.

Finally, our small scale means that we do not encounter many instances of research misconduct or breaches of research integrity, meaning that the opportunity to test our processes are limited. For this reason, it will be important that we review and test those processes regularly. It is also important that we continue to raise awareness among staff of how instances of potential breaches can be reported.

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.

Instances of research misconduct are reported to the convener of the Ethics Committee in the first instance. Should an investigation be required, a member of the Ethics Committee is identified to lead the investigation, with formal consideration of the outcome reviewed by the Ethics Committee in strict confidence, to inform any recommendation to the line manager or academic Director, as appropriate. Appeals are handled by the Deputy Principal, who does not sit on the Ethics Committee.

The Conservatoire does not currently have a discrete policy for handling research misconduct, but guidance is offered by a suite of policies which are applicable. Specifically,

- The Dignity at Work and Study Policy sets out clear expectations on conduct in personal relations between all members of our academic community, with clear processes for handling instances that fall short of those expectations; a

Grievance Resolution Procedure and Guidance on Mediation sets out how breakdowns in relationships between colleagues are handled;

- The Disciplinary and Dismissal Policy and Procedure sets out the processes for staff found to be in breach of professional obligations, including instances of research misconduct;
- Data management is supported by the Records Retention and Data Protection policies, and the Data Protection Breach Investigation Template offers clear guidance on data management;
- A Whistle-blowing Policy and Procedure sets out the process whereby staff can safely report instances of research misconduct.

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

***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.**

Not applicable.