



Annual Statement on Research Integrity 2025

Section 1: Key contact information

Question	Response
1A. Name of organisation	Cranfield University
1B. Type of organisation: higher education institution/industry/independent research performing organisation/other (please state)	Higher Education
1C. Date statement approved by governing body (DD/MM/YY)	23/04/2026
1D. Web address of organisation's research integrity page (if applicable)	Research ethics and integrity (cranfield.ac.uk)
1E. Named senior member of staff to oversee research integrity	Name: Professor Leon Terry
	Email address: research-integrity@cranfield.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: Alicen Nickson
	Email address: alicen.nickson@cranfield.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.

The University aims to promote a positive research culture where all research is undertaken with integrity including the planning and conduct of research, the recording and reporting of results and the dissemination, application and exploitation of findings, supported through our policies, the Ethics and Integrity Committee (CUREIC), Research Committee and training and development opportunities.

CUREIC is responsible for the development, implementation and review of procedures and guidelines relating to research ethics. It is also responsible for strategic development of the University’s research integrity agenda, in compliance with the Concordat to Support Research Integrity.

The University has specific policies regarding ethics and integrity as well as a Process for Managing Breaches of Good Research Conduct (previously called the Process for implementing and monitoring research integrity).

All research related policies are reviewed on an annual basis.

The new Good Research Practice Framework provides staff and students with access to the right information at each stage of the research process. The framework sets out the key responsibilities for research at Cranfield in relation to research integrity, providing links to detailed guidance and key contacts.

The University’s Researcher Development Programme is aimed at academic and research staff at all stages of their career who are interested in developing their research and knowledge exchange funding knowledge.

The Doctoral Researchers Core Development Programme provides a suite of resources to enable our doctoral researchers to develop key skills that will benefit their research and professional development.

The University continues to operate a single online ethics system which is used across the University by staff and students undertaking research. Student projects must be approved by their supervisor and they must provide evidence of ethical approval as part of their thesis submission.

Under the University's Excellence in Scholarship programme, we provide 1-2-1 formative review of outputs which includes feedback on integrity related matters such as data accessibility statements.

The University's Research and Innovation Strategy encourages a research culture that promotes the articulation of intellectual contribution for useful application. This includes prioritising the integrity of our research and associated data and will be addressed through the ongoing implementation of the Research and Innovation Strategy for 2022-2027.

CUREIC meets three times per year and provides an annual report for Senate and Council, alongside the University's Annual Statement on Research Integrity for approval and publication. The Annual Report provides an update of discussions and activities undertaken by CUREIC and the Research and Innovation Office and includes details on the number of applications submitted to the University's Research Ethics System (CURES) at the different risk 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.

Research Committee established a policy review group in 2025 to review all research related policies and will continue to meet annually to review and where appropriate recommend changes. A new template was introduced to provide consistency and clarity in relation to policy scope, monitoring and compliance, contacts points etc.

Following completion of the policy review in 2025, the updated policies fed into a new Good Research Practice Framework which was launched at the end of 2025 and provides an overview of the University's research policies, designed to help both staff and students access the right information at each stage of the research process. The framework sets out the key responsibilities for research at Cranfield in relation to research integrity, providing links to detailed guidance and key contacts.

No significant changes were made to the Research Ethics Policy during 2025, however, CUREIC had numerous discussions over the course of the year regarding the policy position for all research to gain ethical approval through the University's Research Ethics System (CURES). This review will continue during 2026.

[https://cranfield.sharepoint.com/:u:/r/sites/thehub/Policies/Research integrity policy.aspx?csf=1&web=1&e=YXDIEV](https://cranfield.sharepoint.com/:u:/r/sites/thehub/Policies/Research%20integrity%20policy.aspx?csf=1&web=1&e=YXDIEV). Substantial changes were made to the Research Integrity Policy to re-align with the new Concordat to Support Research Integrity, published in April 2025. The policy has been updated to remove duplication and ensure consistency across related policies.

The updated policy includes a clear process for handling allegations of questionable research practice and potential misconduct. This process distinguishes between different levels of misconduct and outlines the steps for investigation and resolution.

The policy emphasises individual accountability for researchers, requiring them to understand and follow relevant policies and procedures. Supervisors also have additional responsibilities to ensure their students receive proper training and guidance.

The Process for Implementing and Monitoring the Research Integrity Policy was reviewed and updated and subsequently underwent a title change to Process for Managing Breaches of Good Research Conduct. The process sits behind the Research Integrity Policy and deals with allegations of academic misconduct. The original process document included lots of policy content which has been removed and now focuses on the process for managing questionable research practice and potential misconduct recognising that there may be a breach of good research practice but it is not up to an individual to determine if misconduct has taken place as this is the role of an investigation.

The policies and process document are available on Cranfield's website [Policies, regulations and information compliance](#)

The remit of the Human Tissue Committee has been revised to a Biological Tissue Committee who will consider issues relating to the University's use of biological tissue which will include human and non-human genetic material, ensuring quality manuals remain appropriate along with associated operating procedures. They will keep abreast of changes to relevant legislation and bring forward any pertinent changes for discussion.

The Research and Innovation Office are developing a new form to feed a central repository of research where non-human genetic resources are being used. This supports our requirements under the Nagoya Protocol to provide assurance that genetic resources were accessed in accordance with provider country legislation.

Cranfield participated in the pilot training on research integrity developed by UKRIO and are now rolling out the updated training module, which will sit on the University's training platform for staff and research students alongside other mandatory training.

A new staff intranet was launched in 2025 which now has a dedicated areas for all University policies and guidance which can be viewed by topic.

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.

Following the introduction of the literature review exemption as part of the ethics application where research based solely on openly available published literature which is in the public domain is now well embedded with just over 1,000 applications submitted via this route since launch.

Formal annual reviews of the CURES form are undertaken with some minor updates made during 2025 including added clarity for some questions, new questions regarding the use of AI tools, change to thesis title confirmation letter now include the original and new title and system emails updated to request applicants respond to reviewer comments in a timely manner.

Following on from the 2024 report, the Research Integrity working group continued to work on implementation of their action plan which had identified areas for review/improvement.

The policies review which involved substantial changes to the University's Research Integrity Policy and Process for Managing Breaches of Good Research Conduct was an important piece of work which aligned the documents with the new Concordat to Support Research Integrity and provides a clear process for handling allegations of questionable research practice and potential misconduct, distinguishing between different levels of misconduct and outlining the steps for investigation and resolution. The policy emphasises individual accountability for researchers, requiring them to understand and follow relevant policies and procedures. Supervisors also have additional responsibilities to ensure their students receive proper training and guidance.

Developing and publishing the Good Research Practice Framework was also a significant piece of work during 2025 and provides a solid basis to support staff and students. Work will continue on embedding the framework into staff and student training in 2026 and raising awareness of all of our research related policies and providing training for staff and students to support them in understanding their individual responsibilities.

As part of the new policy review process, where policies are amended/updated, authors are required to submit a succinct statement aimed at communicating key changes to Research Committee and the broader community.

Following updates to the University's ethics system, CURES, user guides will be updated and training material reviewed and updated where required.

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.

Section 3: Addressing research misconduct

3A. Statement on processes that the organisation has in place for dealing with allegations of misconduct

The University has in place policies, process documents and Handbooks to deal with allegations of misconduct which are all subject to annual review. Staff and students are regularly reminded of the policies through the different University communications channels and through training.

The Process for managing breaches of good research conduct provides guidance for staff about how to raise concerns and allegations and the process for investigation.

The Senate Handbook on Academic Misconduct provides guidance and information on academic misconduct for students. Allegations of academic misconduct involving students are dealt with through the process detailed in the Handbook.

The publication of the Good Research Practice Framework supports staff and students by setting out their key responsibilities as a researcher at Cranfield in relation to research integrity.

Research integrity training and policy information has been incorporated into a new researcher induction programme and sessions related to good research practice are being incorporated into the Researcher Development Programme and the Doctoral Researchers Core Development Programme for our PGR students.

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