



RESEARCH INTEGRITY POLICY

ORYX UNIVERSITY

In Partnership with Liverpool John Moores University

Document Reference:	RKEO-POL-Research Integrity Policy
Version:	1.0
Effective Date:	14 February 2026
Review Cycle:	Annual
Next Review Date:	14 February 2027
Document Owner:	Director of Research and Knowledge Exchange
Responsible Office:	Research and Knowledge Exchange Office (RKEO)
Approved By:	University President

Version History

Version	Author	Description of Changes	Date
Version 1.0	Dr. Maher Salem	Created the first version	14 Feb 2026

Table of Contents

1. POLICY STATEMENT	3
2. STANDARDS OF CONDUCT (The Pillars of Integrity).....	3
2.1 Honesty (Veracity)	3
2.2 Rigour (Accountability)	3
2.3 Transparency (Openness)	3
2.4 Care and Responsibility.....	3
2.5 Respect for Colleagues and Collaborators	4
3. RESEARCH MISCONDUCT	4
3.1 Definition (The "F-F-P" Standard).....	4
3.2 Other Serious Breaches.....	4
4. INVESTIGATION PROCEDURES.....	5
4.1 Reporting Concerns	5
4.2 Preliminary Assessment	5
4.3 Formal Investigation	5
4.4 Outcomes	6
4.5 Appeals	6
5. SUPPORT AND TRAINING	6

1. POLICY STATEMENT

Oryx University is committed to maintaining the highest standards of integrity in all research and scholarly activities. Research integrity is the foundation of trustworthy research and is essential to the University's mission, reputation, and commitment to the LJMU partnership

2. STANDARDS OF CONDUCT (The Pillars of Integrity)

All researchers are expected to adhere to the following standards:

2.1 Honesty (Veracity)

- Report research methods, data, and findings truthfully and without omission.
- Acknowledge the contributions of others appropriately and accurately.
- Disclose all actual or potential conflicts of interest.

2.2 Rigour (Accountability)

- Use appropriate research methods, statistical techniques, and ethical analysis.
- **Data Stewardship (MANDATORY):** Maintain accurate, primary, and complete research records. **All primary data must be retained securely for a minimum of 10 years following project closure** (in line with **RKEO-POL-Data Protection Policy**).
- Subject work to appropriate peer review, and participate in peer review with objectivity and promptness.

2.3 Transparency (Openness)

- Share data and materials where appropriate and ethically permissible.
- Communicate research openly and promptly upon publication.
- Correct errors, retractions, or necessary clarifications when discovered.

2.4 Care and Responsibility

- Respect research participants, subjects, and the environment.
- Ensure the physical and psychological safety of researchers and participants.
- Use research funds and resources responsibly and ethically.

2.5 Respect for Colleagues and Collaborators

- Acknowledge intellectual and material contributions fairly and appropriately (authorship).
- Respect the confidentiality of research data, proposals, and personnel information.

3. RESEARCH MISCONDUCT

3.1 Definition (The "F-F-P" Standard)

Research misconduct means fabrication, falsification, or plagiarism in proposing, performing, or reviewing research, or in reporting research results.

Type	Definition
Fabrication	Making up data or results and recording or reporting them
Falsification	Manipulating research materials, equipment, or processes, or changing or omitting data or results such that the research is not accurately represented in the research record.
Plagiarism	Appropriating another person's ideas, processes, results, or words without giving appropriate credit.

3.2 Other Serious Breaches

The following breaches may also constitute serious misconduct, depending on severity and intent:

- **Improper Authorship:** Gift, ghost, or denied authorship in violation of authorship criteria.
- **Peer Review Misconduct:** Breaching confidentiality during review or sabotaging the work of a competitor.
- **Serious Breach of Ethics:** Failure to obtain ethics approval for a high-risk study, or continuing research after approval withdrawal.
- **Data Management Failure:** Destruction of primary data or failure to archive mandatory records, resulting in non-replicability or inability to audit.
- **Misuse of Funds:** Misappropriation of research grant funds.
- **Conflict of Interest Failure:** Deliberate failure to declare significant conflicts of interest.

4. INVESTIGATION PROCEDURES

4.1 Reporting Concerns

Anyone may report concerns about research integrity to the following designated officials:

- Director of Research and Knowledge Exchange
- UREC Chair
- Faculty Dean
- University Whistleblowing Officer

Whistleblower Protection: The University strictly prohibits retaliation against anyone who, in good faith, reports or assists in the investigation of alleged research misconduct. Reports may be made confidentially. Anonymous reports will be considered but may limit the ability to conduct a thorough investigation.

4.2 Preliminary Assessment

Upon receiving an allegation:

- The Director of Research and Knowledge Exchange assess whether the allegation falls within the scope of this policy.
- If yes, a Preliminary Assessment Panel (2-3 members) is appointed.
- The Panel confidentially determines if the allegation has sufficient merit to warrant a formal investigation.
- **Timeline:** Preliminary Assessment must be completed within **20 working days** of appointment. The Director of RKEO may grant an extension for complex cases.

4.3 Formal Investigation

If the Preliminary Assessment determines a formal investigation is warranted:

- **Appointment:** The **University Provost/Vice President for Academic Affairs** appoints an Investigation Panel (3-5 members, may include an external expert).
- The Respondent is formally informed of the specific allegations and provided full opportunity to present evidence and respond.
- The Panel gathers evidence, interviews witnesses, and produces a final report detailing findings and recommendations.

- **Timeline:** The Formal Investigation must be completed within **60 working days** of Panel appointment. The Provost/VP Academic may grant reasonable extensions for complex international cases or due process requirements.

4.4 Outcomes

Finding	Possible Actions
No misconduct	Case closed; support for respondent if reputation has been damaged.
Minor breach	Training, mentoring, supervision requirements, letter of caution.
Serious misconduct	Disciplinary action (up to and including termination or expulsion); notification to funders, publishers, and Rool University; correction/retraction of publications.

4.5 Appeals

Respondents may appeal investigation findings and disciplinary actions through the University's formal appeals procedures, as governed by the HR or Student Disciplinary policies.

5. SUPPORT AND TRAINING

The University will ensure a culture of integrity by committing to:

- Provide mandatory research integrity training for all researchers and UREC members.
- Offer guidance and support on good research practice and authorship conventions.
- Maintain a culture where concerns can be raised safely and confidentially without fear of reprisal.
- Promote open communication between researchers, supervisors, and the RKEO Office.