RESEARCH & KNOWLEDGE EXCHANGE ETHICS POLICY AND PROCEDURES

Document Title:	RKE Ethics Policy and Procedures
Document Author:	Dr Maru Mormina, Chair of RKE Ethics
Responsible Person and Department:	Dr Maru Mormina (University RKE Ethics Committee)
Approving Body:	Senate RKE Committee: SMT: Senate
Date of Approval:	Senate RKE Committee: 6 August 2015 SMT: 12 August 2015 Senate:
Date Effective From:	16 September 2015
Review Date:	March 2016
Indicate whether the document is for public access or internal access only **Indicate whether the document applies to collaborative provision?** *(Strikethrough text, as appropriate)*	**Public Access** ~~**Internal Access Only**~~ **Applies to Collaborative Provision**

Summary:

This Research and Knowledge Exchange Ethics Policy is founded upon the values of integrity, quality, confidentiality, respect for persons and transparency. These are central to the delivery of the University mission 'to educate, to advance knowledge and to serve the public good' and informed by the University's foundation and its thinking about the educational, social and spiritual character of the University as a whole. The Policy describes how these values are embodied in the conduct of the University's research and knowledge exchange and makes explicit the requirements for the ethical conduct of research and knowledge exchange by the University's staff and students. The Policy should be read alongside the University's policies, codes, guidance and conduct documents, including the Data Protection Policy, the Equal Opportunities Policy, and the Policy on Freedom of Speech.

RESEARCH & KNOWLEDGE EXCHANGE ETHICS POLICY AND PROCEDURES

TABLE OF CONTENTS

RESEARCH & KNOWLEDGE EXCHANGE ETHICS POLICY AND PROCEDURES

POLICY

Introduction

1. This Research and Knowledge Exchange Ethics Policy is founded upon the values of integrity, quality, confidentiality, respect for persons and transparency. These are central to the delivery of the University mission 'to educate, to advance knowledge and to serve the public good' and informed by the University's foundation and its thinking about the educational, social and spiritual character of the University as a whole. The Policy describes how these values are embodied in the conduct of the University's research and knowledge exchange and makes explicit the requirements for the ethical conduct of research and knowledge exchange by the University's staff and students. The Policy should be read alongside the University's policies, codes, guidance and conduct documents, including the Data Protection Policy, the Equal Opportunities Policy, and the Policy on Freedom of Speech.

2. All those engaged in research and knowledge exchange have obligations to the subjects of their study, to sponsors and employers, to colleagues and to the further development and promotion of knowledge. Likewise, the University has obligations to the subjects of any study, to the governing body of any host institution, to the sponsors of the study and the member of staff engaged in the work. All research at the University of Winchester must be designed and conducted in accordance with internationally accepted ethical and professional standards, including the six key ethical principles laid out in the ESRC Research Ethics Framework (Appendix 1), and should comply with the letter and spirit of all relevant legislation.

3. The University has a commitment to considerations of environmental awareness and sustainable development. Researchers working under the auspices of the University are expected to maintain a degree of sensitivity to the potential environmental impacts of their research, to take steps to minimise negative impacts on the natural and the built environments, and to explain such steps in proposals for such research.

4. All Faculties within the University and some Professional Services groups have researchers, research students, taught postgraduate and undergraduate students undertaking research. To meet the requirements of this Research and Knowledge Exchange Ethics Policy all Faculties are required to have procedures in place for the ethics review of research and knowledge exchange projects.

5. In order to ensure that the University is operating within, and according to, current accepted guidelines, a University Research & Knowledge Exchange Ethics Committee (RKEEC) is in operation. The University RKEEC is independent of any bias and compromise and is accountable to all stakeholders and representatives of the University community.

6. The University RKEEC carries out full review of projects where indicated, and supplements and monitors research and knowledge exchange ethics procedures within the Faculties and provides support and guidance to Faculty Research and Knowledge Exchange Committees. Faculties' ethics procedures are subject to scrutiny by the University's RKEEC on an annual basis.

7. The procedures instituted in pursuit of this policy are intended:
   a. to facilitate, not inhibit, research;

   b. to promote a culture within the University whereby researchers conscientiously reflect on the ethical implications of their research;

   c. to apply a principle of subsidiarity whereby responsibility for research ethics will be embraced by researchers, supervisors and departments at a level as close as appropriately possible to the actual conduct of the research.

8. The policy is subject to oversight by the University's RKEEC, which is accountable to the Senate Research and Knowledge Exchange and ultimately to Senate and the Senior Management Team. It will be reviewed periodically. The policy is freely available to potential research funding agencies in the interests of transparency and to avoid possible pre-contractual misunderstandings. This document has been drawn up with regard to ethical guidelines relevant to research within the University. Any researcher considering research ethics should do so in conjunction with the resources and policies listed in Appendix 1.

Freedom of Speech

9. The University policy on Freedom of Speech enshrines the right of members of staff and students of the University to question and test within the law received wisdom and to put forward controversial ideas without risk to their jobs or position in the University, as is required by the 1986 Education Act. Under the University policy, all staff and students have the right to speak freely, without fear of disciplinary action or any other sanction, provided they do so lawfully, without malice and in the public interest. Challenge to accepted thinking is part of the generation of knowledge and the University upholds the rights of staff and students to publish without hindrance except where a specific written provision has been made with the agreement of all parties. At the same time, all staff and students have a responsibility not to abuse this right so as to bring the name of the University into disrepute

10. Rather than challenging the right to academic freedom, research and knowledge exchange ethics scrutiny seeks to safeguard the rights, dignity and safety of research subjects and researchers by minimising detrimental risk-related considerations for subjects of research and for researchers themselves. Such risks include risk to a subject's personal social standing, privacy, physical safety or well-being, personal values and beliefs, their links to family and the wider community, and their position within occupational settings, as well as adverse effects of revealing information that relates to illegal, sexual or deviant behaviour.

Legal and Data Requirements

11. All legal requirements pertaining to privacy, health and safety and intellectual property should be met in accordance with the University's policies in these areas. Data supplier access requirements with regard to the secondary use of datasets must be complied with at all times, including any provision relating to presumed consent and potential risk of disclosure of sensitive information.

Ethics approval for research and knowledge exchange projects

12. The University subscribes to an ethic of personal responsibility by which individual researchers (and in the case of students their supervisors) should take personal responsibility for their research and knowledge exchange projects.

13. Where staff are required to provide project outlines or proposals to their Departments or Faculties, these must state whether ethical approval is required and why. Ethical approval is typically required for research involving living human participants or data derived from directly identifiable individuals. It is also required for research involving tissues under 100 years old that are covered by the Human Tissue Act 2004.

14. It is the responsibility of individual researchers to complete an RKE Ethics proforma for their research and knowledge exchange projects, if ethics approval is indicated. It is their responsibility to ensure that they have gained such approval before they commence the proposed activity. Staff will be provided with advice and staff development as appropriate.

15. Projects and research plans based upon data collected by members of the University while employed by other institutions and engaged on research projects which have previously been subjected to ethical scrutiny in those institutions need not go through further ethics approval processes unless there are significant changes to the original research proposal which have ethical implications (for example, changes or new developments that require further consent from participants). Copies of ethical approval from the previous employer must be provided to RKEEC prior to the start of any research activity.

16. The principal investigator of a joint project is required to manage the ethical scrutiny of the project, as indicated in this policy. Where the principal investigator of a collaborative project is employed by another University, the outcome of ethics review by that University must be communicated to RKEEC.

17. Where a project is conducted in another country, the researcher is required to obtain ethical approval by a local research ethics committee or other relevant authority (e.g. health authority). No research by staff or students may begin until this has been received. RKEEC will have regard to (but not be bound by) guidelines or decisions made by other institutions.

Training

18. The Dean of each Faculty must ensure that all Faculty staff understand this policy and the values that underpin it, and abide by its requirements as they relate to their role.

19. All students and staff undertaking research are required in the course of their studies or career to have undertaken appropriate training or to have had significant relevant experience before embarking on any research activity. Students and staff must responsibly consider whether their training or experience sufficiently qualifies them to evaluate the ethical implications of their research. If not, they should in the first instance seek appropriate advice from within their department and/or from colleagues within their discipline with specific expertise in relation to research ethics. Thereafter, in the event of any remaining uncertainty as to the propriety of their research, they are required to contact the Chair of RKEEC, Departmental Ethics Panel, Head of Faculty RKE or Head of Department, whichever is appropriate in order to identify adequate training.

20. This policy should be formally incorporated into any undergraduate/postgraduate training programme or documentation offered at departmental level. All degree programmes

(undergraduate, Master's and research degrees) must incorporate at least one lecture, seminar or support session that covers research ethics. All students undertaking research for a dissertation or thesis should have access through their supervisor to appropriate advice and support in relation to research ethics. For further information on training researchers should contact the secretary of RKEEC in the first instance.

21. All academic members of the RKEEC, as well as Faculty Heads or RKE, Heads of Department and all those involved in the ethical review of staff or student proposals are required to have undertaken appropriate training and/or to have had significant relevant experience before taking up their responsibilities.

PROCEDURES

When to request Ethics review

22. Research projects involving human participants, or data which could potentially identify human subjects, must undergo Ethics review. In this case, researchers must complete an Ethics proforma.

23. Ethics review is generally not necessary for projects that do not involve human or living animal subjects or handle sensitive materials, and for those that draw on documentary material already in the public domain, for example, published biographies, newspaper accounts of an individual's activities, published minutes of a meeting, interviews broadcast on radio or television or online and diaries or letters in the public domain, or historical records authorised for public access by record offices.

24. The following activities are not typically considered research and therefore do not require ethics review: routine audit, performance reviews, quality assurance studies, testing and review within normal education requirements, service evaluations, polling on current public policy issues, and literary or artistic criticism.

25. Ethics review may not be required for anonymous records and data sets that exist in the public domain. This includes, for example, data sets available through the Office for National Statistics or the ESRC Data Archive. However, where data providers are likely to specify their own restrictions on the access to and use of their data, these must be complied with.

External Ethics Review

26. Research involving NHS patients or premises, adult social care studies, intergenerational studies involving adults and children or families, use of social care databases and some proposals for social science studies situated in the NHS from researchers based in England need to be reviewed by an appropriate external Research Ethics Committee (NHS REC or Social Care REC). In this case, the researcher will complete section 1 and 2 of the Ethics proforma and send it, together with the relevant external ethics approval, to the secretary of RKEEC.

Internal Ethics Review

27. Any other research involving human subjects or data from identifiable individuals which is conducted under the auspices of the University of Winchester will be reviewed internally. Where ethics review is required this will take place at one of two levels: full review and light touch review.

28. Full review of staff and postgraduate research student (PGR) projects will be conducted by RKEEC. Full review of taught student (Master and Undergraduate) projects will be conducted by Departmental Ethics Panels.

29. Light touch review of staff and PGR projects will be conducted by Faculties RKE Committees (typically the Chair or nominee plus at least one more member). Light touch review of taught student projects will be conducted by the supervisor and countersigned by the Head of Department or a nominee.

Light touch review

30. Light touch review may be conducted when the potential of the research to cause a risk of harm to participants and others affected by it is not deemed significant. Typically, light touch review may be sufficient for research which does not involve deception and where participants (or in the case of children, their parents or guardians) have consented to participate and/or to the use of their data by the researcher(s).

31. Research that does not entail the direct participation of living human persons may also be eligible for light touch review, unless it significantly affects living persons. Researchers may be assessing information about identifiable individuals, the publication or analysis of which may have ethical (and indeed legal) implications. For example, collection and use of archive, historical, legal, online or visual materials may raise ethical issues (e.g. for families and friends), and research on provision of social or human services may impact provision for individuals and groups of service users who did not contribute or consent to, or were not consulted about the research. Insofar as possible, researchers should consider such implications.

32. Faculty Heads of RKE will exercise judgement when conducting light touch review. If necessary they will seek advice from RKEEC and/or refer proposals for full review by RKEEC.

Full review

33. Full review will be conducted where the potential of the research to cause a risk of harm to participants and others affected by it is more than minimal. This may include:
    a. Research involving vulnerable children and young people (defined as any person under the age of 18)[1]
    b. Research involving individuals in a dependent or unequal relationship.
    c. Research involving sensitive topics, as commonly defined across the British research sector – for example, participants' relationships, emotions or sexual behaviour, their

---

[1] Vulnerability should not be determined only by reference to the age of an individual. Whether a child is considered to be 'vulnerable' depends on several factors. These will include the child's circumstances, their susceptibility to coercion, the type of research being undertaken and how and where the research is being undertaken. Researchers must therefore take all of these factors into consideration when assessing whether children and young people identified as potential research participants should be deemed to be 'vulnerable.

experience of violence, their mental health, their gender or ethnic status, their political or religious affiliations

    d.   Research involving deception or which is conducted without participants' (or guardians in the case of children) full and informed consent at the time the study is carried out

    e.   Research which involves the sharing of data or confidential information beyond the initial consent given, or where the anonymity of the participant may be compromised.

    f.   Research which may induce psychological stress, anxiety or cause more than minimal pain.

    g.   Research involving intrusive interventions where there is a high risk of severe physical harm.

    h.   Research involving the storage of samples covered by the Human Tissue Act.

34. Where appropriate, relevant guidelines of professional bodies will be taken into account to determine the level of risk and appropriate route for review of specific research projects. In such cases, the requirements of professional bodies may take precedence over the above criteria.

35. In all cases where research involves collection of data from vulnerable populations, it is the researcher's responsibility to ensure that s/he has current CRB advanced disclosure certification.

36. Full review will be conducted by RKEEC. In some cases, a member of the Senior Management Team may be invited to take part in the review process, for example when the research poses serious risks of reputational damage for the institution.

Staff

37. Staff (both academic and professional services) must complete the RKE Ethics proforma at the start of each project, if ethics review is indicated (or where appropriate each project phase). Ethics proformas submitted for approval should specifically address published disciplinary code(s) of practice.

38. Staff will complete sections 1, 2, and 3 of the Ethics proforma. If full review is indicated, they will also complete section 5 and submit the proforma to the secretary of RKEEC. They should ensure that all relevant accompanying documents are appended to the proforma (e.g. consent forms, information sheets, overseas approvals, etc.)

39. If the research is eligible for light touch review, researchers will complete section 4 of the proforma and submit it (together with all relevant documentation) to their Faculty Head of RKE.

40. Research proposals developed by members of Professional Services which are eligible for light touch review should be referred to the Chair of RKEEC, who will advise in which faculty the ethical dimensions of the research can best be scrutinised.

Review by Chair's action

41. Review by Chair's action may be undertaken in the case of staff project proposals which are being submitted for funding from major funding bodies, where ethical approval is a pre-requisite. In such cases, full review is postponed until the outcome of the funding bid is known, but must then be carried out in line with the requirements of both the University and the funding body.

42. Review by Chair's action may also be conducted for research projects that are eligible for light touch review but cannot be reviewed by the Faculty Head of RKE (e.g. because there is a conflict of interest).

43. In this case, the review will be carried out by the Chair of the RKEEC, who may consult one or more members of RKEEC.

44. Outcomes of all reviews by Chair's action will be reported to the next meeting of the RKEEC. A list of all reviews will be included in the RKEEC Annual Report.

Postgraduate Research Students (MPhil, PhD)

45. Research Degrees Quality Committee (RDQC) is responsible for the initial scrutiny of all MPhil/PhD proposals to ensure that ethical standards have been upheld, and that candidates understand the ethical issues involved in their research.

46. PGR students will submit Sections 1, 2, and 3 of the ethics proforma to RDQC for scrutiny. If ethical approval is required, RDQC will advise students and their supervisors on whether their project must be reviewed by a Faculty RKE or by RKEEC. If light touch review is required, RDQC will refer proposals directly to the Faculty Head of RKE. If full review is required, RDQC will refer proposals to the University RKE Ethics Committee.   It will also refer ongoing PGR research to either the Faculty RKE Committee or the University Ethics Committee where this is deemed appropriate.

47. PGR projects require the supervisor's agreement in addition to the approval by Faculty RKE or University RKE Ethics Committee.

48. The University Research Training Programme will include training in the ethical conduct of research.

Professional Doctorates (ProfDocs)

49. Students undertaking professional doctorates will typically conduct the initial phase of their training (the pre-thesis stage) within an academic Department. Should students engage in research activities at this stage, the ethical review will be conducted by the Head of Department (or nominee) or Departmental panel, whichever is appropriate, as per paragraphs 50-53. Once the student has progressed to the Thesis stage, the ethical review of their research will be conducted in accordance with the process outlined for other PGR students, as per paragraph 46.

Undergraduate and Masters Student Research Projects

50. Research undertaken as a part of an undergraduate, or taught master programme of study should, where at all possible, not venture into areas requiring more than light touch review. In these circumstances, ethics review will be conducted by the project or dissertation supervisor and countersigned by the Head of Department or his/her nominee/s.

51. If more than light touch approval is indicated (by completing section 3 of the proforma), Departments may – in consultation with RKEEC - devise appropriate procedures (including alternative discipline-specific forms if they so wish) in order to guide students in the framing of necessary ethical safeguards. Such procedures will typically involve the constitution of a Departmental Ethics Panel, which may be convened on an ad-hoc basis (if full review is not

conducted on a regular basis) or may be formally constituted as a committee. In any case, the full review of students' proposals will be carried out by the Head of Department (or his/her nominee) plus two academic members of staff.

52. In the case of coursework in modules involving data collection from living subjects undertaken during placements or in the workplace by undergraduate or taught Masters students, an ethics checklist must be provided for students to ensure their attention to principles of ethical research.

53. Failure by a student to comply with the University of Winchester Ethics Policy and procedures is considered academic misconduct, and will incur penalties (see UoW Academic Misconduct policy)

Module (undergraduate or Master's) block ethics approval

54. Taught modules in which it is routine practice to undertake a practical activity on an annual basis may be granted block ethics approval, provided the activity is always conducted using the same methodology or protocol.

55. It is envisaged that block ethics approval will be given to modules conducting practical activities assessed as below minimal risk. In this case, the module leader will complete the Block Ethics Approval Form and submit it to the secretary of RKEEC. Approval will be given by the Chair, who may consult with members of RKEEC or other researchers with relevant expertise.

56. Once given, the approval will be valid for a period of three (3) years. After this period, the approval must be renewed. If there are modifications to the activity, the Module Leader must submit a new application for block ethics approval.

57. Any other research activity that is undertaken as part of a taught module, for which block ethics approval is deemed unsuitable must follow the relevant procedures for taught research projects.

Amendments:

58. If after obtaining ethical approval a research project changes substantially in such a way that new ethical considerations arise, such changes need to be communicated to the Committee that granted the original approval (in the case of staff and research students this will be either Faculty RKE or RKEEC). Researchers should complete section 6 of the proforma detailing the changes and any ethical issues associated with those changes that have not been considered in the original application. In some cases, a new application may be required, depending on the nature of the changes and the complexity of the research project.

59. Taught students will not normally be expected to make significant changes to their research proposals, given the short lead time for submission. However, where such changes are necessary, they should complete section 6 of the proforma and submit it to their Head of Department or nominee, countersigned by their supervisor. Approval of the changes will be given by the Head of Department or nominee, or by the Departmental Ethics panel, whichever granted the original approval. In some cases, a new application may be required, depending on the nature of the changes and the complexity of the research project.

Research involving animals

60. If the research involves the use of animals, the researcher will complete sections 1, 2 and 7 of the proforma (countersigned by the supervisor in the case of students) and send it to the relevant Faculty Ethics officer for archival, together with a copy of the relevant licence.

Research involving documentary material not in the public domain

61. If the research involves the use of material not in the public domain, the researcher will complete sections 1, 2 and 8 of the proforma (countersigned by the supervisor in the case of students) and send it to the relevant Faculty Ethics officer for archival.

Research involving environmental interventions

62. If the research involves altering the environment in any way, the researcher will complete sections 1, 2 and 9 of the proforma (countersigned by the supervisor in the case of students) and send it to the relevant Faculty Ethics officer for archival.

Appeals

63. Where an application is submitted for full review, the RKEEC or the Departmental Ethics Panel will make decisions using a majority voting procedure. Where RKEEC/ Departmental Panel decline to approve an application, the Chair will consult with the applicant (or the supervisor in the case of students) with a view to devising a solution that is acceptable to RKEEC/ Departmental Panel. The RKEEC/ Departmental Panel may at its discretion request advice and guidance from colleagues with particular expertise, and in addition may call upon outside experts to assist with advice and review as required. Decisions made by the RKEEC/ Departmental Panel for each proposal will be minuted and provided to the relevant researcher(s). The decision will be kept on file for a period of at least seven years.

64. Where the Committee/Panel declines to accept a proposal, the researcher has the right to request that the decision is considered by the Ethics Appeals Panel.

65. Appeals should be made in writing to the Chair of the Ethics Appeals Panel providing all the documentation considered by RKEEC/ Departmental Panel and a covering letter setting out sufficient information to allow the grounds for appeal to be understood and demonstrating clearly the basis of the appeal.

66. The Ethics Appeals Panel will consist of the following:
    a.   Director for RKE as Chair (the Director has the right to appoint another senior member of academic staff in his or her absence)
    b.   Two senior academic appointed by the Chair
    c.   If additional expertise is required, the Chair may invite up to two further members of academic staff with relevant expertise but who have not been involved in the initial decision to join the panel.

67. All members of the Panel must be fully apprised of and familiar with the RKE Ethics Policy.

68. Unless the Panel decides to uphold the appeal, hearings must provide the researcher with the opportunity of presenting his/her case in person. Following the withdrawal of the researcher, the Panel will determine its decision and provide clear justification for its decision, whether the appeal has been successful or unsuccessful.

Complaints procedure

69. The University shall take seriously all allegations of misconduct relating to research ethics. The University will handle such allegations using (as appropriate) its Complaints Policy, grievance and disciplinary procedures.
70. Expressions of concern about the conduct of research carried out under the auspices of the University should be made in the first instance to the Director of Research and Knowledge Exchange of the University of Winchester. The Director of RKE will liaise with the Chair of the Research and Knowledge Exchange Ethics Committee and the relevant Dean of Faculty as appropriate in recommending further action, which may invoke the University complaints procedure.

Institutional monitoring

71. In the first instance it will be the responsibility of the researcher to monitor the conduct of research that has received ethical approval (for students, in consultation with supervisors). The researcher must ensure that there is an appropriate continuing review of the research, taking into account any possible changes that may occur over the duration of the research project. It is the responsibility of the researcher to alert the Chair of the RKEEC, Faculty Head of RKE or Head of Department (whichever is relevant) if any further ethical implications arise. It is the responsibility of the researcher to ensure that data are securely held and preserved.
72. The RKEEC may periodically conduct a selective audit of current research projects.
73. Where significant concerns have been raised about the ethical conduct of a study, RKEEC can request a full and detailed account of the research for a further ethical review.
74. Where the RKEEC considers that a study is being conducted in a way which is not in accord with the conditions of its original approval it may consider withdrawal of its approval and require that the research be suspended or discontinued. It is the duty of the RKEEC to inform the appropriate funding body that ethical approval has been revoked.
75. Faculty RKE Committees will provide a section of their annual report to RKEEC, which will include information and comment on the development of research and knowledge exchange ethics and an action plan.
76. RKEEC will provide an annual report to the Senate RKE Ethics Committee and will comment on the development of research and knowledge exchange ethics in the University.

Failure to comply with this policy

77. Failure to undertake a review of the ethical implications of research or to comply with any other aspect of this Policy or failure to apply reasonable care in assessing the likely ethical implications of a research project, may constitute research misconduct

Dr Maru Mormina
Chair of RKE Ethics Committee
Revised May 2015

Appendix 1: Resources

1. External Resources

ESRC Ethics Framework http://www.esrc.ac.uk/about-esrc/information/research-ethics.aspx

The framework is based on the following key principles:

Research should be designed, reviewed and undertaken to ensure integrity and quality.

Research staff and subjects must be fully informed about the purpose, methods and intended possible uses of the research, what participation entails and what risks if any are involved.

The confidentiality of information supplied by subjects, and their anonymity, must be respected.

Any participant must do so on a voluntary basis free from coercion.

Harm to participants must be avoided.

The independence of the research must be clear and any conflicts of interest or partiality explicit.

Department of Health Research Governance Framework for Health and Social Care (RGF). The Framework applies to any research, whether funded or unfunded, that relates to the responsibilities of the Secretary of State for Health. See: https://www.gov.uk/government/publications/research-governance-framework-for-health-and-social-care-second-edition

ESRC Postgraduate Training Guidelines. Available through the ESRC's Training and Development Board. Training guidance may be available for a student's own subject area and visiting the websites of the relevant associations and learned societies is encouraged. http://www.esrc.ac.uk/funding-and-guidance/postgraduates/dtc/dtc-policy/dtcnetwork/ptguidelines.aspx

European Commission: How to complete your ethics Self-Assessment http://ec.europa.eu/research/participants/data/ref/h2020/grants_manual/hi/ethics/h2020_hi_ethicsself-assess_en.pdf

European Science Foundation European Code of Conduct for Research Integrity. The code addresses the proper conduct and principled practice of systematic research in the natural and social sciences and the humanities in Europe. http://www.esf.org/media-centre/ext-single-news/article/the-european-code-of-conduct-for-researchintegrity-endorsed-by-european-science-foundations-gove.html

Information Commissioner's Office produces a code of practice for Anonymisation: managing data protection risk. This includes methods for anonymising data. http://ico.org.uk/for_organisations/data_protection/topic_guides/anonymisation

Nuffield Council on Bioethics: The ethics of research involving animals. See: http://nuffieldbioethics.org/project/animal-research/

RCUK Policy and Guidelines on the Governance of Good Research Conduct. The policy aims to help researchers and research organisations to manage their research, and provides guidance of the reporting and investigation of unacceptable research misconduct. http://www.rcuk.ac.uk/Publications/researchers/grc/

The Research Ethics Guidebook. An online guide for social science researchers http://www.ethicsguidebook.ac.uk/

UKRIO Code of Practice for Research: Promoting good practice and preventing misconduct. An essential reference tool to support researchers in the conduct of their research. http://www.ukrio.org/what-we-do/code-of-practice-for-research/

Disclosure and Barring Service criminal record checking guidance. See: https://www.gov.uk/government/collections/dbs-checking-service-guidance--2

Universities UK Concordat to support research integrity. The Concordat sets out five commitments that will provide assurances to government, the wider public and the international community that research in the UK continues to be underpinned by sound standards of rigour and integrity. http://www.universitiesuk.ac.uk/highereducation/Pages/Theconcordattosupportresearchintegrity.aspx

2. Relevant Statutes

The Research Ethics Policy has been drawn up with due regard to relevant statutes, including:

The Data Protection Act (1998) http://www.legislation.gov.uk/ukpga/1998/29/contents.
Further advice specifically written for researchers is available from JISCLegal, see: http://jiscleg.al/DPResearchQandA.

The Information Commissioner's Office has a code of practice on writing privacy notices (data collection notices), which is available here: http://ico.org.uk/for_organisations/data_protection/topic_guides/~/media/documents/library/Data_Protection/Detailed_specialist_guides/PRIVACY_NOTICES_COP_FINAL.ashx

If you are engaged in social research with or for a commercial client, you will find this guide helpful: http://the-sra.org.uk/wp-content/uploads/MRS-SRA-DP-Guidelines-updated-April-2013.pdf.

The Mental Capacity Act (2005) http://www.legislation.gov.uk/ukpga/2005/9/contents

3. University of Winchester resources

Data storage and management – Currently under review

Freedom and Information obligations
http://www.winchester.ac.uk/Documents/Freedom%20of%20Information%20approved%20scheme%2011%2011.pdf

Research Misconduct
https://intranet.winchester.ac.uk/search/Pages/Results.aspx?sq=1&k=code%20of%20practice%20for%20research
https://intranet.winchester.ac.uk/search/Pages/Results.aspx?sq=1&k=academic%20misconduct%20policy

Complaints policy
https://intranet.winchester.ac.uk/information-bank/student-complaints/SiteAssets/SitePages/Home/Complaints%20Policy.pdf

Grievance and Disciplinary procedures.
https://intranet.winchester.ac.uk/search/Pages/Results.aspx?sq=1&k=dignity%20at%20work%20policy
http://www.winchester.ac.uk/Documents/Freedom%20of%20Information%20approved%20scheme%2011%2011.pdf

Appendix 2: Flowchart of the Research Ethics Scrutiny Process