2021

Ethical Approval (Staff and Students) (HE14)

T:C Partnership
Training • Education • Careers

Document Reference:	Ethical Approval (Staff and Students) (HE14)
Version:	4.4
Date of Implementation:	September 2021
Originator:	HE Quality Office
Approval by:	EMT
Date for Review:	March 2023

Description:
This document outlines the structures, processes and procedures that must be adhered to when staff and students are carrying out research projects, dissertations, assessments or any form of activity that requires ethical approval. Within the context of this code the word 'researcher' refers to all staff and under or postgraduate students enrolled at any campus in TEC Partnership. The Code allows the Partnership to assure itself that its requirements for ethical approval reflect its commitment to good ethical practice, as a principle in itself and as a means of maintaining public confidence in the work of its staff and students.

For further advice on how the code of practice works, you should contact the HE Quality Office.

HE Quality Office heqa@tecpartnership.ac.uk

This document is available in alternative forms

Version Control

Number	
4.2	**Replacement**
4.3	5.7 added that appeals can be made via HE16 Academic Appeals for maladministration. 12.0 added to ensure that monitoring and reporting of Ethical Approval is reported into the Academic Authority and Standards Senior Committee.
4.4	**Minor changes to make appropriate for adoption at ERC**
4.4.1	**Minor grammatical changes and removal of gender pronouns.**

1.0 Introduction

1.1 This Code of Practice (the Code) defines the structures and processes through which ethical approval must be obtained and the processes through which students or staff of TEC Partnership must seek to acquire authorisation or approval.

1.2 Ethical Approval and associated processes should not impinge on the academic freedom of staff or students at TEC Partnership. The Office for Students (2018) states that a key public interest governance principle is that academic staff at an English Higher Education provider have freedom within the law to:
- Question and test received wisdom;
- Put forward new ideas and unpopular opinions.

Academic freedom includes the right(s) to:
- freedom in carrying out research without commercial or political interference;
- freedom to disseminate and publish one's research findings;
- freedom from institutional censorship, including the right to express one's opinion publicly about the institution or the education system in which one works.

1.3 This policy is designed to safeguard the rights of those which researchers engage with whilst educating staff, students and any interested parties about ethical issues, and to direct researchers to adhere to best practice in their implementation and dissemination of research.

1.4 The importance of maintaining public confidence in the ethical quality of approved research conducted by staff and students of the Partnership is a key institutional priority.

1.5 All research carried out at all levels of study must be conducted according to rigorous ethical standards.

1.6 Any research undertaken by staff or students must comply with the legal requirements of the United Kingdom, and/or the country of location of the research.

1.7 Where statutory, professional, regulatory or other bodies may have requirements, these must be met before a research project can be authorised or approved.

2.0 Research Ethical Principles and Responsibilities

2.1 Research conducted following approval through this process must be conducted following some basic principles set out by the Academy of Social Sciences (2015) and included in the British Educational Research Association ethical guidelines (BERA 2018):

i. Social science is fundamental to a democratic society, and should be inclusive of different interests, values, funders, methods and perspectives.
ii. All social science should respect the privacy, autonomy, diversity, values and dignity of individuals, groups and communities.
iii. All social science should be conducted with integrity throughout, employing the most appropriate methods for the research purpose.
iv. All social scientists should act with regard to their social responsibilities in conducting and disseminating their research.
v. All social science should aim to maximise benefit and minimise harm. Research must be designed, reviewed and undertaken to ensure integrity, value and quality.

2.2 Through the implementation of this policy, TEC Partnership is ensuring all research is conducted in a

manner which meets a set of five responsibilities, namely:

i. responsibility to participants;
ii. responsibility to sponsors, clients and stakeholders in research;
iii. responsibility to the community of educational researchers;
iv. responsibility for publication and dissemination;
v. responsibility for researchers' wellbeing and development.

3.0 Ethical Process at TEC Partnership

3.1 Any research project undertaken by staff or students which involves human or animal participants, or human subjects, must have received ethical approval. This may be given at 'local' and or 'Committee' level, depending on the nature of the research proposal.

3.2 Any research involving animals must be submitted and approved at Committee level, where changes in food, supplement or environment that may cause harm is made for the purposes of an experiment to any living vertebrate other than man and any living cephalopod. This research must never be classified as a Regulated Procedure under the Animals (Scientific Procedures) Act 1986.

3.3 It is not expected that most undergraduate coursework will require ethical approval. However, there may be exceptions for this, for example oral history assignments in which participants are interviewed. For other programmes of study, for example health and health-related courses, teacher education, sports studies and public relations, interactions with human participants are integral to the programme. In such cases, the ethical issues and professional standards involved are expected to be addressed in the programme documentation and within the School or curriculum area. The extent to which this is the case may be subject to monitoring by the Partnership's Ethics Committee and should be identified in the validation document.

3.4 It is expected that final-year under and post graduate dissertations/projects, and staff primary research projects, are submitted for authorisation or approval. It is also expected that dissertation/project proposals should be such that either authorisation may be made at local or Institutional level.

3.5 Impact on participants and potential host organisations should be considered before approval is given. In this case, the consideration is not only whether the proposed project itself has ethical validity, but also whether it is ethical for the Partnership to permit outside organisations to be approached for the purpose of co-operating with research which may be of limited benefit.

3.6 In discussing the shape of the final year project or dissertation with the student, supervisors should bear in mind the following considerations:

i. Projects/dissertations should be formulated so as to qualify for local level authorisation or approval;
ii. Where interaction with external bodies is proposed (e.g. schools or hospitals), consideration should be given to the potential burden, inconvenience or added responsibility on that outside body which the project would entail, and whether the research outcomes for the community as a whole justify requests being made to these bodies;
iii. The supervisor will be able to supervise adequately any ethical issues during the course of the project/dissertation.

3.7 Supervisors will be assisted in this process if discussion is held at local level to identify those dissertations/projects which require ethical approval, but which fall within an accepted range of topics for which adequate ethical supervision can be assured. Similarly, there may be a range of partner institutions which are prepared to co-operate with undergraduate projects/dissertations. Undergraduate students must

not be permitted to approach outside bodies in a speculative manner.

3.8 Nominated by the respective Curriculum Manager or college manager, each curriculum area or college dependent on size will have a Research Ethics Coordinator. The role of the Research Ethics Coordinator is to determine if a research proposal:

i. Can be considered at local level for ethical authorisation
ii. Must be referred for Committee approval via the Partnership's Ethics Committee.

3.9 For the purpose of monitoring, and also as a check against any departure from the permitted project, ethical authorisation/approval forms should be retained for five calendar years from the date of issue.

3.10 Within every module handbook, module tutors must give clear guidance, at assessment level, about the type of and extent of student research, which must be adhered to complete the assessment. Based on risk of harm, tutors must make clear the limitations on the type of data gathering which can occur, and must state to students whether either:

- Students can begin the research for the assignment without approval;
- A meeting with the tutor, minuted on the learner record, must occur to confirm that the research plans are appropriate before the student begins;
- A full ethical approval is needed.

3.11 There is a nominated Chair of the ethics committee who is responsible for the smooth operation of the system across TEC Partnership. The chair must not be a local ethical coordinator. They are responsible for monitoring the submissions and ensuring that evidence of approval is complete.

4.0 Local Authorisation

4.1 This is undertaken within the school or curriculum area by Research Ethics Coordinator(s). This process confirms that the proposed research project does not need ethical approval at committee level. Research Ethics Coordinators must not review any projects which they have supervised or have been presented for the course for which they are the main Programme Leader.

4.2 Authorisation for research is required by Partnership staff, undergraduate and postgraduate students as a means of confirming that the research to be undertaken does not need ethical approval by the Partnership's Ethics Committee. It also serves to remind students that they may not depart from the authorised project, and may not involve human participants or subjects unless specific ethical approval at the appropriate level is obtained.

4.3 Authorisation at this level should only be given to 'low-risk' projects where the ethical issues are not complex or sensitive, and there is minimal risk of harm either to any human participants or the researcher where adequate supervision of the project is demonstrable.

4.4 Because of the nature of research projects it is impossible to specify in detail, or in absolute terms, those projects which can be approved at local level. However, the themes underpinning local level authorisation are:

i. the experience of the researcher;
ii. assessment of the level of risk;
iii. the complexity and sensitivity of proposals;
iv. appropriate safeguards like experienced supervision being in place.

4.5 In outline, the principles of local level authorisation are as follows:

A. Approvable: low-risk projects, which include the following:
i. projects in which the ethical issues are not complex or sensitive;
ii. projects where there is minimal risk of harm either to participants or researcher;
iii. (for undergraduate and postgraduate proposals) where adequate supervision of the project is demonstrable.

B. Not approvable at local level:
i. projects which do not comply with the provisions above;
ii. all requests of approval of projects involving children or vulnerable persons;
iii. all requests for participant, occluded or covert research projects.

4.6 In making these decisions, the Research Ethics Coordinator(s) within the school or curriculum area empowered to give consent for authorisation need to exercise judgement.

4.7 It is expected that the Research Ethics Coordinator(s) within the school or curriculum area will be members of the Partnership's Ethics Committee through which they will gain experience of the research projects expected to be considered at local and Committee level.

4.8 Research Ethics Coordinator(s) will receive training in the identification of ethical issues, and particularly assessment of the degree of risk involved. They should also be aware of the sensitivity of social issues like divorce or sexual orientation, and criminal/deviant issues like domestic violence or drug abuse. Such projects would not normally be permitted for undergraduate research, and, depending on the level of experience of the staff member as researcher and/or postgraduate supervisor, might be referred to the Partnership's Ethics Committee.

4.9 In cases of doubt, the Research Ethics Coordinator(s) should seek advice from the Chair of the Partnership's Ethics Committee.

4.10 To gain authorisation at local level, a student must submit the ethics proposal to the module tutor or designated supervisor who will pass on all applications to the Research Ethics Coordinator(s) within the school or curriculum area (see HE14A Ethics Proposal Form).

4.11 The decision of whether a proposed research project is authorised or referred for Committee level approval must be communicated to the student by the person(s) nominated within the school or curriculum area to give consent for authorisation.

4.12 The status of authorisation to the student must be communicated on the ethics proposal by the Research Ethics Coordinator(s). This will be a copy of the original which must be retained within the school or curriculum area.

4.13 The Research Ethics Coordinator(s) should sign and date the form. Signatures must be supported by identification of the signature in legible print. Electronic signatures are acceptable where there is email evidence from the staff email account.

4.14 The Research Ethics Coordinator must confirm each student's name and programme title where local level approval has been given for noting at the next Partnership Ethics Committee and recording in the minutes.

5.0 Committee Level Approval

5.1 Approval should be sought from the Partnership's Ethics Committee where there are:
i. 'medium' to 'high' risk or substantial or complex ethical issues involved;
ii. where the consent of external bodies, for example the NHS, are required;
iii. where this is a requirement for funding by an external body.

5.2 This is undertaken by the Partnership's Ethics Committee and occurs when local level authorisation has been rejected or referred.

5.3 All proposals forwarded to the Partnership's Ethics Committee should be submitted on the ethics proposal form, and also a copy of the recommendations made on the ethics proposal from the person(s) nominated within the School or curriculum area to give consent for authorisation at local level.

5.4 Where the research comes under the jurisdiction of a Local Medical Research Ethics Committee, or other equivalent committee, a copy of the appropriate documentation from that body must be included with the application. The School or curriculum area approval will then proceed on the basis of the NHS consent for the project without the need for duplicated assessment of the proposal. This does not preclude the committee additionally requiring compliance with any TEC Partnership requirement.

5.5 The Partnership's Ethics Committee will consider proposals and, if necessary, refer them back to the applicant for further details or remit the final decision to Chair's action. Only in highly exceptional circumstances will the Partnership's Ethics Committee do other than approve or not approve an application – i.e. it is not normally appropriate for the Partnership's Ethics Committee to require ongoing involvement in the research project once it is approved.

5.6 In making decisions, the Partnership's Ethics Committee will bear in mind the need of the applicant for a timely response to the application.

5.7 The decisions of the Partnership's Ethics Committee on matters referred to it can only be appealed by following the guidance in HE16 Academic Appeals, available on the Partnership website. This can only be on the grounds of maladministration of the Ethics Approval system.

6.0 Supervision and Requirements of the Supervisor and Researcher

6.1 Supervisors are responsible for monitoring approved research projects and/or proposals to ensure compliance with the project/proposal as approved, and/or to ensure revised authorisation in light of further developments.

6.2 Researchers submitting proposals for authorisation or approval must understand that the proposal may not be substantially amended after approval. For example, if authorisation is given, a researcher may not subsequently approach human participants; if approval is given for the involvement of human participants, a student may not widen the participant group, or significantly change the text of a questionnaire. An advisory note to this effect will be part of the ethical authorisation/approval process. Researchers will be warned that significant changes to the dissertation/project may invalidate the dissertation/project and result in it not being marked.

7.0 Ethical Principles

7.1 The results of research should benefit society, either directly, or by generally improving human knowledge and understanding.

7.2 All research projects must aim to avoid or minimise harm to groups and individuals.

7.3 Researchers and participants or subjects should be reasonably informed about the purpose, methods, and intended possible use of the research.

7.4 Research participants or subjects must participate in a voluntary way, free from coercion.

7.5 The interests of research participants and research subjects should be considered at all stages of the research project. In particular, the following should be observed:

i. Participants must be no worse off as a result of their participation in the project;
ii. Participation must be on the basis of informed consent either by the person and/or his or her legal guardian;
iii. Provisions for withdrawal from the project must be in place;
iv. The interests of children, vulnerable adults and other vulnerable groups must be given specific consideration;
v. Participants must not be subjected to undue intrusion, distress, indignity, physical discomfort, personal embarrassment or other harm.

7.6 The confidentiality of information supplied by research subjects must be respected, except where the requirements of professional practice determine. Issues of anonymity and anonymization of results must be fully considered, and, where personal disclosure or identification is likely, this must be discussed with the subjects or participants and their specific consent to this obtained.

7.7 The researcher must ensure that the research methodology is appropriate. Research designs must be such as to maximise a project's utility and relevance for the benefit of society.

7.8 Research outcomes must be disseminated in a manner which makes them accessible.

7.9 The independence of the research outcomes must be ensured. External sources of funding and any potential conflict of interest must be declared during the approval process.

7.10 The research culture will be characterised by respect for all groups in society, regardless of race, ethnicity, religion and culture, and with respect for, and awareness of, age, gender or other significant social differences.

7.11 The health and safety of both researcher and participants/subjects will be carefully considered in the design and execution of any research projects.

8.0 Ethical Issues for consideration in the preparation of proposals

8.1 The following are a list of ethical considerations which should be considered in the preparation of a research project involving human participants or human subjects. It is not exhaustive, and Statutory, Professional, Regulatory and other bodies may have other requirements, which the researcher should consult whilst preparing the project.

8.2 **Criteria for approval**: Consideration must focus on two basic issues:

i. Is it ethical to conduct the research project? If the TEC Partnership's Ethics Committee determines that the project itself is unethical, consideration will be terminated at this point.
ii. Is the proposed method of investigation appropriate, thorough and ethical?
iii. Proposals need to be agreed on both these issues before they are approved.

8.3 **Applications:**
i. Researchers submitting applications for authorisation or approval must describe the project, its aims and explain the procedure which will be carried out in relation to participants and/or subjects;
ii. The application will also be required to include an assessment of risk. It is important that researchers identify, in so far as they can, both the nature of any potential risks of the proposed project, and how such risks will be managed and minimised through the research strategy and protocols used.

8.4 **Participants or Subjects:** In respect of participants or subjects this should include:
i. Assessment (if relevant) of health-related issues like physical or psychological harm, discomfort or stress;
ii. Consideration of societal factors, for example risks to a person's social standing, privacy, personal values and beliefs, relations with family and friends and community, and work-related effects;
iii. Any disclosures relating to illegality, for example drug-use, sexuality and sexual practices, or deviant behaviour should have a very careful consideration of risk to the participant/subject, and the nature of the final research report should also address issues of confidentiality and anonymity.

8.5 **Researchers**: In respect of researchers this should include:
i. Assessment of any specific health and safety provisions which would be required, relating both to physical and mental health;
ii. Assessment of whether the researchers have the appropriate experience, including training in questioning and reporting on sensitive issues, to undertake the project;
iii. A judgement as to whether the researcher is a lone-researcher and the suitability of protocols planned to ensure the researcher's safety;
iv. Identification if the research involves participant or non-participant observation (if relevant);
v. Identification if the proposed project is occluded or covert (if relevant).

8.6 **Occluded Research:**
i. These are projects where full information to the participant would invalidate the research (e.g. the use of placebos in medical research); or would be meaningless (e.g. football crowd behaviour); or psychological experiments where prior disclosure would invalidate the responses and so contradict the purpose of the project;
ii. Where such research projects are projected, researchers should consult extensively with supervisors/line managers on the planning and design of the project;
iii. Withholding of information from participants should only occur when the researcher is clear that the aims and objectives of the research cannot be achieved, and the welfare of the participants assured, by any other means;
iv. Debriefing should follow participation as a matter of course;
v. Where deception has been substantial, the participant should be offered the option of withholding the data in accordance with the principle of participation by informed consent;
vi. Requests for ethical approval for occluded research projects must be referred to the Partnership's Ethics Committee for consideration of approval.

8.7 **Covert Research:**
i. Covert projects might be found in fields of deviance studies, and may include investigation of illegal behaviour (where the written consent of the participant would create risk for the individual); or where

such investigation might itself be covert;

ii. The broad principle for such investigations is that they must not be undertaken lightly or routinely. They should be seen as highly exceptional and only justified if important issues are being addressed and if matters of social significance which cannot be uncovered in other ways are likely to be discovered;

iii. Requests for ethical approval for covert research projects must be referred to the Partnership's Ethics Committee for consideration of approval.

8.8 **General Issues:** All proposals for research projects must state whether the proposed project involves consent from any external bodies, and identify these.

8.9 **Selection of Participants/Subjects:** Proposals must state on what basis the selection of participants/ subjects will be done, and how will the researchers assure the Partnership that this participation is voluntary? If it is intended that payments will be made, details of these payments and a rationale must be required.

8.10 **Information to the Participant or Subject of Research:** Proposals must state how the participant will be given sufficient information on the aims, methods, sources of funding of the project, and proposed use of the study. The proposal must make clear the anticipated benefits and potential risks of the project, and any discomfort it may entail. The right to withdraw from the project must be fully set out. A draft information sheet must be included in the application (where applicable).

8.11 **Consent:** Proposals must state how informed consent be obtained. If consent will not be in written form, the justification for this should be included and full details of how consent will be provided. A draft consent form must be included in the application which makes it clear that consent is informed consent.

8.12 **Children, Vulnerable Adults:** If the study involves people in these groups, the proposal must specify what specific provisions will be put in place and how informed consent will be obtained and from whom. A draft consent form must be included in the application. If relevant, the researchers must make clear if relevant Disclosure and Barring Service (DBS) clearance has been obtained.

8.13 **Confidentiality and Anonymity:** Proposals must state how confidentiality and anonymity of participants/subjects will be secured. For example, this may include consideration of circumstances in which the requirements of professional practice might impact on confidentiality and anonymity provisions; any issues relating to information provided by public bodies, corporations, contractors etc; if the identity of a person, company etc is likely to be disclosed or inferred or discoverable, how will this be discussed with the potential participant, and the impact that the proposed project may have on the participant. The proposal must state if there are any limits to participant confidentiality, the rationale and possible outcomes.

8.14 **Dissemination:** Proposals must make clear the planned methods of dissemination (e.g. research report, intended publication in journal or book).

8.15 **Independence:** Proposals must declare the origin of any external funding; identify any areas of possible conflict of interest; and whether any restrictions have been placed on the research by another body.

8.16 **Overseas research:** Proposals must make explicit how the proposal aligns to the requirements of the laws of the country/countries in which it is proposed that the investigation take place. This may include a consideration of issues relating to compliance with local laws on Data Protection and Intellectual Property.

8.17 **Data Security and Disposal:**

i. The proposal must make clear the researchers duties under the Data Protection Act. This is likely to include a consideration of how the processing of data will be handled; for example, how issues of data sensitivity will be considered in relation both to data protection and general lawfulness;
ii. The proposal must make clear the provisions which have been considered for the secure retention of sensitive or personal data; which provisions are in place for the secure destruction of this data, and when is it anticipated that this should take place;
iv. The proposal must make clear that where results are collected individually, (but the outcomes are anonymised), what data protection procedures will be in place to ensure the protection of personal details and how these will be destroyed.

8.18 **Intellectual Property:**

i. The proposal must make clear that researchers are aware of the wide variety of reproduction methods which are restricted in respect of protected data, and the possible implications of any copyright infringements. Any relevant permission in respect of this being obtained (e.g. the use of hitherto unpublished material) must be specified;
ii. In instances of on-line material being used, proposals must make clear if there are any international laws which impact on this.

8.19 **Health and Safety:** The proposal must make clear if there are any health and safety issues either for participants/subjects and/or researchers, and what advice has been taken on how these might be addressed.

8.20 **Ethical Issues relating to Dissemination of Results:**

i. Researchers must ensure that dissemination and/or publication follows good ethical practice. The following should be noted as requirements of good ethical practice. They are not exhaustive;
ii. All research must be appropriately published on its conclusion. This should include the methodology used, including acknowledgement of any limitations of the research. In general, research outcomes should be presented so as to ensure the anonymity of individuals. Where this is not the case, the issues must have been fully discussed with the participants/subjects and this should have been included in the ethical approval for the project;
iii. Researchers have a responsibility to take account of all relevant evidence and present it without omission, misrepresentation or deception. Data and information must not knowingly be fabricated or manipulated in a way which might lead to distortion;
iv. Work of other scholars or colleagues must be acknowledged. Professional standards need to be observed in: attribution of authorship; acknowledgement of sources; correctness of references. Plagiarism is not permitted, and identified plagiarism will lead to action under the Partnership's CoP Academic Misconduct.

9.0 Ethical issues related to the conduct of a research project

9.1 While it is important that ethical considerations are taken into account at the inception of a research project, it is also important that ethical considerations inform it throughout, up to and including the publication/dissemination of the research project.

9.2 It is the researcher's responsibility to abide by the terms of ethical approval given. If the need for further ethical approval becomes apparent as the project develops, it is the responsibility of the researcher to apply for further approval.

9.3 A School or curriculum area supervisor/line manager may monitor the progress of the research project

to ensure compliance with the terms of approval.

9.4 Failure to comply with the terms of ethical approval for a research project, or failure to seek further approval if required, may lead to action under the Student Disciplinary Policy or the CoP Academic Misconduct for students and the Disciplinary procedure for Partnership staff.

10.0 Research Undertaken by Employees of TEC Partnership

10.1 Within the context of this section, research is planned and directed inquiry with the aim of creating new knowledge or providing new perspectives. The following activities are defined under this code:

i. Activities which evaluate facts about existing services or states of affairs are deemed to be research in this respect and are also the focus of this Code;
ii. Research activities which are subject to any other and more specialised ethical review process are only reviewed under this code in a subsidiary way if the more specialised review-board has decided not to review the proposal in question (NHS Research Ethics Committee for example);
iii. Research activities undertaken by employees of TEC Partnership as part of the employees own educational qualifications are to be reviewed under the Code of Practice of the employees educational provider;
iv. Research activities which are part of a collaborative effort of more than one scholar, affiliated to different institutions, have to reach a decision amongst themselves according to which organisation's Ethical Code of Practice they want to engage in an ethics review process.

10.2 Within the context of this section, employees of TEC Partnership are all employed members of staff, either with permanent or a temporary contractual affiliation or within a casual work agreement.

10.3 Research activities can either be scholarly and/or commercial research.

10.4 The safeguarding of ethical conduct of scholarly and commercial research is the responsibility of the researcher.

a) In order to adhere to this ethical responsibility, the researcher has to engage in ethical consideration regarding the planned project and act according to these considerations. If the researcher feels satisfied with the research project at the end of these ethical considerations, the researcher must inform their line manager of the research ideas for local level approval. This might, in general, be the case with literature based secondary research or text interpretations;
b) For any primary research undertaken by the researcher, the researcher must seek guidance and clarification from the Partnership's Ethics Committee in the form of an ethics proposal submitted to the Partnership's Ethics Committee.

10.5 For the purpose of this code, a researcher and employee of TEC Partnership undertaking contracted commercial research is referred to as a consultant researcher.

10.6 The responsibility for the ethical conduct of commercial research, undertaken by a consulting researcher, rests with the funding entity and their ethical approval documentation must be submitted to the Ethics Committee and noted no later than 7 days prior to the start of the proposed research.

10.7 If, however, the consulting researcher is actively engaging in the design of the research and hence encounters the need to exert due ethical considerations to safeguard ethical conduct, the consulting researcher is bound to follow the same system as the scholarly researcher.

11.0 Ethical Misconduct

11.1 TEC Partnership undertakes to protect, from any subsequent victimisation or reprisal, any member of staff or student who has honest and reasonable suspicion that serious breaches of research ethics approval have taken place, even if the suspicion is subsequently found to be mistaken or unfounded.

11.2 Deliberate breaches of the Code and/or ethical standards are viewed seriously and may be referred for consideration under the staff/student disciplinary policy and/or CoP Academic Misconduct.

11.3 Research or ethical misconduct can be a product of deliberate, reckless or negligent action. The following are examples of research or ethical related misconduct:

i. Failure to obtain permission to conduct research
ii. Falsification of information or deception in research proposals
iii. Unauthorised use of confidential information
iv. Unethical behaviour in the conduct of any research
v. Fabrication, falsification or corruption of research information or data
vi. Deviation from good research practice where this results in harm to humans, animals or the environment
vii. Dishonest misinterpretation of results and/or publication of data known to be misleading, plagiaristic or dishonest use of sources
viii. Misquotation or misrepresentation of other authors
ix. Fraud, misuse of research funds or equipment
x. Attempting, planning or conspiring to be involved in research misconduct
xi. Eliciting others to be involved in research misconduct

12.0 Monitoring and Reporting

12.1 An annual report of Ethical Approval decisions, including trends within the academic year, will be reported into Academic Authority and Standards Senior Committee.

T:C Partnership
Training • Education • Careers

Grimsby Institute
University Centre Grimsby
Skegness TEC Training Education Careers
The Academy Grimsby YOUR FUTURE, FOCUSED
gi International
nel National Employer Training
workforce SKILLS
Little Stars Day Nursery
Doncaster LEARNING CENTRE
distance LEARNING
Skegness Learning Centre
Grimsby Learning Centre
Immingham Learning Centre
Louth Learning Centre
Scarborough TEC Training Education Careers
MODAL TRAINING
ecosh EAST COAST OCCUPATIONAL SAFETY & HEALTH
Transafe TRAINING
FRPERC Food Refrigeration and Process Engineering Research Centre
East Riding College

Nuns Corner, Grimsby, North East Lincolnshire, DN34 5BQ, UK
Tel: 01472 311 222 **Email:** infocent@grimsby.ac.uk **Web:** grimsby.ac.uk