THE LONDON INTERDISCIPLINARY SCHOOL

Research Ethics Policy and Procedure

Preamble

'Research ethics' can be described as a set of principles governing the way in which research is designed, managed and conducted.

LIS is committed to ensuring that its research activities are conducted in a way which respects the dignity, rights, and welfare of participants, and which minimises risk to participants, researchers, third parties, the local and global environment, and to LIS itself. In accordance with its policy on research involving human participants and personal data, and research that may pose a risk to biodiversity or the natural environment, LIS requires that all such research be subject to appropriate ethical review.

In addition to academic research undertaken by faculty, research involving human interaction, human data or activities with the potential to affect the natural environment may arise as part of the learning of students at the School, for example in projects and coursework. This document describes the School's Policy and Procedure for ensuring that in preparing and conducting a research project, the dignity, rights, safety, and wellbeing of participants and the natural environment are considered, respected, and safeguarded.

Definition of research for the purpose of this policy

Research is provisionally defined as an investigative activity that:

- aims to generate new knowledge that may or may not have practical applications;
- has the potential to lead to generalised conclusions;
- relies on the collection of new data or a novel analysis of existing data;
- generates results which could be published or disseminated.

Scope

This Policy and Procedure governs the ethics of research across the School, and applies to all staff, students, and anybody else carrying out research under the auspices of the School, whether their current place of work is within or outside School premises.

Specifically, it applies to:

- research that involves human participants
- data relating to directly identifiable human subjects (whether living or recently deceased)
- research that involves animals, plants, fungi, bacteria, viruses or other living organisms, or the *ex vivo* manipulation of genetic material, cells or tissues that were originally derived from living organisms
- research with the potential to impact local, national and/or global ecosystems

It does not apply to research involving secondary analysis of established datasets from which it would not be possible to identify any living or recently deceased person (although it should

be noted that there must be a record in relation to data of this type that ethical procedures were followed in gathering the data). However, where it is necessary for data to be anonymised by LIS staff or students, this Policy and Procedure applies.

This Policy and Procedure does not apply to any research that is commissioned by an employer as part of a student's work whilst on an immersive internship; this will be covered by the employer's own research ethics policies and procedures.

Legislative and best practice context

This Policy and Procedure have been drawn up with due regard to the reference to the Data Protection Act 2018, the GDPR, and the Mental Capacity Act 2005. It has also drawn on best practice as set out by external organisations such as the Information Commissioner's Office (ICO), UKRI Economic and Social Research Council, UK Research Integrity Office and Universities UK (see Annex 2 for these and other useful resources).

Links to other Policies and Procedures

This Policy and Procedure should be read in conjunction with other School regulations, policies and procedures, including:

- Data Protection Policy
- Data Retention Policy and Detailed Data Retention Schedule
- Safeguarding Policy and Procedure (including Prevent)
- Code of Ethical Conduct
- Academic Freedom Policy

Principles

The School's Research Ethics Policy and Procedure has been adopted in support of the School's wider commitment to academic freedom and excellence. It seeks to ensure sound ethical standards in research without creating a disproportionate and onerous procedure that will impede the conduct of academic research. It seeks to facilitate ethical research and promote a culture where students and staff continuously reflect on the ethical implications of their research.

Where a member of staff is teaching a module that comprises a piece of work that may include a research project, they must make students aware of the required ethical standards and this Policy and Procedure. They should also provide advice and guidance on the ethical implications of any proposed research project. This research project may be undertaken independently by a student or group of students, or in close collaboration with a staff member. All student applications must be countersigned by an appropriate member of staff (see 'Procedures' below).

Informed Consent

Where information is to be collected from human participants, prior informed consent must be obtained from those subjects for any use of their information. Consent should be:

- **Freely given,** without pressure or manipulation; not under the influence of drugs or alcohol
- **Reversible** – participants are aware that they have the right to withdraw from the research at any time, without giving a reason, and to request removal of their data from the study
- **Informed –** participants are given enough detail about the research to make an informed decision, including whether their data will be anonymised, how their data will be stored and for how long, who has permission to view or use their data, how the research findings will be disseminated, and (if applicable) what will happen to any images or video footage.

Where the research exposes its participants to a risk of harm, the researcher has an ethical duty to consider these risks, even where the participants have consented to participate in the research; this is particularly important in dealing with vulnerable groups.

Research that does not entail the direct participation of living human persons may nonetheless indirectly but significantly affect living persons. Researchers may be assessing information about identifiable individuals, the publication or analysis of which may have ethical or legal implications. For example, collection and use of archive, historical or legal materials may raise ethical issues for the families of deceased people. Researchers must consider these implications in considering the ethics of their research proposal. Secondary use of datasets must be given careful consideration by the researcher and the Research Ethics Panel, especially where reliance is being placed on a presumed consent by subjects to the use of their information, or where there is a potential risk of disclosure of sensitive information.

For the purposes of Research Ethics Panel submissions, 'Informed Consent documentation' is defined as either (a) documentary evidence that the researchers have already obtained informed consent from all intended participants, together with a statement that no additional participants will be recruited; or (b) a copy of the information sheet that will be supplied to participants in advance of the research, when seeking consent, as well as the consent form that the researchers intend to use. The participant information sheet should include the name and contact details of the researcher and their supervisor, as well as information on what to do in the event of a complaint or concern about the research and details of how to withdraw consent.

Legal and data protection requirements

Any student or staff member conducting research must ensure compliance with the Data Protection Act 2018 and the General Data Protection Regulations (GDPR), as well as the School's Data Protection Policy, Data Retention Policy, and Detailed Data Retention Schedule. It is the researcher's responsibility to ensure that arrangements are in place to maintain the integrity and security of research data. Advice on data protection requirements can be obtained from the School's Data Protection Officer, the Registrar.

Training in Research Ethics

Staff: All staff undertaking research are required, in the course of their career, to have undertaken appropriate training or to have had significant relevant experience before embarking on an evaluation of the ethical implications of their research. Students or staff who do not feel that they have sufficient training or experience to evaluate the ethics of their research must seek advice from a senior member of the Teaching and Learning Department.

Students: All students will undergo training in ethical research as part of the programme, and this Policy and Procedure will be incorporated into the training. Students will be required to prepare and submit project proposals for ethical review at Stage 1, Stage 2, and/or Stage 3 as appropriate, depending on their level of study and the nature of the research. The rationale for this requirement is as follows:

- If any of our students wish to go on to graduate studies at other institutions to pursue academic research, they will benefit from an understanding of research and ethics.
- These principles of research (see below) are relevant beyond the scope of 'pure research'.
- Understanding ethical research offers an opportunity for students to develop critical thinking about existing research (and historic, unethical research), as well as methods and study design.

Training should include learning about core principles and concerns in ethical research such as:

- Protection of participants; maximising benefits, avoiding or mitigating any possible harm
- Consent: freely given, reversible, informed, and obtained *before* the study (in writing wherever possible)
- Confidentiality: maintain anonymity of the participants where desired, consider long-term repercussions of writing about the lives of others
- Right to withdrawal: ensure freedom to withdraw at any point during the study, with no negative impact on participants
- Deception: avoid where possible, but if unavoidable, ensure all participants are fully debriefed after the study and have a clear understanding of the actual aim of the study
- Systems perspective: avoiding or mitigating any possible harm to non-human participants and ecosystems; minimising any risks from hazardous chemicals, ionising radiation, genetically modified organisms, pathogenic or potentially pathogenic organisms, etc.

As applicable, the training can also include an exploration of some key issues to consider when thinking about ethics and research:

- Ethical research design: building students' capacity to think through the aim of their study, the target population, the necessary methods and the limits in terms of the principles outlined above, including the issue of the researcher's personal health and safety.
- Participants: what kind of information is required from participants? Avoid unnecessary questions and undue intrusion into participants' personal space, consider participants' familiarity with techniques, etc.
- What kind of informed consent will be taken? What will participants be told in advance? Consider participants' ability to give free and informed consent and, where applicable, relations with gatekeepers, e.g., institutions or parents.
- Are there power imbalances? Avoid economic or academic exploitation, offer fair return for assistance where appropriate, etc.
- How will data be stored and shared with colleagues, sponsors, funders, employers, etc.? Are there any (apparent) conflicts of interest, including financial or other personal considerations that may hinder (or have the appearance of hindering) the researcher's ability to make a professional judgement in conducting or reporting research? Note that a supervisor's conflict of interest is inherited by the students.
- Research space/protection for the researcher: clarify roles and expectations before signing contracts; know about the planned use and dissemination of data and findings; ensure the rights and interests of the participants are protected.

THE LONDON INTERDISCIPLINARY SCHOOL

Ethical Review Procedures

Stage 1: Self-Assessment with Countersignature

Where a staff member or student has a research proposal that

• is under the auspices of the School; and

• is not part of work conducted on an immersive internship with an employer; and

• involves any of the following:

- primary research with human participants (for example, interviews, surveys, focus groups or experiments)
- data relating to directly identifiable human subjects
- the use of animals, plants, fungi, bacteria, viruses or other living organisms
- the *ex vivo* manipulation of genetic material, cells or tissues that were originally derived from living organisms
- any potential risk to local, national and/or global ecosystems;

the staff member or student in question must complete the Research Ethics Review Checklist (Annex 1), which requires reflection on the potential ethical implications of their research and risk of harm to human and non-human participants and wider ecosystems.

If, on completion of the Checklist, a **staff member** determines that there are no significant ethical issues raised by their research, or that adequate safeguards will be put in place, they must mark this on the form in the designated section and submit it for countersignature to the **Director of Teaching and Learning or their nominee**.

If, on completion of the Checklist, a **student** determines that there are no significant ethical issues raised by their research, or that adequate safeguards will be put in place, they must mark this on the form in the designated section and submit it for countersignature to an appropriate staff member. This would normally be the student's **academic tutor** in the case of Level 4 modules, and the **module leader** (or their deputy if necessary) for Level 5 and above.

Countersignature

If the designated counter-signatory is satisfied *either* that the research raises no significant ethical issues *or* that the safeguards are adequate and have been explained in sufficient detail, they should countersign the form and (if applicable) forward a copy to the Director of Teaching and Learning.

If the counter-signatory requires more information about the proposed safeguards before reaching a decision, they may, at their discretion, ask the student to revise the Ethics Checklist and resubmit it to them by a specified date. This may be done only once and if the second attempt is unsuccessful, the application should be immediately referred to Stage 2 (Internal Panel Review).

Note: Students may also be asked by their module leaders to provide further detail on potential ethical issues and proposed safeguards in parallel with the Stage 1 process, as a way

of demonstrating that they have achieved the learning outcomes for the module. This does not necessarily imply that proceeding to Stage 2 will be required.

Stage 2: Internal Panel Review

Where either the prospective researcher or the individual reviewing the checklist determines that there are significant ethical issues raised by the research that are not satisfactorily mitigated by the proposed safeguards, they must mark this on the form and refer the research proposal for an Ethical Review by the Research Ethics Panel.

They must do so by emailing the following to ethicalreview@t-lis.org:

• Completed Checklist (found at Annex 1)

• Detailed Research Proposal and Ethical Assessment

  o Aims, research questions and methods (500 words max)

  o Further detail on any aspect of the checklist that was ticked

  o Further detail on proposed safeguards

• Informed Consent documentation (see below)

• Any other supporting documents requested by the individual reviewing the checklist

Research proposals comprising the following must **always** be referred to Stage 2:

- Research involving deception of participants, or that is intentionally conducted without their full and informed consent at the time the study is carried out or when the data are gathered
- Research which involves or may lead to the publication of confidential information
- Research where informed consent will be obtained orally but not in writing
- Research involving any of the following:
  - Vulnerable groups, i.e., individuals in a dependent relationship who may be coerced or pressured into taking part, e.g. children or people with learning difficulties;
  - Historically marginalised groups;
  - Sensitive topics, as defined by Dickson-Swift, V. et al, Undertaking Sensitive Research in Health and Social Sciences;
  - Groups where permission of a gatekeeper is normally required for initial access to members (where involvement of the gatekeeper might raise questions as to whether the participants' taking part is fully voluntary);
  - Potential to cause undue psychological stress, anxiety or humiliation, or to pose an elevated health and safety risk, to human participants and/or researchers.
  - Incentives to participate (financial or otherwise)
  - Commercially sensitive information or possible conflicts of interest

- Research with NHS staff, patients or service users as participants, or involving identifiable samples, tissue or data from NHS patients or service users (see also Stage 3 below).
- Any *ex vivo* manipulation of genetic material, cells or tissues that were originally derived from living organisms
- Research that has the potential to cause distress or suffering to any animal, damage to vegetation, or serious harm to local or global ecosystems, e.g., through the release or possible release of hazardous or potentially hazardous substances, ionising radiation, or pathogenic or potentially pathogenic organisms.

Research Ethics Panel

The Research Ethics Panel is a sub-committee of the Academic Council and is comprised of a minimum of three and a maximum of five faculty members, of whom at least two should be senior faculty members or co-opted external experts. The membership of the Panel should include at least one person with experience in assessing risks to human participants, and at least one with experience in assessing risks to the natural environment. The Panel is chaired by the Director of Teaching and Learning or their nominee.

The Panel will be convened to review the ethics of research proposals as they arise, and always within two weeks of the submission of a proposal for review, unless otherwise specified. Module leaders may, for example, require all students taking a particular module to submit their proposals by a specified deadline so that the Panel can review them all on the same day. The Director of Teaching and Learning may also, at their discretion, instigate specific dates for the Panel to be convened and corresponding deadlines for the submission of proposals.

In convening Panel meetings, the Director of Teaching and Learning or their nominee should ensure that members are provided with the proposals in advance and given adequate time to read them and note any concerns before the meeting.

The Research Ethics Panel will ensure that adequate consideration has been given to the ethical aspects of a research project, reducing the potential for harm and upset to participants and researchers and damage to local or global ecosystems.

The Ethics Panel will assess whether the research proposed can be ethical, i.e., whether:

- it is justified—whether it is likely to add to the existing knowledge base;
- it is of sufficient standard, including whether researchers are qualified to undertake it;
- participation is voluntary;
- incentives to encourage participation are appropriate or ethical;
- appropriately recorded consent is assured;
- adequate support and protection are in place for participants and researchers;
- the sensitivities of the research (e.g., cultural sensitivities, and/or inequities and power dynamics involving historically marginalised groups) have been appropriately managed;

- there is an appropriate policy and practice concerning confidentiality, anonymity, or acknowledgment of research participants;
- any risks of the research to the participants and/or researchers (in terms of dignity, rights, safety or wellbeing) are outweighed by the potential benefits;
- any risks of harm to living organisms or damage to local or global ecosystems have been appropriately assessed and mitigated;
- the research complies with all statutory and other guidance;
- collection and management of data comply with data protection regulation and the School's Data Protection Policy, Data Retention Policy and Detailed Data Retention Schedule;
- there are any conflicts of interest;
- there are any issues of commercial confidentiality.

The Research Ethics Panel will make a decision by majority; where there is a split vote, the Chair shall have the final say. The Research Ethics Panel will give written response to the researcher as quickly as possible, and in all cases within five working days of meeting to consider the research proposal. The Panel decision may be either (i) Approve unconditionally; (ii) Approve with conditions; (iii) Require additional information or clarification; (iv) Require revision; or (v) Reject. The decision to reject a proposal outright, rather than calling for it to be revised and resubmitted, should be taken only as a last resort if the Panel considers that the research is unjustifiable or the risks are so great that they cannot be adequately mitigated.

Once a research project has gained approval from the Research Ethics Panel, it must be conducted as proposed; any significant change to the research methodology, approach or purpose must be reassessed by the Research Ethics Panel.

Where the student or staff member disagrees with the decision of the Research Ethics Panel, they may refer the matter in writing to a nominated independent member of the Academic Council (i.e., a member who is not on the Research Ethics Panel) within ten working days. The decision of the independent member of the Academic Council will be final and will be given in writing within fifteen working days of receiving the appeal.

Stage 3: External Review

Research with NHS staff, patients or service users as participants, or involving identifiable samples, tissue or data from NHS patients or service users, is subject to the NHS's own review process. This will normally include an application to the Research Ethics Committee. While certain types of research activity (such as the compilation of databases) may be exempt from REC review, other aspects of the HRA approval process – such as regulatory compliance – will still apply.

Because of the time and human resources involved in external review and the constraints imposed by the COVID-19 pandemic, the NHS is not currently accepting applications received directly from undergraduate students. Student projects *may*, however, be considered within the context of a wider programme of research led by a member of faculty.

LIS strongly discourages students from proposing any research activity that is likely to require NHS review, unless there is a compelling reason to do so as part of their capstone project *and* there is a suitably qualified and experienced member of faculty available to serve as the lead applicant.

Failure to comply

Where a student fails to comply with this Policy and Procedure, they will be subject to the provisions of the Academic Misconduct Policy and Procedure.

Where a staff member fails to comply with this Policy and Procedure, they will be subject to the School's Employee Disciplinary Procedure, which can be found in the Staff Handbook.

Audit

The Research Ethics Panel will periodically conduct a selective audit of current staff research projects. Where it considers that a study is being conducted in a way that is not consistent with the conditions of the project's original approval, the Panel may withdraw its approval.

The Director of Teaching and Learning or their nominee will audit a sample of student Research Ethics Review Checklists on an annual basis to determine whether the determinations of low or appropriately mitigated risk are appropriate.

Monitoring and Review

This Policy and Procedure is subject to oversight by the Research Ethics Panel, which is accountable to the Academic Council. This Policy and Procedure will be reviewed annually by the Research Ethics Panel and any appropriate amendments authorised by the Academic Council.

THE LONDON INTERDISCIPLINARY SCHOOL

Annex 1: Stage 1 Ethical Review – Self-Assessment with Countersignature

1. Your Details
a. Ñame: **b. E-mail:** **c. Status:** Staff / Student * *If you are a student:* **d. Module for which research will be conducted:** **e. Name of supervisor or module leader:**
2. Brief Description of Proposed Research
a. Project title: **b. Intended start date:** **c. Describe the aim(s), research question(s) and method(s) in 150-200 words**   **d. Have you already obtained valid consent (freely given, reversible, informed, enthusiastic and specific) from all prospective participants?** Yes / No If the answer to (d) is 'No': **e. Draft participant information sheet and consent form:** [ ] Attached [ ] Already submitted [ ] Not applicable (see policy)

3. Ethical Issues Checklist	
	Yes/No
a. Does your study involve participants who are in any way vulnerable, or who may have difficulty giving written consent to their participation or the use of their data?	
b. Will any person be involved in the study without their knowledge and consent?	
c. Will the study require the cooperation of a gatekeeper?	
d. Does the research involve deception?	
e. Does the research involve sensitive topics as defined by Dickson-Swift *et al.*?	
f. Does the research involve historically marginalised groups?	
f. Will incentives (other than reasonable expenses or payment for time) be offered?	
g. Could the study cause undue psychological stress, anxiety, humiliation or trauma (including re-triggering of past trauma) to the participants and/or to you?	
h. Does the study pose any other risks to the participants, to you, and/or to other people, in terms of dignity, rights, safety or wellbeing (above and beyond the risks that would be encountered during their usual daily activities)?	
I. Does the study involve the use of animals, plants, fungi, bacteria, viruses or other living organisms, or the *ex vivo* manipulation of any genetic material, cell or tissue that was originally derived from a living organism?	

j. Could the study have an adverse impact on local or global ecosystems (other than carbon emissions from standard usage of public transport or information technology?)	

Continues overleaf

Continued from page 1:

	Yes/No
k. Will the research involve the sharing of data or confidential information beyond the initial consent given?	
l. Is there ambiguity about whether the data you are collecting is considered public?	
m. Will the research involve administrative or secure data that requires permission from the appropriate authorities before use?	
n. Will the research involve the use of visual or vocal methods that potentially pose an issue regarding confidentiality or anonymity?	
o. Is there any reason why the research will not comply with the requirements of data protection legislation or the School's Data Protection Policy or Data Retention Policy?	
p. Are there any specific groups or individuals who are likely to be harmed by the dissemination of the results of the study?	
q. Is there any potential for misuse of the findings of the study?	
r. Does the study involve accessing security sensitive material (e.g., related to terrorism/ violent extremism)?	
s. Are there any potential conflicts of interest or issues of commercial confidentiality?	
t. Are you aware of any other ethical concerns relating to this research?	

4. Risks and Safeguards

If you have answered 'Yes' to any of the questions (a)-(t) above, please provide brief details of the nature of the risk and the safeguards that you have put in place, or intend to put in place, to eliminate or mitigate the risk. Continue on a new page if necessary.

5. Declaration by Researcher

The above checklist provides a full and accurate description of my proposed research. I have read and understood the School's Research Ethics Policy and Procedure and the questions in the checklist above, and I confirm that (*select one*):

[ ] There are no ethical issues raised by the research

[ ] The research may raise some ethical issues, but adequate safeguards will be put in place

[ ] The research requires an Ethical Review by the Research Ethics Panel

I understand that if my research plans change in a way that introduces new risks or ethical issues, or renders the proposed safeguards ineffective, I will be required to submit a new checklist.

Signature: Date:

6. Declaration by Counter-signatory

I have read and understood the above research proposal and in my professional opinion:
[ ] There are no ethical issues raised by the research
[ ] The research may raise some ethical issues, but adequate safeguards will be put in place
[ ] The research requires an Ethical Review by the Research Ethics Panel
[ ] I require further information or clarification before making a decision on this application.

Name: Position: Signature:

Annex 2: Stage 2 Ethical Review – Submission to Research Ethics Panel

1. Your Details

a. Ñame:

b. E-mail: **c. Status:** Staff / Student *

If you are a student:
d. Module for which research will be conducted:

e. Name of supervisor or module leader:

2. Detailed Description of Proposed Research

a. Project title:

b. Intended start date:

c. Describe the aims, research questions and methods, and the benefits of the proposed research, in up to 500 words.
Please ensure that you provide enough information for the Panel to assess your application.

d. Describe how you will recruit participants for your study. If the research involves a gatekeeper (e.g. a teacher, parent or caregiver) to help you gain access to participants, please explain their role and describe how you will ensure that participation is fully voluntary.

e. If you have not yet obtained valid consent (freely given, reversible, informed, enthusiastic and specific) from all prospective participants, please indicate how and when you will do this. Copies of your informed consent documentation should be attached (if not already submitted).

3. Ethical Concerns

Please provide further detail on any aspect of the checklist that was ticked.
Continue on a new page if necessary

4. Safeguards and Support

Continue on a new page if necessary

Please describe how you will address any sensitivities (including cultural sensitivities).

Please describe how you will protect participants from any identified risks, if applicable.

Please describe the support that you will provide to participants, especially those who are likely to experience psychological stress, anxiety, humiliation or trauma (including re-triggering of past trauma), if applicable.

Please describe the steps that you will take to protect your own safety and mental wellbeing.

Please describe how you will avoid or mitigate risks to animals, plants, habitats, and/or local and global ecosystems, if applicable.

5. Declaration by Researcher

The above submission provides a full and accurate description of my proposed research.

I understand that if my research plans change in a way that introduces new risks or ethical issues, or renders the proposed safeguards ineffective, I will be required to submit a new application.

Signature: Date:

6. Declaration by Chair of Research Ethics Panel

The Panel has discussed the above application on _____ (date) and has decided to:

[ ] Approve the application unconditionally
[ ] Approve the application with the following condition(s):

[ ] Require additional information about, or clarification of, the following aspect(s):

[ ] Require revision of the application to address the following serious concern(s):

[ ] Reject the application on the grounds that this research is unjustifiable, or the risks are so great that they cannot be adequately mitigated.

Name: Position: Signature:

THE LONDON INTERDISCIPLINARY SCHOOL

Annex 3: Online resources

Protecting Human Research Participants, National Institutes of Health:
https://phrp.nihtraining.com/index.php

Research Integrity: Social and Behavioural Sciences:
https://weblearn.ox.ac.uk/access/content/group/78538594-13fc-4982-884bbbf340ddbbd9/index.html

Association of Social Anthropologists of the UK and Commonwealth:
http://www.theasa.org/ethics/guidelines.shtml

British Psychological Society: http://www.bps.org.uk/what-we-do/bps/ethicsstandards/

American Psychological Association: http://www.apa.org/ethics/code/

Name of policy/procedure:	**Research Ethics Policy and Procedure**
Document owner:	Hannah Kohler, Director of Admissions and Student Support
Date Originally Created:	02/2019
Last reviewed:	08/2021
Reviewed by:	Prof. Chris Maguire (Registrar), Prof. Carl Dr Ash Brockwell, Regulatory Working Group
Audited by:	Academic Council
Date of Audit:	12/2019, 03/2020 - approved
Date of next review: (annually unless otherwise agreed)	
Related documents: (eg associated forms, underpinning processes, related policies or overarching policies)	Research Ethics Panel: Membership and Terms of Reference Code of Ethical Conduct Data Protection Policy Data Retention Policy Detailed Data Retention Schedule Academic Council: Membership and Terms of Reference Academic Misconduct Policy and Procedure Staff Handbook (includes Disciplinary Procedure) Safeguarding Policy and Procedure (including Prevent) General Academic Regulations

Version Control			
Version	**Author**	**Date**	**Brief summary of changes**
1	Hannah Kohler (Director of Admissions and Student Support)	20/02/2019	Original draft

2	Hannah Kohler (Director of Admissions and Student Support)	08/07/2019	Addition of information on research relating to internships
3	Prof. Chris Maguire (Registrar)	10/07/2019	Inclusion of provision for faculty research, included checklist step and annexed checklist, included resources, further detail on Panel procedure and membership
4	Prof. Carl Gombrich (Director of Teaching and Learning)	04/11/2019	Minor wording changes
5	Academic Council	18/12/2019	Requires review given overall update on general academic regulations in light of decision to pursue NDAPs
6	Dr Ash Brockwell (Faculty member)	02/03/2020	Subheadings to differentiate stage 1 and stage 2; addition of a clause on provision of additional information by students at stage 1 if requested by module tutors; addition of references to researchers' safety; further detail on Informed Consent documentation.
7	Dr. Priya Lall (Faculty member)	02/03/2020	Additional stipulations in relation to secondary analysis of established datasets; additions to Research Ethics Panel referral criteria
8	Academic Council	16/03/2020	Approved
9	Regulatory Working Group	11/08/2021	Revised version approved