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INTRODUCTION

1. Cardiff Metropolitan University’s Ethics Committee (UCEC) is a Sub-Committee of the Academic Board and is responsible for ensuring that all research involving human participants and/or samples of human origin carried out by staff and students within Cardiff Metropolitan University or at other locations conforms to the highest ethical standards. In line with quality management processes across the university, responsibility for research ethics is devolved to the most local level (i.e., Schools). However, School Research Ethics Committees provide details of approved research projects to UEC for auditing purposes. Further, UEC is used to share best practice throughout the university and also maintains approved protocols.

2. The Cardiff School of Sport (CSS) undertakes multi- and inter-disciplinary research including the disciplinary conventions and traditions of: biochemistry; biomechanics; dance studies; education studies; ethics; health studies; history; kinaanthropometry; management studies; measurement concepts; performance analysis; philosophy; physiology; psychology; sociology; sports coaching; sports development; sports medicine; and strength, conditioning and rehabilitation.

3. Professional and academic communities are placing increasingly exacting responsibilities on their members to improve the ethical standards of research and practice within their disciplines, and journal editors may require evidence that research projects have secured formal ethical clearance before agreeing to publish their findings.

4. The CSS document – Research Ethics: A Handbook of Principles and Procedures has been produced by the Cardiff School of Sport Research Ethics Committee (CSSREC). Originally written in 2009, this document was produced in response to this growing awareness of ethically sensitive issues in research and scholarly activity. The intention of this updated handbook is to guide and, where necessary, regulate the scholarly activities of researchers at undergraduate, postgraduate and staff levels within the CSS and to promote a stronger appreciation of ethical considerations in research.

5. The handbook comprises three parts:

   Part A is a statement of ethical principles designed to articulate a common set of values to guide and support the professional conduct of academic research and research-related activities.

   Part B contains the procedures by which research proposals can be assessed and, where necessary, given ethical clearance.
Part C contains selected appendices which address the general and particular concerns of research in a variety of academic and professional fields. Its intention is to act as a context for the principles and procedures and to offer critical guidance. In particular, attention is drawn to Appendix 1 which is a discussion of some of the principal issues in research ethics, and Appendix 2 which contains a sample of questions that should guide the researcher in minimising risks and moving towards best practice in research.

6. For the purposes of this handbook, the definitions used for the various types of research and scholarly activities are those articulated by the Roith Report (PCFC, 1990), which have gained wide acceptance within Higher Education:

**Basic Research**: experimental and theoretical work undertaken to acquire new knowledge of the underlying foundation of phenomena and observable facts, without any particular application or use in view;

**Strategic Research**: applied research that is in a subject area which has not yet advanced to the stage where eventual applications can be clearly specified;

**Applied Research**: work undertaken in order to acquire new knowledge. It is, however, directed primarily towards practical aims or objectives;

**Scholarship**: work which is intended to expand the boundaries of knowledge within and across disciplines by in depth analysis, synthesis and interpretation of ideas and information and by making use of rigorous and documented methodology;

**Creative Work**: the invention and generation of ideas, images and artefacts including design. This is usually applied to the pursuit of knowledge in the arts;

**Consultancy**: the deployment of existing knowledge for the resolution of specific problems presented by a client, usually in an industrial or commercial context;

**Professional Practice**: a variant of consultancy applied to certain well defined professions (e.g., law, accounting, architecture, nursing, and social work).

Aspects of creative work and professional practice are growing areas within sport and exercise research within the CSS and whilst the descriptions of the various types of research are general and are derived from the Roith Report, they should by no means limit creativity in approaches to research.
7. The following statement of principles places a considerable emphasis on the personal responsibility of researchers to act ethically and to promote ethical behaviour in all aspects of research activities. It is also recognised that statements of principles and procedures cannot be expected to cover every aspect of a complex area such as research ethics. For these reasons, the CSSREC, which operates and monitors the procedures described in this handbook, would welcome comments and suggestions for future enhancements from individuals, research centres, or any other interested parties.
PART A: PRINCIPLES

1. Introduction

1.1. The primary responsibility for the conduct of ethical research lies with the researcher. It is a fundamental principle that staff and students engaged in research adopt a continuing personal commitment to act ethically, to encourage ethical behaviour in those with whom they collaborate, and to consult where appropriate concerning ethical issues.

1.2. The CSS acknowledges the importance of the professional codes of conduct of external agencies and organisations (e.g., the British Association of Sport and Exercise Sciences [BASES], the British Psychological Society [BPS], the British Educational Research Association [BERA], the British Sociological Association [BSA], the National Health Service Local Research Ethics Committee [NHS LREC]), and where appropriate accords them primacy as a default position.

2. General responsibilities

2.1. Towards research participants
Researchers have a responsibility to ensure as far as possible that the physical, social and psychological well-being of their research participants is not affected detrimentally by the research. Research relationships should be characterised, whenever possible, by mutual respect and trust.

2.2. Towards other researchers
Researchers should avoid, wherever possible, actions which may have adverse consequences for other researchers or which might undermine the reputation of their discipline or of the academic community more generally. Those directing research should bear in mind their responsibilities towards members of their research teams and should aim to anticipate and guard against the possible harmful consequences of the research for team members.

2.3. Towards the University
Researchers must avoid all actions that might undermine the reputation of the CSS and of Cardiff Metropolitan University in general. Researchers should be aware that they are representing the university in their endeavours and consequently abide by the university’s rules and regulations for appropriate behaviour.
3. Informed consent

3.1. Research should be based, as far as possible and practicable, on the freely given informed consent of those under study. However, it is recognised that in some cases it may be necessary to employ deceptive or covert methods should these constitute the only means to obtain the required data. In such cases, please refer to section 4 below.

3.2. It is the responsibility of the researcher to explain as fully as is reasonable and appropriate, and in terms meaningful to the participants: the aims and nature of the research, who is undertaking it, who is funding it, its likely duration, why it is being undertaken, the possible consequences of the research, and how the results are to be shared with others – particularly in the public domain.

3.3. The power imbalance between researcher and researched should be considered. Care should be taken to ensure that the latter are not pressurised into participation. Research participants should be aware of their right to refuse participation at any time (e.g., their right to withdraw) and should not be given the impression that they are required to participate. It should also be recognised that research may involve a lengthy data-gathering period and that it may be necessary to regard consent not as obtained once and for all, but subject to re-negotiation over time.

3.4. The researcher should explain how far research participants will be afforded anonymity and confidentiality and participants should have the option of rejecting the use of data-gathering devices such as tape-recorders and video cameras.

3.5. If there is a likelihood of data being shared with or divulged to other researchers, the potential uses of the data should be discussed with the participants and their agreement to such use should be obtained.

3.6. Where access to a research setting is gained via a ‘gatekeeper’ external to Cardiff Metropolitan University, researchers should also obtain the informed consent of research participants, while at the same time taking account of the gatekeeper’s interests. It should be borne in mind that the relationship between research participant and gatekeeper may well continue long after the research has been undertaken.

3.7. Where research participants are young children (people under the age of 18 years) or other vulnerable groups (e.g., elderly, disabled or sick people, or people with learning difficulties) whose understanding is impaired in
some way so that they are unable to give full informed consent, it may be necessary to use a proxy in order to obtain consent. In this case great care must be taken not to intrude upon the privacy of the vulnerable participants. The researcher should consult relevant professionals, parents/guardians and relatives, as appropriate. Researchers should attempt to obtain the informed assent of children and the informed consent of their parents and in relation to school children, adults who are in loco parentis\(^1\).

3.8. In addition to obtaining the informed consent (and/or assent where necessary) of those under study, researchers should attempt to anticipate and guard against the possible harmful consequences of their research for participants.

3.9. For research involving children, investigators must hold an enhanced clearance from the Disclosure and Barring Service (DBS). This clearance is required for studies where children are both: (a) active participants (e.g., where interviews are conducted directly with children); and (b) passive participants (e.g., where the researcher makes observations of an adult participant who is working with children).

4. **Deceptive and covert research**

4.1. It is recognised that there is a continuum of covert-overt research (and therefore difficulty in defining research simply as entirely covert or overt). Researchers should endeavour, wherever possible and practicable, to avoid the use of deception in their research methods, as this violates the principle of informed consent and may invade the privacy of those under study, particularly in non-public spaces.

4.2. **Any researcher considering deceptive methods in research must seek approval from the CSSREC.** The burden of proof will rest on the investigator to show that no alternative methods are possible, and that the data sought are of sufficient value to over-ride the issues of free and informed consent. Where approval has been given, the potential implications arising from publication must be fully considered.

4.3. Covert research in non-public spaces (that is, where persons would not normally expect to be under observation), or experimental manipulation of

---

\(^1\) In line with UEC regulations only in projects that are deemed by the CSSREC as ‘public’ (e.g., discussions about views on sport) and non-invasive (e.g., are not different from what would normally be expected of the pupils in a school day) can the head of the organisation act in loco parentis.
research participants without their knowledge should be a last resort when it is impossible to use other methods to obtain the required data. It is particularly important in such cases to safeguard the anonymity of participants.

4.4. If covert methods are approved and employed, and informed consent has not been obtained prior to the research, every attempt should be made to secure *ex post facto consent* (i.e., getting consent retrospectively) and/or presumptive consent (i.e., getting consent from ‘mock’ participants).

5. **Confidentiality and anonymity**

5.1. The anonymity and privacy of research participants should be respected and personal information relating to participants should be kept confidential and secure. Researchers must comply with the provisions of the Data Protection Act (1998)\(^2\) and should consider whether it is proper or appropriate even to record certain kinds of sensitive information.

5.2. Where possible, threats to the confidentiality and anonymity of research data should be anticipated by researchers and normally the identities and research records of participants should be kept confidential, whether or not an explicit pledge of confidentiality has been given. Researchers may embargo publication of research findings for a defined period to protect commercial interests and confidentiality.

5.3. Whilst the researcher should take every practicable measure to ensure the confidentiality and anonymity of research participants, s/he should also take care not to give unrealistic assurances or guarantees of confidentiality. Research participants with easily identifiable characteristics or positions within an organisation should be reminded that it may be difficult to disguise their identity totally without distorting the data. Researchers should be mindful that it is sometimes necessary to sacrifice data if there is no means of securing anonymity.

5.4. In situations where the researcher becomes aware of issues, during the collection of data, that may cause (or be causing) the participant physiological or psychological harm (e.g., child abuse; substance abuse; self-harm), the researcher is obliged to disclose such information in attempts to protect the well-being of the participant.

---

6. **Operational definitions**

6.1. Research involving **human participants** is defined broadly to include research that:

6.1.1. directly involves people in the research activities, through their physical participation, and may include invasive (e.g., taking of blood samples, muscle biopsies) and / or non-invasive research (e.g., laboratory-based experiments, interviews, questionnaires, surveys, observational research) and may mean the active or passive involvement of a person, or observation of their behaviour for research purposes;

6.1.2. indirectly involves people in the research activities, through their provision of or access to personal data and / or tissue;

6.1.3. involves people on behalf of others (e.g., parents / legal guardians of children and the psychologically and / or physically impaired, and supervisors of people under controlled environments [e.g., pupils]).

6.2. Research involving **samples of human origin** is covered by the Human Tissue Authority, and regulates removal, storage and use of human tissue – defined as material that has come from a human body. Under the Human Tissue Authority (HTA) licence agreement, Cardiff Metropolitan University is required to abide by the Code of Practice.

7. **Research undertaken externally or in collaboration with other institutions**

7.1. Where research is being conducted by members of staff or students in more than one institution, the research should gain formal research ethics approval in one of them. Normally, this would be the institution of the principal researcher. If ethical approval is given by another institution, this does not remove the responsibility of researchers to comply with the UEC’s principles. The CSSREC will require evidence of the scrutiny process.

7.2. If data are to be collected in an organisation external to Cardiff Metropolitan University, the CSSREC will require evidence from the organisation that permission has been granted.

7.3. Other studies may be required to comply with externally developed guidelines, such as in the case of research funded by Research Councils (e.g., Arts and Humanities Research Council, Economic and Social Research Council), Professional Bodies (e.g., BASES, BPS), or charities (e.g., British Heart Foundation, Medical Research Council). It is the
applicants’ responsibility to ensure that they are fully aware of, and meet the requirements of any external agencies.

7.4. Where researchers from external organisations wish to sample the CSS staff and/or student population for their research, an approved ethics application should be submitted to the Chair of the CSSREC for review prior to any contact with the desired sample.

8. **Research requiring LREC approval**

8.1. Approval from the NHS Local Research Ethics Committee is required for all projects involving, inter alia:

   8.1.1. patients and users of the NHS - this includes all potential research participants recruited as users of the NHS;

   8.1.2. individuals identified as potential research participants because of their status as relatives or carers users of the NHS;

   8.1.3. access to data, samples of human origin of past and present NHS patients;

   8.1.4. the use of, or potential access to, NHS premises or facilities; and

   8.1.5. NHS staff recruited as research participants by virtue of their professional role.

8.2. The CSSREC will require evidence of the scrutiny process and approval.

8.3. These principles are also applied to research projects involving private hospitals (approval required by the specific institution’s LREC), as well as non-NHS patients in NHS facilities.

9. **Procedures for approval**

9.1. All research conducted by staff and students from the CSS that is not exempt must be formally approved by the CSSREC. At undergraduate and postgraduate level, research that is deemed as being exempt (e.g., philosophical research) must be confirmed as being so by a member of academic staff in the CSS.

9.2. Set against the principles expressed in this handbook, specific approval by the CSSREC is required for:

   9.2.1. research involving biomedical or clinical intervention;

   9.2.2. deceptive research where an investigator actively sets out significantly to misrepresent himself or herself, the nature of the

---

research, and/or any other significant characteristics of the research;
9.2.3. sensitive research where the topic deals with sensitive aspects of participant behaviour;
9.2.4. research involving vulnerable populations;
9.2.5. postgraduate taught Sports Medicine dissertation projects; and
9.2.6. undergraduate and postgraduate taught Masters dissertation projects that the supervisor deems potentially worthy of future publication. This is so that the CSSREC can protect against a supervisor recommending approval for a project on which they could potentially be a named author.

9.3. Approval for all other research undertaken as a part of taught undergraduate and postgraduate level qualifications can be recommended at supervisor level before being presented in a formal CSSREC meeting. If ethical approval is recommended in this manner, researchers and supervisors are still required to comply with CSSREC principles.

9.4. Projects may also be approved on conditions (CSSREC status code: CON) specified by the CSSREC or academic staff for projects completed as part of taught undergraduate and postgraduate programmes. This means that the project may be approved if the researcher(s) agree to comply with the stated conditions. If they cannot meet these conditions the researcher(s) must re-apply for ethical approval.
PART B: PROCEDURES

1. Introduction

1.1. Following the principles that underpin Cardiff Metropolitan University’s general quality assurance systems, responsibility for ensuring that research is conducted in an ethical way lies at the most ‘local’ level. Responsibility for the ethical conduct of research, therefore, rests primarily with the person who is planning and undertaking a project, supported by the various arrangements for the scrutiny and approval of proposals which involves ‘gatekeepers’ and the CSSREC.

1.2. Every attempt has been made to develop a system of procedures sufficiently flexible to accommodate the needs of the various research communities within the CSS. Researchers who believe that the procedures do not adequately address their specific situation may consult directly with the Chair of CSSREC.

1.3. Where a member of staff is also a member of a professional organisation whose own published Code of Conduct in any way contravenes or conflicts with this handbook, it is the responsibility of the member of staff to bring this to the attention of CSSREC. The CSS recognises a default position in favour of researchers’ obligations to their professional Codes of Conduct but must be informed of such conflict and be able to consider it before the investigation is approved for commencement.

2. The ‘gatekeeper’ system

2.1. The relevant School gatekeeper acts as a conduit between the researcher and the possible use of CSSREC. The gatekeeper will guide the researcher in areas of uncertainty. In particular, where a research proposal does not fall clearly into one of the categories expressed in Part A, Section 9.2, the gatekeeper will judge whether or not a proposal should be submitted to CSSREC or UREC formal approval. In summary, gatekeepers are:

2.1.1. For members of staff: CSSREC members
2.1.2. For research degree students: the School’s Director of Postgraduate Research
2.1.3. For taught postgraduate students: the Programme Director (taking advice from the Chair of CSSREC as appropriate).
2.1.4. For undergraduate students: the appointed supervisor / advisor (taking advice from the Chair of CSSREC as appropriate).
3. **CSSREC**

3.1. The principal aims of the CSSREC are three-fold: (1) to consider and, in accordance with the principles expressed in Part A of this handbook, grant or refuse permission for the undertaking of research investigations which fall in the categories listed in Part A, Section 9.2; (2) to act as an advisory body to UEC on matters related to research ethics; and (3) to sponsor appropriate training and staff development.

3.2. The terms of reference for CSSREC are as follows:

3.2.1. The CSSREC is responsible to the UEC for:

3.2.1.1. the approval, referral and/or rejection of staff and student research investigations in accordance with the principles expressed in *CSSREC Research Ethics: A Handbook of Principles and Procedures* on a regular basis;

3.2.1.2. monitoring the appropriateness and effectiveness of procedures for granting or withholding ethical approval mechanisms for research;

3.2.1.3. reviewing and, if necessary, revising *CSSREC Research Ethics: A Handbook of Principles and Procedures*;

3.2.1.4. the operation of a system of appeals for researchers who have been refused permission to undertake research and/or research-related activities on ethical grounds;

3.2.1.5. advice on policy issues related to research ethics as determined and requested by UEC;

3.2.1.6. sponsoring staff development in the area of research ethics with appropriate partners within the university;

3.2.1.7. auditing as an assessment of the appropriateness of the decisions made by members of academic staff in their consideration of the ethical status of student research projects (both at undergraduate and postgraduate level); and

3.2.1.8. developing and approving research protocols that allow standardised procedures to be adopted that are deemed ethically sound.

3.2.2. Membership of CSSREC is as follows:

3.2.2.1. Chair (nominated by the Dean of School);

3.2.2.2. School nominations (to cover discipline areas);

3.2.2.3. Administration Support Officer.
3.2.2.4. The committee may co-opt other members in cases where specialist expertise is necessary.

3.2.3. The terms of office are for a period of three years for all nominated members.

3.2.4. Regularity of Meetings and Availability of Minutes
   3.2.4.1. The CSSREC will meet on a regular basis (at least once every two months) and in response to applications submitted to it. Copies of minutes of the CSSREC will be forwarded to the CSS Research and Enterprise Committee. An annual report will be submitted to the Research and Enterprise Committee’s final meeting of each academic year. Copies of all minutes will be held by the Officer for scrutiny.
   3.2.4.2. Where a formal meeting is not permitted an e-meeting will take its place so that applications can be administered in a timely fashion.

3.2.5. Failure to submit such proposals for approval or, once submitted, violation of CSSREC’s decision to refuse permission for such research to proceed, may negate Cardiff Metropolitan University’s insurance cover and also result in disciplinary action. For student projects at all levels, in accord with UEC policy, failure to obtain ethical approval for a research project will result in no part of the project being marked and thus a score of zero will be awarded (see Appendix 18 for policy wording).

4. Procedures for securing approval for research projects

4.1. Members of staff seeking approval
   The primary responsibility for the ethical conduct of research lies with the researcher. However, in cases of uncertainty, members of staff seeking approval may liaise with the relevant gatekeeper in order to ensure that their research does not contravene the principles expressed in this Handbook. A pro forma for recording decisions and advice from relevant gatekeepers should be obtained from the Chair of CSSREC. Any proposal which falls under Part A, Section 9.2.1 and 9.2.2 of this handbook must be submitted to UREC. Any proposal which falls under Part A, Section 9.2.3 and 9.2.4 of this handbook must be submitted to CSSREC. Such proposals must be received by the Officer at least eight working days before the next scheduled meeting. Chair’s action may be taken on matters that require greater expediency but such decisions will be taken in
consultation with at least one other CSSREC member. The CSSREC must be made aware of all other research that is recommended for approval by a gatekeeper or which is deemed exempt.

4.2. **Research degree students seeking approval**
The general framework for approval will apply to research students as well as staff. The CSS Director of Graduate Studies' signature on the form confirms that both student and supervisors are aware of, and agree to abide by, those principles. The Director of Studies should liaise with the Chair of CSSREC where there is any doubt whether a research proposal should be considered by CSSREC.

4.3. **Taught postgraduate taught students seeking approval**
The general framework for approval will apply to students following taught postgraduate courses. Programme Directors are responsible for ensuring that all students are aware of, and agree to abide by, the principles expressed in this Handbook, through their respective Postgraduate Scheme in Sports Studies handbook. Any proposal which falls under Part A, Section 9.2.1 and 9.2.2 of this handbook must be submitted to UEC. Any proposal which falls under Part A, Section 9.2.3, 9.2.4, 9.2.5, and 9.2.6 of this handbook must be submitted to CSSREC. The Programme Director should liaise with the CSSREC Chair where there is any doubt whether a research proposal should be considered by CSSREC.

4.4. **Undergraduate students seeking approval**
The general framework for approval will apply to students following taught undergraduate courses. Programme Directors are responsible for ensuring that all students are aware of, and agree to abide by, the principles expressed in this Handbook, through their respective scheme / programme handbook. Any proposal which falls under Part A, Section 9.2.1 and 9.2.2 of this handbook must be submitted to UEC. Any proposal which falls under Part A, Section 9.2.3, 9.2.4, and 9.2.6 of this handbook must be submitted to CSSREC. The appointed supervisor / advisor should liaise with the CSSREC Chair where there is any doubt whether a research proposal should be considered by CSSREC.

5. **Appeals procedure**

5.1. All investigators have the right to appeal against the judgement of the CSSREC. There are two grounds for such appeal:
5.1.1. where the researcher feels that the CSSREC has been unfair in its consideration of a proposal and/or has not properly understood it⁴;

5.1.2. where there have been any irregularities in the procedures adopted by the CSSREC.

5.2. A researcher has the right to appeal in writing against a decision made by CSSREC within ten working days of the notification of that decision.

5.3. The Chair of CSSREC will convene a meeting of the committee with the proposer to review the proposal and the grounds for the decision. This meeting will normally be held within ten working days of notification of the appeal. There will be at least two CSSREC members in addition to the Chair in attendance.

5.4. At this stage the CSSREC may:
   5.4.1. maintain its original decision;
   5.4.2. uphold the appeal of the researcher and reconsider the original proposal.

5.5. Following an unsuccessful appeal, and where the researcher is dissatisfied with the decision of the CSSREC, he or she has the right to submit a final appeal to the UEC. This appeal must be lodged through the Chair of the UEC within five working days of receipt of CSSREC’s final decision. A panel of not less than three members of the UEC, who have not previously been associated with the proposal, will make a final decision which will be based solely on the procedural propriety of CSSREC’s decision-making process. The proposer will be notified in writing within five working days of UEC’s hearing.

⁴ NB – Research applications should be clear and understandable. Where research is described vaguely the CSSREC cannot approve it. Further, information for participants must be understandable to them otherwise informed consent is not possible.
# Appendix 16: Definitions of Ethics Applications Status Codes

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Status Code</th>
<th>Definition</th>
<th>Action</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>APPR</td>
<td>Approved – the application form is detailed, well presented and in sufficient detail from which a decision can be made about the suitability of the project. The ethical issues associated with the project are recognised, well considered, and appropriate strategies are in place to deal with and/or reduce risks.</td>
<td>Form to be signed by the supervisor, or member of the CSSREC reviewing the application. The approval code (e.g., 14/10/01R) to be added to the form which is then uploaded to the CSSREC database.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CON</td>
<td>Conditional approval – the application form is detailed, well presented and in sufficient detail from which a decision can be made about the suitability of the project. The ethical issues associated with the project are recognised, well considered, and appropriate strategies are in place to deal with and/or reduce risks. However, there are conditions upon which approval is granted that must be adhered to by the researcher. If the conditions cannot be met then the project must be changed and a new application submitted.</td>
<td>Form to be signed by the supervisor, or member of the CSSREC reviewing the application. The approval code (e.g., 14/10/01R) to be added to the form which is then uploaded to the CSSREC database. The supervisor must ensure that the conditions are met for student projects.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DEF</td>
<td>Deferred – the application appears fine in principle but lacks some information that is required for a decision to be made. Approval is postponed until further information is gathered.</td>
<td>The application is to be returned to the researcher with feedback. The researcher edits the form and resubmits when the edits have been attended to adequately.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>INS</td>
<td>Insufficient information – the application is missing significant and/or vital detail required to be able to make a decision about the project’s suitability for approval (e.g., methodological information, consideration of risks and how they might be managed effectively).</td>
<td>The application is to be returned to the researcher with feedback regarding the missing information. The researcher edits the form and resubmits when the edits have been attended to adequately.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>REJ</td>
<td>Reject – the proposed research has considerable ethical issues that cannot be managed and therefore is likely to be considered as high risk and not suitable for consideration.</td>
<td>The researcher is to be informed that the fundamental nature of the research project needs to be altered, and in most cases a new line of enquiry considered.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CSSREC</td>
<td>The project proposes research covered in Part A, Section 9.2.3; 9.2.4; 9.2.5; or 9.2.6 of the <em>CSSREC Research Ethics: A Handbook of Principles and Procedures</em>; or there are contentious issues that concern the supervisor/gatekeeper.</td>
<td>Supervisor to review the application for accuracy, level of information and to ensure all additional information (e.g., DBS, Informed Consent Form) is present before sending to the Chair of the CSSREC (<a href="mailto:cssethics@cardiffmet.ac.uk">cssethics@cardiffmet.ac.uk</a>).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EXE</td>
<td>The project is exempt as it does not involve human participants (passive or active) and is therefore a philosophical project.</td>
<td>Supervisor or gatekeeper to inform the Chair of the CSSREC of the project.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix 18:

Cardiff Metropolitan University

Policy on undergraduate student dissertations and ethics approval

1. Introduction

1.1 This policy is the product of a series of meetings of the University Ethics Committee (UEC) during 2012/2013. UEC members from all Schools and LTDU as well as the UEC Student Representative contributed to the development of the policy.

1.2 The over-arching concerns of discussions were to ensure equitable treatment of each student across the University, and implement an uncomplicated, unambiguous procedural requirement.

1.3 This policy is underpinned by the principle that research must not be conducted by staff or students of Cardiff Metropolitan University unless and until the ethical considerations of the proposed project have been considered and approval has been granted.

1.4 The conditions of this policy are minimum standards, external accrediting agencies may have additional requirements.

1.5 The usual exceptions and additional arrangements resulting from students having approved Mitigating Circumstances will apply.

2. Policy details

2.1 The failure of a student to secure ethical approval for a project prior to commencing data collection will result in the dissertation (or equivalent) being ineligible for assessment. A mark of zero will then be entered for the student as a failure to have attempted the work.

2.2 This policy will take effect from the 2013/2014 Academic Year.

2.3 Schools will ensure students are aware of research ethics principles and governance arrangements relevant to their programme of study prior to embarking on a dissertation (or equivalent). This will normally occur before and/or during Level 5 research methods training (or equivalent).

2.4 Ethics approval must be gained before the student embarks upon the project. In order to ensure this is the case:

- Students will ensure they make an application for research ethics approval in a timely way, subject to the local arrangements of the particular School.
- Academic and technical support staff will ensure students are aware of this requirement and enable student compliance.
- Those responsible for dissertation (or equivalent) administration arrangements in Schools will enable students to secure ethics approval if they intend to begin work on the project during commencing Level 6.

2.5 Schools will maintain a record of ethics approval for auditing purposes.

UEC May 2013