

**RESEARCH ETHICS: A CSAD HANDBOOK OF  
PRINCIPLES AND PROCEDURES**

(May 2014)

**Cardiff School of Art & Design**

## RESEARCH ETHICS: A HANDBOOK OF PRINCIPLES AND PROCEDURES

### Contents

<b>Introduction</b>		p 3
<b>Part A: Principles</b>		
2. Introduction		p 5
3. General Responsibilities		p 5
4. Informed Consent		p 5
5. Deceptive And Covert Research		p 7
6. Confidentiality and Anonymity		p 7
6. Operational Definitions		p 7
7. Research Undertaken Externally Or In Collaboration With Other Institutions		p 8
8. Procedures for Approval		p 8
<b>Part B: Procedures</b>		
9. Introduction		p 9
10. The 'Gatekeeper System		p 9
11. CSAD Research Ethics Committee		p 10
12. Procedures for Securing Approval for Research Projects		p 11
13. Procedures for the Dissemination of Ethics Information to Staff and Students (UG PGT and Research)		p 12
14. Procedures for Ethics Training Provided to Staff and/or Students		p 12
15. Appeals Procedure		p 13

### **Acknowledgment**

***This document is modelled upon work first at the University of Gloucestershire, Birmingham City University and the AHRC Research Training Initiative***

## Introduction

Art and Design are disciplines with distinctive characteristics. Whilst researchers in art and design have learnt a significant amount about good ethical practice in research from scientific disciplines, the specificity of the subject domains and the particular research practices that are becoming established in the arts warrant careful consideration as they may challenge conventional responses to ethical issues developed in other disciplines.

Fine art practice research most frequently involves audience participation, participatory research projects and projects involving visual representation through photography; all raise particular ethical issues. Furthermore, ethics should not be seen simply as a matter of bureaucracy and compliance. In many projects where there is a close relationship between research and practice, there is an intrinsic ethical dimension. This can be seen, for example, in design for disability research, or sustainable design research. At CSAD we believe that engaging with research ethics is part of the maturing of research in art and design. Ethical awareness and sound knowledge of ethical practice in research in one's discipline is a key attribute of the trained researcher, and all researchers should be able to articulate an ethical defence of their approach, yet what this means for our subjects is continuing to evolve.

Furthermore, 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 funding councils/bodies, museums, galleries, publishers, other institutions, etc. can be expected increasingly to require evidence that research projects have secured formal ethical clearance [by the university / school] before agreeing to participate.

***Research Ethics: a Handbook of Principles and Procedures*** has been produced by Cardiff School of Art & Design (CSAD), in response to this growing awareness of ethically sensitive issues in research and scholarly activity. Under the aegis of Academic Board, its intention is to guide and, where necessary, regulate the scholarly activities of researchers at undergraduate and postgraduate levels, and staff members within UWIC and to promote a stronger appreciation and application of ethical considerations in research.

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 will be assessed and, where appropriate, 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.

For the purposes of this document, 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, as outlined in the Arts & Humanities Research Council's Panel 2 subject cover (Visual Arts and Media: practice, history and theory):

*Art and design may include: painting; public art; sculpture; performance; installation; time-based art; printmaking; photography; screen productions; virtual reality; multimedia; digital and interactive art and design; software design for visual artefacts; animation; illustration; graphic and communication design; art and design in the landscape; environmental and interior design; theatre design; exhibition and events design; fashion; textiles; jewellery and metalwork; ceramics; glass; automotive design; product and furniture design; art and design management; cultural, theoretical and historical studies (where this is principally contextual to contemporary practice and culture within art and design). The Council will also support research in architecture that concerns building design (but not structural or civil or other aspects of engineering).*

**Professional Practice:** where this contains elements or aspects of research, as previously described

**Consultancy:** the deployment of existing knowledge for the resolution of specific problems presented by a client, usually representing industry (including the creative industries), commerce or institutions or agencies associated with the fields covered by the School.

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 expect to cover every aspect of a complex area such as research ethics. For these reasons, the CSAD-Research Ethics Committee - which will operate and monitor 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, *including in the case of students, their supervisors*. 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 have as participants and audiences, and to consult where appropriate concerning ethical issues.
- 1.2 The School recognises that the range of its research activities include discrete, multi-disciplinary and inter-disciplinary activities and where overlap of fields and associated ethical guiding principles occur, these may be complementary, but on occasion be in conflict. In these circumstances, there is a responsibility to reconcile disparities where possible, without unnecessarily undermining the originality, independence or impact of the research outputs.
- 1.3 The School acknowledges the importance of the professional codes of conduct of external accredited agencies and organisations, and will recognise their primacy, where required by the professional body.

### 2 General Responsibilities

#### 2.1 *Towards research participants*

Researchers have a responsibility to ensure as far as possible that the physical, psychological and social well-being of their research participants is not detrimentally affected 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 deleterious consequences for other researchers or which might undermine the reputation of their discipline. 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 Audiences*

Researchers should consider the ways outputs may be received and in circumstances where it can be anticipated to cause physical, psychological or social harm or distress, take appropriate steps to alert their potential audience to the nature of the research outputs

### 3 Code of Practice for Gaining Informed Consent

3.1 The overarching principle of research ethics is respect for the autonomy of participants; this includes the protection of participants from physical or psychological harm whilst participating in a research study. Central to this is the concept of Informed Consent.

3.2 Informed Consent is the process by which a participant voluntarily confirms his or her

willingness to participate in a study, having been informed of the full details of the project.

3.3 This Handbook details the process for obtaining informed consent from potential participants in research studies. It outlines the informed consent procedures for adults, for children and for individuals who may not be able to give fully informed consent.

#### **4. General principles for gaining informed consent**

4.1 Potential participants in research studies must normally have the right to choose whether or not they will participate. Obtaining informed consent is therefore central to the ethical conduct of all research involving human participants. Fully informed consent in this context means consent which is freely given with proper understanding of the nature and consequences of what is proposed.

4.2 Written informed consent from participants will normally be required for all studies except those that are exclusively based on questionnaires and are not collecting sensitive data. There may however be instances where gaining written informed consent is deemed to be problematic; in such instances the researcher should fully explain the circumstances in their application for ethics approval. The CSAD research ethics committee will assess such applications on a case by case basis.

4.3 Prior to embarking on the research study, ethics approval must be sought from the appropriate School committee<sup>1</sup>. An application for ethics approval will include examples of the consent form and participant information sheets, which must be approved by the committee before the process of gaining informed consent commences.

#### **5. Responsibility for taking consent**

5.1 It is ultimately the responsibility of the lead researcher to ensure that participants have fully understood what they are consenting to by agreeing to take part in the project. In the case of student led projects, this responsibility lies with the student's supervisor. The process of gaining informed consent will therefore normally be carried out by the lead researcher although this responsibility may be delegated to another, suitably qualified member of the research team. Any individual to whom this responsibility is delegated should meet the following criteria:

- \* Be qualified, through previous experience and appropriate training, for the process of gaining informed consent.
- \* Have a full understanding of the study, potential risks / benefits and the associated research area in order that they are able to give appropriate information to participants.
- \* Be prepared to take on the additional responsibility and feel confident to seek informed consent.

5.2 Any individual undertaking the process of gaining informed consent in projects using human tissue MUST have attended the appropriate Cardiff Met training course.

5.3 The delegation of authority for the taking of informed consent should be documented in the Project File which should include details of the individual responsibilities of each member of the study team. This should be signed off by the lead researcher prior to commencement of the project.

5.4 The individual responsible for seeking informed consent must ensure that they are completely familiar with all aspects of the study as described in the study protocol and the

ethical submission approved by the appropriate ethics committee.

## **6. The consent form**

6.1 Participant information and consent forms to be used must have been approved by the CSAD research ethics committee prior to commencement of the project. This is also the case for any documents provided to participants in respect of the study eg activity diaries.

6.2 In order to meet Cardiff Met requirements, the consent form should:

- \* Be printed on headed paper;
- \* Include the correct title and version number of the study (which should also be included on the participant information sheets)
- \* Include a statement that the participant has had the study explained to them and by whom and confirm that the risks and any benefits related to their participation have been discussed and all the participant's questions have been satisfactorily answered.
- \* Include a statement that participation is voluntary and that participants are free to withdraw at any time without penalty.
- \* Include a statement that confidentiality will be maintained throughout the study, unless this cannot be guaranteed

## **7. Procedure for taking informed consent**

7.1 In order to ensure fully informed consent has been obtained, researchers should follow the process below:

- \* Each participant should be given an oral explanation of what participation in the project will entail.
- \* Each participant should then be given an information sheet explaining in simple, non technical terms, the procedures involved, any potential risks and hoped for benefits.
- \* The participant should be given reasonable time to consider this information and to consult others as necessary.
- \* Except in the case of questionnaire based studies, the participant should be asked to sign a consent form. In cases where participants are either children or "vulnerable" adults, consent should normally be gained from a parent or guardian with the participant giving informed assent (see below for further details).
- \* Throughout the process there should be sufficient time allowed to answer any questions raised by the potential participant.
- \* Potential participants should not be coerced to participate.

7.2 When providing information to participants, either verbally or in writing, researchers should explain the following:

- \* The purpose of the study and any background information which might be relevant.

- \* The reason that they have been approached to participate.
- \* That confidentiality will be maintained throughout the study, unless this cannot be guaranteed<sup>4</sup>.
- \* The design of the study and the number of study visits involved. Details such as the location of the study visits and the names of individuals who participants will meet with should also be given.
- \* All procedures required as part of the study.
- \* The potential benefits and risks of participation in the study.
- \* That participation in the study is voluntary and that participants may withdraw at any time without penalty.
- \* Details of any payments which will be made to participants eg payment of expenses.
- \* Their responsibility as a participant in the project. This is particularly important where the study duration is substantial.
- \* That, despite providing informed consent, they may not be engaged in the project should it be discovered that they do not meet the inclusion (or exclusion) criteria for the study.

Ideally, these points should be verbally discussed with the potential participant. They should then be provided with a written participant information sheet and separate consent form. Participants should be made aware that participant information sheets are available in a range of formats eg large print, audio, Braille.

7.3 In order to meet these minimum standards, use of the CSAD exemplar Participant Information Sheet is recommended.

7.4 The consent form should be signed and dated by the potential participant and the person seeking consent. Each should also print their name next to their signature. A copy of the signed form should be given to the participant and the original retained for inclusion in the project file.

7.5 Contact details of the individual participants can contact for further information about the study should be provided. CSAD/Cardiff Met contact details (eg CSAD/Cardiff Met telephone number and / or email) rather than personal contact details should be provided.

7.6 It is important to note that the informed consent process does not end once the consent form has been signed. The practice of providing information about the study to participants should be an ongoing process performed by all members of the research team.

7.7 As the timing of the signing of the consent form relative to the commencement of the study may be subject to audit, it is important to record dates correctly on both the consent form and any associated documentation. The consent form must be signed by the participant prior to any aspect of their involvement in the study.

## **8 Projects involving participants under the age of 18**

8.1 In essence, researchers carrying out studies involving participants under the age of 18 should follow the same process as outlined above. However, researchers should also

ensure that their study meets the additional requirements outlined in this section.

8.2 It is essential that any study involving participants under the age of 18 either relates directly to this group or can only be carried out on this group.

8.3 The study should be designed to minimise pain, discomfort, fear and any other foreseeable risk in relation to the child's stage of development and continuous monitoring should take place throughout the study to ensure this remains so.

8.4 In studies involving children, generally Cardiff Met requires that both the assent of the child and the consent of the parent or guardian are obtained prior to commencement of the project. Separate information sheets should be provided for parents and children to take account of their different cognitive abilities. Both should make clear that the participant may withdraw from the study at any time without penalty.

8.5 Child assent should be sought in a way which is appropriate to the age and ability of the child. For example, in the case of younger children, this may involve the use of pictures to signify how the child feels about participating in the project.

8.6 For projects involving very young children, eg those who are too young to understand a simple explanation of the research to be undertaken, the project may proceed with parental consent only.

8.7 Participants aged between 16 and 18 are generally considered to be competent for the purposes of gaining consent. It may however be highly desirable to obtain parental consent for some projects involving participants in this age group. Conversely, in other cases, the research involved may be clearly innocuous and not require parental consent. Researchers whose project involves participants of this age group are asked to fully justify a decision not to obtain parental consent when seeking ethics approval.

## **9 Projects involving participants who are unable to give informed consent**

9.1 Researchers who intend to conduct research involving adults who may not be able to give fully informed consent on their own behalf must give a clear justification for this when applying for ethics approval of their project. It is normal for such individuals to only participate in studies which relate directly to a clinical condition from which they suffer. It will be expected that the study will produce benefits to the participants and that there will be no risk associated with participation. Continuous monitoring must take place throughout the project in order to ensure that risks to the participant are minimised at all times.

9.2 Although consent cannot be given on behalf of another, it is important to inform and/or enlist the support of those involved in the care of vulnerable individuals. The legal representative of the potential participant must therefore be provided with full information about the project and the likely involvement of the participant. This should include an assurance that the participant may withdraw from the study at any time without penalty. The representative should also be given sufficient time to ask questions during the consent process.

9.3 The participant must be given information about the study according to their level of understanding. In cases where the potential participant is able to form an opinion based on the information provided, their wish to participate or not must be respected by the person seeking consent.

9.4 No incentives or financial rewards must be used to influence either the potential participant or their representative.

## **10 Deceptive and Covert Research**

- 10.1 While 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.
- 10.2 Any researcher considering potentially deceptive methods in research must seek approval from CSAD REC. 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.
- 10.3 Covert research in non-public spaces (that is, where persons would not normally expect to be under observation), or experimental manipulation of 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.
- 10.4 If covert methods are approved and employed, and informed consent has not been obtained prior to the research, every attempt should be made to obtain this *post hoc*.

## **11 Confidentiality and Anonymity**

- 11.1 Unless otherwise agreed with research participants, their anonymity should be respected, and in all circumstances, their privacy and personal information relating to them should be kept confidential and secure (see section 3.4 and 3.5). Researchers must comply with the provisions of the Data Protection Act 1998 and should consider whether it is proper or appropriate even to record certain kinds of sensitive information.
- 11.2 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.
- 11.3 Whilst the researcher should take every practicable measure to ensure the confidentiality and anonymity of research participants, she or 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.

## 12 Operational definitions

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

12.1.1 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;

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

12.1.3 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).

## 13 Research undertaken externally or in collaboration with other institutions

13.1 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 UEC principles. The CSAD- REC will require evidence of the scrutiny process.

13.2 If data are to be collected in an organisation external to Cardiff Met, the CSAD-REC will require evidence from the organisation that permission has been granted.

13.3 Other studies may be required to comply with externally developed guidelines, such as in the case of research funded by Research Councils, Professional Bodies or charities. It is the applicants' responsibility to ensure that they are fully aware of, and meet the requirements of any external agencies.

## 14 Procedures for Approval

14.1 All research involving human participants requires ethical approval. Set against the principles expressed above, specific approval is required for:

i) **research, the aim of which is psychological, physiological or social intervention**

ii) **deceptive research** which is defined as 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, which could include audience or public participation;

iii) **certain classes of covert research** in particular, those where the data are not recorded in a manner that protects the anonymity of subjects or

participants, where the research topic is one dealing with sensitive aspects of the subject's or participant's behaviour, or where proposals for research involve vulnerable populations (see Appendix 4 for further guidance).

- iv) **research involving vulnerable populations**
- v) cases where the topic to be researched raises or **confronts ethical issues**, as defined in section 1 of this Part A. The individuals and communities whose rights and responsibilities need to be considered are specified in sections 2, 3, and 4 of this Part A.

14.2 In all cases that fall outside 6.1 no ethical approval is required. Procedures for gaining approval are contained in Part B.

## Part B: Procedures

### 15 Introduction

- 15.1 Following the principles, which underpin Cardiff Met's general quality assurance systems, responsibility for ensuring that research is conducted in an ethical way lies at the closest point possible to its actual conduct. 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', the CSAD Research Ethics Committee (CSAD-REC) and, where there is doubt, Cardiff Met Ethics Committee (UEC).
- 15.2 Every attempt has been made to develop a system of procedures sufficiently flexible to accommodate the needs of the various research communities within the School. Researchers who believe that the procedures do not adequately address their specific situation may consult directly with the Chair of CSAD-REC.
- 15.3 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 CSAD-REC. The School recognises that a default position may exist 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.

### 16. The 'Gatekeeper' System

- 16.1 The relevant School gatekeeper acts as a conduit between the researcher and the possible use of CSAD-REC. The gatekeeper, who will have received appropriate training and have a strong grasp of precedence in local issues, 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 6, the gatekeeper will judge whether or not a proposal should be submitted to CSAD-REC for formal approval. In summary, gatekeepers are:

<b><i>For members of staff:</i></b>	The Director of Research
<b><i>Research degree students</i></b>	The School's Director of Research and the Graduate Studies Coordinator.
<b><i>Postgraduate taught students</i></b>	the appropriate Programme Leader or Course Director or dissertation advisor (taking advice from the School's Director of Research).
<b><i>Undergraduate students</i></b>	the appropriate Subject or Constellation Programme Director and the Field manager (taking advice from the School's Director of Learning and Teaching and Head of Undergraduate Studies).

## **17. CSAD Research Ethics Committee**

17.1 The principal aims of the CSAD Research Ethics Committee (CSAD-REC) are three-fold. Its first aim is to consider and, in accordance with the principles expressed in Part A of this Handbook, grant, refer or refuse permission for the undertaking of research investigations which fall in the categories listed in Part A, Section 6. Its second aim is to act as an advisory body to the Academic Board on matters related to research ethics. Its third aim is to sponsor appropriate training and staff development.

17.2 The details of CSAD-REC are as follows:

### **TERMS OF REFERENCE**

School Ethics Committees shall be responsible for ensuring that all research involving human participants carried out by staff and students within the School or at other locations conforms to standards set by the School and approved by the Cardiff Met Research Ethics Committee (UEC). They will:

- i. with the approval of UEC establish, implement, and keep under review procedures, and guidelines for the consideration, approval, and monitoring of research projects involving human participants which are undertaken by members of staff and/or student members of the School;
- ii.
  - this may include the setting up of sub-panels, such as the Undergraduate Ethics panel, to consider applications for approval from designated parts of the School
- iii. ensure that ethical principles are clearly laid down and are disseminated to staff and students of the School, and that ethical practices are implemented (for example, within module handbooks).
- iv. ensure that appropriate training in ethics is put in place for members of the School undertaking or supervising research involving human participants

- v. keep the School's Ethical Guidelines under annual review
- vi. report annually to UEC on the numbers and types of projects considered by the committee, together with details of any policy or procedural changes recommended by the committee.

## **Membership**

The committee will consist of:

- A nominated Chair
- The School Director of Research
- The School Director of Learning and Teaching
- A minimum of three additional members of research active staff
- An academic Associate
- The School Director of Graduate Studies
- Other members of staff as appropriate

## **Meetings:**

Not less than two per term

- 17.3 It is an expectation that CSAD-REC will be asked to consider any research proposal, which falls under the categories listed in Part A, Section 6 of this Handbook. Failure to submit such proposals for approval or, once submitted, violation of CSAD-REC REC's decision to refuse permission for such research to proceed, may negate the University's insurance cover and also result in disciplinary action.

## **18 Procedures for Securing Approval for Research Projects**

### **18.1 *Members of staff seeking approval***

18.1.1 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 Graduate School.

18.1.2 Any proposal which falls under Part A, Section 6 of this Handbook must be submitted to CSAD REC. Such proposals must be received by the Officer at least five working days before the next scheduled meeting. Chair's action may be taken exceptionally, on matters that require greater expediency but such decisions will be taken in consultation with at least one other CSAD-REC member.

### **18.2 *Research degree students seeking approval***

18.2.1 The general framework for approval will apply to research students as well as staff. Additionally, all research students will be offered appropriate education and training in Research Ethics. All research students are required to signal their adherence to the University's principles on the registration form, as is the supervisory team for each research degree programme. The School Research Director or the Chair of CSAD-REC's signature on the form confirms that both

student and supervisors are aware of, and agree to abide by, those principles.

18.2.2 All proposals which fall under Part A, Section 6 of this Handbook must be submitted to CSAD-REC for approval before the Research Proposal form is considered by the School's Research Degrees Committee. The School Research Director should liaise with the Chair of CSAD REC where there is any doubt whether a research proposal should be considered by CSAD REC

### **19.3 *Postgraduate taught students seeking approval***

19.3.1 The general framework for approval will apply to students following taught postgraduate courses. Additionally, all Postgraduate Modular Scheme students will be offered appropriate education and training in research ethics in their Research Methods module(s). Programme Leaders are responsible for ensuring that all students are aware of, and agree to abide by, the principles expressed in this Handbook, through their respective Programme Guides.

19.3.2 All proposals which fall under Part A, Section 6 of this Handbook must be submitted to CSAD-REC for approval. The Programme Leader should liaise with the CSAD-REC Chair where there is any doubt whether a research proposal should be considered by CSAD-REC

### **19.4 *Undergraduate Modular Scheme students seeking approval***

19.4.1 The general framework for approval will apply to students following programmes within the CSAD Undergraduate Modular Scheme. All undergraduate students will be offered appropriate education and training in research ethics in their first Subject Module or its equivalent. Heads of Studies in the Undergraduate Modular Scheme are responsible for ensuring that all undergraduate students are aware of, and agree to abide by, the principles expressed in this Handbook, through their respective Programme Handbooks. All undergraduate students are required to signal their adherence to the principles expressed in this Handbook on their assignment cover sheets. Where a given project or element of coursework may entail ethically sensitive issues, it is the responsibility of the Module Tutor to liaise with the student. Programme Leader and Head of Studies. Guidelines for ethical practice and the submission of applications for ethical approval will be included in all Undergraduate Programme Guides. Subject, Field and Constellation Leaders are required to submit a Protocol Application to CSAD-REC for each and every module that may require ethical approval. Once a Protocol has been approved and assigned a Protocol reference number, students will be required to use the Protocol and number for any assignment requiring ethical compliance. Where a project proposal does not fall clearly into one of the categories expressed in Part A, or which may involve participants under 18 years, or those unable to give consent, the Subject, Field and Constellation Leader is responsible for bringing the Application for Ethics Approval to the attention of CSAD-REC. A sample of Undergraduate assignments using protocols will be submitted for review by the CSAD L&T Committee.

19.4.2 All proposals which fall under Part A, Section 6 of this Handbook must be submitted to CSAD REC for approval. The Module Tutor or Head of Department should liaise with the CSAD-REC Chair where there is any doubt whether a research proposal should be considered by CSAD-REC

## **20 Procedures for the dissemination of ethics information to staff and students (UG, PGT and research)**

20.1 Dissemination of research ethics information to students occurs as follows:

### *Undergraduate students*

Through programme handbooks and delivery of specific lecture sessions on Research Methods and through the Constellation supervision process.

### *Postgraduate (taught) students*

Through programme handbooks and delivery of specific lecture sessions on core modules and through the project supervision process.

### *Postgraduate research students*

For the purposes of research ethics governance, research students will access to all the opportunities available to staff. Scrutiny of research degree proposals are undertaken by the CSAD Research Degrees Committee and members of the CSAD-REC are tasked with interrogating proposals for ethical propriety and compliance (in particular).

## **21 Procedures for ethics training provided to staff and/or students**

21.1 The Director of Learning and Teaching, the Chair of CSAD-REC and the Director of Graduate Studies will ensure that all research active staff, Subject, Field and Constellation leaders undertake a CSAD Ethics workshop, based on the Postgraduate Research Methods Module.

These 'Discipline' based workshops focus on three main themes:

- The principles of 'good' research ethics governance;
- Consideration of hypothetical case studies;
- Compliance with Cardiff Met's procedures for research ethics.

## **22 Appeals Procedure**

22.1 All investigators have the right to appeal against the judgement of CSAD-REC. There are two grounds for such appeal:

- a) where the researcher feels that CSAD-REC as been unfair in its consideration of a proposal and/or has not properly understood it;
- b) where there have been any irregularities in the procedures adopted by CSAD-REC.

22.2 A researcher has the right to appeal in writing against a decision made by CSAD-REC within ten working days of the notification of that decision.

22.3 The Chair will convene a meeting of CSAD-REC with the proposer to review the proposal and the grounds for the CSAD-REC decision. This meeting will normally be held within ten working days of notification of the appeal. There will be at least two

CSAD-REC members in addition to the Chair in attendance.

22.4 At this stage the CSAD REC may:

- (a) uphold its original decision to reject the proposal;
- (b) uphold the appeal of the researcher and approve the original proposal;
- (c) uphold the appeal of the researcher but refer the decision until appropriate revisions have been made to the proposal.

22.5 Following an unsuccessful appeal, and where the researcher is dissatisfied with the decision of the CSAD-REC, he or she has the right to submit a final appeal to the University Ethics Committee (UEC). This appeal must be lodged through the Chair of the UREC within five working days of receipt of CSAD-REC'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 CSAD-REC's decision-making process. The proposer will be notified in writing within five working days of UEC's hearing.