



LEEDS
BECKETT
UNIVERSITY

RESEARCH ETHICS SUB COMMITTEE

22 May 2019
at 14:00 in G07 Old Broadcasting House,
City Campus

Governance & Legal Services

Leeds Beckett University, 101 Old Broadcasting House, City Campus, Leeds, LS2 9EN
T: 0113 812 7542 E: Governance@leedsbeckett.ac.uk



AGENDA for the Wednesday 22 May 2019 meeting

The Research Ethics Sub-Committee will be held at 14:00 in Room G07, Old Broadcasting House, City Campus.

14:00	Part A: Preliminary Items	Paper	Led by
	A1 Apologies		K Spracklen
	A2 Declarations of interest		K Spracklen
	A3 Membership <i>To note addition of Research Ethics Co-Ordinator for School of Computing, Creative Technology & Engineering</i>	REE-2018-040	K Spracklen
	A4 Minutes of the last meeting held on 06 March 2019	REE-2018-041	K Spracklen
	A5 Matters arising	REE-2018-042	Secretary
14:15	Part B: Items for Information & Monitoring	Paper	Led by
	B1 Annual PREVENT Update	REE-2018-043	K Spracklen
	B2 European Code of Conduct for Research Integrity – mapping	REE-2018-044	K Nacto
	B3 2017/18 action plan monitoring:		
	(a) Art, Architecture & Design	To follow	A Simson
	(b) Built Environment & Engineering	REE-2018-045	N Evans
	(c) Computing, Creative Technology & Engineering	REE-2018-046	B Dalton
	(d) Carnegie School of Education	NS	S Hunter
	(e) Clinical & Applied Sciences	REE-2018-047	R Brooks
	(f) Cultural Studies & Humanities	REE-2018-048	H Shore
	(g) Film, Music & Performing Arts	REE-2018-049	P Thompson
	(h) Health & Community Studies	REE-2018-050	F Brown
	(i) Leeds Business School	REE-2018-051	B Jones
	(j) Leeds Law School	NS	J Guth
	(k) Social Sciences	REE-2018-052	S Price
	(l) Carnegie School of Sport	REE-2018-053	J O’Hara

(m) Events, Tourism, & Hospitality

NS

A Kenyon

15:00 **Part C: Items for discussion / decision** **Paper** **Led by**

C1 Draft Research Incentive Guidelines REE-2018-054 K Spracklen

15:30 **Part D: Other Business** **Paper** **Led by**

D1 Draft Schedule of meetings & business REE-2018-055 K Spracklen
* 2019/20

D2 Any other business K Spracklen

Date of next meeting:
Wednesday 02 October 2019, at 14:00
in Room G07, Old Broadcasting House,
City Campus

 *Shaded items indicate that the Board / Committee is being asked to make a decision.*

**Starred items will be taken without discussion unless a member notifies the Chair or Secretary in advance that she or he wishes the item to be open for debate*

Proposed amendments to the Terms of Reference & Membership of the Research Ethics Sub Committee

Executive Summary

This report provides an overview of the proposed changes to the Research Ethics Sub-Committee. The proposals are:

- a) The Chair would be drawn from Director of Research constituency and nominated by the Research & Enterprise Committee
- b) Nominated staff are nominated by their respective Dean of School unless otherwise specified.

Action Requested

This report is **for decision** The Committee are asked to **endorse** the following amendments to the terms of reference and membership prior to seeking approval from the Research & Enterprise Committee and the Academic Board.

Appendices

Appendix 1 – REE Terms of Reference

Appendix 2 – REE Membership

Author

Name: Rachael Andrews

Job title: Governance Administrator

Date: April 2019

Approval Route

April 2019

Professor Karl Spracklen – Chair of the Research Ethics Sub-Committee



RESEARCH ETHICS SUB COMMITTEE TERMS OF REFERENCE

The University Research Ethics Sub-Committee (URESC) is responsible to the Research & Enterprise Committee for overseeing the development and implementation of the University's Policy & Procedures relating to Research Ethics.

The Committee's terms of reference are to:

- (a) oversee and monitor the implementation of, and compliance with, the University's Policy & Procedures for Research Ethics;
- (b) advise the Research & Enterprise Committee on the development of institutional policies and guidelines relating to ethical issues in research arising from teaching, research and other related institutional activities;
- (c) monitor the external research ethics environment and ensure that the University responds to all external requirements;
- (d) advise the Research & Enterprise Committee of the training & development needs of University Staff in relation to research ethics;

Delegated Authority

The Research Ethics Sub-Committee has authority from the Research & Enterprise Committee to consider for approval research projects:

- (a) referred to it by a local research ethics coordinator;
- (b) that involve substantial and / or complex ethical issues;
- (c) where the consent of an external body is required;
- (d) where it is a requirement for funding by an external body.

Staff, and students and their supervisors, may be required to attend the University Research Ethics Sub-committee when their research proposals or other matters relating to the ethics of their research are being discussed.

Delegation

In accordance with the Standing Orders, the Committee may establish short life working groups to perform specific tasks and in so doing must determine their terms of reference, membership (including the Chair who must be a member of this Committee), and lifespan.

Membership Profile

Members [18]

Quorum [9]

- Director of Research (Chair) [1] – Nominated**
- School Research Ethics Co-ordinators [13] – Nominated*
- Co-opted members of staff (co-optees must have relevant experience of research ethics) [2] – Nominated**
- External co-opted member [1] Nominated**
- A Research Student [1] - Elected

In attendance

- Representative of the University Research Office

** Nominated by Dean of School*

***Nominated by Research & Enterprise Committee*

For non-ex-officio members, terms of office should normally be three years. Students' terms of office should normally be one year.

All nominated staff will be nominated by the respective Dean of School or the Research and Enterprise Committee, unless otherwise specified.

The Constitution of the Committee is made by resolution of the Academic Board on

Research Ethics Sub-committee - 2018-2019

Membership [18]

Quorum [9]

<u>Position</u>	<u>Member</u>	<u>Start of term of office</u>	<u>Expiry of term of office</u>	<u>Elected / nominated / ex-</u>
<u>Director of Research (Chair) [1]</u>	Professor Karl Spracklen	01/09/2018	31/08/2021	Nominated
<u>School Research Ethics Co-ordinators [13]</u>				
Leeds Business School	Dr Brian Jones	01/09/2018	31/08/2021	Nominated
Film, Music and Performing Arts	Dr Paul Thompson	06/12/2016	31/08/2020	Nominated
Carnegie School of Education	Dr Shona Hunter	01/02/2019	31/08/2021	Nominated
Carnegie School of Sport	Professor John O'Hara	04/10/2017	31/08/2020	Nominated
Cultural Studies and Humanities	Professor Heather Shore*	01/09/2016	31/08/2019	Nominated
Art, Architecture and Design	Professor Alan Simson	01/09/2016	31/08/2019	Nominated
Built Environment and Engineering	Dr Neil Evans	01/09/2016	31/08/2019	Nominated
Leeds Law School	Dr Jessica Guth	01/09/2016	31/08/2019	Nominated
Events, Tourism and Hospitality Management	Dr Alex Kenyon	01/09/2016	31/08/2019	Nominated
Clinical and Applied Science	Dr Rob Brooks	01/09/2016	31/08/2019	Nominated
Health and Community Studies	Professor Fraser Brown*	01/09/2018	31/08/2019	Nominated
Leeds School of Social Sciences	Dr Sophia Price	01/12/2018	31/08/2021	Nominated
School of Computing, Creative Technology and Engineering	Ben Dalton	22/05/2019	31/08/2021	Nominated
<u>Co-opted members of staff (must have relevant experience of research ethics) [2]</u>				
1	Dr Andrew Wilson	01/09/2017	31/08/2020	Nominated
2	Martin Watson	04/10/2017	31/08/2020	Nominated
<u>External co-opted member [1]</u>	Dr Niall William Richard Scott	01/09/2016	31/08/2019	Nominated
<u>One research student [1]</u>	Kay Nacto	01/09/2018	31/08/2019	Elected

**Professor Fraser Brown is nominated by the School for a one-year term of office. Dr Ros Brownlow will take over on 01 Sept 2019. Dr Brownlow will attend meetings in 2018/19 as an observer.*

**Dr Andrew Lawson is nominated by the School of Cultural Studies and Humanities and will take over from Professor Heather Shore on 1 Sept 2019*

MINUTES of the meeting of the Research Ethics Sub-Committee (the 'Committee') held at 14:00 on 6 March 2019 in Old Broadcasting House, Leeds.

Present:

Professor Karl Spracklen (Chair)

Dr Rob Brooks

Dr Sophia Price

Professor Heather Shore

Dr Brian Jones

Dr Neil Evans

Martin Watson

Professor Fraser Brown

Professor Alan Simson

In attendance:

Rachel Bradford (Secretary)

Sally Clayton

Apologies:

Dr Alex Kenyon

Dr Andrew Wilson

Kay Nacto

Professor John O'Hara

Wendy Hopkins

Dr Shona Hunter

Dr Paul Thompson

Dr Jessica Guth

Dr Niall William Richard Scott

Part A: Preliminary Items

Quorum

038.2018.REE It was **noted** that the meeting was quorate with nine members present.

Declarations of interest

039.2018.REE No declarations of interest were made.

Membership

040.2018.REE The Committee **noted** the addition of Shona Hunter to the membership to replace John Sharp for Carnegie School of Education (paper reference REE-2018-028).

- 041.2018.REE
- (a) It was **noted** that the terms of office for the nominated positions of School Research Ethics Co-Ordinators for the Schools of Cultural Studies and Humanities, Art Architecture and Design, Built Environment and Engineering, Leeds Law School, Events, Tourism and Hospitality Management and Clinical and Applied Science as their terms of office would be coming to an end on 31 August 2019.
 - (b) It was **AGREED** that the Deans of the relevant Schools would be contacted and asked to nominate who they would like to fill the position on the

CHAIR APPROVED

Committee for this category of membership for their Schools when the current terms of office expire.

- (c) It was **noted** that the Committee was carrying a vacancy for a School Research Ethics Co-Ordinator to represent the School of Computing, Creative Technology and Engineering. It was noted that their most recently appointed representative left the University in December 2018 and had not been replaced on the Committee. It was agreed that the Acting Dean of the School would be contacted to confirm who would represent the School at future meetings.

042.2018.REE It was **noted** that the administration of Committee was being handed over from the University Secretary's Office to the Vice Chancellor's meeting. Sally Clayton was attending the meeting as an observer and representative from the Vice Chancellor's office and she would be co-ordinating secretarial support for the next meeting.

Minutes

043.2018.REE The Committee **AGREED** that the minutes of its meeting held on 5 December 2018 were an accurate record (paper reference REE-2018-029).

Matters arising

044.2018.REE The Secretary presented a report on the matters arising from the minutes of the previous meeting of the Committee held on 5 December 2018 (paper reference REE-2018-030) and the following points were **noted**.

- (a) **European Code of Conduct for Research Integrity:** The action to approach Kay Nacto to see if she was willing to take on the mapping exercise to see the extent that the University's practices aligned with the Code was outstanding. It was agreed that the Secretary would approach Kay and advise of her response.
- (b) **List of Institution/ethics committees that have been agreed for light touch approval process:** The list had not been published at the time of the meeting although the request had been made. The action remained outstanding.
- (c) **Short Life Working Group:** The Committee noted that the Head of Research was setting up a panel to oversee the development of the new online ethics system to oversee developments and unexpected fixes. The Chair suggested that the Group would benefit from having a member of the Committee on the panel at Professor level and that the Head of Research should be approached for this to be facilitated.

Part B: Items for Information & Monitoring

Prevent update

- 045.2018.REE The Committee received an update report on Prevent matters from the Chair (paper reference REE-2018-031).
- 046.2018.REE It was **reported** that there had been 1 staff application and 17 student applications for Research Ethics approval submitted via the online system that ticked the Prevent Duty box during the period 1 September 2018 – 25 February 2019.
- 047.2018.REE It was **reported** that the staff application had been approved and 9 of the student applications had been approved. The remaining 8 student applications had been rejected as when they were reviewed it transpired that they did not in fact fall within the Prevent Duty.

Research Ethics Audit action plan monitoring:

- 048.2018.REE
- (a) The following School's provided an update on their action plans:
 - Built Environment & Engineering (paper reference REE-2018-032)
 - Carnegie School of Education (paper reference REE-2018-033)
 - Clinical & Applied Sciences (paper reference REE-2018-034)
 - Cultural Studies & Humanities (paper reference REE-2018-035)
 - Health & Community Studies (paper reference REE-2018-036)
 - Leeds Business School (paper reference REE-2018-037)
 - Carnegie School of Sport (paper reference REE-2018-040)
 - (b) A verbal update was provided for Leeds School of Social Sciences and the School of Art, Architecture and Design.
 - (c) It was **noted** that no reports had been submitted by the School of Film, Music and Performing Arts, Leeds Law School and the School of Computing Creative Technology & Engineering. It was agreed that updates would be sought from these Schools.
 - (d) It was **noted** that Leeds Law School were to submit their own report separate from that of Leeds Business School.

Part C: Items for discussion/decision

Feedback from Research Ethics Away-Day held on 14 February 2019

- 049.2018.REE The Committee received a verbal update from the Chair following the Research Ethics Away-Day held on 14 February 2019.
- 050.2018.REE It was **reported** that the following decisions had been made at the Away Day:
1. Postgraduate students would need to contact the Insurance & Risk Officer to discuss projects where they intend to conduct research outside of the

- United Kingdom. This would allow the University to make sure appropriate insurance coverage would be in place.
2. Retrospective applications for ethics approval would not be permitted.
 3. The Chair of the Research Ethics Committee would contact Deans of Schools to remind them of the importance of allowing Local Research Ethics Co-Ordinators and School Research Ethics Co-Ordinators time to carry out their important roles.
 4. The Chair of the Research Ethics Committee would contact all School Research Ethics Co-Ordinators at the end of each academic year to get a list of all Risk Category 3 project approvals. A sample (1 in 50) would be audited to check the approval process was sufficiently robust and that the project had not strayed beyond the agreed scope.
 5. A simple guide to research ethics would be drafted for publication on the Research Ethics pages of the University's website.
 6. Content about research ethics would be developed for the Skills for Learning site.

051.2018.REE It was **noted** that the Chair had prepared the simple guide to research ethics which had been circulated to members of the Committee for comment. The Committee **APPROVED** the draft guide.

Proposal for School Research Ethics Audit Process for 2018/19

052.2018.REE The Committee received a report from the Chair detailing proposals for School Research Ethics Audit Process for 2018/19 (paper reference REE-2018-038).

053.2018.REE The Committee considered the paper and **noted** that the process was the same one being followed for the 17/18 academic year.

054.2018.REE The Committee **APPROVED** the proposal.

Part D: Other Business

Schedule of meetings and business for 2018/19

055.2018.REE The Committee received its schedule of meetings and business for 2018/19 (paper reference REE-2018-039).

Date of next meeting

056.2018.REE The next meeting of the Research Ethics Committee would be held at 14:00 on 22 May 2019 in Room G07, Old Broadcasting House, City Campus.

Other business

057.2018.REE No other business was raised.

Confirmed by the Committee/Board as a correct record and signed by the Chair:

Signed: _____ Date: _____

22 May 2019

Matters Arising

Executive Summary

This paper provides an update on matters arising and on matters from previous meetings of the Committee that are not otherwise covered by items on the agenda for this meeting.

Action Requested

The report is **for information**. The Committee is asked to note the report.

Appendices

Schedule of Actions

Author

Name: Rachel Bradford
Job title: Governance Services Manager
Date: 14 May 2019

Research Ethics Sub-Committee -Matters arising/Update on outstanding actions as at 22 May 2019

Minute	Matter and action required	Responsibility	Progress and status
<i>035.2017.REE and 021.2018 REE</i>	<p>European Code of Conduct for Research Integrity A fuller mapping of the European Code of Conduct for Research Integrity would now be presented at the October 2018 meeting of the Sub-Committee once the administrative support in the Research Office was in place to support this piece of work.</p>	Research Office	Complete – Please refer to paper reference REE-2018-044 under Part B: Items for Information & Monitoring.
<i>008.2018.REE</i>	<p>List of Institution/ethics committees that have been agreed for light touch approval process Arrange for list to be published on Research Ethics webpages.</p>	Digital Team/Committee Secretary	Complete – Document published on website 10.04.2019
<i>044.2018.REE</i>	<p>Short Life Working Group Chair of Research Ethics Sub-Committee suggested that the panel set up by the Head of Research would benefit from membership of someone at Professor level and requested that the Head of Research be approached to see if this could be facilitated.</p>	Committee Secretary	

Research Ethics Sub-Committee -Matters arising/Update on outstanding actions as at 22 May 2019

<i>041.2018.REE</i>	Membership Contact Deans of School with members whose terms of office were due to expire at the end of the Academic Year 2018/19 and request nominations for School Research Ethics Co-Ordinators to sit on the Committee in the 2019/20 academic year Contact Acting Dean of School of Computing, Creative Technology & Engineering to get a new School Research Ethics Co-Ordinator nominated to represent the School.	Committee Secretary	Complete Deans were contacted on 7 March 2019 to request nominations for members for the next academic year. Ben Dalton has been nominated as the Research Ethics Co-Ordinator for the School of Computing, Creative Technology & Engineering.
<i>048.2018.REE</i>	Research Ethics Audit action plan monitoring Request an update from School of Film, Music and Performing Arts, Leeds Law School and the School of Computing Creative Technology & Engineering.		

Annual PREVENT Update

Executive Summary

This report provides an overview of applications made on the on-line system for approval to undertake research that falls under the Prevent Duty so far in 2018-2019.

Action Requested

The sub-committee is required to note the report.

Appendices

None.

Author

Name: Professor Karl Spracklen

Title: Chair, URESC

Date: 01 May 2019

Approval Route

01 May 2019

Professor Karl Spracklen / Chair, URESC

PREVENT UPDATE

Introduction

The Counter-Terrorism and Security Act 2015 contains a duty on specified authorities to have due regard to the need to prevent people from being drawn into terrorism. This is also known as the Prevent duty. Universities are one of the key specified authorities that have to show they comply with the remit of the Prevent Duty, and research is clearly one aspect of higher education's work where the Government requires information that we are doing all we can to assess and monitor anything considered to fall under the remit of Prevent. Our university revised the risk assessment on the research ethics system to enable 'Prevent Duty' research to be checked and approved through this sub-committee and its Chair. This has allowed us to ensure monitoring is effective while balancing academic freedom.

This report provides an overview of applications made on the on-line system for approval to undertake research that falls under the Prevent Duty in total in 2017-2018, and so far in the academic year 2018-2019.

2018-2019

In the period 01 September 2018-30 April 2019 there has been one staff application, and nineteen student ones. The staff project was approved. Ten students had their project approved, nine were rejected because they did not fall under the Prevent Duty. Of the student projects, all were L6 apart from two M Level student. Schools were: LSSS; ETH; LBS; CSH; CSS; and BEE.

Conclusions and recommendations

The sub-committee is required to note the report.

References and further information

None.

Author

Professor Karl Spracklen, Chair, URESC, 01 May 2019



European Code of Conduct for Research Integrity - mapping

Executive Summary

The purpose of this report is to map out what the European Code of Conduct for research Integrity describes as good research practices in the areas of Research Environment, Training, Supervision and Mentoring, Research Procedures, Safeguards, Data Practices and Management, Collaborative Working, Publication and Dissemination, Reviewing, Evaluating and Editing and then seeing if the practices of the University meet this guidance.

Action Requested

This report is **for information**

Appendices

Appendix 1 - European Code of Conduct for Research Integrity vs. Leeds Beckett University

Author

Name: Kay Nacto

Job title: Part-time Lecturer in Carnegie School of Education

Date: 8 May 2019

European Code of Conduct for Research Integrity vs. Leeds Beckett University

<u>European Code of Conduct for Research Integrity Guidance</u>	<u>LBU Ethics Policy and Ethics Procedure</u>
<p>Research Environment</p> <p>(a) Research institutions and organisations promote awareness and ensure a prevailing culture of research integrity.</p> <p>(b) Research institutions and organisations demonstrate leadership in providing clear policies and procedures on good research practice and the transparent and proper handling of violations</p> <p>(c) Research institutions and organisations support proper infrastructure for the management and protection of data and research materials in all their forms (encompassing qualitative and quantitative data, protocols, processes, other research artefacts and associated metadata) that are necessary for reproducibility, traceability and accountability</p> <p>(d) Research institutions and organisations reward open and reproducible practices in hiring and promotion of researchers.</p>	<p>1.) It reflects the University’s commitment to good ethical practice, as a principle in itself and as a means of maintaining public confidence in the work of staff and students of the University.</p> <p>2.) This Policy is fully aligned with the University’s Strategic Planning Framework 2016-21. In particular, research ethics is underpinned by the key themes of ‘An Excellent Education and Experience’ and ‘Leading Research and Academic Enterprise’. The Policy contributes to the promotion and maintenance of scholarly ethics throughout the curriculum; and in particular to setting standards for an ethical culture of respect and dignity throughout the research process, conducted both within the University and through research projects in which staff and students engage with the wider community.</p> <p>3.) Nothing that states the practices in hiring and promotion of researchers.</p>

<u>European Code of Conduct for Research Integrity Guidance</u>	<u>LBU Ethics Policy and Ethics Procedure</u>
<p>Training, Supervision and Mentoring</p> <p>(a) Research institutions and organisations ensure that researchers receive rigorous training in research design, methodology and analysis.</p> <p>(b) Research institutions and organisations develop appropriate and adequate training in ethics and research integrity and ensure that all concerned are made aware of the relevant codes and regulations.</p> <p>(c) Researchers across the entire career path, from junior to the most senior</p>	<p>1.) Training is not directly mentioned. It is expected that the researcher does not collect data without training but does not state options to achieve the training.</p> <p>2.) Please take note of 4.2 Research Supervisors of Ethics Procedure</p> <p>3.) Please take note of A3.2 Requirement for Ethical Approval of Ethics Policy</p> <p>4.) Please take note of 4.3 Research module leaders of Ethics Procedure</p> <p>5.) Schools are responsible for identifying appropriate learned societies with ethical guidelines.</p>

<p>level, undertake training in ethics and research integrity.</p> <p>(d) Senior researchers, research leaders and supervisors mentor their team members and offer specific guidance and training to properly develop, design and structure their research activity and to foster a culture of research integrity.</p>	<p>6.) Please take note of 4.5 School level Group of Ethics Procedure</p> <p>7.)</p>
--	---

<u><i>European Code of Conduct for Research Integrity Guidance</i></u>	<u><i>LBU Ethics Policy and Ethics Procedure</i></u>
<p>Research Procedures</p> <p>(a) Researchers take into account the state-of-the-art in developing research ideas.</p> <p>(b) Researchers design, carry out, analyse and document research in a careful and well considered manner.</p> <p>(c) Researchers make proper and conscientious use of research funds.</p> <p>(d) Researchers publish results and interpretations of research in an open, honest, transparent and accurate manner, and respect confidentiality of data or findings when legitimately required to do so.</p> <p>(e) Researchers report their results in a way that is compatible with the standards of the discipline and, where applicable, can be verified and reproduced.</p>	<p>1.) The University recognises the importance of ongoing staff and student development in the field of research ethics, and will promote and facilitate this at University, School and local level.</p> <p>2.) Research should be designed, reviewed and undertaken to ensure integrity, value and quality.</p> <p>3.) The independence of the research outcomes must be ensured. External sources of funding and any potential conflict of interest must be declared during the approval process.</p> <p>4.) Research outcomes should be disseminated in a manner which makes them accessible.</p>

<u><i>European Code of Conduct for Research Integrity Guidance</i></u>	<u><i>LBU Ethics Policy and Ethics Procedure</i></u>
<p>Safeguards</p> <p>(a) Researchers comply with codes and regulations relevant to their discipline.</p> <p>(b) Researchers handle research subjects, be they human, animal, cultural, biological, environmental or physical, with respect and care, and in accordance with legal and ethical provisions.</p> <p>(c) Researchers have due regard for the health, safety and welfare of the</p>	<p>1.) The research culture will be characterised by respect for all groups in society, in line with the University's Equality Policy and national legislation on Equality, Diversity and Human Rights.</p> <p>2.) The health and safety of both researcher and participants/subjects will be carefully considered in the design and execution of research projects.</p>

<p>community, of collaborators and others connected with their research.</p> <p>(d) Research protocols take account of, and are sensitive to, relevant differences in age, gender, culture, religion, ethnic origin and social class.</p> <p>(e) Researchers recognise and manage potential harms and risks relating to their research.</p>	<p>3.) Some types of research projects may require a risk assessment to consider health and safety issues (the risk assessment should not be confused with the Risk Checklist for research ethics). Risk assessment is the responsibility of your subject area and you need to be aware of what your subject area's requirements are.</p>
---	---

<p><u>European Code of Conduct for Research Integrity Guidance</u></p>	<p><u>LBU Ethics Policy and Ethics Procedure</u></p>
<p>Data Practices and Management</p> <p>(a) Researchers, research institutions and organisations ensure appropriate stewardship and curation of all data and research materials, including unpublished ones, with secure preservation for a reasonable period.</p> <p>(b) Researchers, research institutions and organisations ensure access to data is as open as possible, as closed as necessary, and where appropriate in line with the FAIR Principles (Findable, Accessible, Interoperable and Re-usable) for data management.</p> <p>(c) Researchers, research institutions and organisations provide transparency about how to access or make use of their data and research materials.</p> <p>(d) Researchers, research institutions and organisations acknowledge data as legitimate and citable products of research.</p> <p>(e) Researchers, research institutions and organisations ensure that any contracts or agreements relating to research outputs include equitable and fair provision for the management of their use, ownership, and/or their protection under intellectual property rights.</p>	<p>1.) Please make note of A3.3 Ethical issues related to the Conduct of a Research Project in Ethics Policy</p> <p>2.) Please make note of Data security, records management and data retention (pg.13-20) in Ethics Procedure</p> <p>3.) Mostly in the Ethics Procedure, researchers are given questions on how to approach data management but not clear insight is given. A lot of the practices are left up to individual schools and supervisors to take care of, which could be a knowledge gap.</p>

<u>European Code of Conduct for Research Integrity Guidance</u>	<u>LBU Ethics Policy and Ethics Procedure</u>
<p>Collaborative Working</p> <p>(a) All partners in research collaborations take responsibility for the integrity of the research.</p> <p>(b) All partners in research collaborations agree at the outset on the goals of the research and on the process for communicating their research as transparently and openly as possible.</p> <p>(c) All partners formally agree at the start of their collaboration on expectations and standards concerning research integrity, on the laws and regulations that will apply, on protection of the intellectual property of collaborators, and on procedures for handling conflicts and possible cases of misconduct.</p> <p>(d) All partners in research collaborations are properly informed and consulted about submissions for publication of the research results.</p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1.) All funded, contractual or collaborative research must comply with the specified requirements for data storage. 2.) Fair attribution of authorship in a collaborative research project should be observed, with seniority of position not creating an automatic right to co-authorship. Honorary authorship is unacceptable. The order of authors should recognise their respective contributions to the work. 3.) Work of other scholars or colleagues must be acknowledged. Professional standards need to be observed in: attribution of authorship; acknowledgement of sources; correctness of references.

<u>European Code of Conduct for Research Integrity Guidance</u>	<u>LBU Ethics Policy and Ethics Procedure</u>
<p>Publication and Dissemination</p> <p>(a) All authors are fully responsible for the content of a publication, unless otherwise specified.</p> <p>(b) All authors agree on the sequence of authorship, acknowledging that authorship itself is based on a significant contribution to the design of the research, relevant data collection, or the analysis or interpretation of the results.</p> <p>(c) Authors ensure that their work is made available to colleagues in a timely, open, transparent, and accurate manner, unless otherwise agreed, and are honest in their communication to the general public and in traditional and social media.</p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1.) Researchers also need to ensure that dissemination and/or publication follows good ethical practice. Researchers should seek advice locally and follow appropriate learned society guidelines 2.) Researchers have a responsibility to take account of all relevant evidence and present it without omission, misrepresentation or deception. Data and information must not knowingly be fabricated or manipulated in a way which might lead to distortion. 3.) Work of other scholars or colleagues must be acknowledged. Professional standards need to be observed in: attribution of authorship; acknowledgement of sources; correctness of references.

<p>(d) Authors acknowledge important work and intellectual contributions of others, including collaborators, assistants, and funders, who have influenced the reported research in appropriate form, and cite related work correctly.</p> <p>(e) All authors disclose any conflicts of interest and financial or other types of support for the research or for the publication of its results.</p>	<p>4.) If you intend to publish the findings from your study (eg, in a research report or journal article) you may require permission or informed consent to do so. For example, if your research has been commissioned by an external body, they may want prior approval before publication. Also, if the research involves human participants, they may wish to approve the content prior to publication. However, there are no constraints on you in terms of publishing your research if the information you have evaluated is publicly available to everyone for free.</p>
---	---

<p><u><i>European Code of Conduct for Research Integrity Guidance</i></u></p>	<p><u><i>LBU Ethics Policy and Ethics Procedure</i></u></p>
<p>Reviewing, Evaluating and Editing</p> <p>(a) Researchers take seriously their commitment to the research community by participating in refereeing, reviewing and evaluation.</p> <p>(b) Researchers review and evaluate submissions for publication, funding, appointment, promotion or reward in a transparent and justifiable manner.</p> <p>(c) Reviewers or editors with a conflict of interest withdraw from involvement in decisions on publication, funding, appointment, promotion or reward.</p> <p>(d) Reviewers maintain confidentiality unless there is prior approval for disclosure.</p> <p>(e) Reviewers and editors respect the rights of authors and applicants, and seek permission to make use of the ideas, data or interpretations presented.</p>	<p>1.) Researchers have a responsibility to take account of all relevant evidence and present it without omission, misrepresentation or deception. Data and information must not knowingly be fabricated or manipulated in a way which might lead to distortion.</p> <p>2.) The Policy and Procedures do not lay out the ways in which students should go about their REE process. It is more so implied that they should have done the REE process already before submitting.</p>

Research Ethics Audit Action Plan 2018/19 Monitoring Report 3: School of Built Environment and Engineering

Executive Summary

This report provides an update on progress on completing the 2018/19 Research Ethics Action Plan. It indicates that further progress has been made on the final uncompleted action concerned with overseas franchise courses but the action point remains ongoing.

Action Requested

The report is for information.

Appendices

Not applicable

Author

Name: Dr Neil Evans

Job title: Course Director BA Human Geography / Human Geography and Planning

Date: 8 May 2019

Approval Route

Not applicable

2018/19 Research Ethics Audit Action Plan Monitoring Report for School of Built Environment and Engineering

Introduction

The 2017/18 BEE Research Ethics Audit was completed in September 2018. It included an action plan for 2018/19. This report is a third update on progress towards addressing the actions contained therein.

School of Built Environment and Engineering Research Ethics - Action Plan 2018/19

Issue	Action	Responsibility	Deadline
1. A high level of non-compliance within the Civil Engineering Group	Liaise with CDs and Dissertation Module Leaders to ensure all staff are aware of the need to engage with the University research ethics procedures	SREC	Oct/Nov 2018
2. Some pockets of non-compliance within the Surveying Group UG courses	Liaise with CDs and Dissertation Module Leaders to ensure full compliance	SREC	Oct/Nov 2018
3. Need for research ethics staff training, particularly for new staff	Hold training event(s) in course groups	SREC	2018/19 Semester 1
4. Need to ensure students on overseas franchise courses are compliant with Leeds Beckett research ethics procedures	Liaise with CD responsible for overseas franchise courses and with LBU Link tutors to explain need to ensure compliance. If necessary provide relevant information and guidance to Module leaders at franchise institutions	SREC and LREC	2018/19 Semester 1
5. Research ethics data reports not user-friendly	Report this at next URESC meeting	SREC	3 Oct 18

Actions taken

1. Action 1 was completed before 5 Dec UREC meeting.
2. Action 2 was completed before 5 Dec UREC meeting.
3. Action 3 was completed before 5 Dec UREC meeting – the SREC carried out staff training for the Surveying, Construction and Project Management Group on 12 November and the LREC carried out staff training for the Civil Engineering Group soon after. The SREC subsequently carried out bespoke training for the new member of staff in the Planning, Housing and Human Geography Group
4. Action 4 is ongoing. Good progress was made with staff at the Asian Institute of Built Environment in Hong Kong, including making use of an accreditation visit to the Institute

and it is considered that they are now fully compliant with LBU's research ethics procedures. Contact has been made with the other overseas franchise institutions, namely Hong Kong College of Technology, the Rushmore Business School in Mauritius and KTG in Malaysia about verifying their processes. I will be setting up a meeting with the School Franchise Coordinator and Course Leaders shortly to discuss their response and decide what course of action if any is needed. I am also in the process of trying to arrange a meeting with a colleague in the School of Clinical and Applied Sciences to find out about best practice elsewhere in the University.

5. Action 5 was completed before 5 Dec UREC meeting.

Conclusions and recommendations

Actions 1, 2, 3, and 5 have been completed, while Action 4 is still ongoing.

References and further information

Not applicable

[Author(s)]

Dr Neil Evans, Research Ethics Coordinator, School of Built Environment and Engineering, 8 May 2019

RESEARCH ETHICS SUB-COMMITTEE

22 May 2019

Research Ethics Audit Outcomes: action plan monitoring: School of Computing, Creative Technology and Engineering

Executive Summary

Audit monitoring summary – School of Computing, Creative Technologies & Engineering.

Action Requested

The report is **for information.**

Appendices

None

Author

Name: Ben Dalton
Job title: Principal Lecturer
Date: 8 May 2019

Approval Route

N/A

Research Ethics Audit Report

Name of School:	School of Computing, Creative Technologies & Engineering
Author of School Report:	Ben Dalton
Outcomes / Actions carried over from the last audit:	
<p>I have taken over from Edward Abbott-Halpin as the Local Research Ethics Coordinator for the School of Computing, Creative Technologies & Engineering, with a hand-over during his departure from our university at the end of 2018 to take up the role of Principal University of the Highlands and Islands, Orkney College, and following his period of long-term health leave.</p> <p>Eddie had set out two objectives for the School within the Action Plan for the year:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Continue to train all supervisors of projects and dissertations. 2. Continue to review ethics process in School. <p>These both build on previous ongoing objectives, and Eddie reported them as complete at the time of hand over.</p> <p>I have followed up to agree our School process in cases that require school level oversight or consideration beyond the LREC process with representative colleagues, allowing the LREC to refer any approvals requiring consideration as part of regular meetings of Professors and Readers within the School. This ensures that a group of experienced research active colleagues can consider the more complex ethical approvals as required.</p>	



2019 Applications and Statistics:

[note these statistics are derived from access as LREC since January 2019]

Undergraduate

Risk Category 1	
Risk Category 2	
Risk Category 3	
<i>Total</i>	<i>No Data</i>

Postgraduate

Risk Category 1	21
Risk Category 2	19
Risk Category 3	0
<i>Total</i>	<i>40</i>

Staff

Risk Category 1	0
Risk Category 2	4
Risk Category 3	0
<i>Total</i>	<i>4</i>

For the first half of the academic year, in 2018, Eddie has commented that: as with last year, there does not appear to be anything of particular significance to report within the trends of the ethics approvals. The supervisors appear to have worked to keep the need for ethical approval at Undergraduate level to risk level 1. Further there is a fairly significant number of approvals rejected or subject to revision after intervention from the supervisors, with far fewer requiring this action from the LREC; this seems to indicate that the supervisors have taken heed of the guidance and training offered within the School.

The Feb 2018 cohort of MSc students who are submitting their dissertations on Sunday (12 May) all have approved ethics. Total number: 9. The September 2018 MSc students (total number 25) have submitted their proposals on Sunday (5 May), they should all be at least in the seeking approval stage.

Overview of Staff Development and Attendance at Staff Development:

Eddie confirmed that research ethics training and support has been offered to all relevant supervisor as an element of the module briefings and discussions throughout the year to all dissertation/final year project.

Outcomes of the Sampling Exercise and School Academic Committee scrutiny:

The Research Methods Module Leaders maintain a comprehensive sample, by spreadsheet, of all applications and throughout the process sample approximately 10% of each level of risk. This is also an element of the process that monitors the progress of the student and forms a requirement for them to pass the dissertation/final year project module.

What outcomes / comments / conclusions can be drawn from this exercise?

As LREC I have begun by reviewing approximately 10% of decisions that I have made for both Post Grad research and Staff applications, though being new to the role this is at an early stage.

In all cases, where necessary, feedback is provided to applicants on the specific issues that they need to address.

Research ethics and student projects undertaken outside of the UK:

Eddie reported that: the small number of students who have undertaken research outside the UK have been advised to check for local requirements, to undertake suitable risk assessments, and to fully explain the nature of such research within their ethics proposals and to the university travel insurance section, if appropriate.

Since starting the role, all students I have seen have thus far complied with these requests.

Information provided to students regarding non-compliance with the Research Ethics Policy:

Eddie reported that: all module handbooks contain clear guidance to students, both indicating directly the research ethics policy and referring students to the policy and procedure of the university at the relevant webpages.



CCTE Research Ethics - Action Plan 2019/20

Issue	Action	Responsibility	Deadline
Evaluation and play-testing in the ethics approval process.	Consider the relationship of evaluation and play-testing to the categories of the ethics approval process.	LREC with Research Methods Module Leaders	April 2020
Fairness, Accountability, and Transparency in (public) big data and AI.	Revisit wording of how publicly available data are treated in our guidelines in relation to large-scale data aggregation and/or potential for machine learning bias.	LREC with Readers and Professors	April 2020

Table 2 Postgraduate Taught course Research Ethical Authorisation and Approval for the Academic Year 2018/19

Subject Group/School	Courses / Modules	Number of ethical authorisations	Number of local level ethical approvals	Number of School level ethical approvals	Number of University Level ethical approvals	Number of students expected to apply for Ethical authorisation or approval	Difference in number of students enrolled and decisions made	Comments on figures by course.
						<i>(how many students in a L7 cohort expected to undertake a Major Independent Study project or similar)</i>		

Table 3 – Postgraduate Research Ethical Authorisation and Approval for the Academic Year 2018/19

Subject Group/School	Number of ethical authorisations	Number of local level ethical approvals	Number of School level ethical approvals	Number of university level ethical approvals	Total number of ethical authorisations / approvals required for new students	Difference in number of students enrolled and decisions made	Comments

Table 4 – Staff Ethical Authorisation and Approval for the Academic Year 2018/19

Subject Group/School	Number of local level ethical approvals	Number of School level ethical approvals	Number of university level ethical approvals	Total number of ethical approvals required for staff projects.	Difference in number of students enrolled and decisions made	Comments



**Research Ethics Action Plan Update 2018/19:
School of Clinical & Applied Sciences**

Executive Summary

Audit monitoring summary – School of Clinical and Applied Sciences

Action Requested

The report is **for information**

Appendices

Author

Name: Dr Rob Brooks
Job title: School Research Ethics Co-ordinator
Date: 9 May 2019

Approval Route

Not applicable



LEEDS BECKETT UNIVERSITY

SCHOOL OF CLINICAL &
APPLIED SCIENCES

School of Clinical and Applied Sciences – Research Ethics Action Plan Update 2018/19

Dr Rob Brooks – School Research Ethics Co-ordinator

9th May 2019

Issue	Action	Responsibility	Deadline	Comment	Outcome (May 2019)
1. Develop a school research training and development programme, including opportunity for ethical debate.	For discussion and planning at LREC meeting	RB + LRECs	December 2018	This has been discussed at SREG and agreed that training and development would be delivered, where needed, to course groups.	Achieved
2. Develop minimum documentation standards for each risk category, to inform training and audit.	For discussion and planning at LREC meeting	RB + LRECs	March 2019	This has been discussed at SREG – plan to implement at next audit.	On-going
3. Review and develop local process for recording research ethics outcomes.	Coordinator to discuss with school research admin.	RB + admin	August 2019	Discussion has been held with research ethics admin who have put in place a recording processes. This should enable easier and faster auditing.	Achieved
4. Peer application review	For discussion and planning at LREC meeting	RB + LRECs	August 2019	All LRECs have a buddy that they can use for peer review. This process is discussed at SREG meetings.	Achieved
5. Review non-compliance statements in module handbooks	For discussion and planning at LREC meeting	RB + LRECs	March 2019	This has been discussed at SREG and all LRECs have discussed this with research module leads,	Achieved
6. Need for clearer statements about the storage of data	For discussion at SREG	RB + LRECs	August 2019	This issue was added in February 2019 following discussion at SCA. To be discussed at next School Research Meeting	On-going

Action Plan Monitoring – Cultural Studies & Humanities

Executive Summary

Update on Ethics compliance within the School of Cultural Studies and Humanities, since 23/02/19.

Action Requested

Issue	Action	Responsibility	Deadline
1. School Secretary (Adele Jackson) requires full access to Online Ethics System, if she hasn't got this.	Raised at the University Research Ethics Sub-Committee October, 2018	LREC; Chair URESC	Ongoing
2. Hand-over to new LREC	Need for new LREC raised at last URESC	LREC outgoing	ongoing

Appendices

None

Author

Heather Shore
Professor of History, CSH
23/02/19

Approval Route

<Date><Month><Year> <Approving Person / Body>

<Date><Month><Year> <Approving Person / Body>

<Date><Month><Year> <Approving Person / Body>

Ethics Update for School of Cultural Studies and Humanities

Introduction

This report outlines compliance and developments in Ethics policy since February 2019.

Report

Things are largely unchanged since the last report. LRECs (Shore, Robbins, Raisborough) have periodically issued reminders to their colleagues undertaking dissertation supervision. The LREC (Shore) gave a short session on Ethics to the MA Social History Students in March. Until the audit is completed later this year, it is not possible to address the School Secretary's access to the system.

Conclusions and recommendations

Compliance to be revisited once audit completed. More work still needs to be done on ethics compliance in staff research project.

References and further information

N/A

Author

Heather Shore
Professor of History
06/05/19

22 May 2019

School of Film, Music and Performing Arts
School Research Ethics Action Plan Monitoring 2018-19

Executive Summary

The report provides an update on the 2018-19 action plan for the School of Film, Music and Performing Arts. The report has been submitted to the School Research Ethics Committee for information.

Action Requested

The report is for information.

[Report authors should also indicate which committees / areas should receive the report and why following consideration by the Board/Committee]

Appendices

[Please list and give details of any appendices accompanying the report.]

Author

Name: Dr Paul Thompson
Job title: FMPA School Research Ethics Co-ordinator
Date: 30th April 2019

Approval Route

N/a

School of Film, Music and Performing Arts School Research Ethics Action Plan

Introduction

The terms of reference for the University Research Ethics Sub-Committee ('URESC') expect the sub-committee to oversee the implementation of the University Policy & Procedures for Research Ethics and monitor ethical approval within the Schools. The Schools are required to submit an annual audit report to the URESC outlining and reviewing how the Policy is being implemented whilst also recommending where improvements should be made. This report was submitted and the following interim report outlines the action plan that arose from this audit.

The Audit and Action Plan

The Schools were asked to:

- (a) Provide details about how the recommendations made in the outcomes of the previous audit at the older, relevant, faculty level have been addressed through the action plan;
- (b) Provide a summary of all ethical authorisations and approvals during 2017/18;
- (c) Provide details of all research ethics staff development training undertaken within the School during 2017/18;
- (d) Provide a review of what Schools have in place to assure themselves that international students are complying with the University's Research Ethics Policy and Procedures.
- (e) Provide a review of the guidance provided by each school in the module handbooks concerning the consequences

In light of the 2017/18 action plan for 2018/19 was developed as follows:

Issue	Action	Responsibility	Deadline
1. Some ambiguity around the role of Supervisor, LREC and SREC	Design and deliver bespoke training to LRECs and SREC in the School of FMFA.	SREC and UREC	Ongoing
2. Some Staff research may not be submitted through the online application system.	Encourage staff applications by meeting with Academic leads and course directors	SREC	Dec 2019
3. Additional documentation might be duplicated if research project is similar	Review documentation types, seek best practice and develop templates/exemplar documents if necessary	SREC	Dec 2019
4. Some areas of the school may not be fully aware of the ethics procedures and/or the new online system in development.	Meet with academic leads across the school to ensure they are aware of current developments	SREC and UREC	Dec 2019

Report

Issue	Response
1. Some ambiguity around the role of Supervisor, LREC and SREC	2 LREC training sessions were delivered by the UREC in September 2018. Bespoke training has been designed by the UREC and will be delivered at a time convenient to staff who were unable to attend this training.
2. Some Staff research may not be submitted through the online application system.	Staff applications have been encouraged at team meetings and this encouragement is ongoing.
3. Additional documentation might be duplicated if research project is similar	A review of documentation types has been scheduled for Summer 2019.
4. Some areas of the school may not be fully aware of the ethics procedures and/or the new online system in development.	A meeting has been scheduled with academic leads across the school to ensure they are aware of current developments

Conclusions

The action plan will continue to be monitored and reported on after the following year's audit. It is hoped that points 3 and 4 of the action plan will be completed by December 2019.



RESEARCH ETHICS SUB-COMMITTEE

22 May 2019

School of Health & Community Studies Research ethics audit action plan monitoring 2018-19

Executive Summary

This report is an update on progress towards addressing the actions for 2018-19 from the School's Research Ethics audit report for 2017-18.

Action Requested

The report is **for discussion**.

Appendices

n/a

Author

Name: Professor Fraser Brown
Job title: School Research Ethics Co-ordinator
Date: 15 April 2019

Approval Route

School of Health & Community Studies

Research ethics audit action plan monitoring 2018-19

	Issue in 2017-18	Action in 2018-19	Responsibility	Deadline	Progress
1	<p><u>Data management:</u> For projects where personal data is collected, the data management information is to be clearly articulated in applications, and in participant information sheets and consent forms, in line with the requirements of the General Data Protection Regulation (GDPR) and Data Protection Act 2018 for research data.</p>	<p>Request that supervisors and LRECs review in particular the section 7 of the application regarding data management (e.g., security, retention, access and destruction) in line with the main principles for research data of GDPR (lawfulness, purpose, data minimisation, accuracy, storage, access, security, overseas transfer, accountability) and the new Data Protection Act 2018.</p> <p><i>This action will be reviewed as part of the sampling exercise in the 2018-19 audit.</i></p>	SREC to advise academic staff	Sept 2018	<p>School staff were advised on 26 September 2018 of this action.</p> <p>School staff were contacted on 22 November 2018 regarding the University's new Data Management Policy for staff.*</p> <p>Queries have arisen on reviewing DMPs as part of the research ethics approval process, and guidance has been requested on this. We await further guidance from the University.</p>
2	<p><u>Supporting documentation:</u> Adequate supporting documentation to be submitted with an application, to reduce the number of submissions made to obtain approval for a project.</p>	<p>To remind research supervisors of the support provided for students in the Research Ethics Procedures regarding the production of supporting documentation, to help reduce the number of submissions made to obtain approval for a project.</p> <p><i>This action will be reviewed as part of the sampling exercise in the 2018-19 audit.</i></p>	SREC to advise academic staff	Sept 2018	<p>School staff were advised on 26 September 2018 of this action.</p>

	Issue in 2017-18	Action in 2018-19	Responsibility	Deadline	Progress
3	<p><u>Maximum number of versions submitted in order to obtain approval for a project:</u> To limit the number of versions that can be submitted to obtain ethical approval for a student project.</p>	<p>Supervisors, research module leaders and LRECs to consider limiting the number of versions of an application that can be submitted (eg, three versions), if version 3 cannot still be approved without major revisions (at this point, students would have received feedback from a supervisor and/or LREC at least twice). Students can then undertake a literature review instead of primary research (submitting a new research ethics application for this). <u>If this is taken forward, the details will need to be included in the module handbook so students are aware.</u></p> <p><i>This action will be checked as part of the sampling exercise in the 2018-19 audit.</i></p>	SREC to advise research supervisors and LRECs	Sept 2018	<p>School staff were advised on 26 September 2018 of this action.</p> <p>One subject area has advised that they are following this process with the following text used in the module handbook: ‘You must follow the guidance provided regarding obtaining ethical approval. It is your responsibility to ensure you have received ethical approval evidence prior to any data collection. Your Supervisor can help with this process. If your application is rejected or revisions are required, you will be given the opportunity to address the issues raised. However, if your application is rejected or revisions are required on three occasions, ethical approval will not be given on the third attempt. As a result, you will not be able to undertake empirical research for your project, and you will need to submit a new application for a desk-based study, i.e. an extended literature review.’</p>
4	<p><u>Staff training:</u> Sessions to be arranged and opportunities to discuss research ethical issues.</p>	<p>The School will deliver staff training sessions in semester 1 and 2, 2018-19. Dates to be advised to staff as soon as possible. Staff will be asked if there are specific topics they would like to discuss.</p> <p><i>For this action, attendance will be monitored for next year’s audit.</i></p>	SREC and secretary	Sept 2018	<p>An ethics training session was held on 9 October 2018. A second session is planned for 8 May and has been incorporated into the School’s research seminar programme.</p>

	Issue in 2017-18	Action in 2018-19	Responsibility	Deadline	Progress
5	Research undertaken outside of the UK: Guidance for student overseas research	Student overseas research projects guidance will be reviewed again when the proposed University checklist for research being undertaken outside of the UK is available, including reference to indemnity cover.	SREC and secretary	when available	The proposed University checklist is awaited. The wording from the recent University ethics guide is noted: 'Students and Supervisors must consider specific risks of conducting research overseas, particularly of a sensitive cultural or security nature and of potential reputational damage to third parties or the University. An initial discussion with Insurance and Risk may be of benefit at the outset. Liability and travel covers, global assistance resources and training will be made available prior to travel.'

Data Management and Research Ethics: http://libguides.leedsbeckett.ac.uk/research/research_data

- All research projects need to show how data are managed to receive ethical approval. This will normally be through a Data Management Plan (**staff only**)
- All participants in research projects normally have to give their informed consent (with any exceptions in line with the [Research Ethics Policy](#) and [Procedures](#))
- All data in the life of a project need to be stored securely, accessible only through password-protected files. The Data Management Plan needs to identify processes for secure archiving and destruction
- If data are to be made openly accessible, then informed consent forms and information sheets need to include this use. Where data will be made openly accessible, the data must be anonymised, and all participants must understand how that takes place so that they are comfortable taking part in the research
- Not all data from every research project needs to be made openly accessible as not all data are suitable for anonymisation and publishing openly. However, the University believes there is a strong ethical case to move anonymised data into openly accessible repositories

Data Management Plans - staff only

Your **Data Management Plan** (DMP) describes what you will collect and how you will organise, analyse, preserve and share your data, taking into account the whole lifecycle of your data. Completing it helps ensure you meet funder requirements (where applicable) and you should complete it as early as possible during the research project. If your research project is externally funded by a research council or charitable organisation, [check if they have their own DMP](#). Otherwise, you should download and use the Leeds Beckett University DMP.

Leeds Beckett University has agreed the following policy on Research Data Management, covering the activities of all researchers in our institution, both staff and students. It is acknowledged that full implementation of this policy will take place over a period of time.

1. Research data will be managed to the highest standards throughout the research data lifecycle, and will take into account the definitions and principles described in the [RCUK Concordat on Open Research Data 2016](#)
2. Responsibility for research data management through an appropriate **research data management plan**; during any research project or programme lies primarily with Principal Investigators (PIs)

3. All new research projects must include **research data management plans** that explicitly address data capture, management, integrity, confidentiality, retention, deletion, sharing and publication
4. Research data management plans must outline how research data are available for access and re-use where appropriate, under appropriate safeguards, and subject to ethical considerations
5. Where possible, researchers should seek to recover the direct costs of managing research data generated by projects from the research funder
6. The University will provide training, support, advice and, where appropriate, guidelines and templates for management of research data and for research data management plans
7. Our University will provide mechanisms and services for storage, backup, registration, deposit and retention of research data assets in support of current and future access, during and after completion of research projects
8. The Principal Investigator (PI) should ensure that all relevant research data are offered and assessed for deposit and preservation in an appropriate University, national or international data service or domain repository, unless specified otherwise in the data management plan. Any non-digital or digital data which is retained elsewhere, for example in an international data service or domain repository should be registered with the University, for example in our University repository
9. Data should not be deposited with any organisation that does not commit to its access and availability for re-use, unless this is a condition of the project funding or arising from other requirements
10. Exclusive rights to reuse or publish research data should not be handed over to commercial publishers or agents without retaining the rights to make the data openly available for re-use, unless this is a condition of funding
11. All relevant data and the intellectual properties rights of that data are subject to our University's IPR policy

22 May 2019

2018/ 2019 Research Ethics Audit Outcomes – Action Plan Monitoring (Leeds Business School)

Executive Summary

This brief report offers an update on matters relating to Research Ethics since the last report to this committee.

Action Requested

For information

Appendices

Author

Name: Dr Brian Jones
Job title: Senior Lecturer
Date: 7 May 2019

Approval Route

Not applicable

LBS Research Ethics Action Plan 2018-19

Issue	Action	Responsibility	Deadline
Increase completion rates of UG franchise/ overseas applications	To ensure all relevant module/course leaders, course directors, supervisors and LRECS are aware of the off-line process, we will: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> I. Identify all programme leads II. Identify good practice from PG programmes III. Provide additional training to UG leads IV. Report progress at each SRERG 	SRERG Co-ordinator, Research Ethics Support and LRECs	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> I. End November 2018 II. End December 2018 III. End February 2019 IV. Quarterly
Work is ongoing on this issue, an update will be presented at the LBS Research Ethics Review Group in May.			
Ensure all new DA cohort staff and students are aware of the Ethics Procedures	To ensure all DA ethics applications are submitted, we will: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> I. Liaise with the Course Director to identify upcoming delivery II. Offer specific ethics training support during block delivery periods and appoint a LREC for DA provision III. Review and provide additional guidance as necessary IV. Report progress at each SRERG 	SRERG Co-ordinator and Research Ethics Support	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> I. End October 2018 II. End November 2018 III. From end of November 2018 IV. Quarterly
Students are engaging with the Research Ethics process earlier in their programmes, and working through the system on delivery days has improved the quality of applications. The assessment for the project module has been changed to include a mark for the proposal which takes into account submission of the ethics form.			
Raise awareness and usage of the new online ethics system once rolled out	To ensure the smooth transition from the old system to the new, we will: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> I. Schedule a series of training sessions to introduce the new system II. Provide ad hoc support and guidance as necessary III. Monitor usage, feedback and report any issues to URESC IV. Review progress at each SRERG 	SRERG Co-ordinator and Research Ethics Support	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> I. TBC (depending on when the new system is available) II. TBC III. TBC IV. Quarterly

N/A following the disappointing announcement regarding the new system.			
Reduce common pitfalls which can result in applications being rejected/revisions requested	<p>To assist with common issues and improve support available, we will:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> I. Develop one-page good practice guidance for staff and students II. Provide templates where necessary III. Review progress at each SRERG 	SRERG Co-ordinator and Research Ethics Support	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> I. End October 2018 II. End October 2018 III. Quarterly
Further good practice guidance has been circulated from other Schools which will be incorporated into the LBS good practice guide.			



**Research Ethics audit Outcomes 2017/18 action plan monitoring:
School of Social Sciences**

Executive Summary

Audit monitoring summary – School of Social Sciences

Action Requested

The report is **for information**

Appendices

Author

Name: Dr Sophia Price

Job title: Head of Politics and International Relations, School of Social Sciences

Date: 9 May 2019

Approval Route

Not applicable

School of Social Sciences Research Ethics Action Plan Update May 2018

School of Social Sciences Research Ethics Action Plan 2018-19 Update

	Issue	Action	Responsibility	Deadline	Progress
1	Data Quality	SREC and Administrator to work with URESC & Research Office to ensure reports generating data are accurate and available in useful format	SREC	April 2019	A full review of the data has been undertaken. A new SREC and Administrator have been appointed and are working with School Admin Team to ensure all data is accurate. We are reviewing the recording of Staff, PhD and MA ethics applications at the Subject Group Level to improve monitoring of compliance
2	Multiple Submissions	SREC and LRECs to work with Staff and Students to avoid multiple submissions	SREC and LRECs	December 2018	This remains an issue and is under review by the School Research Ethics Committee
3	Staff Approvals	Ensure all new staff gain ethical authorisation, even for projects which have been approved elsewhere	SREC	April 2019	Held a LREC training event by UREC in January 2019 to ensure compliance. Recording of compliance will be included in review of action point 1

Additional In Year Actions

1. Due to the appointment of new SREC, administrator and several new LRECs a training meeting was held in January 2019, a new School of Social Sciences Research Ethics Committee and School Level Research Ethics Review Group has been formed
2. To ensure compliance with action plan, a School wide research ethics training event will be held in sept 2019
3. LREC Meeting in May included training by Research Office on Data Management Plans, school wide training will be added to school training event in sept 2019

2018/ 19 Applications Year to Date

Year to date approved applications are 719. There has been a total of 6 risk category 3 projects approved and 3 projects under the Prevent category approved by UREC

Full Data presented in Tables 1- 4.

	Risk 1	Risk 2	Risk 3	Prevent
UG	291	233	1	3
PGT	35	29	0	0
PGR	1	5	1	0
Staff	82	37	4	0
Total	409	304	6	3

Table 1: Social Sciences Undergraduate Courses 2018-19

Course	Approved Supervisor	Approved LREC	Approved LREC	Approved School	Approved School	Pending	PREVENT	Total Decision	Total Expected	Diff	Notes
	Cat 1	Cat 2	Cat 3	Cat 2	Cat 3		UREC				
CRIMINOLOGY & PSYCHOLOGY	53	18	0	0	0	1	0	72	75	3	
PSYCHOLOGY & SOCIETY	15	21	0	0	0	0	0	36	34	+2	
IR & PEACE	10	5	0	0	0	0	1	15	15	0	
CRIMINOLOGY	101	29	0	0	0	0	2	130	139	9	10x MITS (crim/crim psych)
IR & GLOB DEV	10	0	0	0	0	0	0	10	14	4	MITS and NS
POLITICS	18	1	0	0	0	0	0	19	23	4	MITS and NS
SOCIOLOGY	25	32	0	0	0	4	0	61	68	7	MITS and NS
PSYCHOLOGY	59	127	1			2	0	189	198	9	13x MITS
TOTAL	291	233	1	0	0	7	3	532	566	-34	

Table 2 Social Sciences Postgraduate Taught Courses 2018-19 (SEPT STARTERS ONLY)

Course	Approved Supervisor	Approved LREC	Approved LREC	Approved School	Approved School	Pending	PREVENT	Total Decision	Total Expected	Diff	Notes
	Cat 1	Cat 2	Cat 3	Cat 2	Cat 3		UREC				
PEACE AND DEV	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	6	4	(inc 2 PT)
CRIMINOLOGY	8	4	0	0	0	2	0	14	23	9	(inc 2 PT)
INT HUMAN RIGHTS PRACTICE	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	14	12	(inc 1 PT)
INTERDISCIPLINARY PSYCHOLOGY	4	2	0	0	0	0	0	6	18	12	(Inc 5 PT)
INTERNATIONAL POLITICAL ECONOMY	2	0	0	0	0	1	0	3	6	3	(Incl 1 PT)
INTERNATIONAL RELATIONS	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	10	9	(Incl 1 PT)
SPSYC	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	2	0	2	
PSYCHOLOGY (incl DL)	15	22				12	0	49	87	38	(incl 35 PT)
TOTAL	35	29	0	0	0	15	0	79	164	87	

22 May 2019

2018/ 2019 Research Ethics Audit Outcomes – Action Plan Monitoring (Carnegie School of Sport)

Executive Summary

An update on the 2018 / 2019 Research Ethics Action Plan from the Carnegie School of Sport.

Appendices

Appendix 1. Action Plan and Progress to Date

Author

John O'Hara

Professor of Sport and Exercise Physiology

8th May 2019

RESEARCH ETHICS SUB-COMMITTEE

22 May 2019

Appendix 1: School of Sport: Research Ethics - Action Plan 2018/19

Issue	Action	Responsibility	Original Deadline	Progress
1. Increase staff and student's awareness of research ethics policy and procedures in preparation to make all staff LRECs.	Provide training on research ethics policy and procedures for staff where appropriate.	Chair/LRECs	31/07/18	Training has been delivered by the 'Super' LREC's to the staff who are new this academic year to supervising dissertations.
2. To support staff/LRECs with resources	Provide exemplar ethics applications, especially UG applications	Chair/LRECs/ Supervisors	31/07/18	This is an on-going item, which is discussed at each advisory group meeting.
3.To continue to provide feedback to URESC on the University Policy, Procedures and Online system	Written communications to the Chair of URESC	Chair	31/07/18	On-going
4. Recruitment a Deputy Chair	Advertise, shortlist and appoint a Deputy Chair	Chair/Director of Research	01/11/2018	A decision has been made that a Deputy Chair is not required.
5. Sampling procedure for UG/PG ethics applications.	To undertake appropriate sampling of ethical submissions.	Chair/SREG	31/07/18	This process has started for UG dissertation ethics submissions.
6. Annual Review of 'Best Practice'.	Delivery of relevant workshops, discussing our 'Best Practice'.	Chair/SREG	31/07/18	On-going
7. Appoint new LREC with specific Strength and Conditioning Expertise	Recruit relevant academic staff member	Chair	01/09/2018	Alex Dinsdale was appointed on the 1 st September 2018.

8. Appoint a new external member	Make contact with appropriate contacts and recruit a new external member of the committee.	Chair	01/10/2018	Shaunna Burke from Leeds University was appointed but has since resigned. A new external needs to be recruited.
9. Develop and implement new and relevant GDPR and IT security measures.	Work with the University to develop appropriate policies, to be disseminated to staff and students.	Chair/SREG	01/12/2018	Mathew Page (IT Security Manager) has meet with the Advisory group to discuss IT security for research data.

Draft Research Incentives Guidelines

Executive Summary

This report provides draft research incentive guidelines, following discussion at the Away Day and an agreement that Leeds Beckett University had to develop guidelines on research incentives.

Action Requested

The sub-committee is required to approve the guidelines.

Appendices

None.

Author

Name: Professor Karl Spracklen

Title: Chair, URESC

Date: 01 May 2019

Approval Route

01 May 2019

Professor Karl Spracklen / Chair, URESC

RESEARCH INCENTIVES GUIDELINES

Introduction

This report provides draft research incentive guidelines, following discussion at the Away Day and an agreement that Leeds Beckett University had to develop guidelines on research incentives. The current risk assessment mentions payments, but we have been unclear about what the ethical risk is, and what we might consider to be good or best practice. The draft below has been put together drawing on a number of existing guidelines.

Research Incentives Guidelines – Proposal Draft

1. Incentives may be offered to potential research participants, providing the incentives are proportionate.
2. Incentives must not be connected to any services or products in which the University or the lead researcher have any financial interest.
3. Researchers offering incentives need to make it clear to participants about how they will be awarded the incentives, and participants must be told how withdrawing from the project may affect the award of the incentive.
4. Researchers need to make sure that personal data and anonymity is not compromised by managing a system of incentives.

Conclusions and recommendations

The sub-committee is required to approve the guidelines.

References and further information

None.

Author

Professor Karl Spracklen, Chair, URESC, 01 May 2019



Schedule of meetings and business 2019/20

Executive Summary

The report presents the Sub-Committee's schedule of meetings and business for 2019/20.

Action Requested

The report is for information and discussion. The Sub-Committee is invited to note its schedule of meetings and business for 2019/20.

Should any additional items be identified that are agreed to come to future meetings then these items will be added to the schedule. Please contact the Chair and Secretary of the meeting if you wish to propose additional items of business.

Appendices

None

Author

Name: Pam McLaren
Job title: Personal Assistant
Date: 10 May 2019

Research Ethics Sub-Committee: DRAFT Schedule of meetings and business for 2019/20

02 October 2019 Deadline – 18 September 2019	11 December 2019 Deadline – 27 November 2019	04 March 2020 Deadline – 19 February 2020	20 May 2020 Deadline – 06 May 2020
School Research Ethics Audits 2018/19	2018/19 Research Ethics Audit outcomes – action plan monitoring	2018/19 Research Ethics Audit outcomes – action plan monitoring	2018/19 Research Ethics Audit outcomes – action plan monitoring
List of institutions/ethics committees that have been agreed for light touch approval process	Discussion about an away-day for research-ethics in the University	Feedback from away-day for the management of ethics in the University	
Overview of the management of Research Ethics at School level	New Research Ethics Online System	Proposal for School Research Ethics Audit Process for 2019/20	
Implementation of the Research Ethics Procedures	Research Ethics Training		
European Code of Conduct for Research Integrity – mapping			
Standing items			
Membership & terms of reference (generally first meeting only but also should feature on the agenda when there are any changes proposed to the TOR or Membership profile)	PREVENT update (Plus 2019/20 Annual PREVENT Update (K. Spracklen/Secretary))		
Declarations of interest			
Minutes of the last meeting			
Matters arising			
Schedule of business			