

ROYAL CENTRAL
SCHOOL OF SPEECH & DRAMA • UNIVERSITY OF LONDON

**RESEARCH ETHICS AND INTEGRITY
HANDBOOK
2022/23**

CONTENTS

CONTENTS	2
FOREWORD	4
1 INTRODUCTION	5
2 RESEARCH CONDUCT AND INTEGRITY	7
2.1 OVERVIEW	7
2.2 SCOPE	8
2.3 RESEARCH INVOLVING HUMAN PARTICIPANTS	8
2.4 COLLABORATIVE RESEARCH	12
2.5 HEALTH AND SAFETY	13
2.6 RISK ASSESSMENT	13
2.7 INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY AND THE DISSEMINATION OF RESEARCH	13
2.8 FINANCE	14
2.9 DATA PROTECTION	15
2.10 LEGISLATION, INTERNAL POLICIES AND CRIMINAL OFFENCES	16
2.11 INSURANCE AND LIABILITY	17
2.12 DEVELOPMENT AND TRAINING	17
3 RESEARCH ETHICS	18
3.1 INTRODUCTION	18
3.2 DEFINITIONS AND PRINCIPLES	18
3.3 RESEARCH ETHICS REVIEW PROCESS	19
3.4 RESEARCH ETHICS FULL APPLICATION PROCESS	21
3.5 RESEARCH ETHICS GOVERNANCE ARRANGEMENTS	22
4 RESEARCH MISCONDUCT	23
4.1 INTRODUCTION	23
4.2 EXAMPLES OF RESEARCH MISCONDUCT	23
4.3 GENERAL PRINCIPLES	24
4.4 ROLES AND RESPONSIBILITIES	24
4.5 INVESTIGATION PROCESS	24
4.6 STAFF NOT EMPLOYED BY THE SCHOOL	25
APPENDIX 1	26
SOURCES	26
APPENDIX 2	28
RESEARCH ETHICS AND FUNDING GUIDELINES	28
APPENDIX 3	30

RESEARCH ETHICS REVIEW FORM (LOW RISK) Error! Bookmark not defined.

APPENDIX 4..... 34

 RESEARCH ETHICS REVIEW FORM (FULL APPLICATION)..... 34

APPENDIX 5..... 35

 SAMPLE INFORMED CONSENT TEMPLATES..... 35

APPENDIX 6..... 38

 GUIDANCE ON ETHICAL REVIEW FOR STAFF/STUDENTS ON TAUGHT COURSES 38

APPENDIX 7..... 40

 Research Ethics and Integrity Workflow Processes 40

Authored/Modified by	Research Ethics and Integrity Sub-Committee
Date	November 2022
Date confirmed	Research Ethics and Integrity Sub-Committee, November 2022
Version	8

FOREWORD

The Royal Central School of Speech and Drama's *Research Ethics and Integrity Handbook* provides staff and students with detailed guidance on best practice in undertaking research to an appropriate ethical, legal and professional standard.

This handbook is underpinned by commitments made in our institutional Strategic Plan 2021-23. One key objective has a particular relevance to this handbook: 'Deepening our engagement with challenge-led research, responsive to the needs of both local and wider communities, and consolidating our increasingly visible position in the sector by providing a civic model for ethical research leadership underpinned by meaningful actions, including a commitment to diversifying the field'. This commitment is about the ways we work, engage, research and create. It is about what we value and why.

Universities UK's [Concordat to support research integrity](#) has provided the HE sector with a national framework for good research conduct and its governance. Central endorses the *Concordat*, and has reviewed all of its related policies and procedures so that they align with it. At the same time, the guidelines provided in this handbook have also been written to ensure their consistency with other relevant sources of sector best practice, in particular the policies on good research conduct provided by Conservatoires UK and UKRI.

Research integrity and ethical conduct in undertaking research are shared endeavours, and everybody engaged in research should be cognisant of their responsibilities both to the School and to the wider community in upholding the best possible standards in their work. Central will continue to monitor and enhance its guidelines and policies around research conduct, ethics and integrity to ensure that they remain appropriate and relevant and in dialogue with the broader research communities and participants in research we are involved with. The handbook is reviewed on a yearly basis to ensure it responds to developments in the sector.

I would like to extend my thanks to the Chair of the Research Ethics and Integrity Sub-Committee and our Postdoctoral Research Assistant for working to ensure that dialogues about ethics and integrity underpin all our research activities.

Professor Maria Delgado
Vice Principal (Research and Knowledge Exchange)

1 INTRODUCTION

This handbook, and the policies, procedures and guidelines contained within it, has been developed to support all staff and students engaged in research at The Royal Central School of Speech and Drama (Central, or the School) in conducting that research to the highest ethical, legal and professional standards. It applies equally to academic staff (whether on scholarship or research contracts), students on taught and research degrees and visiting researchers; and to all research outputs and research activity.

The handbook is supplemented by induction activities for staff and students, and by regular training and refresher events for staff.

Central's research ethics and integrity policies are framed, in the national context, by the [Concordat to Support Research Integrity](#) published by Universities UK (UUK). The *Concordat* understands research integrity in relation to core elements of honesty, rigour, transparency and open communication, care and respect, and accountability which applies to all aspects of research from preparation, dissemination and review. The research ethics processes outlined in this handbook are connected to these core elements and are framed in relation to them. This document outlines a series of principles and commitments that enable organisations and individuals engaged in research to undertake their work with common values of rigour and integrity and to conform to all related ethical, legal and professional obligations. The [Code of Practice for Research](#) produced by the UK Research Integrity Office (UKRIO) similarly provides guidance on good practice in research and has been used in the development of this document. As a member of Conservatoires UK (CUK), Central is also bound by that organisation's ethics procedure and has drawn up its associated policies to ensure alignment. Finally, underpinning this national context are the statutes, Acts of Parliament and Government guidelines relevant to good conduct in research (including the Data Protection Act and Prevent duty guidance). A list of sources is provided in [appendix 1](#).

The procedures outlined in this handbook have been designed to align with related School policies - primarily its Ethical Policy Framework, but also, for example, its Health and Safety and Whistleblowing policies. [Section 4](#) of the handbook provides details of Central's research misconduct procedures, which are linked to its staff and student disciplinary processes.

The School's Research Services is responsible for providing guidance to all levels of the institution on the application of good conduct and ethics in research, and keeps a record of staff and postgraduate research student work requiring ethical approval. This handbook and its implementation are reviewed annually by the School's Research Ethics and Integrity Sub-Committee (REISC), taking into account changes in the external research environment, statutory and legislative developments and recommendations from external research funders and external examiners and national and international legislation. In addition (and in keeping with the commitments outlined in the UUK's *Concordat*), the Research Ethics and

Integrity Sub-Committee reports annually to the School's governing body on research integrity issues (including an overview of any research misconduct investigations that have been undertaken). Furthermore, there is normally a five-yearly audit of Central's research ethics procedures, involving external representation.

2 RESEARCH CONDUCT AND INTEGRITY

2.1 OVERVIEW

The Royal Central School of Speech and Drama aims to provide ethical leadership within the discipline of theatre and performance practices. We believe that integrity is key to the way we engage with other researchers, undertake peer review and provide critical feedback. Ethics and integrity are core to our responsibility as researchers and guide the way we conduct research alone and with contributors. As such, this handbook is intended to ensure that all our projects are conducted according to the highest standards of integrity, including by minimising and managing ethical risks. Staff with responsibility for students undertaking research should ensure that students are made aware of research conduct expectations.

Research should be conducted for the purposes of furthering knowledge or establishing substantial new insights. The creation of new knowledge should be for public, rather than private, benefit. This handbook has been drawn up with the specific aim of assisting all researchers based at the School with conducting their research to the highest professional and ethical standards. It is presented with the intention of facilitating (rather than inhibiting) research and to promote a culture where staff and students consider and reflect on the ethical implications of their work.

The handbook has been written with particular reference to the [Nolan Committee on Standards in Public Life](#). The Nolan Committee identified seven principles for public life:

- selflessness;
- integrity;
- objectivity;
- accountability;
- openness;
- honesty;
- leadership.

These principles should be used to guide and inform any research process.

It is Central's requirement that all research undertaken within the institution by staff and students should accord with the School's equal opportunities statements, risk assessment procedures, data protection legislation and general standards of good practice in the treatment of others (including non-humans). Because the school encourages all staff and students to engage in a process of critical self-reflection in relation to intellectual work and practice, it is expected that attention to social and ethical issues in research will be at the forefront of academic endeavour. Staff and students engaged in research are expected to foster good practice and intellectual integrity in all professional circumstances.

Particular principles that should be emphasised by researchers at all levels are:

- care and avoidance of harm;
- honesty and openness;
- accountability and appropriate documentation;
- confidentiality;
- informed consent;
- avoidance of conflicts of interest;
- compliance with the law and relevant codes of conduct;
- due acknowledgement of collaborators, informants, participants or other contributors.
- Researchers should also be aware of best professional conduct in relation to animal and child welfare, as appropriate for their research.

These principles do not conflict with academic freedom, which allows individual researchers to pursue projects that may be unfashionable, provocative or unpopular, or which may include elements that open difficult ethical questions.

2.2 SCOPE

Everyone involved in research must accept full responsibility for the way in which it is conducted. For academic staff, this includes the activities of any staff, students or others under their direction or supervision.

It is the responsibility of everybody engaged in research at Central to arrange for the ethical review and approval of their work. This includes the importance of ensuring good practice in the design of all research projects with due attention paid to ethical review, clear determination of roles and responsibilities, identification of potential conflicts of interest, appropriate collection and storage of research data. [Section 3](#) provides full details of the School's ethics guidelines and procedures.

2.3 RESEARCH INVOLVING HUMAN PARTICIPANTS

It is to be expected that much research in Central will involve human participants. This can include, but is not restricted to, workshop participants, interviewees, those participating in focus groups and participants who are being observed in non-structured settings.

All research involving human participants must be submitted for ethical review prior to the start of the research (see [section 3](#)).

If you are undertaking a research project with an external partner organisation or research institution and the project has undergone an ethical review process external to the School, you are required to provide details of ethical approval to the Research Ethics and Integrity Subcommittee by emailing the approval to ethcs@cassd.ac.uk.

Participants should have sufficient knowledge of the project and the implications of consenting to taking part. 'Informed consent', which will be supported by a plain language statement, means that the researcher has a responsibility to explain the project in appropriate detail. See below for more details: a standard informed consent pro forma can be found in [appendix 5](#), as well as further guidance on informed consent. It is important that participants understand and actively consent to participate in the research and therefore appropriate methods to ensure informed consent (such as non-written methods and informed assent) can and should be considered. Questions about alternative methods of ensuring informed consent should be addressed to ethics@cssd.ac.uk

Inducements, such as financial payments or other incentives (other than reimbursements for travel expenses and in some cases time) should form part of your ethical consideration.

Research projects undertaken by staff and research students that involve particularly complex issues relating to human participants (for example, in terms of their consent or the scope and detail of the information with which they are provided) should be submitted for full ethical approval (Full Application): refer to [section 3](#) of this handbook for more information. Full applications are typically referred to the Conservatoires UK Research Ethics Committee and further details and timelines about this process can be found on the [Conservatoires UK website](#).

Confidentiality

The confidentiality of information supplied by research participants and the anonymity of respondents must be respected. Unequivocal guarantees of confidentiality and anonymity should not, however, normally be given. Where they are given, such guarantees must be honoured, unless there are clear and overriding reasons to do otherwise, for example in relation to the abuse of children. Researchers should be aware that legal challenge may preclude the honouring of such a guarantee. Passing on confidential information without the express permission of the participant should not be undertaken lightly and legal and professional advice should be sought immediately if this is contemplated.

Research involving children or adults in vulnerable situations

Research that involves the participation of children and/or adults in vulnerable situations must always be submitted for ethical review (see [section 3](#)).

Researchers should be cognisant of the definitions, procedures and protocols of the School's Safeguarding Children and Vulnerable Adults policy, including the need to undergo an enhanced Disclosure and Barring Service (DBS) check. Further information on the latter can be obtained from the Programmes Office or the Human Resources department.

Before commencing the research project, researchers should:

- be certain the research is worthwhile and the techniques proposed are appropriate;

- satisfy themselves that there is a need to involve children and/or adults in vulnerable situations or neurodiverse participants and be able to justify this;
- familiarise themselves with, and comply with, the relevant legislative framework, and with the School's Safeguarding Children and Vulnerable Adults policy;
- complete and, with the Ethics approval form, submit a risk assessment;
- gain the informed consent of participants, and of any parents, carers or legal equivalent (see below);
- in relation to research taking place in schools, gain the informed consent of the Head Teacher and/or Board of Governors; the consent of the child, if they are deemed old enough to give it; and the consent of the parent or legal equivalent (see below);
- undergo a Disclosure and Barring (DBS) check.

Informed consent

Gaining informed consent is normally a requirement of all research projects involving human participation. The School recognises, however, that this may not always be possible or desirable (for example, where research data is collected through observing the behaviour of anonymous participants). In such cases, further details should be provided on the Research Ethics Review Form (Low Risk): refer to [section 3](#), and [appendix 3](#), for more information.

Informed consent entails providing as much information as possible about the research being undertaken so that prospective participants and/or their proxies can make an informed decision about their possible involvement. Normally this information should be supplied in written form (via a plain language statement) and signed off (consent) by the research participant(s). However, appropriate alternative means of gaining informed consent should be employed for those who require it. Participants speak languages other than English or who might otherwise require additional support in understanding the information may also need to receive it in an alternative form (e.g. use of a translator). The primary objective is to conduct research openly and without deception.

Researchers should also consider, in addition to receiving informed consent at the start of a research project, ongoing participant assent as the research develops. Ongoing assent is important in all forms of research with human participation, but of particular importance for research undertaken with vulnerable populations, including young people under the age of 18 or any for whom a parent or carer provides consent. In these instances, the onus is on the researcher to obtain informed consent and also observe the participant carefully and satisfy themselves that the participant is giving their "assent" to participate in the research.

As noted, 'Informed Consent' should be sought from any Responsible Adults in the case where participants are considered vulnerable, or not legally allowed to define their own consent. Participants should have sufficient knowledge of the project and where possible, the implications of the consenting being sought on their behalf, to taking part. 'Informed consent', which will be supported by a plain

language statement, means that the researcher has a responsibility to explain the project and participation, in appropriate detail. See below for more details: a standard informed consent pro forma can be found in [appendix 5](#), as well as further guidance on informed consent. Additionally, it is important that participants understand and actively assent to participate in the research and therefore appropriate methods to ensure informed consent and assent (such as non-written methods and informed assent) can and should be considered.

The plain language statement information should be supplied to participants making clear the purpose of the research. It should be written in terms that a lay person - rather than a specialist in the field - can understand. The information provided should be accurate and concise, specific to the proposed research and appropriate for the social and cultural context in which it is being given.

Dependent on your participants, the plain language information sheet should be appropriate and typically include the following:

- the name of the researcher(s);
- an explanation of what the research is hoping to achieve (unless it is critical to the integrity of your research that this is not revealed);
- a clear explanation of what the participant is expected to do during the study;
- an explanation and assessment of the risks, pain or discomfort, if any, that the participant may experience;
- a statement that the participant is not obliged to take part, and may withdraw at any time;
- a clear statement of payment arrangements for compensation for the participant's time and inconvenience, and any out-of-pocket expenses;
- a clear statement on confidentiality and data security and usage;
- a consent statement (this can be separate to the information sheet).

Having understood the above, the participant (or their proxy) gives their consent to take part in the study by signing a consent form, or by an approved alternative means if appropriate, and is given a copy of both the information sheet and the consent form to keep.

A sample informed consent form can be found in [appendix 5](#). Consent may be implied by the completion and return of questionnaires, removing the need for written consent. In this case, the front of the questionnaire should indicate that completing it implies consent and what that constitutes, including details of potential uses of the data collected where appropriate.

Consent is only valid for the procedures set out on the information sheet. Should any of the substantive information included on that sheet change during the course of the research, new consent should be sought; participants are free to refuse to consent and withdraw from the study if they wish. It should not be assumed that, because consent was given at the start of the research project, it stands in all circumstances for the entire length of the research project. It is good practice to renew consent at appropriate points during the research process. Moreover, all

participants need to be informed of their right to withdraw from the study at any time and for any or no reason.

There are some *exceptional* circumstances where written consent might not be appropriate, such as where the taking of consent itself might provoke fear. If participants are to be completely anonymous throughout the research, such that their names are not collected at all rather than collected and then anonymised, asking for them to sign a sheet might compromise their safety and the safety of the field researcher if there is a risk of interference from a third party. In such cases, full ethical approval must always be sought.

Subjects of an earlier research exercise should not be re-contacted to participate in a new project simply because their details are still held in the researcher's database, unless they were asked to consent to such a procedure in the first instance (i.e. at the time of their recruitment for the first project). In other words, if a chain of research activities with similar subjects is planned, researchers should ask during the first project for their informed consent to be re-contacted. That is, unless clearly articulated in the original research plan, each link in the chain of research activities is distinct and requires its own clearance.

If you are unsure about any issues of informed consent (or ongoing assent), further guidance can be sought by emailing ethics@cssd.ac.uk. Researchers are encouraged to have a wider conversation about informed consent before their research as part of an ongoing conversation and note that complex issues of informed consent will not stop the research, but that communication is important.

2.4 COLLABORATIVE RESEARCH

Most research is collaborative in nature, involving partners - individuals, groups, organisations - within and without the School and often conducted according to the expectations of external funding bodies.

It is important that any research partners, and the institutions or organisations by whom they are employed, are able to meet the required standard of conduct outlined in this document. To this end, those engaged in collaborative research should always assess the research conduct and ethics guidance of collaborating bodies and institutions (and should of course in turn provide Central's policies and procedures, as and when requested), seeking guidance from the Research and Knowledge Exchange Services where necessary. Please remember, if the research you are undertaking with a partner has undergone an ethical review process external to the School, you are required to provide details of ethical approval to the Research Ethics and Integrity Subcommittee by emailing the approval to ethics@cssd.ac.uk.

Respective rights and responsibilities in relation to, among other things, research roles, intellectual property and the ownership of research outcomes should be agreed in advance of the commencement of the research, and if appropriate codified in the form of a written agreement.

In the case of international collaborations, it is important for researchers to ensure that they are following all relevant laws both of the UK and the country where the collaborator/s is/are based.

Where there are significant or potentially problematic differences in the law or research conduct and ethics guidelines, or where there are questionable aspects of the law or a country's or organisation's humanitarian, scholarly or public reputation, the Research Ethics and Integrity Sub-Committee must be informed to enable it to make an assessment on reputational risk. The Sub-Committee may refer the issue to the Academic Board for discussion.

2.5 HEALTH AND SAFETY

The safety of everybody involved in the research process is paramount, and researchers must ensure that their work complies with both the School's Health and Safety guidelines (including those relating to lone working) and national legislation pertaining to safety in the workplace. It is the responsibility of researchers to ensure that any students and staff that they oversee (including visiting and guest staff) work safely. This means, for example, that all research should be conducted in a suitable working environment and with appropriate equipment and facilities.

2.6 RISK ASSESSMENT

A documented process of risk assessment and management (including mitigation) should be carried out in the case of any research activities that carry significant risks to those involved and anyone else who might be affected by the work, before the research takes place.

Researchers may adapt the risk assessment pro forma for staff/student research activities. Further information can be found on the health and safety page of My Central (see [appendix 1](#) for details). All risk assessments should be included in the Ethics approval submission.

2.7 INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY AND THE DISSEMINATION OF RESEARCH

The intellectual property of the research outcomes rests with the authors of that research, subject to the provisions of the School's [Intellectual Property Policy](#). The intellectual property of any recordings, plays or transcripts of the words of participants rests with the participants themselves, unless otherwise agreed.

It is important to agree how each contributor to the research is credited before the commencement of that research. This agreement should be revisited before any reports, articles, essays, papers or case studies are submitted, or any other form of dissemination takes place, making allowances for different understandings

of how rights to intellectual property are perceived and negotiating these fairly. Research outcomes should be shared with the participants of the research where possible or appropriate, and researchers should respect and act upon any objections or concerns they have.

All authors must be credited. An author is defined as someone who can identify a particular section of the work as their contribution (this may be a relatively small section or the entire work) and are intimately familiar with the content of the work and willing and able to defend its content; honorary authorships must not be granted under any circumstances. Credit must also be given to anyone who assisted with the research but did not author it. All funders and sponsors of the research should be clearly acknowledged and any competing interests listed. Further useful and detailed guidance on authorship credit is often based on the Vancouver Protocol.

Research sources that have been used should always be referenced in the appropriate format.

All research should be disseminated as widely as possible. No researcher should ever actively prevent publication of their research without good reason. If valid reasons are identified that may prohibit the dissemination of research outcomes, the Research Ethics and Integrity Sub-Committee, and where appropriate funding bodies, must be notified at the earliest opportunity. For example, cultural and spiritual beliefs of participants may restrict dissemination for periods of time after the decease of a participant, or cultural practices may have different understandings about what the intellectual ownership and creative rights are in relation to research outcomes of projects. Due consideration should be given to these understandings.

Researchers must ensure that they familiarise themselves with any terms and conditions of research-related contracts to ascertain to what extent they are allowed and able to disseminate their research outcomes. If this information is omitted from the terms and conditions, or is questionable in any way, the Research Ethics and Integrity Sub-Committee, via Research Services, must be informed.

In addition to the dissemination of research outputs, researchers should consider how to best disseminate their research data, where possible and appropriate, at the time of publication. For more guidance and advice please see the Open Data Ethics Principles, FAQs and Resources on the Ethics page of MyCentral or in the appendices to the School's Open Access Policy.

2.8 FINANCE

Compliance with the latest financial regulations is compulsory for all staff connected with the School. A member of staff who fails to comply with the financial regulations may be subject to disciplinary action under the School's disciplinary policy. The Regulations set out, amongst other things, Central's procedures in relation to the costing and financial management of research grants,

contracts and projects: researchers are responsible for ensuring the integrity of the financial management of their research, which should always be in line with the terms and conditions of the related funding. We expect researchers to respect the regulations of all external bodies, funding councils and charities that support their research. See [Appendix 2](#) for information on Research Ethics and Funding from external sources.

2.9 DATA PROTECTION

The management of research data should be in accordance with the Data Protection Act 2018, and the School's [Data Protection and Records Retention Handbook](#). The Act outlines GDPR responsibilities including the use and storage of data, and researchers are expected to work within institutional and national frameworks in relation to their use of data.

Beyond Data Protection, the School's Open Access Policy contains an Appendix on Open Data Ethics to guide researchers when considering research ethics and data. The appendix draws on the Concordat on Open Research Data (2016) to outline principles for research ethics and data, including accounting for the many forms data can take in performing arts research. These principles are supported by a series of Frequently Asked Questions and Resources that can be accessed on the Ethics page of MyCentral by all staff.

Researchers should abide by the following general points when dealing with research data (and consult the School's Data Protection and Records Retention Policy for guidance on specific areas):

- It is very important that data gained through research, especially personal data, must be stored and treated carefully;
- When collecting data, researchers should consider whether or not a privacy notice needs to be included (refer to the Data Protection and Records Retention Handbook for more information);
- Where required, data must be anonymised, removing all information that could be used to identify a participant (which could include their name, address, email address, age, ethnicity, or internet user name);
- Researchers should not use a database of names that was collected for another purpose, such as enrolled students, without the written consent of the data manager and assurance that it complies with data storage policy and law;
- The key for identifying participants should be kept separate from the actual data that has been collected for the purposes of research;
- Data should be stored in a locked filing cabinet and/or in a protected file on the researcher's School network account and should be protected in accordance with its sensitivity. The storage folder should be password protected. For data judged to be more sensitive, encryption technology should be used to provide a greater level of protection. Researchers must ensure that they do not take raw data off campus or make unnecessary copies of the data. Further information and advice on data encryption can be sought from the IT Department;

- Data should be stored for the current academic year plus six further years and then destroyed, unless any research funders have asked for data to be kept for longer. Further information and advice on destroying data effectively can be sought from the IT Department.

If a member of staff or student at Central is asked to peer review a work of research prior to publication, it is incumbent upon them to maintain confidentiality of any personal or proprietary information within the research outcome.

2.10 LEGISLATION, INTERNAL POLICIES AND CRIMINAL OFFENCES

All researchers - whether staff or students - are expected to comply with the relevant UK, European and International legislation relating to research conduct and management. This includes, but is not limited to, the Data Protection Act 2018, the Freedom of Information Act 2000, the Mental Capacity Act 2005 and the Safeguarding Vulnerable Groups Act 2006, or other specific laws or legislation which might apply to the research. Those involved in clinical research will additionally need to observe the legal framework within the UK governing such research, and may be required to obtain regulatory approval from the appropriate external bodies (for example, the NHS). The Medical Research Council offers guidelines for good clinical practice in clinical trials.

Researchers should seek guidance from supervisors, line managers or Research and Knowledge Exchange Services on any research-related work that might involve material or activities which could be deemed pornographic, racist or otherwise offensive. They should also be aware that it can be a criminal offence to access, store or disseminate certain classes of material unless it is for the purposes of a clearly-defined research project or academic programme (for example, the Terrorism Act 2000 s58 states that it is an offence to collect or make a record of information of a kind likely to be useful to a person committing or preparing an act of terrorism). It is sensible to exercise caution in such instances and (for example, through a formal process of risk assessment) make the purposes of the research or programme clear and explicitly prohibit further dissemination of relevant material by staff or students.

Researchers are also expected to comply with Central's own internal policies that touch on research conduct: these include its Acceptable Use of Central's IT Systems policy, and its Health and Safety, Data Protection and Records Retention and Intellectual Property Rights policies (referred to above). Researchers should also be cognizant of the guidelines the School has in place in relation to its Prevent Duty responsibilities (including its External Speaker policy, Ethical Policy Framework and the Safeguarding Children and Vulnerable Adults policy).

Further advice on legislative and internal frameworks in relation to research conduct can be sought from Research Services.

2.11 INSURANCE AND LIABILITY

The School's Public and Products Liability policy provides legal liability cover for damage to third party property and injury to third party persons. The cover applies on Central's premises or offsite within the UK.

Researchers should be aware that Central does have the right to refuse to insure a project, or limit its insurance, or ask for special arrangements (which may have resource implications for the project) if:

- there are deemed to be risk factors which lie outside normal ethical review;
- the research is conducted abroad (in which case the Insurance Officer usually arranges appropriate terms);
- the research involves participants who might claim the jurisdiction of a US or Canadian court of law (this is dealt with on a case-by-case basis).

2.12 DEVELOPMENT AND TRAINING

Central is committed to embedding a culture of good practice within the School with regards to research conduct and research ethics.

All staff engaged in research and in the teaching and supervision of students are expected to be inducted in the principles and policies contained within this document. Regularly scheduled 'refresher' events also address developments in the areas of research conduct and ethics, and to the School's associated procedures.

A system of line management ensures that staff employed on research projects and/or with supervisory responsibilities are adequately supported in their roles.

The research training and methodologies programme, which all postgraduate research students are required to undertake in their first year at the School, provides an opportunity to discuss issues in research conduct and ethics and to raise awareness of Central's guidelines and procedures. All postgraduate research students who undergo ethical review send their work to the Conservatoires UK Research Ethics Committee for approval.

It is Course Leaders' responsibility to organise the induction of students on the School's taught courses into these procedures to take place at a relevant point in their studies, and will include an introduction to the contents of this handbook.

3 RESEARCH ETHICS

3.1 INTRODUCTION

This section outlines the processes that researchers at Central are required to take to gain approval for their research in relation to ethics. The term ‘researchers’ applies equally to academic staff (whether on scholarship or research contracts), students on taught and research degrees and visiting researchers.

No institutional guidance can cover all eventualities or provide specific ethical guidelines for every circumstance. If anything is unclear, Research Services will be able to advise or refer it on to the Research Ethics and Integrity Sub-Committee for consideration and guidance.

The School’s procedures have been written to align with sector best practice, and in particular the guidelines on ethical approval produced by Conservatoires UK (CUK), of which Central is a member.

3.2 DEFINITIONS AND PRINCIPLES

All research conducted by students and staff at Central that involves human participation or work with animals requires ethical review and/or approval. Examples include, but are not limited to

- Research involving children and/or adults in vulnerable situations or;
- Research involving sensitive topics - for example participants’ sexual behaviour, illegal behaviour, experience of violence, their mental health or their gender or ethnicity;
- Research involving groups or individuals where access to the group or individual is controlled by a ‘gatekeeper’ - for example ethnic or cultural groups or indigenous communities;
- Medical or clinical research that, for example, involves the recruitment of patients or staff through the NHS;
- Research involving individuals, groups or activities which may be construed as terrorist or extremist;
- Research involving prisoners or people in custody;
- Research potentially interpreted as involving deception, or which could potentially be conducted without the full and informed consent of all participants;
- Research involving access to records of personal or confidential information;
- Research which may induce psychological stress, anxiety or humiliation or which may cause pain;
- Research involving intrusive interventions - for example vigorous physical exercise or techniques such as hypnotherapy;

- Research involving the collection of large datasets or the personal information of participants.

Researchers are reminded that they should, if in any doubt about the need for an ethical review of their research, seek the advice of their Course Leader, supervisor, line manager or Research Services.

Research activities put forward for ethical review always require approval *prior* to the commencement of the research. They must not continue if ethical approval is subsequently withdrawn or suspended.

If a research plan alters during the course of the research, it may be necessary to resubmit it for initial review and/or full application (see below).

3.3 RESEARCH ETHICS REVIEW PROCESS

As stated above, all research projects involving human participation or the use of animals require ethical review. The project must be submitted for review before it commences. It is incumbent upon the individual researcher - whether they are a student or a member of staff - to ensure that this happens.

There are two connected processes for ethics clearance. First is what is likely to be low risk research activity, which should be used for activities where there is little risk of harm (this might be, for instance, interviews with non-vulnerable adults about their practice in the theatre). Second is the full ethics application, where you think there might be ethical implications to your research that require further explanation. Typically, all full ethics applications are sent to Conservatoires UK (CUK) Research Ethics Committee (REC) for review unless in exceptional circumstances. Low Risk applications may also be required to undergo the Conservatoires UK process if deemed appropriate by the Research Ethics and Integrity Subcommittee. Information on the CUK process for ethical review can be found [here](#). For more information about processing ethics applications with the School see [Appendix 7](#).

There is the expectation that all research is conducted with integrity and adheres to ethical practices as laid out at the beginning of this handbook but that, assuming no conflict of interest, some work can be excluded from research ethics process of authorisation, specifically that which falls into:

- Criticism of publicly available artworks;
- Interacting with publicly available data sets where no individual is identifiable;
- Research involving material available in the public domain (newspapers, published books and papers, performances etc.).

However, because it is often a requirement for funders, if the research is funded, it *must* go through the process regardless.

Students on taught courses

Approval for research being conducted within undergraduate and taught postgraduate courses is normally dealt with at a course level.

You should think if your research projects should in the first instance be submitted for ethical review using the Low Risk Research Ethics Review Form provided in [appendix 3](#). This form should be submitted to the relevant Course Leader (or delegated course team member) before the research project commences.

The Course Leader (or delegate) will assess the form and will then either:

- Confirm ethical approval of the project/research;
- Discuss with the student/tutor any further considerations that they should have before commencing the research/project;
- Exceptionally, require the submission of a Full Ethics Application to the Research Ethics and Integrity Sub-Committee and subsequently the CUK process if appropriate (see [section 3.4](#)).

A copy of the review form for the project or unit will be kept by the Programmes Office for the current academic year plus six further years. The Course leader is responsible for ensuring that the ethical review process has been enacted responsibly and comprehensively.

Refer to [appendix 6](#) (Guidance on ethical review for staff/students on taught courses) for more information.

Research students

Prospective research students are required to outline on their application any ethical implications of their proposed project. All doctoral research is required to be submitted via Conservatoire UK's Research Ethics Committee, following approval from the Chair of the Research Ethics and Integrity Sub-Committee; details of this application process and form can be found [here](#).

All postgraduate researchers must submit their research before or during completing their preparation for Transfer (see Research Degree Course Handbook for further guidance on this process). Due to CUK REC timelines, approval by CUK REC is not required for the transfer process to be approved, but evidence of the process being underway or a commitment to undertaking this process is required. Research degree students are advised to speak to their supervisors and the Chair of the Research Ethics and Integrity Sub-Committee for further support and guidance and/or email ethics@cssd.ac.uk.

A copy of the review form will be kept by Research Services.

Staff

Ethical approval of research undertaken by staff requires confirmation from the Research Ethics and Integrity Sub-Committee, and is usually undertaken by 1-2 reviewers who are research active with support from the Sub-Committee.

Staff undertaking research must complete the Research Ethics Review Form (Low Risk) provided in [appendix 3](#) and submit any supporting documentation before commencing the research. This form should be submitted to ethics@cssd.ac.uk. A decision will then be communicated within 10 working days (more if during holiday periods), the possible outcomes being:

- Automatic ethical approval of the research;
- A requirement that further discussion takes place between the staff member, their line manager and Chair of the Research Ethics and Integrity Sub-committee;
- A requirement that the staff member submits a Full Ethics Application to the Research Ethics and Integrity Sub-Committee or CUK processes (see [section 3.4](#)).

A copy of the review form will be kept by Research Services.

It is possible that research undertaken by staff will require full ethical approval (Full Application) from its outset; in such cases, the member of staff may still wish to complete the Low Risk form (and submit it together with the Full Application).

3.4 RESEARCH ETHICS FULL APPLICATION PROCESS

Where possible, all Research Ethics Review Full Applications are processed through Conservatoires UK (CUK) Research Ethics Committee (REC) and therefore researchers should consult the [CUK Research Integrity, Governance and Ethics website](#).

Details on how to apply for the CUK ethics process, as well as applications forms and guidance, can be found [here](#).

Before submitting to CUK, researchers should contact the Chair of the Research Ethics and Integrity Subcommittee to review the application by emailing ethics@cssd.ac.uk. Researchers can contact ethics@cssd.ac.uk for any queries about this process or for advice about any aspects of the application.

A copy of the ethics application documentation will be kept by Research and Knowledge Exchange Services.

3.5 RESEARCH ETHICS GOVERNANCE ARRANGEMENTS

Central's policies and procedures in relation to research ethics - including the contents of this handbook - are normally updated annually in the light of changes to legislation and sector best practice. Any key developments or policy changes that need to be referenced can be added as necessary to ensure the handbook remains up to date.

The School's Research Ethics and Integrity Sub-Committee meet termly and receive, as part of a standing item, a record of the number of Low Risk (in the case of staff and research students) and Full Application forms submitted for approval since its last meeting, together with an indication of any broad issues that have arisen. The REISC discuss general trends and areas for consideration in light of these submissions.

The Chair of the Research Ethics and Integrity Sub-Committee produces an annual Research Integrity Statement to the School's governing body on research conduct and ethics, including a summary of actions and activities that have been undertaken to support and strengthen understanding in this area in line with the recommendations of the Concordat to Support Research Integrity.

The School will normally submit its ethics and research misconduct procedures for external audit every five years.

4 RESEARCH MISCONDUCT

4.1 INTRODUCTION

UUK's *Concordat to support research integrity* defines research misconduct as 'behaviour or actions that fall short of the standards of ethics, research and scholarship required to ensure that the integrity of research is upheld'.

The School expects all researchers - whether staff or students - to uphold the highest ethical, legal and professional standards in their work, and, specifically, to abide by its guidelines on research conduct and research ethics contained within this handbook. This expectation applies whether the research is conducted within or outside Central's premises.

Allegations of misconduct in research are accordingly taken extremely seriously by the School, which is committed to ensuring that all such allegations are dealt with thoroughly, swiftly and in a fair, transparent and confidential manner. These become part of Central's Standards of Professional Conduct Policy.

The procedure detailed below for investigating alleged cases of research misconduct applies to staff: where concerns are raised regarding research undertaken by a research student or a student on a taught course, the procedures relating to academic misconduct outlined in Central's *Handbook of Academic Regulations and Guidance* apply (refer to Part 4 for students on taught courses and Part 6 for research students). Central's procedure draws on the guidance for investigating research misconduct provided by UKRIO.

4.2 EXAMPLES OF RESEARCH MISCONDUCT

Research misconduct includes (but is not limited to) the following, whether deliberate, reckless or negligent:

- Failure to obtain appropriate permission to conduct research, including non-referral of research for ethical approval;
- Deception in research proposals;
- Fabrication, falsification or corruption of research data;
- Distortion of research outcomes, by misrepresentation or omission of data that does not fit expected results;
- Wilful and deceitful misinterpretation of results;
- Publication of data known or believed to be false or misleading;
- Plagiarism, or dishonest use of unacknowledged sources;
- Misquotation or misrepresentation of other authors;
- Inappropriate or fraudulent attribution of authorship;
- Conduct which seriously deviates from accepted ethical standards in research, as defined in this handbook.

Other areas in the School's Standards of Professional Conduct Policy that might relate to research misconduct include:

- Unauthorised use of confidential information;
- Fraud (including, for example, misuse of research funds or equipment);
- Failure to comply with relevant legislation, including that relating to health and safety, data protection and intellectual property.

4.3 GENERAL PRINCIPLES

Allegations of research misconduct can be received from both internal and external sources.

All students and staff of the School, including those employed on visiting or honorary contracts, have an obligation to report, in confidence, any suspected case of research misconduct. Allegations will be dealt with according to the terms of Central's Whistleblowing Policy, and with the same level of protection outlined in that document.

Those involved in the investigation of cases of alleged research misconduct must declare any potential conflicts of interest.

4.4 ROLES AND RESPONSIBILITIES

The School's Human Resources department is responsible for maintaining the suite of Employment Policies that set out the rights and responsibilities of the employee and employer and which detail procedures to be followed in a set of given circumstances: these include the Disciplinary Procedure and Investigation Policy.

The Chair of the Research Ethics and Integrity Sub-Committee will, as part of the annual report to the School's governing body on research conduct and ethics, produce a high-level statement on any formal investigations of research misconduct that have taken place during the year.

4.5 INVESTIGATION PROCESS

Allegations of research misconduct can come from a variety of sources and be addressed to a number of individuals. It is important that anybody receiving details of an alleged misconduct should notify the Head of Research and Knowledge Exchange Services (the named contact) immediately, and certainly no later than one working day after receipt.

The Head of Research and Knowledge Exchange Services will then acknowledge receipt of the allegation to the complainant, and confirm the details of the School's Disciplinary Procedure within one week. They will also notify the

employee, in writing, that the alleged act of misconduct is being formally investigated.

The Head of Research and Knowledge Exchange Services, following discussion with a member of Human Resources, will then initiate an investigation process in accordance with the School's Investigation Policy, consulting the Vice Principal for Research and Knowledge Exchange or the Chair of REISC as appropriate.

If the investigation process does not identify any evidence to support the allegation of misconduct, the individual under question will be informed and exonerated; the Head of Research and Knowledge Exchange Services will also normally inform the complainant.

If the investigation process identifies evidence to suggest a breach in institutional policy or procedure, HR would coordinate the next stage of the process in accordance with the relevant policy, for example the School's Disciplinary Procedures.

4.6 STAFF NOT EMPLOYED BY THE SCHOOL

If an allegation of research misconduct concerns an individual who is not employed by the School, the Head of Research and Knowledge Exchange Services will normally, if the initial review panel decides that a formal investigation should take place, take responsibility for notifying that individual's employer of the matter. Central will only investigate matters that have occurred on its premises or under its aegis, but may request that the individual's employer either cooperates in the investigation or undertakes its own investigation.

APPENDIX 1

SOURCES

For this version of the Research Conduct and Ethics Handbook:

Internal policies, procedures and guidelines

The Royal Central School of Speech and Drama Ethical Policy Framework,

Handbook of Academic Regulations and Guidance,

The Financial Regulations,

Health and safety policy statement,

Whistleblowing policy,

Disciplinary procedures,

Acceptable Use of Central's IT Systems policy,

Data Protection and Records Retention Policy,

Intellectual Property Rights policy,

External Speaker policy,

Safeguarding Children and Vulnerable Adults policy,

Statements on equality,

Research Degrees handbook.

National guidelines and examples of good practice

Universities UK, [*The concordat to support research integrity*](#),

Conservatoires UK, [*Ethics procedure and Guidelines on good research conduct*](#),

UK Research Integrity Office, [*Code of Practice for Research: Promoting good practice and preventing misconduct*](#),

UK Research Integrity Office, [*Procedure for the investigation of misconduct in research*](#),

Research Councils UK, [Policy and Guidelines on Governance of Good Research Conduct](#).

Relation legislation

[Data Protection Act 2018](#),

[Human Rights Act 1998](#),

[Health and Safety at Work Act 1974](#),

[Mental Capacity Act 2005](#),

[Freedom of Information Act 2000](#),

[Safeguarding Vulnerable Groups Act 2006](#),

[Prevent Duty Guidance for England and Wales](#),

The Nolan Committee on Standards in Public Life, [Seven Principles](#).

APPENDIX 2

RESEARCH ETHICS AND FUNDING GUIDELINES

Research at Central is funded both by QR ‘internal’ funding and by external organisations and individuals. Researchers have a responsibility to consider the ethical implications of accepting funding from organisations who either commission or support their research. It is incumbent upon researchers to declare the sources of research funding when completing a Research Ethics Application. When approaching research funding it is important to consider the following key principles:

- Academic freedom; in particular that the funding sources are not in conflict with academic freedom, which allows individual researchers to pursue projects that may be unfashionable, provocative or unpopular, or that may include elements that open difficult ethical questions.
- Conflict of Interest; in particular that the parameters or expectations of research funding do not impede upon the independence and/or integrity of the research or researcher.
- Ownership; in particular that the researcher understands and considers the respective rights and responsibilities in relation to, among other things, research roles, intellectual property and the ownership of research outcomes. This should be agreed in advance of the commencement of the research, and if appropriate codified in the form of a written agreement.
- Risk; in particular where there are significant or potentially problematic differences in the law, research conduct and ethics guidelines. In addition, where there are questionable aspects of the law or a country’s or organisation’s humanitarian, scholarly or public reputation, these should be taken into consideration. In both of these cases, the Research Ethics and Integrity Sub-Committee must be informed to enable it to make an assessment on reputational risk. The Sub-Committee may refer the issue to the Research Committee for discussion and then if appropriate to Academic Board.
- In addition to Central's principles, we further acknowledge the importance of External Regulations; in particular that researchers respect the regulations of all external bodies, funding councils and charities that support their research.

Please note that the above principles apply to all stages of research, for example from developing a proposal, collecting data and sharing findings. It may be, for example, that a funder could have particular sensitivities about the wording of findings. As shown in the above principles, the independence and integrity of the researcher is crucial throughout the research, so it may be necessary to consider the implications of your potential findings when accepting funding for your work. When thinking about funders the Research Ethics and Integrity Sub-Committee will consider each application with following questions linked the key principles above:

- Does the funding source compromise the independence and/or integrity of the research or researcher?
- Does the research funding or funder impede upon the academic freedom of the research/researcher?
- Is there a conflict of interest between the researcher, the goal of the researcher, the goal of the funder or other stakeholders?
- Does the funder or the outcomes of the funding source require a risk assessment beyond what is presented in the ethics application?
- Has the researcher considered School's Ethical Policy Framework when considering whether to accept the funding?

It is important to note that each application is considered on a case-by-case basis to ensure all relevant contextual material is taken into consideration.

This statement on the Ethics of Research Funding is drawn from existing policies with the Research Conduct and Ethics Handbook, the School's Ethical Policy Framework and the School's Financial Regulations. It has been developed in line with existing publicly accessible policies at other institutions (including UCL, LSE, RCA and St Andrews), in collaboration with the Research Ethics and Integrity Sub-Committee.

APPENDIX 3

A version of this form in Word for internal use can be found on the School's MyCentral (Central's intranet pages) under:
MyCentral > Research > Ethics

RESEARCH ETHICS REVIEW FORM (LOW RISK)

All research conducted by students and staff at Central that involves human participation or work with animals requires ethical review and approval. Please ensure that you have read the School's [Research Ethics and Integrity Handbook](#).

For taught students: this form is to be completed and handed to your Course Leader (or delegated course team member) prior to the start of the work. If you are unsure about whether to use this form, please ask your Course Leader.

For postgraduate research students: All doctoral research is required to be submitted via Conservatoire UK's Research Ethics Committee; details of this application can be found [here](#).

For staff: this form is to be completed and submitted to ethics@cssd.ac.uk prior to the start of the work

In addition to completing this form, please include:

- a plain language statement
- an example of your consent form

(Your Plain Language Statement and Consent Form could be contained within the same document which would be given to participants. See Section 2.3 and Appendix 5 of the Research Ethics and Integrity Handbook for more information).

Project type: Staff / Postdoctoral Researcher / Postgraduate Research / Postgraduate Taught (MA/MFA) / Undergraduate (BA) (<i>delete as appropriate</i>)
Project title:
Brief description of project (max. 100 words):
Name of researcher(s):
Name of Supervisor(s) / Line Manager / Tutor(s):
Are you in receipt of funding from an external source for this project? Yes / No <i>If 'yes', please state the name of the funding body.</i>

Have you completed a Risk Assessment for this project (where necessary) and discussed any Health and Safety requirements with you supervisor(s)/tutor(s)/line manager?

Yes / No / Not Applicable

Please give details, including attaching an approved Risk Assessment if appropriate.

Section A

Please answer all questions in Section A and use them to consider the ethical implications of your research. Once you have completed Section A, please provide more details as required in Section B. These are not exhaustive questions but offer you the chance to consider the ethical implications of your research.

Please note, if your answers in Section A raise ethical questions, this does not mean your application will not be approved, but indicates that you should consider how to mitigate these ethical questions in Section B.

	<i>Mark with X in box</i>	Yes	No	N/A
1	Does the research involve human participation?			
2	Does the research involve work with animals?			
3	Will you describe the main research processes to participants in advance, such that they are informed about what to expect?			
4	Will you tell your participants that their participation is voluntary?			
5	Will you obtain consent for participation (including if the research is observational) and for subsequent - anonymised - publication of research?			
6	Will you tell participants that they may withdraw from the research at any time and for any reason?			
7	If your project involves questionnaires or interviews, will you give participants the option of omitting questions they do not want to answer?			
8	Will you tell participants that their data will be treated with sensitivity and that, if published, it will not be identifiable as theirs (unless they have signed agreement that their names may be used)?			
9	Will you debrief participants at the end of their participation, if appropriate (i.e. give them a brief explanation of the study)?			
10	With interviews, will you tell your participants that you wish to record the interview, and that they may decline to have their interview recorded?			
11	With research that requires audio or video recordings, will you tell your participants that their permission has been sought to play any excerpts in the course of presentations given?			

12	Have you made plans for data collection, storage, and future access, and have those been clearly communicated to the participants?			
13	Will it be necessary for participants to take part in the project, or for spectators to experience it, without their knowledge and consent at the time (e.g. photography or video-footage, invisible theatre, covert observation)? Or will your project involve deliberately misleading participants in any way?			
14	Will financial inducements (other than reasonable expenses and compensation for time) be offered to participants? If no, have you considered any other relationships between yourself and your participants which could effect the research (for example, existing student-teacher relationships)?			
15	Will the study involve recruitment of patients or staff through the NHS (if yes, you will also need to submit an application through the Health Research Authority, http://www.hra.nhs.uk/)?			
16	Have you considered the Prevent Duty's definition of extremist and terrorist individuals, groups or activities, and is this relevant to your research? If so, please give more information below.			
17	Could the project give offence, or cause anxiety, physical or psychological distress or discomfort, or have negative consequences beyond the risks encountered in normal life (e.g. offensive or obscene representations, invasion of personal space?)			
18	Does your research involve participants who are under 16 years old? (You should ensure that you have DBS clearance).			
19	Does your research involve participants who could be classified as vulnerable adults/adults in vulnerable situations?			
20	Have you considered how your research might engage neurodiverse participants?			
21	Does your research involve participants living in secure settings or serving custodial sentences?			
22	Have you considered the impact of this research on your own health on wellbeing as a researcher?			
23	Have you considered how to acknowledge all contributors to your research?			

Section B

This section requires you to expand upon any ethical considerations in your research. You should provide all of the information listed below, and any other relevant supporting details which have been raised by answering the questions in Section A above.

Please indicate in this section that you have considered the ethics of your research and addressed them.

1. Proposed timetable for the research
2. Purpose of the research and its anticipated benefits
3. Brief description of the project's overall design and methodology
4. Indication of participants to be studied (if applicable): age, sex, number, recruitment methods and selection criteria saying whether any are drawn from vulnerable groups.
5. Brief outline of any ethical issues that might arise from the project (including any potential risk to participants) and how they are to be addressed
6. Risk assessment (as appropriate)

Please note:

- You have an obligation to bring to attention any ethical implications not clearly covered by the above checklist.
- Any significant changes to the research that might impact on its ethical status must be communicated to Research Ethics and Integrity Sub-Committee - failure to do so may result in a charge of research misconduct.
- By signing below you commit to notifying your line manager/supervisor/tutor of your whereabouts when completing this research project.

Please remember to include your plain language statement and consent form when you submit your form.

Submit to: ethics@cssd.ac.uk

Signed:

Print name:

Date:

You should keep a copy of this form for your own records.

Form Version: 2021-22_4

Form Approved: October 2022

APPENDIX 4

RESEARCH ETHICS REVIEW (FULL APPLICATION)

Where possible, all Research Ethics Review Full Applications are processed through Conservatoires UK (CUK) Research Ethics Committee (REC) and therefore researchers should consult the [CUK Research Integrity, Governance and Ethics website](#).

Details on how to apply for the CUK ethics process, as well as applications forms and guidance, can be found [herehttps://conservatoiresuk.ac.uk/about-us/research-integrity-governance-and-ethics/how-to-apply-for-ethical-approval/](https://conservatoiresuk.ac.uk/about-us/research-integrity-governance-and-ethics/how-to-apply-for-ethical-approval/).

Before submitting to CUK, researchers should contact the Chair of the Research Ethics and Integrity Subcommittee to review the application by emailing ethics@cssd.ac.uk. Researchers can contact ethics@cssd.ac.uk for any queries about this process or for advice about any aspects of the application.

APPENDIX 5

SAMPLE INFORMED CONSENT TEMPLATES

SAMPLE 1:

Project title:

Name of the Researcher [with contact details]

Plain Language Statement:

- an explanation of what the research is hoping to achieve;
- a clear explanation of what the participant is expected to do during the study;
- an explanation and assessment of the risks, pain or discomfort, if any, that the participant may experience;
- a statement that the participant is not obliged to take part, and may withdraw at any time;
- a clear statement of payment arrangements for compensation for the participant's time and inconvenience, and any out-of-pocket expenses;
- a clear statement on confidentiality and data security and usage.

Date:

Consent Statement (this can be separate to the Plain Language Statement):

I confirm that I have read and understood the information sheet provided to me in respect of the project in which I have been asked to participate. I have had the opportunity to ask questions about the project, and am aware that I may withdraw at any later time if I wish and without giving any reason.

I am over 18 years of age *or* I am responsible for the participant who is under 18 years of age. [Delete as appropriate.]

I agree that any information, oral statements, written statements, photographs or other audio-visual recordings given as a part of the research can be processed in order to facilitate the research being undertaken. I understand that my responses will be anonymised before analysis and I give permission for members of the research team to have access to these anonymised responses. I understand that all personal data about me will be kept confidential.

I agree to participate in this research project.

Participant/Responsible Adult Name [please state relationship to participant if you are the 'responsible adult']:

Signature:

Date:

Witness Name [if deemed necessary]:

Signature:

Date:

Copies: one copy for the participant, and one copy for the supervisor or researcher.

SAMPLE 2:

Project title:

Name of the Researcher [with contact details]

Plain Language Statement:

- an explanation of what the research is hoping to achieve;
- a clear explanation of what the participant is expected to do during the study;
- an explanation and assessment of the risks, pain or discomfort, if any, that the participant may experience;
- a statement that the participant is not obliged to take part, and may withdraw at any time;
- a clear statement of payment arrangements for compensation for the participant's time and inconvenience, and any out-of-pocket expenses;
- a clear statement on confidentiality and data security and usage.

Date:

Consent Statement (this can be separate to the Plain Language Statement):

Date:

I confirm that I have been provided with sufficient and appropriate information in respect of the project in which I have been asked to participate. I have had the opportunity to ask questions about the project, and am aware that I may withdraw at any later time if I wish and without giving any reason.

I agree to participate in this research project.

Participant Name:

Signature:

Date:

Copies: one copy for the participant, and one copy for the supervisor or researcher.

APPENDIX 6

GUIDANCE ON ETHICAL REVIEW FOR STAFF/STUDENTS ON TAUGHT COURSES

Please read the Research Ethics Review Form (Low Risk).

- Academic tutors of taught courses will decide whether the Research Ethics Review Form should be used by students in particular units, in liaison with the Course Leader. Where a visiting lecturer is organising a unit that contains research projects with participants, it is the Course Leader's responsibility to ensure this liaison takes place.

- How will you make the decision whether students should use this form?

Where someone else is in charge of the research and holds responsibility for the ethics of that research (e.g. a host on placement who has asked the student to undertake the work) students do not need to complete this form. If the research is initiated by the student without another holding responsibility for it, the form should be completed.

- The form will be completed and handed in to the unit tutor, prior to the research starting and in time for the tutor to assimilate the student's form and respond as necessary. This may be added to other documentation (e.g. a proposal form). Tutors must respond to the student if they think there are any issues arising from the form, prior to the research project starting. In exceptional circumstances, they will refer a student's form to Research Services (ethics@cssd.ac.uk), delaying the start of the student's research, but it is expected that all due care will have been given in the lead-up to the proposed work such that this should not arise.
- The unit tutor (or Course Leader) will consider any additional information the student offers within the form. If the additional information is reasonable, then the tutor can sign the form.
- The form should be countersigned and retained in the Course Leader's records for the current academic year plus six further years.
- The form is intended to ensure students undertake relevant ethical processes as part of the research. It acts as both a guide as well as an approval mechanism. By signing this form, the students have indicated what they will be undertaking.

The following are four examples of projects where the form might or might not be required.

- A) An MA Acting student wishes to interview minors as part of their research into how young people perceive Shakespeare. This will be done after a touring production of *A Midsummer Night's Dream* for the student's SIP

portfolio. Does this require a Research Ethics Review Form (Low Risk) to be completed? **Yes**.

- B) A BA DATE student on a Collaborative Outreach project is working with young street dwellers in India, undertaking drama activities that engage with domestic violence. The project is being documented for a presentation back at Central. Does this require a Research Ethics Review Form (Low Risk) to be completed? **Yes**. This is for the documentation (e.g. filming) that will be used in the presentation, not the work itself.
- C) A production (e.g. BA Acting, BA TP) includes semi-nudity and the fetishising of the female body on stage as part of the script. Does this require a Research Ethics Review Form (Low Risk) to be completed? **No**. This is not a student's research project although, of course, there are ethical implications. The issue should be discussed within the course team in the first instance.
- D) MA ATP students are filming other students participating in a research project for their Performing Research unit conference presentation. Does this require a Research Ethics Review Form (Low Risk) to be completed? **No**. Students would be expected to check with their colleagues that they are happy for this to be the case, of course.

APPENDIX 7

Research Ethics and Integrity Workflow Processes

(See page below)

Reviewing Notes 1:

How does the REISC Chair decide who reviews an application?

- **Is there a conflict of interest?** For example, is the reviewer the line manager of or supervisor of the applicant, or does the reviewer have any other vested interest that we know of? *If yes, then another reviewer would be found. Reviewers are also bound to let us know if there is a conflict of interest.*
- **Is the reviewer a member of the Research Ethics and Integrity Subcommittee?** *Whilst we draw from a wider pool of researchers with the School, we would ask Subcommittee members first, as long as there was no conflict of interest or other reason not to choose this reviewer.*
- **Is the application time sensitive?** *If yes, we are likely to ask someone who has the capacity to look at the application in a timely manner, as long as there is no conflict of interest or other reason not to choose this reviewer.*
- **Is the reviewer a specialist in this area of research?** *if yes, and there is no conflict of interest or other reason not to use this person, then this reviewer is likely to be asked.*
- **How many applications has the reviewer reviewed recently?** *If the reviewer has recently reviewed an application, it is likely we would ask another reviewer (unless conflict of interest, timing, or specialism dictated that this reviewer was the most appropriate person to review this application).*
- **Is this a revision or amendment to a previously approved application?** *If so, we would usually ask the same reviewers to look at this application in the first instance, as long as no circumstances had changed to produce conflict of interest or other reason not to choose this reviewer.*

Reviewing Notes 2:

RCSSD REISC Reviewing Process for Conservatoires UK (CUK) Research Ethics Committee (REC):

1. In principle, any research that is not Low Risk is sent to CUK REC. Exceptions to this include if:
 - a. The research is time sensitive and/or will be delayed due to the specific timelines of CUK REC ethics review processes.
 - b. There is a conflict of interest, or other reason, why the research cannot be reviewed by the CUK REC.
2. All Research Degree Students will submit to the CUK REC (subject to the excisions indicated in point 1.)
3. A Low Risk application may be escalated to CUK under the following circumstances:
 - a. If the internal reviewers believe the application requires external scrutiny to ensure research ethics and integrity are upheld.
 - b. If the internal reviewers agree that the ethics of a piece of research are complex enough to require a full ethics process (this may be the same decision, or a distinct decision, from point a.)
 - c. If the internal reviewers are in disagreement about the outcome of the research ethics review.
 - d. If there is a conflict of interest by which no internal reviewers can appropriately review the research.
 - e. All of the above points are subject to the exceptions indicated in point 1.

NB Ethics Review Applications that go to Conservatoires UK Ethics Committee are seen by all members of the committee. Full details of the committee can be found here: <http://www.conservatoiresuk.ac.uk/research-ethics/>