Academic Ethics Policy

Version Number 3.0

Effective from May 2024

Issued jointly by the Research & Knowledge Exchange Directorate and the Associate Pro Vice-Chancellor Education & Student Experience

1.0 Purpose

This policy sits under the University's Ethics Framework, Research Code of Practice and the policies contained in the Academic Handbook. The ethical research principles of the University of Salford are universal across the academic activities of all taught programmes and Research & Knowledge Exchange projects.

The purpose of this policy is to:

- Provide an academic ethics policy which underpins the conduct of the University's academic activities to ensure these activities are conducted to the highest ethical standards.

- Set out ethics principles and responsibilities and to act as a signpost to the other existing and relevant policies.

- Ensure that academic freedom and endeavour are supported and maintained through proportionate levels of scrutiny in relation to the assessment of risk or compliance requirement arising as a consequence of the proposed academic activities.

2.0 Scope

a. Research Ethics refers to the academic activities of research, enterprise, consultancy and commercialisation. These activities are governed by the Academic Ethics & Research Integrity Committee (AERIC) with day-to-day management delegated to the Research & Knowledge Exchange Directorate.

b. Taught Programme Ethics refers to the academic activities of teaching and learning. These activities are governed by the Education & Student Experience Committee (ESEC) with day-to-day management undertaken by the Associate Deans Academic (Quality Assurance & Enhancement) through the School Education & Standards Committee (SESC) and the School Ethics Approval Committee (SEAC).[1]

c. This policy applies to the academic activities of research, enterprise, consultancy, commercialisation and teaching and learning. It does not apply to non-academic issues concerning business partnerships, procurement or investment. Responsibility for such issues sits with the Governance, Nominations and Ethics Committee (GNEC) of Council and the University Ethics Framework.

d. This policy applies to all University staff, students, visiting or emeritus staff, associates, holders of honorary and clinical appointments or contracts, contractors and consultants and others working on or off University premises or carrying out academic activities in the name, or on behalf, of the University of Salford. It applies across all subject disciplines and fields of study, including instances where the University of Salford is not the lead partner.

e. This policy applies to all who undertake academic activities on University premises or with University owned or hosted equipment (including cloud-based software) but not in the name of the University of Salford. These individuals are expected to adhere to the principles, standards and procedures outlined in this policy and related procedures, even if ethics review and approval has been undertaken by their home institution.

---

[1] SESC is responsible for operational matters of ethics review at school level and SEAC is responsible for strategic matters. Both committees may cross-refer and this is reflected in the terms of reference.

    f.   All academic activities are subject to the conditions of the policy version live at the time of receipt of a Favourable Opinion following project ethics review.

3.0 Policy Statements

3.1   Commitment

a. As set out in our Charter, "*the objects of the University shall be to advance education and knowledge by teaching and research, and in doing so to foster an academic environment which is enterprising and applied to business and the professions, for the benefit of society at large.*"

b. The University is committed to fulfilling that purpose only in ways that comply with broad obligations to social responsibility, including the protection of human rights, civil liberties, the natural environment and health and wellbeing, maintaining and promoting the highest standards of integrity, rigour, honesty and transparency in its creation, advancement and dissemination of knowledge and learning, and all related academic activities.

c. When considering the advancement of knowledge through research for the benefit of society at large, it must be acknowledged and considered that there are additional barriers for some in our society. The University and its staff and students have a duty to create and maintain an academic environment free of discrimination and harassment.

3.2   Principles of Good Ethics Standard

In addition to the principles and ethical requirements set out in the University's Ethics Framework and Research Code of Practice, the following principles apply to the management of participation in any academic activities. These are summary principles; detailed responsibilities are outlined in the named related procedures (see Related Documentation, 4.0).

a. This policy, and all related policies and procedures, align with both statutory and regulatory requirements, and also with the standards and codes of practice outlined by the professional bodies with whom we work on a general or subject-by-subject basis.

g. Whilst the University advocates proportionate and appropriate ethics review, there are academic activities where ethics issues will need particular consideration. The University of Salford is committed to safeguarding the interests of staff, students, partners, research project participants and all others engaged with, or affected by, its academic activities. All academic activities are considered against the potential risks outlined below and in the context of current health and safety legislation and the University's Health and Safety Policy (see 4.0), and the potential vulnerability of research project participants. This principle takes into account considerations which must take precedence over academic, or any other, factors or interests. These considerations include (but are not restricted to):
   i. The dignity, interests, rights, safety and wellbeing of all actual and potential research project participants, observers and all others involved in the academic activity
   ii. The welfare and interests of those carrying out the activity
   iii. The welfare and interests of the University's partners and collaborators and the individuals associated with those organisations

    iv. Animal welfare

    v. Cultural heritage

    vi. The natural environment

    vii. The reputation of the University and the wider academic community

    viii. The welfare and interests of the wider community

h. Ethics review pathways will be determined by the nature of the proposed academic activity, regardless of the type of academic activity or level of study of the students involved. For taught programme students there are two review pathways: block approval and individual (see Definitions).

i. Any research project seeking to involve sensitive research topics or subject to Professional, Statutory & Regulatory Body ('PSRB') requirements must receive individual ethics review, without exception. For taught programme students, this means the student undertaking the research project must submit an independent ethics application on Infonetica that is reviewed and signed off by their supervisor and submitted to the School Ethics Review Panel (see Sensitive Research Project Topics, 4.0).

j. Academic activities should be designed, reviewed and undertaken in adherence to the appropriate standards of quality, integrity, ethical governance, and legal compliance. Where academic ethics review and sign off is required, this must take place before the activity commences and before any data collection. Retrospective ethics review is not acceptable under any circumstances.

k. The confidentiality of information supplied by research project participants, and participants' right to anonymity, must be held in accordance with the Data Protection Act 2018 and the University's Data Protection Policy. Where applicable, consent procedures should make it clear that where behaviours or activities are discovered in the course of a project, which are issues of safeguarding or are potentially or actually illegal, these may need to be disclosed to the proper authorities.[2]

l. Those responsible for academic activities should plan in advance how potential incidental information relating to the welfare or interests of participants in academic activities, or third parties, are to be handled in accordance with professional and legislative requirements. This plan should be considered as part of the formal academic ethics review (such as a Safeguarding Plan for Research, see 4.0).

m. All data and other materials from and about research project participants in academic activities will be collected, managed, processed, retained, stored, and disposed of in accordance with current legislative requirements and the University Information Governance policies. Particular care must be taken when collecting, handling and storing sensitive, classified and/or personal data (see Definitions, 5.0). Such data must be kept securely and protected from unauthorised, accidental or malicious access, supported by a clear and documented access control procedure for granting and revoking access to the data. This procedure must be considered as part of the formal academic ethics review process (Data Management Plan, 4.0). All such data should be disposed of appropriately and securely at the end of their lifespan, in line with legal and any funder requirements.

---

[2] Only if there is no immediate risk of harm or danger, it is recommended that prior to disclose of suspected or actual illegal activities, first discusses the matter with a senior colleague (ADRI or ADA) or, for students, their supervisor or Module Leader.

n. Additional measures are required for the collection, use and storage of "special category data" (see Definitions, 5.0), which also includes some of the protected characteristics outlined in the Equality Act.

o. Where the academic activity involves vulnerable groups (see 3.2.q), care must be taken to safeguard participants' welfare, including Disclosure and Barring Service checks where appropriate. This should not be seen as a barrier to including such groups in the activity.

p. All those engaged with the academic activity must normally be informed fully about the nature, purposes, methods and intended possible uses of the activity, what their participation in the activity entails, and what risks and benefits are involved. This information should be accurate, clear, and easily understood by the potential research participant, who should have the ability to understand what is involved in their participation. Academic activities proposing variation from this principle may be approved only in very specific contexts, in which the lack of proper information, or the inability of the research project participants to comprehend the information, must be justified by the value of the activity. Evidence of the provision of information and participant acceptance must be kept in accordance with the Data Protection Act 2018 and any other regulatory or any funder requirements (see also Records Retention Schedule, 4.0).

q. The University of Salford promotes inclusion of all those who may benefit from its academic activities. However, careful consideration must be given to academic activity which involves:

   ix. Human participants, including gathering of data using interviews, questionnaires, observation and testing

   x. The use of personal data from living and recently deceased people

   xi. Financial inducements to participation in academic activities

   xii. The collection of human or animal tissue, or other samples

   xiii. Vulnerable, or potentially vulnerable, groups including, but not restricted to:
   - Children (under the age of 18)
   - People with learning or communication difficulties
   - People for whom English is not their first language and/or people who are unable to readily understand the language used in the academic activity
   - Patients or clinical populations and/or their carers
   - Pregnant women or participants in academic activities relating to conception or contraception
   - People who are recently bereaved
   - People in custody or any other form of detention
   - People engaged in illegal activities (e.g. drug taking)
   (see also Safeguarding Policy, 4.0)

r. Participants in academic activities must be able to consent to participation in a voluntary way, free from coercion, harassment, pestering, undue influence, or manipulation. Use of inducements to encourage participation must be considered and approved as part of the formal academic ethics review process and be carefully monitored as part of this process.

s. Participants in academic activities should be informed in advance of any controversial or sensitive materials or topics which have the potential to cause offence or distress,

and must be given the opportunity to opt out, or to view alternative materials (where possible).

t. The default position is that written consent is required from research project participants in academic activities, and/or their appropriate representatives.[3] Where this is not possible, the method by which consent will be obtained and recorded, and/or the justification for exception must be reviewed and approved as part of the formal academic ethics review process.

u. Any academic activities involving public engagement are subject to formal academic ethics review. Involvement of the public in the design of research studies is exempt where information is for internal use only and will not be released into the public domain.

v. Any conflicts of interest or partiality must be disclosed in accordance with the Register of Interests, Gifts, Hospitality Policy (4.0). Publication of results or other outcomes of academic activities must be done fairly and with the public good taking priority over private interests.

w. The University does not prohibit academic activities involving any country, organisation or sector; however, all academic activities should adhere to the University's Ethics Framework and the National Security in Research Policy (4.0).

x. All academic activities which are of a controversial and/or security sensitive nature should follow the University's ICT Acceptable Use Policy (4.0) and are subject to an agreement with Digital IT's Information Security Team, which should be detailed in the formal academic ethics review process.

y. Any academic activities involving the use of human tissue and fluid samples must undergo rigorous internal and external ethics scrutiny and control, and must comply with all statutory legislation and codes of practice including the Human Tissue Act (2014) and the Human Fertilisation and Embryology Act (2008).

z. The University does not permit animal research or experimentation, meaning on live vertebrates and cephalopods, on its premises. It is the responsibility of the researcher to ensure, in the case of research on animals undertaken on behalf of the University either by a third party or in external organisations, that the methods used must adhere to the principle of Replacing, Refining and Reducing the use of animals for research purposes, and that all statutory controls and codes of practice are observed by the third-party organisation, including the Animals (Scientific Procedures) Act (1986).

aa. All academic activities involving non-human genetic resources (GR) or associated traditional knowledge accessed on or after 12th October 2014 must comply with the Nagoya Protocol on Access to Genetic Resources and the Fair and Equitable Sharing of Benefits Arising from their Utilization (ABS).

bb. Any academic activities involving self-experimentation (meaning that the designer, operator, subject, analyst, and user or reporter of the experiment are all the same) must be subject to formal academic ethics review. Applicants will need to provide clear justification, a full description of what measures will be taken to mitigate any potential risks and concerns and, where samples are being taken, follow specific safety limits. Activities of self-experimentation that are part of the staff member's role or which serve the purpose of planning research, and which have been risk assessed, are exempt.

---

[3] For online research it may constitute a digital signature.

cc. All new or substantially altered modules must undergo a process of formal academic ethics review and will be referred by the Quality Management Office (QMO) to the relevant school ethics panel. Modules must be rereviewed every five years or after every substantial change to content or delivery, whichever occurs first. An internally open record of all modules that require ethics review should be kept on the Hub.

3.3   Academic Ethics Management

a.   All academic activities (2.0) which involve the principles outlined in 3.2 should undergo formal academic ethics review and sign-off and must also adhere to the University's Ethics Framework. Individuals are required to determine whether their activities fall within the scope of this policy, and where this is the case, the activities should be formally reviewed and signed off through the University's governance structures (see 3.4) before the activities take place, and with regards to the degree and risk (including the impact and/or likelihood) of potential harm.

b.   The purpose of ethics review is to ensure that academic activities are undertaken from a place of sound ethical basis and to ensure that the University can defend work carried out in its name and on its premises.

c.   Retrospective ethics approval is not permitted under any circumstances.

d.   It is essential that the University is aware of all projects with ethical implications being undertaken in its name or on its premises.

e.   Where activities require ethics approval by an outside body (e.g. the NHS, the EU or a partner organisation), it is still necessary for them to be reviewed by the relevant internal panel. This enables any issues of fundamental or specific concern for the University to be identified and addressed before details are submitted for external sign-off. The final outcome of, as well as any subsequent amendments to, ethics scrutiny by any outside body must be reported back to the relevant School Ethics Panel and/or committee for final ratification and recording.

f.   Records pertaining to Academic Ethics management and review will be retained on the Ethics Management platform, Infonetica and managed by the Research Ethics Administrators in Research & Knowledge Exchange (for Research Ethics) and by the School Ethics Administrators (for Taught Programme Ethics) in line with appropriate internal data storage and destruction policies. It is, however, the responsibility of the individual researcher (student or staff) to retain their own copies of such records, adhering to appropriate internal data storage and destruction policies and external legislation.

3.4   University Academic Ethics Governance and Approval Structures

a. The governance and management of academic ethics review and approval processes is outlined in the University's Scheme of Academic Governance (see 4.0).

b. Governance of Research Ethics is through the School Ethics Approval Committee (SEAC) and the Academic Ethics & Research Integrity Committee (AERIC) with day-to-day administrative management through the Research & Knowledge Exchange (RKE) Directorate.

c. Governance of Taught Programme Ethics operational matters is through the School Ethics Approval Committee (SEAC) and the Education & Student Experience

Committee (ESEC).[4] Governance of taught programme ethics strategic matters is through the Academic Ethics & Research Integrity Committee (AERIC). Day-to-day administrative management is through the School.

d. The purpose and Terms of Reference for each Committee/Panel is provided in the University's Scheme of Academic Governance and can also be found at:

➢ [Senate and its Committees](#) (internal access only)
➢ [Council and its Committees](#) (internal access only)
➢ More information on Academic Ethics and associated procedures can be found on the [Academic Ethics Hub](#) (staff and PGRs), the [Research & Knowledge Exchange Hub](#) and the [Taught Programme Ethics Hub](#).

3.5   Roles and Responsibilities

The Pro Vice-Chancellor Research & Enterprise has overall responsibility for Research Ethics and the Associate Pro Vice-Chancellor Education and Student Experience has overall responsibility for Taught Programme Ethics through a designated committee structure.

a. The University is responsible for:
   i.   Maintaining and managing academic ethics and governance frameworks.
   ii. Providing an approved structure for the leadership and management of academic ethics to ensure that the highest standards of ethics are maintained at the University of Salford.
   iii. Creating and maintaining an environment where it is safe to report any breaches in ethical standard, using accessible processes including Adverse Event Report (Infonetica) the Code of Conduct for Students, the Whistle Blowing Policy, the Research Misconduct Policy and Procedure and the Academic Misconduct Procedure (see 4.0).
b. All staff, students and individuals outlined in section 2.0 are responsible for:
   i.   Demonstrating a personal ethical standard and delivering academic activities in a manner which maintains sound ethical behaviour and University culture, in line with the principles outlined in 3.2.
   ii. Following the appropriate University procedure for obtaining ethics guidance and approval to proceed with academic activities.
   iii. Recognising that ethics approval can take time, especially for highly sensitive activity, and for ensuring that in planning their work they allow sufficient time to obtain academic ethics approval before commencing the proposed activity.
   iv. Reporting any breach in ethics standards as outlined in this Policy, the Research Code of Practice, the Research Misconduct Policy and Procedure and the Academic Misconduct Procedure.
c. Supervisors of postgraduate research students are responsible for:
   i.   Providing guidance and assistance to ensure ethical design, conduct and dissemination of their students' academic activities.

---

[4] Operational matters include but are not limited to: review panel membership, matters of workload, academic misconduct, administration, auditing and assessments.

        ii. Providing considered initial sign-off of their students' applications prior to submission to academic ethics panels in accordance with agreed timescales.

   d. Supervisors of undergraduate and taught postgraduate programme students are responsible for:

        i. Providing appropriate ethical guidance and taking all reasonable precautions in ensuring that students' academic activities are conducted ethically.

        ii. Providing considered sign-off of their students' applications prior to submission to academic ethics panels in accordance with agreed timescales.

   e. Undergraduate and taught postgraduate programme students are responsible for:

        i. Complying with the requirements of block ethics approval.

        ii. Seeking individual ethics review if their proposed academic activities include or change to include sensitive research topics.

        iii. Prompt reporting to their supervisor(s) or Module Leader of any problems they face complying with the requirements of academic ethics review (whether block approval or individual).

        iv. Keeping their supervisor(s) apprised of the status of their ethics application.

        v. Where relevant and appropriate, maintaining records of academic ethics review and related documentation in line with any data protection and data management expectations.

        vi. Submitting evidence of declaration of compliance with the block approval application **or** an individual ethics application Favourable Opinion outcome with the final project submission.[5]

   f. Undergraduate and postgraduate taught programme Module Leaders are responsible for:

        i. Where appropriate and relevant, obtaining block ethics approval for all students on a specified module (module as defined by CRN).

        ii. Obtaining module-level ethics review for modules where there are, or may be, ethical dimensions or considerations.

        iii. Providing guidance to the students enrolled on the module(s) on how to submit an ethics application and for which individual projects block approval and individual ethics review are permissible.

   g. Undergraduate and postgraduate taught Programme Leaders are responsible for:

        i. Ensuring that their programmes' aims, learning outcomes and delivery are aligned with the University's expectations around ethical undertaking of academic activities, including formal academic ethics review.

        ii. Upholding all appropriate policies and regulations which apply to their students and/or programmes.

3.6 Policy Enforcement

   a. Breach of this Policy in terms of either the general ethics standard or specific process will be considered as having the potential to bring the University and its employees into disrepute and managed in that context.

   b. Specific processes will be brought to bear in this context, including the Research Misconduct Policy and Procedure, the Academic Misconduct Procedure, Student Misconduct Procedure, Fitness to Practice Procedure and the University's Disciplinary Policy.

---

[5] Confirmation undertaken by the assessor.

3.7   Policy Promotion and Training

    a. The University is responsible for providing support for those in key leadership roles within the governance structure for ethics, including committee and panel members, ensuring that they have access to the necessary knowledge and skills training in order to perform their role effectively.

    b. The University also takes the lead on bringing this policy to the attention of all those to whom it applies and ensures that there are adequate provisions made for providing training and development for staff and students in the principles and application of ethics policy to enable staff and students to understand what is expected of them.

    c. The Research & Knowledge Exchange Directorate will be responsible for research staff and postgraduate research student inductions in relation to academic ethics and the promotion of the Academic Ethics Policy and related training materials. Schools will be responsible for teaching and learning staff, undergraduate and postgraduate taught student inductions and training in relation to academic ethics and the promotion of the Academic Ethics Policy.

    d. The Human Resources (Development) Division is responsible for the delivery of mandatory online training materials.

4.0 Related Documentation

Internal Websites (the Hub)
Academic Ethics Staff website
Academic Ethics Student website
Academic Handbook
Code of Practice for the Conduct of Postgraduate Research Degree Programmes
Data Management Plan
Equality, Diversity & Inclusion Annual Report 2021 (incl. EDI Statement)
Information Governance website
Programme Development and Review Procedures and Guidance
Quality Management Office

[Senate and Committees website](#)
[Student Facing Procedures website](#)
Policies and Procedures **(all internal)**
[Academic Misconduct Procedure](#)
[Data Protection Policy](#)
[Disciplinary Policy](#)
[Health and Safety Policy](#)
[ICT Acceptable Use Policy](#)
[Research Misconduct Policy and Procedure](#)
[Programme Approval, Amendment, Review and Withdrawal Policy](#)
[Programme Monitoring and Enhancement Procedure](#)
[Records Retention Schedule](#)
[Register of Interests, Gifts, Hospitality Policy (Declaration and Management of Conflicts of Interest)](#)
[Research Code of Practice](#)
[Safeguarding Guidance for Research](#)
[Safeguarding Policy](#)
[Sensitive Research Project Topics (Research Ethics)](#) [Taught Programme Ethics Sensitive Research Project Topics (Taught Programme Ethics)](#)

[Student Misconduct Procedure](#)
[Scheme of Academic Governance](#)
[University Ethics Framework](#)
[Whistle Blowing Policy](#)

Related external legislation, policies and information
[Animals (Scientific Procedures) Act (1986)](#)
[Charter (University of Salford)](#)
[Data Protection Act (2018)](#)
[Disclosure and Barring Service](#)
[Equality Act (2010)](#)
[Gender Recognition Act (2004)](#)
[Human Fertilisation and Embryology Act (2008)](#)
[Human Tissue Act (2004)](#)
[Nagoya Protocol (Convention on Biological Diversity, CBD)](#)   [Nagoya Protocol (UK: DSIT/DEFRA)](#)

5.0 Appendices

Appendix A: Definitions

Term	Definition
Block Approval	The process by which a Module Leader applies for ethics review for all independent student projects to be completed and submitted a specified module (as defined by its CRN). This may only apply where there are no PSRB requirements and where the project does not seek to, or actually, involve any [sensitive research projects](#); for these projects, individual student ethics applications are required with no exceptions.

Honorary Contract	A formally recognised appointment arranged by an authorised individual that may be paid or unpaid and permanent or temporary, either:
	
	   a) To undertake a specified piece of work/research, **OR**
	
	   b) Following a process of nomination by a Dean(s) of School and the Vice Chancellor, and sign off by the Vice Chancellor
	
	and in both cases where the appointee undertakes work on behalf of the University.

Human Participant	A human participant is any research participant engaged for/recruited onto a research study. Recruitment and/or engagement may be face-to-face, online, over the telephone, through responding to a questionnaire or survey, involving invasive or non-invasive research methods through qualitative or quantitative research.
Informed Consent	A potential research participant must be given all the information about the what the research involves and what their involvement will entail before they can give informed consent. Consent must be voluntary. How informed consent is sought and recorded may depend on the nature of your research; whichever process is used should be clearly outlined in the associated ethics application. However, item 3.2 q of this policy states that the default position is written consent.
Minor, or Child	A human being under the age of 18 (see UN Human Rights Office of the High Commissioner, OHCHR, 'Convention on the Rights of Child').
Personal Data	The University adheres to the Information Commissioner's Office (ICO) definitions of personal data. The ICO also defines "special category data" which are singled out in GDR as likely to be more sensitive. Researchers must be aware that some of the protected characteristics outlined in the Equality Act are classified as special category data. Researchers should make themselves aware of the appropriate access, storage and use of special category data, which requires specific protection.
Research Participants (also referred to as "participants)	Study participants. Individuals recruited to a research study by means of providing data, testing a product, providing insight and

	opinions on a specified matter for the purposes of informing an academic activity being undertaken as research. This may be in a clinical setting, focus group, on film, or a recipient of a survey or questionnaire, etc.
Self-Experimentation	In a research project, self-experimentation refers to when the designer, operator, subject, analyst, and user or reporter of the experiment are all the same
Sensitive Research Topics	As defined by the institution, there are two internal guides: Sensitive Research Topics (for staff and PGRs) Taught Programme Ethics Sensitive Research Topics (including a definition of Block Approval, for UG, PGT and Modules)
Vulnerable individual	Vulnerable populations in the context of research refer to those whose circumstances may cause them to be susceptible to undue influence. This can include (but is not limited to) physical or mental health, age or social position. A non-exhaustive list of vulnerable groups is given in this policy, item 3.2 j The Care Act (2014) NHS England Safeguarding Adults GMC Consent to Research

Appendix B. Contacts, Concerns, Complaints: Research Ethics

a. An appropriate complaints procedure for research project participants should be detailed in the Participant Information Sheet and/or any other appropriate supporting documentation. Guidance on completing a PIS and all other supporting documentation is provided on the Academic Ethics Staff hub and Taught Programme Ethics hub.

b. Informal concerns and queries for research ethics may always be directed to research-governance@salford.ac.uk where they may be addressed to the Research Governance Manager.

c. If you have any concerns about how research is being conducted at or on behalf of the University of Salford, there are a number of ways to raise these concerns. To do so anonymously, you may use the Whistleblowing Policy, to do so confidentially, you may contact research-governance@salford.ac.uk. If you wish to raise concerns about research project misconduct in undergraduate or postgraduate taught programme projects, including an allegation, this should be done, with all available information, to studentconduct@salford.ac.uk

Please contact the Research Governance & Policy team in the Research & Enterprise Directorate with queries or comments about this Policy on research-governance@salford.ac.uk

Appendix C. Contacts, Concerns, Complaints: Taught Programme Ethics

a. An appropriate complaints procedure for research project participants should be detailed in the Participant Information Sheet and/or any other appropriate supporting documentation. Guidance on completing a PIS and all other supporting documentation is provided on the [Academic Ethics Student hub](#).

b. Informal concerns and queries for taught programme ethics may always be directed to ethics@salford.ac.uk

c. If you have any concerns about how research is being conducted at or on behalf of the University of Salford, there are a number of ways to raise these concerns. To do so anonymously, you may use the [Whistleblowing Policy](#), to do so confidentially, you may contact the School's Chair of Taught Ethics, details available on Infonetica (emailing ethics@salford.ac.uk for details if unknown).

d. If you wish to raise concerns about research project misconduct in undergraduate or postgraduate taught programme projects, including an allegation, this should be done, with all available information to studentconduct@salford.ac.uk or by escalating to the School Associate Dean Academic.

Document Control Information			
Revision History incl. Authorisation: (most recent first)			
Author	**Summary of changes**	**Version**	**Authorised & Date**
Task & Finish Group, Taught Programme Ethics	*Detailing of changes to governance structure and reporting lines for taught programme ethics.*	*V3.0*	Senate (April 2024) Education & Student Experience Committee (March 2024) Academic Ethics & Research Integrity Committee (February 2024)
RMC	Minor changes to Committee names and updates to URLs	*V2.2*	Research Governance Manager, March 2023
Research Governance Working Group	*Major review of content and fitness for purpose undertaken by the 2021-22 Research Governance Working Group under chairing of Dr Sibylle Thies. Addition of statements 3.2.U and 3.2.V, update of EIA.*	V2.0	Academic Ethics Committee, May 2022
Research Governance & Policy Manager	*Minor updates to text throughout for clarity; addition of item 2.d and of Definitions (Section 5.0); updates to URLs and job titles.*	V1.2	Academic Ethics Committee 28/04/21
Research Governance Officer	*Updates to Section 4.0*	V1.1	Academic Ethics Committee 29/04/20
Associate Director Research	*New document with input from QMO and consultation across the University*	V1.0	Academic Ethics Committee 28/06/17
Policy Management and Responsibilities:			
Owner:	This Policy is jointly issued by the Directorate of Research & Knowledge Exchange and the Associate PVC Education & Student Experience, who have the authority to issue and communicate policy on academic ethics. The day-to-day management and communication of the policy has been jointly delegated to the Research Governance & Policy Manager and the Associate Deans Academic (Quality Assurance & Enhancement).		
Others with responsibilities (please specify):	Research Governance Working Group; Academic Ethics & Research Integrity (AERIC) and the Education and Student Experience (ESEC) committees. All subjects of the Policy will be responsible for engaging with and adhering to this policy.		
Author to complete formal assessment with the following advisory teams:			
Equality Analysis (E&D, HR) **Link to EIA Library EIA2022-24**	1. *Completed with Equality, Inclusion & Diversity Team. Approved April 2022. Updated April 2024.*		
Legal implications (LPG)	2. *Assessed from August 2022. No further changes required. Future assessment only required for reasons of counsel or changes to legal position.*		
Information Governance (LPG)	3. *Assessed from August 2022. No further changes required. Future assessment only required for reasons of counsel or to information governance procedures.*		

Document Control Information	
Student facing procedures (QEO)	4. *Passed to QMO for consultation on changes, additional comments incorporated, July 2022.*
UKVI Compliance (Student Admin)	5. *N/A*
Consultation:	
Staff Trades Unions via HR Students via USSU Relevant external bodies (specify)	1. *N/A – consulted with HR representative for confirmation* 2. *Ongoing consultation with USSU through representation at committees*
Review:	
Review due:	At request of Senate, V3.0 to be reviewed by August 2025. As standard, every 2 years (by August 2026)
Document location:	**Research & Knowledge Exchange Hub**, the **University website** and **Student Hub:** - Student Handbook: Rules, Regulations and Procedures - SBS Taught Ethics; SEE Taught Ethics; SAMCT Taught Ethics; H&S Taught Ethics; - University website: Academic Handbook: Academic Ethics Policy
The owner and author are responsible for publicising this policy document.	