Research Ethics Policy and Procedures

Table of Contents

Statement of Principles

1. The Research Ethics Policy forms a part of the School's over-arching Ethics Code[1].

2. Researchers in the social sciences have responsibilities: to society at large; to those who fund their research; to the institutions that employ them or at which they study; to their colleagues and the wider academic and research community; to the people who take part in their research; and for their own safety and wellbeing. Reconciling those responsibilities can be difficult and may entail ethical judgement. The intention of this policy statement is that the School should provide a procedural framework to assist staff and students in exercising such judgement.

3. The policy relates to research – whether funded or unfunded – involving human participants[2], or involving data relating to directly identifiable human subjects (whether living or recently deceased), conducted by researchers[3]. It does not relate to other types of ethical judgements. For the purposes of this policy, the term 'researcher' includes members of the School's community including academics, contract research staff, postgraduate researchers, Master's students, and undergraduate students. For the purposes of this policy, 'research' is defined according to the HEFCE definition used for the Research Excellence Framework.[4]

4. The policy has been adopted in support of the School's wider commitments to the rights and dignity of all human subjects, intellectual freedom and research excellence. Sound ethical standards are a pre-requisite for excellent research. Equally, disproportionate, burdensome and narrowly framed research ethics procedures can be an obstacle to excellent research, and might thus themselves create an ethical challenge.

5. The procedures instituted in pursuit of this policy are intended:
    *   to facilitate, not inhibit, research;
    *   to promote a culture within the School whereby researchers conscientiously reflect on the ethical implications of their research;
    *   to apply a principle of subsidiarity whereby responsibility for research ethics will be embraced by researchers, supervisors, departments or institutes at a level as close as appropriately possible to the actual conduct of the research.

6. The policy is subject to oversight by the Research Ethics Committee, which is accountable to the Research Committee, the Ethics Committee, Academic Board and ultimately Council. It will be reviewed periodically. The policy is freely available to potential research funding agencies in the interests of transparency and to avoid possible pre-contractual misunderstandings. This document has been drawn up with regard to ethical guidelines relevant to research within the School. Any researcher considering research ethics should do so in conjunction with the resources and policies listed in Annex A.

---

[1] https://info.lse.ac.uk/staff/services/Policies-and-procedures/Assets/Documents/ethCod.pdf

[2] Should it arise, researchers conducting research involving animals should consider such elements of this policy as may apply, as well as any other relevant guidelines. Please contact the Research Ethics Committee via research.ethics@lse.ac.uk to discuss the relevant ethics review process.

[3] Research involving secondary analysis of established data sets from which it would not be possible to identify any living or recently deceased person need not be subject to the procedure, but wherever it is necessary for data to be effectively anonymised by LSE researchers, the procedure applies.

[4] REF2021: *"...research is defined as a process of investigation leading to new insights, effectively shared. It includes work of direct relevance to the needs of commerce, industry, and to the public and voluntary sectors; scholarship; the invention and generation of ideas, images, performances, artefacts including design, where these lead to new or substantially improved insights; and the use of existing knowledge in experimental development to produce new or substantially improved materials, devices, products and processes, including design and construction. It excludes routine testing and routine analysis of materials, components and processes such as for the maintenance of national standards, as distinct from the development of new analytical techniques. It also excludes the development of teaching materials that do not embody original research."*

Policy

Research ethics review procedure

7. Researchers are required to complete a Research Ethics Review for any research which involves human participants (or involves data relating to directly identifiable human subjects) – see full list below. The purpose of the review is to require researchers to reflect on the potential ethical implications of their research and the potential risks of harm (including risks to life, livelihoods, social relationships, emotional well-being, reputation, mental health, and more) that might be caused to the participants (as well as to the researcher(s) themselves).
Ethics review is required for any research involving:

   - Interviews, surveys, focus groups, experiments, observations of people, etc.
   - User generated data (e.g. from discussion forums, social media, vlogs, blogs, comments on posts or articles)
   - The collection or use of any personal data/identifiable information (e.g. names, email addresses, IP addresses, social media profiles or meta-data, visual material, etc.)[5]
   - Any other information that could identify a living individual (or potentially lead to their identification). For example: where information from micro datasets, if combined, could lead to the identification of individuals; or where an online search for particular wording could lead to the identification of an individual
   - If findings/conclusions/publication could have damaging repercussions for any individuals (reputation, stigma, bullying) or groups with protected characteristics
   - Any other reason why the research might raise ethical issues

8. When reflecting on the ethical implications of their research, researchers should refer not only to this policy but also to any/all the following where relevant: disciplinary frameworks, funders' guidance, legal statutes, cultural norms of those they intend to involve in their research. Researchers should also be familiar with the basic principles of the Belmont Report[6], which are: Respect for persons (and their autonomy), Beneficence, Non-maleficence, Distributive justice (ensuring benefits and burdens are shared equitably).

9. Researchers should refer to the guidance and instructions as to how to complete the online ethics review form.[7] There are two review/approval routes: applications categorised as low risk are reviewed/approved at **Departmental/Centre** level by either the supervisor/mentor (for student applications), or by the faculty approver (for staff applications); applications categorised as higher risk require review/approval by the **Research Ethics Committee** (see §11 below). Ethics review applications are automatically routed to either the Departmental or REC review process. In the case of student applications which are higher risk, the supervisor will review the application prior to submitting it to the Research Ethics Committee.

10. MSc student projects which are *not* for dissertations, and all undergraduate projects, are exempted from REC review[8], even where the project may contain some elements that would normally require REC review approval. They will be categorised for Departmental review and can be reviewed and approved by the relevant course convenor/supervisor/mentor. Where a course convenor/supervisor/mentor has significant concerns about a project they will have the option to refer the application to the REC should they wish to. (Course convenors may also like to

---

[5] Research that will only use data from publicly available archival records (including newspapers) does not require ethics review (unless there are other reasons why it may give rise to ethical issues – for example, see §34)
[6] https://www.hhs.gov/ohrp/sites/default/files/the-belmont-report-508c_FINAL.pdf
[7] https://info.lse.ac.uk/staff/divisions/research-and-innovation/research/research-ethics/Research-Ethics-Submission-System
[8] Unless the supervisor has concerns and opts to refer the application to the REC.

consider the option for review of 'small student research projects undertaken for coursework' outlined in §21-23 below.)

11. Applications requiring review/approval by the Research Ethics Committee are deemed to be those where the research:

- Will involve children/young people under the age of 18 or other vulnerable groups[9]; or sensitive topics that may be distressing[10]
- Will involve asking participants questions that they may find emotional or distressing
- Involves deception of participants or that is intentionally conducted without their full and informed consent at the time the study is carried out
- Entails the collection of any biometric or physiological data
- Might have negative repercussions for individuals or groups
- Will involve more than minimal risk of harm (whether emotional or physical) to the participants or the researcher(s) beyond that normally encountered in their regular activities.

Or where:
- The researcher will not obtain consent in writing[11]
- External obligations (e.g. funder requirements, data access requirements) require approval by the Research Ethics Committee

12. If your research may be subject to ethics review by an external body, please refer to § 24 below.

13. Any queries regarding the ethics review procedure should be directed to the Senior Research Ethics Manager in the first instance (via research.ethics@lse.ac.uk).

14. Substantial research projects and projects presenting significant ethical challenges will, on occasion, require Project Advisory Panels to be established to oversee the progress of the project and in such instances, it may be appropriate that a member of the Research Ethics Committee should sit on the Advisory Panel.

15. Ethical approval will normally be required before the commencement of research covered by this policy, or if required by the research funder[12], at a designated point in the development of the project,. Researchers should incorporate an appropriate lead-time into the planning of their research to allow for the deliberation, discussion, possible changes and reconsideration required in the ethics review process.

16. Reviews will be undertaken by the Research Ethics Committee as promptly as reasonably possible, having regard to the circumstances and the urgency with which approval may be required. The timeframes for ethics review can be found in §20 below.

---

[9] Please note that we follow the ESRC definition of vulnerability as follows: 'Vulnerability may be defined in different ways and may arise as a result of being in an abusive relationship, vulnerability due to age, potential marginalisation, disability, and due to disadvantageous power relationships within personal and professional roles. Participants may not be conventionally 'vulnerable', but may be in a dependent relationship that means they can feel coerced or pressured into taking part, so extra care is needed to ensure their participation is truly voluntary.' https://esrc.ukri.org/funding/guidance-for-applicants/research-ethics/frequently-raised-topics/research-with-potentially-vulnerable-people/ See also the LSE REC guidance on research with children and other vulnerable groups (see link, footnote 18)

[10] For example: where research intrudes into the private sphere or delves into some deeply personal experience; where the study is concerned with deviance or social control; where the study impinges on the vested interests of powerful persons or the exercise of coercion or domination; where the research deals with things that are sacred to those being studied that they do not wish profaned; or where discussion of the topic could place the participant (or researcher) at risk.

[11] Written consent does not necessarily require a hard copy or electronic signature - typed confirmation is acceptable. For online surveys, an explicit tick box for consent is also considered to be "written" consent). For researchers in the Anthropology department, the lack of written consent alone does not warrant REC review.

[12] For example, the ESRC requires full ethical scrutiny and approval only after the confirmation of award. However some funders require ethical safeguards to be described in advance of application, and ethical approval after confirmation of award.

17. The Research Ethics Committee may undertake an expedited review where the ethical risks of the project are not especially complex and where there is a genuine case for urgency due to circumstances which could not have been anticipated and which are outside of the researcher's control[13]. Expedited reviews are carried out by the Chair or Deputy Chair only. Decisions taken by expedited review will be reported to the Research Ethics Committee. Researchers requesting expedited review should email research.ethics@lse.ac.uk. However, researchers should not expect that urgency will pre-empt the full extent of the review process.

18. Where the Committee is not satisfied with an initial application, the applicant will be consulted with a view to revisions to the project or solutions to ethical problems that are acceptable to both the Committee and the researcher. The Committee may, at its discretion, request advice and guidance from others at the School or from outside experts to assist with advice and review as required. Decisions made by the Research Ethics Committee for each proposal will be recorded either by the Senior Research Ethics Manager or within the online ethics review system. The decision will be kept on file for a period of at least seven years or for the duration of the project (whichever is longer).

19. Committee decisions to reject a proposal are very rare. However, should the Committee decline to accept a proposal, the researcher has the right to request that the decision is considered by the Ethics Appeals Panel. See §45 below.

Timeframe for research ethics review

20. Researchers must ensure they obtain ethics approval before they commence any data collection. Applications can be submitted at any time; however, students should check any internal Departmental deadlines, and allow for those plus the following timeframes for the review/ approval process:

    Departmental review: researchers should check the timeframe with their Department.

    Research Ethics Committee review: student applications first go to the relevant project supervisor/academic mentor for review. Students should monitor the status of their application online and send a reminder to the supervisor if necessary. Once the supervisor submits the application to the Research Ethics Committee, students can then expect to receive initial feedback from the Committee within two weeks of submission. In most cases approval may take longer as the student may be asked to provide some additional details, clarifications or to make amendments before approval can be confirmed. Complex applications may require even longer and/or further iterations with the researcher. Students should as a rule allow four weeks for the REC review process (in addition to the review by the supervisor).

    Expedited review: expedited review should only be requested where there is a genuine case for urgency – see §17 above. Where such a case is presented, the review will be undertaken by the Chair or Deputy Chair of the Research Ethics Committee usually within a few days. Again, however, even in expedited cases time pressure should not be expected to pre-empt the full review process and the iterations or requests for clarification and amendment which require a further round of approval.

---

[13] For example, in the case of fast-track funding to address global or national emergencies

Review of small student research projects undertaken for coursework

21. Where students will be undertaking very small projects as part of their coursework, the course convenor/class teacher may submit a single/consolidated ethics review form via the online ethics review submission system for the course/assignment that covers the types of projects the students will be conducting in lieu of the students submitting individual review forms. This option should not, however, be used for student dissertations.

22. Where a course convenor/class teacher wishes to submit an ethics review form for a whole class in this way, they should enter the course code/title in the Project title field (e.g. 'SO451 Cities by Design'), and select Yes to question F8 so that the review form is directed to the REC. The course convenor/class teacher should provide a brief note (in the 'Covering comments' box) about any potential ethical concerns they feel the projects might give rise to. Subsequently, the convenor/class teacher must let the Research Ethics Committee know each year whether or not there are changes with ethical implications to the types of projects the students will be conducting.

23. Any questions about this option should be directed to Lyn Grove in the first instance via research.ethics@lse.ac.uk

External ethics review

24. Duplication of ethics reviews will be avoided where possible, especially in regard to research that may fall under the rubric of other ethics review bodies (e.g. NHS Research Ethics Committees , or the Research Ethics Committee of another university). In these cases the researcher should provide details of the external review body in the relevant section of the online ethics review form. The researcher will receive confirmation via Senior Research Ethics Manager as to whether or not LSE ethics review/approval is also required. The researcher will be asked to submit a copy of the letter of approval from the relevant review body. Notwithstanding the principle of avoiding duplication, if deemed appropriate the LSE Research Ethics Committee will consider the ethical implications of the research in its own right (regardless of whether approval has already been granted externally).

25. As a guide, external ethics review/approval will normally be deemed to be sufficient where the body undertaking the review is:
    • another academic institution within the UK; or
    • an international academic institution operating in a country with equivalent ethical standards to the UK, and has a defined ethics review policy/procedure; or
    • a third party organisation that can demonstrate the existence of an ethics approval process that aligns to the standards applicable to higher education institutions and/or is appropriate for the research in question (e.g. the Health Research Authority, Social Care Research Ethics Committee).

26. In all cases, the researcher should confirm that the external ethics review will cover all research activities to be undertaken by themselves and any LSE researchers involved in the project.

27. Exemption from review by an external partner will not be accepted in lieu of review/approval by the LSE Research Ethics Committee if the study requires review/approval according to the LSE Research Ethics Policy.

28. Where research involves more than one institution, each institution retains formal responsibility for overseeing the ethical review of research conducted under its auspices. Wherever possible

the School should accept the decisions made by the Research Ethics Committee of the institution where the Principal Investigator is based.

Amendments

29. Ethics review forms cannot be edited once they have been approved. Where a researcher needs to make amendments to a study that has already received ethics approval, the researcher should complete an Amendments form[14] and send this to the research ethics team via research.ethics@lse.ac.uk (students should copy in the their project supervisor[15]). The research ethics team will advise whether any further review of the proposed amendment is required (either by the supervisor/Department or the Research Ethics Committee as appropriate). Once approval is confirmed, the research ethics team will upload a copy of the Amendments form to the researcher's original ethics application submission online.

30. **Taught students** should avoid wherever possible having to make any amendments to their projects over the summer vacation period that will require ethics approval as their project supervisor may not be available to review these changes where required.

31. Submission of a new ethics review form will be avoided wherever possible. However where there are very significant changes the researcher may be asked to submit a new application for review.

Informed consent and vulnerable groups

32. Where information is to be collected from human participants, other than in very particular circumstances informed consent will have to be obtained from those subjects for any use of their information. Researchers should refer to the LSE guidance on Informed Consent (which includes two sample templates)[16].

33. Where proposed research might expose its participants to a risk of harm, the researcher has an ethical duty to consider these risks, even where the participant has consented to participate in the study. It is particularly important to think through carefully the likely impact on vulnerable groups, for example children, incarcerated persons, stateless persons, persons belonging to groups who have been or are often targeted with abuse or discrimination based on protected characteristics such as race, gender, sexuality, disability or religion, or people with learning disabilities, or students when they are participating in research as students[17]. Some participants may have diminished capacity to give consent and are therefore less able to protect themselves and require specific consideration. Where researchers will have unsupervised access to children or vulnerable adults a Disclosure and Barring Service check may be required. Researchers should refer to the LSE Safeguarding in Research and International Activities Policy[18] and guidance 'Research with children and other vulnerable groups'[19].

34. Research that does not entail the direct participation of living human persons may nonetheless indirectly but significantly affect living persons. Researchers may be assessing information about

---

[14] https://info.lse.ac.uk/staff/divisions/research-and-innovation/research/Assets/Documents/Word/ethics-amendments-form.docx

[15] The word 'supervisor' is used to encompass project/dissertation/thesis supervisor (or academic mentor/ advisor) as appropriate.

[16] https://info.lse.ac.uk/staff/services/Policies-and-procedures/Assets/Documents/infCon.pdf

[17] Since students being asked to participate in research being conducted by a member of faculty or a class teacher may not want to decline participating for fear it might impact their marks

[18] https://info.lse.ac.uk/staff/services/Policies-and-procedures/Assets/Documents/safResIntActPol.pdf

[19] https://info.lse.ac.uk/staff/divisions/research-and-innovation/research/Assets/Documents/PDF/ethics-working-with-children-and-vulnerable-groups-v1.pdf

identifiable individuals, the publication or analysis of which may have ethical (and indeed legal) implications. For example, the collection and use of archive, historical, legal, online or visual materials may raise ethical issues (e.g. for families and friends of people deceased), and research on provision of social or human services may impact provision for individuals and groups of service users who did not contribute or consent to, or were not consulted about the research. Researchers should as far as possible consider such implications and outline strategies to mitigate the harms.

Research conducted outside the UK

35. Where research is to be conducted outside the UK, the researcher must establish whether local ethical review is required by the host country, and if not, how the principles of the Research Ethics Policy can be followed in developing and undertaking the research. The ethical standards that the School expects for UK research apply equally to work undertaken outside the UK. Researchers must, however, ensure that they comply with any legal and ethical requirements of the country/ies where the research is taking place[20].

36. Where the LSE researcher will be hiring local research assistants or project partners overseas, they must ensure that appropriate methodological and ethical training is given, and also that any such collaborators work in accordance with the principles of the LSE Research Ethics Policy, data protection policies, and Safeguarding in Research and International Activities Policy[21]. A risk assessment may also be required of any activities to be undertaken by local research assistants.[22]

Legal and data protection requirements

37. Researchers must comply with any relevant legal requirements. In particular, they must ensure compliance with the UK Data Protection Act 2018 and EU General Data Protection Regulation (GDPR), regardless of where in the world they will be conducting their research.

38. It remains the responsibility of the researcher to ensure that arrangements are in place to maintain the integrity and security of research data. Please refer to Annex A for guidance on LSE research data management. If further guidance is required regarding the security of data the researcher should contact the research data librarian via datalibrary@lse.ac.uk .

39. Secondary use of datasets must be given careful consideration by the researcher and the Research Ethics Committee, especially where reliance is being placed on a presumed consent by subjects to the use of their information, or where there is a potential risk of disclosure of sensitive information. Researchers who collect primary data that are to be archived and may be used by others for secondary analysis should be mindful that the consent obtained from the persons providing such data and the safeguards applied to protect their identity should be sufficient for that secondary purpose. (For guidance on these matters please contact the Research Data Librarian via Datalibrary@lse.ac.uk)

---

[20] A useful resource is the US Department of Health and Human Services International Compilation of Human Research Standards listing, available at: https://www.hhs.gov/ohrp/international/compilation-human-research-standards/index.html
[21] https://info.lse.ac.uk/staff/services/Policies-and-procedures/Assets/Documents/safResIntActPol.pdf
[22] Advice on this should be sought from the Health and Safety team, Health.and.Safety@lse.ac.uk

Health and Social Care research

40. Researchers working in the field of health or social care must comply with the *UK policy framework for health and social care research*[23]. The policy framework applies to health and social care research involving patients, service users or their relatives or carers. This includes research involving them indirectly, for example using information that the NHS or social care services have collected about them. Researchers should check whether their research should undergo ethics review via the Health Research Authority[24]. Under the UK Policy Framework, the researcher carries defined responsibilities as does the School in its capacity as the employer of the investigator. In addition to the ethics procedures outlined here, documentation will be held on record demonstrating compliance with the UK Policy Framework. The Director of the Research Division will provide written confirmation of compliance on behalf of the School, as required by the UK Policy Framework, seeking advice from the Chair of the Research Ethics Committee where necessary.

Training

41. All students and staff undertaking research involving human participants or data that identifies human subjects are required in the course of their studies or career to have undertaken appropriate training, or to have relevant experience, in order to evaluate the ethical implications of the research they plan to undertake.

42. This policy should be formally incorporated into any undergraduate/postgraduate training programme/documentation offered at departmental level. All degree programmes (undergraduate, Master's and research degrees) must incorporate at least one lecture, seminar or support session that covers research ethics. All students undertaking research for a dissertation or thesis should have access through their supervisor to appropriate advice and support in relation to research ethics. For further information on training please contact research.ethics@lse.ac.uk. Students should also refer to the training available via LSE LIFE and the PhD Academy.

43. All academic members of the Research Ethics Committee are required to have undertaken appropriate training and/or to have had significant relevant experience before taking up their responsibilities on the Committee.

44. Any members of the Research and Innovation Division whose roles may include providing advice on the implementation of this Policy are also required to have undertaken suitable training or to have had significant relevant experience before providing advice on the implementation of this Policy.

Appeals procedure

45. As stated in §19 above, Committee decisions to reject a proposal are very rare. However, should the Committee decline to accept a proposal, the researcher has the right to request that the decision is considered by an Ethics Appeals Panel.

46. Appeals should be submitted to the ProDirector for Research in the first instance, who may then convene an appeals panel as appropriate. The constitution of the appeals panel may vary, but

---

[23] https://www.hra.nhs.uk/documents/1068/uk-policy-framework-health-social-care-research.pdf

[24] There is an easy-to-use tool to help you ascertain whether or not you need HRA approval or not at: http://www.hra-decisiontools.org.uk/ethics/ For further guidance see: http://www.hra.nhs.uk/research-community/before-you-apply/determine-which-review-body-approvals-are-required/

would normally include the ProDirector for Research (as Chair),the Chair and/or Deputy Chair of the Research Ethcis Committee, and the Deputy Head (Research) of the relevant department (or equivalent in the case of research centres/institutes).

Researcher, departmental and institutional monitoring

Researchers' responsibilities

47.   In the first instance it will be the responsibility of the researcher to monitor the conduct of research that has received ethical approval (for students, in consultation with supervisors). The researcher, together with any Project Advisory Panel or Group where relevant, must ensure that there is an appropriate continuing review of the research, taking into account any possible changes that may occur over the duration of the research project. It is the responsibility of the researcher to alert the Research Ethics Committee if any further ethical implications arise. It is the responsibility of the researcher to ensure that data are securely held and preserved.

Departmental/centre/institute responsibilities[25]

48.   Departments are responsible for ensuring that students and staff complete an ethics review where required and obtain approval before commencing any data collection. Students should receive appropriate training including guidance on research design. Following ethics approval (whether approved at Departmental level or by the Research Ethics Committee) Departments/ supervisors are responsible for maintaining supervision of student projects to ensure there is practical compliance with the ethics approval.
Departments are asked to undertake two types of monitoring:

- **Monitoring the status of student ethics submissions**

    Departments (e.g. programme administrators or class teachers) should monitor the ethics submissions from students to ensure that where relevant:
    - Students have submitted their ethics review forms within the timeframe expected
    - Supervisors have reviewed and approved (or, where relevant, referred to the Research Ethics Committee) the application within the timeframe expected
    - That where an application has been categorised as "Approval not required", that the supervisor has checked and confirmed that this is correct[26]

- **Auditing of ethics submissions**
For applications approved at Departmental level, Departments are asked to check periodically that these have undergone review/approval by the appropriate person. The Research Ethics Committee recommends that this monitoring is conducted at two specific times during the academic year – for instance, early in the Winter Term and early or middle of the Spring term.

    Departments should therefore have procedures in place to monitor:
    i.   that student ethics review forms have been submitted where required and have been approved by the appropriate supervisor;
    ii.   that staff ethics review forms have been reviewed/approved by the appropriate departmental/faculty ethics approver.

It is up to Departments how best to organise this process. For instance, course convenors or programme administrators/managers could oversee (i), whereas either the faculty approver or

---

[25] Where 'Department' is stated the same applies to research centres and institues if appropriate
[26] As of November 2022 applciations categorised as 'Approval not required' will automatically be routed to the supervisor/approver named in B7 of the form, who should check that the student/researcher has correctly answered the questions in screen C.

Department manager should oversee (ii). The outcome of both monitoring exercises should be reported to the Departmental research committee (or, in the case of Centres/Institutes, to their management committees).

Institutional responsibilities

49. The Research Ethics Committee will periodically conduct a selective audit of current research projects.

50. Where significant concerns have been raised about the ethical conduct of a study, the Research Ethics Committee can request a full and detailed account of the research for a further ethical review.

51. Where the Research Ethics Committee considers that a study is being conducted in a way which is not in accord with the conditions of its original approval it may consider withdrawal of its approval and require that the research be suspended or discontinued. It is the duty of the Research Ethics Committee to inform the appropriate funding body that ethical approval has been revoked.

Failure to comply with this Policy

52. Failure to undertake a review of the ethical implications of research or to comply with any other aspect of this Policy or failure to apply reasonable care in assessing the likely ethical implications of a research project, may constitute research misconduct under the School's research misconduct policy and procedures.[27]

---

[27] https://info.lse.ac.uk/staff/services/Policies-and-procedures/Assets/Documents/codResCon.pdf

Annex A: Useful external and School resources

Anonymisation: managing data protection risk
See Research Data Toolkit, under Data Management, below

Belmont Report
https://www.hhs.gov/ohrp/sites/default/files/the-belmont-report-508c_FINAL.pdf

Research with Chidren and other vulnerable groups (LSE guidance)
https://info.lse.ac.uk/staff/divisions/research-and-innovation/research/Assets/Documents/PDF/ethics-working-with-children-and-vulnerable-groups-v1.pdf

Code of Research Conduct, LSE (incorporating research misconduct policy and procedures)
https://info.lse.ac.uk/staff/services/Policies-and-procedures/Assets/Documents/codResCon.pdf

Data management and data protection (LSE resources)
Research Data management webpage:
https://www.lse.ac.uk/library/research-support/research-data-management-and-open-data
Research Data Toolkit:
https://info.lse.ac.uk/staff/services/Policies-and-procedures/Assets/Documents/internal/staffAndStudents/resDatManToo-B460.pdf

Disclosure and Barring Service
Criminal record checking which may be required if working with children or vulnerable groups.
https://www.gov.uk/government/collections/dbs-checking-service-guidance--2

ESRC Framework for Research Ethics
The ESRC requires that the research it supports is designed and conducted in such a way that it meets certain ethical principles; that it is subject to proper professional and institutional oversight in terms of research governance.
http://www.esrc.ac.uk/files/funding/guidance-for-applicants/esrc-framework-for-research-ethics-2015/
See also ESRC Postgraduate Training Guidelines:
https://www.ukri.org/publications/esrc-postgraduate-training-and-development-guidelines/

Ethics review considerations: A quick guide for researchers (students or staff)
https://info.lse.ac.uk/staff/divisions/research-and-innovation/research/Assets/Documents/PDF/ethicsReviewConsiderations-QuickGuide.pdf

External Funding Acceptance Procedures
https://info.lse.ac.uk/staff/services/Policies-and-procedures/Assets/Documents/extFunAccPro.pdf

Ethics Code, LSE
The LSE Ethics Code is a set of six core principles, including Responsibility and Accountability, Integrity, and declaring conflicts of interest.
https://info.lse.ac.uk/staff/services/Policies-and-procedures/Assets/Documents/ethCod.pdf

Ethics review submission system (LSE): Instructions and guidance for users
https://info.lse.ac.uk/staff/divisions/research-and-innovation/research/research-ethics/Research-Ethics-Submission-System

European Science Foundation European Code of Conduct for Research Integrity

The code addresses the proper conduct and principled practice of systematic research in the natural and social sciences and the humanities in Europe.
https://ec.europa.eu/info/funding-tenders/opportunities/docs/2021-2027/horizon/guidance/european-code-of-conduct-for-research-integrity_horizon_en.pdf

Informed consent (LSE guidance)
Including two sample Information Sheet and Consent form templates
https://info.lse.ac.uk/staff/services/Policies-and-procedures/Assets/Documents/infCon.pdf

International Compilation of Human Research Standards listing
Published by the US Department of Health and Human Services, provides a listing of laws, regulations, and guidelines on human subjects protections in 130 countries and from many international organizations:
https://www.hhs.gov/ohrp/international/compilation-human-research-standards/index.html

Mental Capacity Act (2005)
http://www.legislation.gov.uk/ukpga/2005/9/contents

Nuffield Council on Bioethics: The ethics of research involving animals
http://nuffieldbioethics.org/project/animal-research/

Payments and benefits to research participants (LSE guidance)
https://info.lse.ac.uk/staff/divisions/research-and-innovation/research/Assets/Documents/PDF/ethics-incentives-reimbursement-etc-v5.pdf

Research Privacy Notice (LSE), for Participants, Partners and Collaborators
https://info.lse.ac.uk/staff/divisions/Secretarys-Division/Assets/Documents/Information-Records-Management/Privacy-Notice-for-Research-v1.1.pdf

Safeguarding in Research and International Activities Policy (LSE)
https://info.lse.ac.uk/staff/services/Policies-and-procedures/Assets/Documents/safResIntActPol.pdf

Social media and internet data in research: ethics and consent (LSE guidance)
https://info.lse.ac.uk/staff/divisions/research-and-innovation/research/Assets/Documents/PDF/ethics-Using-internet-and-Social-media-data-v8.pdf

UKRI Policy and Guidelines on the Governance of Good Research Conduct
The policy aims to help researchers and research organisations to manage their research, and provides guidance of the reporting and investigation of unacceptable research misconduct.
https://www.ukri.org/wp-content/uploads/2021/03/UKRI-050321-PolicyGuidelinesGovernanceOfGoodResearchConduct.pdf

UKRIO Code of Practice for Research: Promoting good practice and preventing misconduct
http://www.ukrio.org/what-we-do/code-of-practice-for-research/

UK policy framework for health and social care research
The policy framework applies to health and social care research involving patients, service users or their relatives or carers. This includes research involving them indirectly, for example using information that the NHS or social care services have collected about them.
https://www.hra.nhs.uk/documents/1068/uk-policy-framework-health-social-care-research.pdf

Review schedule

Review interval	Next review due by	Next review start
3 years	July 2025	November 2024

Version history

Version	Date	Approved by	Notes
Nov 14	Nov 2014	REC, RC	Completed review of policy plus annexes A, B and C
annexB2016_v4	Nov 2016	REC Chair	Minor amendment of wording to Q6 (re DMP) in Annex B
annexB_v5	Oct 2017	RC Chair	Updated web links; small change to fieldwork/risk assessment wording; sentence added to start of Part II re circumstances where Self-certification of ethics review is not appropriate
v8	Dec 2018	REC, RC	Changes to Self-certification process; revised policy and annexes
v9	August 2020		Updated ethics review procedure to align with online ethics review submission system; removal of Annex B (the previous ethics review from) and Annex C (the previous flowchart)
v9(i)	Sept 2020	Research Governance Manager	Re-insertion of a couple of missing footnotes
v10	March 2022	REC, Feb 2022; RC, March 2022; RC Chair May 2022	Review of policy. New sections re external review, amendments, timeframes, small student projects, and re-introduction/ update re departmental monitoring; ref to Belmont report; change to Appeals process.
v11	Nov 2022	REC & RC, Nov 2022	Change to review procedure for taught student projects that are not for dissertations; 'Low' and 'High' risk categories re-named 'Departmental' and 'REC review' respectively
v12	May 2023	REC & RC Chair, September 2023	Inclusion of a footnote to §3 the REF2021 definition of 'research'; clarification of Amendments process, §29-31
v13	Dec 2023	RC December 2023	Clarity/list given in §7 (and footnote added regarding archival research) minor edits to §11. v13i: links corrected, March 2024.
v14	August 2024	RC Chair	Change to UG review, §10.

Contacts

Position	Name	Email	Notes
Senior Research Ethics Manager	Lyn Grove	l.grove@lse.ac.uk	Author

Communications and Training

Will this document be publicised through Internal Communications?	**Yes**
Will training needs arise from this policy	**Yes**
Staff and students should contact their Department/Centre/Institute regarding any training needs	