

# School of Business and Creative Industries

## School Guidelines for Ethical Practice

### Named Contact

Dr John Quinn  
Chair, School Academic Integrity & Ethics Committee  
[John.quin@uws.ac.uk](mailto:John.quin@uws.ac.uk) / [BCIEthics@uws.ac.uk](mailto:BCIEthics@uws.ac.uk)

### Introduction

The University has the responsibility to maintain the highest ethical standards in teaching, research, scholarship and creative practice through a culture of honesty, rigour, transparency and respect. In doing so, it is required that the UWS community is aware of the policies and processes relating to academic and ethical integrity.

All teaching, research, scholarship and professional and creative practice involving animals, human participants, personal data or risk to the investigator requires ethical scrutiny. This requirement applies to all staff employed by the University, both academic and administrative, as well as to students, and to all related activity taking place within the University or under the auspices of the University.

The procedures for ethical review within UWS are devolved to Schools. Each School, therefore, has a responsibility to 1) make sure that the School and University ethical guidelines are available to all staff and students, and 2) to ensure that all programme teams are committed to raising awareness of the ethical implications of research, scholarship and professional and creative practice.

All school activity that requires ethical scrutiny is overseen by the School of Business and Creative Industries Academic Integrity & Ethics Committee (SAIEC). The Committee conforms with the requirements of the University's regulations and the University's [policies, procedures and guidance](#).

The composition of the current SAIEC is documented in Appendix I (below).

This document provides an overview of good ethical practice and guidance to the approach adopted within the School of Business and Creative Industries, and the scrutiny and approval thereof, across all areas of teaching, research, scholarship and professional and creative practice.

## Principles for Good Practice

All students and staff within the School of Business and Creative Industries are expected to act in accordance with the highest standards of ethical and academic integrity in their teaching, learning, research, scholarship, and professional and creative practices. All practice within the school should be underpinned by the following principles and elements:

- *Honesty* in the intention, design, implementation and reporting of work, including but not limited to acknowledging the work of others, abiding by the principles of academic integrity, reporting of findings and in making valid interpretations and claims and protecting against all forms of exploitation
- *Rigour* in all areas of practice, including but not limited to choice and application of practices, methods, the drawing and communication of results, engagement with teaching and learning, the submission, and quality assurance of, academic work
- *Transparency* in actions, decisions and interactions, including but not limited to the declaration of conflicts of interest, the reporting of data, and making appropriate findings widely available
- *Respect* for all participants, colleagues, students, and stakeholders in all areas of practice

## School Ethical Approval Processes

All teaching, research, scholarship, and professional and creative practice involving animals, human participants, personal data or risk to the investigator, not adequately mitigated by proper application of the University Health and Safety Policies and Procedures, requires independent ethical scrutiny.

The purpose of this scrutiny is to protect the dignity, rights, welfare and safety of all participants, including the researcher, and to consider the legitimate interests of other individuals, bodies and communities.

**Any teaching, research or professional and creative practice within the School which requires the interaction with animals, human participants, personal data or risk to the investigator <sup>1</sup>must receive full ethical approval prior to the collection of any data.**

The School will maintain, at all times, a team of ethical reviewers who will have responsibility for the review of ethical applications via the University's ethical review management system. The composition of the current ethical review team can be found in appendix II.

Upon receipt of an application for ethical review, the School's nominated leads for ethical review will allocate the project to member(s) of the review team for consideration. A review will take place within fifteen working days of receipt.

Applications for review will be allocated to reviewer(s) in such a way as to ensure a proportionate and expert level of review and appropriate diversity in the review panel.

Typically, category 1 or 2 applications will be reviewed by one colleague, and category 3a and 3b applications will be reviewed by two colleagues. All staff and doctoral applications will be reviewed by two colleagues irrespective of the risk category.

The School of Business and Creative Industries acknowledges that varying levels of ethical consideration may be required for differing types of research, scholarship, and professional and creative practice. Consequently, three distinct processes have been designed to facilitate ethical screening, review, progress, and amendment, specifically but not

---

<sup>1</sup> Where the risk to the investigator is not adequately mitigated by proper application of the University Health and Safety Policies and Procedures

exclusively, of undergraduate student projects, postgraduate taught and research student projects and staff research, scholarship, and professional and creative activity.

**Where students or staff are uncertain as to which process applies to their work, this should be discussed with the School Ethics Leads prior to submission.**

*1. Student Research within non-dissertation and project modules*

Where students undertake primary research or creative practice as part of a module or course of study which requires more than one student to collect data around the same area of practice and under the supervision of an academic member of staff (e.g. a module co-ordinator), a single ethical review application can be made on behalf of all participants. The academic member of staff supervising the project is responsible for securing ethical approval via an application to the University's Ethical Review Manager portal (the ERM User's Guide can be viewed and downloaded from the [University Ethics webpage](#)), and for ensuring that all participants act in an ethically appropriate manner. Ethical approval must be in place prior to undertaking any work. Ethical approval must be in place prior to the approval of assessment by external examiners.

*2. Student research within dissertation and individual settings*

Any student who undertakes primary research involving animals, human participants, personal data or risk to the investigator, either as an individual or as a group where the data collection is unique to their work must have ethical approval prior to collecting data.

For undergraduate dissertations, the module co-ordinator should submit an ethical application as per the above point, in the first instance, covering all projects. This should demonstrate how relevant staff and students will be made aware of and supported to meet the required standard of ethical conduct. Students should then work with the processes set out by their module coordinator to obtain ethical approval for their project. However, where the student and/or supervisor/module coordinator believe an individual project to be of higher level of risk, individual ethical approval from the SAIEC must be obtained prior to data collection, through a full, individual ethical approval submission. The module co-ordinator should be made aware of all such cases, and these should be recorded. If students or staff are unsure as to whether a project requires additional ethical approval, the Chair of the SAIEC should be consulted. Data collection should not occur until this has been resolved and approval granted. For postgraduate taught dissertations, where modular ethical approval is in place, students can follow the procedure above. For postgraduate taught students where modular approval is not in place, all doctoral students and any other modular work not covered by modular approval, the student (or nominated lead student in case of group work) is responsible for submitting an ethical application for review. This should be discussed with their supervisor and or module coordinator in advance and supported, by application of a signature prior to submission. It is expected that, by signing an ethical application, the supervisor is confirming they believe the work is of appropriate rigour to be submitted for review.

*3. Staff research, consultancy, professional and creative practice and advanced independent student work*

All academic research, consultancy and professional and creative practice undertaken by UWS staff which requires the collection of primary data and/or interaction with human subjects must be submitted for ethical approval before beginning data collection. It is the responsibility of the academic (or lead academic in case of collaborative work) to submit the application for review.

While Reviewers may provide constructive suggestions in relation to methodology in relation to ethical matters, these should not be a *requirement* for approval, except where this represents an ethical risk to the participants, applicant, or School.

Reviewers may recommend approval of the project or ask for alterations and resubmission. In some rare cases, approval may not be granted. Should resubmission be required, a second fifteen working day review period will be allocated following resubmission. Should resubmission be requested, applicants should revise the existing application rather than submitting a new one.

Instructions and training on how to use the online Ethical Review Manager system is available at:

<https://sites.google.com/uws.ac.uk/bciethicsguidance/home>

**Ethical approval should be secured prior to any data collection activities.**

Retrospective ethics review i.e. request to approve research that has been commenced or completed, is not permitted.

**Where a breach of this procedure is found, the Dean of School and or the Chair of the University Academic Integrity & Ethics Committee must be notified. They will then agree an appropriate response.**

Approved projects are required to be carried out in accordance with the original application and the conditions. If changes are made to the project whether these have an ethics impact or not e.g. engagement of different groups of participants, different recruiting methods, and a different approach to obtaining consent, then the SAIEC must be informed immediately and, if deemed necessary, additional ethical approval sought prior to undertaking work.

An applicant may appeal the decision of any SAIEC.

**Contact details**

Where additional guidance or support is required, please direct enquiries to [BCIEthics@uws.ac.uk](mailto:BCIEthics@uws.ac.uk)

## **Appendix I**

### **School of Business and Creative Industries Academic Integrity & Ethics Committee**

Dr John Quinn, Chair  
Prof John Struthers, Vice-Chair  
Prof David McGillivray, Research Lead / Associate Dean (Research)

#### **Accounting, Finance & Law**

Colin McFadyen, Accounting, Finance & Law Rep  
Clive Mitchell, Accounting, Finance & Law Rep

#### **Arts & Media**

Prof Graham Jeffery, Arts & Media Rep  
Dr Margaret Hughes, Arts & Media Rep

#### **Externals**

Ian Gillan, External  
Dr Rachael Flynn, External

#### **Management, Organisation & People**

Nondas Pitticas, Management, Organisation & People Rep  
Dr Kae Reynolds, Management, Organisation & People Rep

#### **Marketing, Innovation, Tourism and Events**

Lorraine Quinn, Marketing, Innovation, Tourism and Events Rep  
Dr Adam Talbot, Marketing, Innovation, Tourism and Events Rep

#### **Student**

TBC, Student Rep (DBA)  
Tomi Olabode, Student Rep (PGR)

#### **Lay Member**

Jackie Blake, Lay Member

#### **Co-opted Members**

Dr Stephen Langston, Plagiarism Rep  
Matt Moir, School Business Manager  
Dr Margaret Hughes, Equality, Diversity & Inclusivity Rep  
Siobhan White, Associate Dean (Learning & Teaching)

#### **Secretariat**

Kevan Limond, Secretariat

## **Appendix II –**

### **School of Business and Creative Industries Ethical Review Team**

#### **Overview and principles:**

- The School Leads will have responsibility for allocating all ethics applications to the relevant member(s) of the review team.
- The reviewers will have 15 working days to complete and submit their review through the online portal.
- Reviews will be allocated on a rotational basis to ensure an equal distribution of reviews over the year.
- Reviews will be allocated appropriate to the qualification of the review team (ie. only colleagues with a doctoral level qualification or equivalent will be asked to review doctoral level work)
- The Chair and nominated committee members will be asked by the School Leads to review any cases considered to be 'high risk' or requiring appeal/clarification.
- Training will be provided to all colleagues in the team on an ongoing basis to ensure consistency of review across the School.

### **Leadership**

Dr John Quinn, Chair  
Prof John Struthers, Vice Chair

### **School Leads**

Prof Graham Jeffrey, School Lead  
Dr Adam Talbot, School Lead

### **Accounting, Finance & Law**

Dr Marie Fletcher, Reviewer  
Dr Dalia Alazzeh, Reviewer  
Dr Michael Guo, Reviewer

### **Arts & Media**

Dr Ken Pratt, Reviewer  
Dr Cat Fallow, Reviewer  
Dr Margaret Hughes, Reviewer

### **Management, Organisation & People**

Dr Andrew Burnett, Reviewer  
Mr Nondas Pitticas, Reviewer  
Ms Lorraine Quinn, Reviewer  
Dr Kae Reynolds, Reviewer

### **Marketing, Innovation, Tourism and Events**

Dr Pravin Balaraman, Reviewer  
Dr Kalyan Bhandari, Reviewer  
Dr Masood Khodadadi, Reviewer  
Dr Emma Reid, Reviewer

### **Professoriate**

Prof Sandro Carnicelli, Reviewer  
Prof Angus Duff, Reviewer  
Prof Stephen Gib, Reviewer  
Prof Nick Higgins, Reviewer  
Prof Katarzyna Kosmala, Reviewer  
Prof David McGillivray, Reviewer  
Prof Gayle McPherson, Reviewer  
Prof Heather Tarbert, Reviewer