



Research Councils UK

**Code of Conduct and Policy
on the Governance of Good Research Conduct**

INTEGRITY, CLARITY, AND GOOD MANAGEMENT

Public Consultation Document

July – October 2008



**Code of Conduct and Policy
on the Governance of Good Research Conduct**

INTEGRITY, CLARITY, AND GOOD MANAGEMENT

This consultation document is complementary to the work of the UK Panel for Research Integrity in Health and Bio-Medical Sciences and that in the Department of Health / National Health Service but will in certain parts cover a wider range of issues because of RCUK's concern with all research, and with issues of good research practice as well as research integrity. Equally it will cover other aspects in less depth. Every effort has been made to ensure that there will be no conflict in the guidance from these different sources, and this will be reviewed further after the completion of the consultation

This draft consists of four sections and two appendices:

1. Invitation for Feedback and Comment.
2. Overall Background and Policy for the Governance and Management of Good Research Conduct and Research Ethics
3. Code of Conduct for Ensuring Good Research Conduct and Research Integrity
4. Issues for the Reporting and Investigation of Allegations of Misconduct or Performance below Acceptable Levels of Good Conduct, and of Recording and Monitoring Such Cases.

Appendix 1 - Key elements of good reporting and management procedures

Appendix 2 - Other reference documents consulted in the preparation of this statement

The Research Councils UK Partnership comprises:

Arts and Humanities Research Council (AHRC)

Biotechnology and Biological Sciences Research Council (BBSRC)

Economic and Social Research Council (ESRC)

Engineering and Physical Sciences Research Council (EPSRC)

Medical Research Council (MRC)

Natural Environment Research Council (NERC)

Science and Technology Facilities Council (STFC)

Section 1:

Invitation for Feedback and Comment

- 1.1 Given developments over the past few years both in the UK and globally, RCUK feels that there is now a need to consider how we take forward UK policies on good research conduct and research integrity, framing these in a positive light, and ensuring that the UK is alongside the world leaders in ensuring robust systems for the highest standards in these areas, including systems for research governance.
- 1.2 This document is consultative at this stage, deliberately setting out to stimulate debate and consideration about how we need to develop our systems.
- 1.3 Key questions on which we would particularly welcome comment include:
 - The overall policy statement and any additions or amendments needed
 - The code of conduct: including whether this needs to be expanded, re-focussed or developed in any way
 - Suggested guidance on desirable management arrangements in research organisations
 - General guidance on procedures for reporting and investigating complaints, identifying any key weaknesses without making the guidance overly prescriptive
 - The need for a central repository of information on cases of proven misconduct, and how this might be established and managed
 - The need for a national advisory body on a voluntary basis to establish common guidance on codes of conduct, desirable management systems to ensure best practice, procedures for dealing with problematic cases, sanctions/penalties for varying failures in conduct. Such a body might also oversee and advise on investigations into serious allegations of misconduct, and liaise with non-UK national authorities on cases of cross-border misconduct.
- 1.4 Your feedback would be greatly welcomed, by Friday **24 October 2008**, to:

Ben Aubrey, RCUK Strategy Unit, Polaris House, North Star Avenue,
Swindon SN2

Or e-mail ben.aubrey@rcuk.ac.uk.

Section 2:

Overall Background and Policy for the Governance and Management of Good Research Conduct and Research Ethics

Background

- 2.1 The UK Research Councils (RCs) wish to promote and improve standards of conduct within UK research. Although high standards of conduct have always been a requirement of all research council-supported research, on 18 December 1998 the then Director General of Research Councils and Research Council chief executives issued a joint statement to all organisations they fund about "safeguarding good scientific practice", and expected requirements and procedures.
- 2.2 Over the following decade, the RCs have sought to ensure that these requirements are enforced. Individual councils, particularly those with their own institutes, have issued specific policies. In 2004 the Medical Research Council, on behalf of all Councils, sought assurance from all recognised research organisations (ROs - including universities and other higher education institutions) that they had policies in place which complied with the requirements. In 2006 and 2007 RCUK sought assurance from ROs that they are applying and regularly reviewing their policies. Meanwhile during 2005 the Council for Science and Technology (CST) also issued a report on the "Universal Ethical Code for Scientists", which was published by the Government Office for Science. This also sought to strengthen UK practice and activity in this area.
- 2.3 Following the 2006 and 2007 compliance surveys, ROs have asked for guidance about common RCUK policies and procedures. This consultation draft document sets out the questions which may need to be addressed in any such guidance.

RCUK Requirements

- 2.4 The RCs are responsible for ensuring that the (approximately) £3 billion per year of public funds they distribute to support research, and training in research, are used in projects carried out and conducted to exemplary standards and with the highest levels of integrity. RCs therefore assess research not only in terms of quality, potential impact and value for money, but also have a responsibility to ensure that its methodological, ethical and other standards have been appropriately reviewed, and that it will be carried out in an environment where good governance of research conduct is actively promoted and appraised. This is to ensure that the reputational risk of UK research is not compromised in any way.
- 2.5 ROs eligible to receive RC funding should therefore take steps to promote the highest standards in research and in the conduct of research. This should include carrying out regular reviews of their policies and procedures, and also ensuring careful management and supervision of research projects. There should be regular reporting on the standards of good conduct and ethics which are being applied, both to heads of department and the Director / Pro-Vice Chancellor for Research, as the senior responsible officer for research across the organisation. Their policies should include actions to promote good conduct in research through:
 - effective leadership and management (which should be given high priority);

- an active education and training programme, which should include continuing development for research professionals at all stages of their careers (including those trained outside the UK, honorary and temporary staff);
 - mentoring and support systems which should re-inforce education and training;
 - systems to monitor the progress and standards of all research programmes and projects (paying particular attention to research involving specific requirements, e.g. humans or animals, which might require additional monitoring or audit procedures);
 - the operation of robust checks at recruitment for misconduct in research, including those who have worked overseas.
- 2.6 ROs should also have robust procedures for the reporting and investigation of allegations of poor research conduct (see Code of Conduct below). Essential procedures are outlined in Appendix 1.
- 2.7 In addressing issues of good research conduct the RO should ensure that it covers all matters set out in the Code of the Conduct, not only those which appear the most serious. Issues such as minor plagiarism, misrepresentation of credentials, partial misrepresentation of findings and false claims of authorship, should be treated appropriately as examples of unacceptable research conduct. These have important influences on the culture of conduct established. In major cases of plagiarism or fabrication and falsification of findings, it appears that there may have been a background of lesser breaches which were not identified or were overlooked. RCUK therefore expects all ROs to be equally attentive to creating an over-riding culture of best practice, as well as investigating major breaches.

Development of the UK system

- 2.8 A key issue at this stage in the development of good research conduct and research integrity policies in the UK is the scale of the perceived problem. Only a very low number of cases are reported to RCs each year. However, other evidence suggests that this may not reflect the full extent of the problem. This seems to be supported by evidence from other countries with robust systems for monitoring and reporting poor research conduct, such as the US and Germany, assuming that there are similar issues in the UK to other countries.
- 2.9 It therefore seems possible that in the UK minor cases may be under-reported within institutions and not reported at all beyond institutional level. Although this may not be perceived as a major issue, as explained in 2.7, it can contribute to a culture which does not expose major issues until they become over-powering. We therefore suggest that, to show that the UK is not complacent in this area, we should establish more robust and open procedures for reporting any minor failures and misdemeanours that may be occurring. Issues on reporting and monitoring are discussed further in the final section of this paper. Proposals have already been developed by the UK Panel for Research Integrity in the Health and Bio-Medical Sciences (UK RIO Panel), and we believe this valuable work now needs to be expanded and developed to apply to all areas of research. RCUK will therefore continue to work with the UK RIO Panel to develop and integrate our two streams of work.

Section 3:

Code of Conduct for Ensuring Good Research Conduct and Research Integrity

- 3.1 All research should be conducted to the highest levels of integrity, including appropriate research design and frameworks, to ensure that findings are robust and defensible. Researchers should also adhere to the highest level of research ethics, in line with requirements set out by national and international regulatory bodies, professional and regulatory research guidance, and research ethics frameworks issued in appropriate areas. The onus should lie with the researcher to establish that s/he has always met the highest standards that could reasonably be expected of them, and with the employing institution to ensure that systems are in place to support and re-inforce this.
- 3.2 Research employers, sponsors and publishers must also ensure that sound systems are in place to promote best practice. These should include:
- training and development modules to ensure that all researchers are aware of best practice requirements
 - training needs analysis for all new employees, especially but not exclusively for those who have not received formal training (at for example PhD level) and those from non-research organisations or institutions outside the UK
 - mentoring and promotion of good research conduct roles for key research managers within the organisation
 - clear requirements for preservation of relevant primary data, lab books, and other relevant materials
 - stewardship responsibilities for heads of laboratories and departments, so that they actively promote and report on activities which ensure best research practice within their domain
 - guidance from publishers and sponsors on the standards which they expect to be applied.
- 3.3 Such systems will help to minimise problems in this area. Where, however, an individual falls short of the required standards, this might lead to a conclusion of inappropriate (unacceptably poor) conduct or of misconduct in research. This might be through deliberate intention, recklessness, or gross negligence, in the conduct of any aspect of a research project, leading to research outcomes which were known, or should have been known, to be unsupportable. All researchers will, with appropriate procedures in place, always be aware that such performance is not acceptable, and can and should lead to appropriate allegations against them. While negligence might be a lesser offence than deliberate or reckless behaviour, all researchers should always be aware that it is their duty to maintain high standards of research conduct.
- 3.4 The following may serve as useful guidance in terms of conduct or performance which would normally be regarded as unacceptable, and could therefore lead to charges of misconduct. While RCUK is primarily concerned with those whom it does or may fund, we propose that this code should be universally applicable to all researchers from postgraduate level onwards, whether in public, independent or private research organisations,, irrespective

of subject area, entry route into research (for example whether or not through a PhD), location of training in the UK or elsewhere, or any other consideration.

- ***Fabrication***
This may include the creation of (fictitious) data or other aspects of research, including documentation and participant consent.
- ***Falsification***
This may include inappropriate manipulation and/or selection of data, imagery and/or consent(s)
- ***Misrepresentation***
This may include:
 - Misrepresentation of data, including undisclosed suppression of findings or data, or knowingly or negligently presenting flawed interpretation of data
 - undisclosed duplication of publication, including undisclosed duplicate submission of publications
 - misrepresentation of interests, including failure to declare interests of either the researcher or the funders of the research
 - misrepresentation of qualifications and/or experience, including claiming or implying qualifications or experience which are not held
 - misrepresentation of involvement, such as inappropriate claims to authorship and/or attribution of work, or the denial of the same to others
- ***Plagiarism***
This includes the general misappropriation or use of ideas, intellectual property or work (written or otherwise) of others, without acknowledgment or permission
- ***Management and preservation of data and primary materials***
This may include failing to ensure that relevant primary data and research evidence are preserved and accessible to others for reasonable periods after the completion of the research. This is a shared responsibility between researcher and the research organisation, but individual researchers should always ensure that primary material is available to be checked. Such conditions should also be applied where ownership of data may rest with third parties, for example where there is commercial sponsorship of research. Data should normally be preserved and accessible for not less than 10 years for any projects, and for projects of clinical or major social, environmental or heritage importance, the data should be retained for up to 20 years, and preferably permanently within a national collection, or as required by the funder's data policy.
- ***Breach of duty of care***
This may involve deliberately, recklessly or by gross negligence:
 - disclosing improperly the identity of individuals or groups involved in research without their consent or other breach of confidentiality
 - placing any of those involved in research in danger, whether as subjects, participants or associated individuals, including reputational danger where that can be anticipated, without their

prior consent, and without appropriate safeguards even with consent

- not taking all reasonable care to ensure that the risks and dangers, the broad objectives, and the sponsors of the research, are known to participants or their legal representatives to ensure appropriate informed consent, and that this is obtained explicitly and transparently
- not observing legal and reasonable ethical requirements or obligations of care for animal subjects of research
- not observing legal and reasonable requirements or obligations of care for the protection of the environment
- improper conduct in peer review of applications or publications, including gross misrepresentation of the content of material, inadequate disclosure of clearly limited competence, or abuse of material provided in confidence for peer review.

3.5 All individual researchers should ensure that they are properly qualified to, and do, carry out research which meets these obligations. If they have any concerns that these requirements are not being met by others, they should be reported to the appropriate person within their institution for investigation.

3.6 ROs should ensure that all researchers and support staff are always aware of these requirements, and are provided with appropriate training and mentoring to ensure that they can address them. This should include appropriate training modules for new researchers and those taking on research managerial responsibilities. Researchers should always be aware of a senior independent person within the RO with whom they can confidentially raise any concerns they have in this area at any time.

Section 4:

Procedures for the Reporting and Investigation of Allegations of Misconduct or Performance below Acceptable Levels of Good Conduct

Appendix 1 sets out the guidance in this area which RCUK requires ROs to follow. This section sets out some of the key issues on which RCUK would welcome ROs' views.

- 4.1 These procedures in all ROs should cover:
- **Clear policy statements on required and best practice**
 - **Training and mentoring policies**
 - **Procedures for obtaining ethical approval**
 - **Clear managerial arrangements for mentoring, promotion, observation and stewardship of best practice**
 - **Raising concerns: reporting and whistle-blowing procedures**
 - **Procedures for informal enquiries and "prima facie" investigations**
 - **Formal disciplinary procedures**
 - **Imposition of sanctions or penalties**
 - **Reporting of sanctions or penalties which have been completed**
- 4.2 Guidance on essential procedures is set out in Appendix 1. In framing appropriate procedures ROs should consider guidance from relevant professional bodies, particularly from the UK RIO Panel (see references in Annex 2).
- 4.3 Key issues for which further consideration and policy development may be required in the UK include:
- a. **Code of Conduct**
Formulating clear guidance on what is, and is not, acceptable. How far does the Code of Conduct proposed in Section 3 provide a basis for this?
 - b. **Focus on Good Conduct**
Clear guidance on instruction, training, and mentoring on what constitutes good conduct, with the accent on positive approaches to the highest standards, rather than simply regulation of or response to poorer conduct. Do all ROs in the UK now have appropriate approaches and systems in this area, including procedures for normal supervision and reporting on research projects in these areas?
 - c. **Distinction of levels of poor, unacceptable, and misconduct**
Does the UK need to have clear procedures for identification of all degrees of poor conduct, with gradations as suggested in the annex to Appendix 1 below?
 - d. **Clear supervision, management, reporting and whistle-blowing policies**
Are these currently adequate? Are there in-built systems for regular supervision and reporting at departmental level of current research projects? Are there simple systems for individuals to raise issues of

concern without disincentive? In what ways do systems need to be improved to ensure an open and transparent system?

National Advisory Body

- 4.4 Views would also be welcomed on the absence of any overall and clear national advisory or governance framework for good research conduct in the UK, and whether there is need to consider further development in this area. The UK appears to have far fewer reported cases than countries such as the USA or Germany which have national systems to oversee complaints and investigations, though this may be partly because less serious offences in the UK are never reported outside the home research organisation. There is no national repository of known cases, and individuals may move from one RO to another without cases against them being disclosed. Should there be a national framework to address this? It might, for example:
- Fulfil the central role of providing guidance and codes of conduct in this area, replacing much of the need for many separate activities
 - Have an educational role for all researchers and research employers in any capacity for promoting best practice
 - Sponsor research and analysis on issues about good research conduct, research integrity and research ethics
 - Provide guidance on best management practice, focussing upon systems in research organisations which help reinforce a strong research integrity culture, and ensures that research managers are positively engaged in developing and monitoring this at departmental and laboratory level
 - Provide guidance on appropriate investigatory responses when cases are raised, including appropriate sanctions for different types of research misdemeanour
 - Provide a focus for serious complaints, demonstrating to those involved that there is oversight beyond individual institutions (which may have, or be perceived as having, their own interests in such matters)
 - Have oversight of investigations of serious complaints in exceptional cases
 - Provide a central record and depository, for consultation by relevant authorities and employers, of all proven cases of misdemeanour or misconduct, and of resulting penalties and sanctions
 - Be the source of contact for non-UK national bodies when issues arise of alleged misconduct which crosses national boundaries
- 4.5 Should bodies with responsibility for research in the UK (these might include for example Universities UK, RCUK, Wellcome Trust, AMRC, the Higher Education Funding Councils, the UK RIO Panel) be encouraged to work together to strengthen the UK system in this way, or is this not necessary? In what ways, if any, might we need to strengthen the current framework in the UK over the coming decade?

Appendix 1:

Key elements of good reporting and management procedures

Key requirements in all ROs are:

- Misconduct and unacceptably poor research practice are publicly seen as serious matters which the institution will not tolerate. The highest achievable standards of integrity, accuracy and fairness must be applied at all times
- There is a responsible senior official publicly named to whom regular managerial reports on conduct, integrity and ethics will be made, and to whom complaints or concerns may be reported on a confidential basis
- This individual has the authority and resources to conduct appropriate investigations into any concerns which may arise either through normal reporting procedures, or through evidenced allegations received, whether internal or external to the organisation
- In carrying out any investigations the principles of fairness, confidentiality, transparency, integrity, no detriment and balance will be applied
- Both the source and object of any allegations will be properly and reasonably protected at all appropriate stages of an investigation
- No reasonable, evidenced worries or allegations will be overlooked, and an annual report will be made to the appropriate governance committee of the institution (usually the research governance or audit committee) of all such allegations made and the conclusions reached
- When anyone is formally accused of either misconduct in research, or falling unacceptably below agreed standards of good research, they must be given full details of the allegations in writing and reasonable opportunity to respond.

These procedures in all ROs should cover:

- **Clear policy statements on required and best practice**
- **Training and mentoring Policies**
- **Procedures for obtaining ethical approval**
- **Clear managerial arrangements for mentoring, promotion, observation and stewardship of best practice**
- **Raising concerns: reporting and whistle-blowing procedures**
- **Procedures for informal enquiries and "prima facie" investigations**
- **Formal disciplinary procedures**
- **Imposition of sanctions or penalties**
- **Reporting of sanctions or penalties which have been completed**

Clear policy statements

These should:

- Include clear guidance on what is acceptable and not acceptable
- Be drawn to the attention of all staff on appointment
- Be easily available at all times in guidance manuals and on website
- Set out differing levels of poor and unacceptable conduct (see annex below for examples)

Training and mentoring policies

- All ROs should have in place procedures for training and mentoring

- They should ensure that all relevant staff are aware of the procedures, and how any cases should be reported
- These should also cover standards to be applied in publication of materials, preparation of conference papers, etc., and the conduct of peer review

Ethical approval procedures

- ROs should have clear and full policies on ethical standards
- ROs should have clear procedures for obtaining ethical approval for research
- Where delegated to schools and departments, for small scale research, procedures should be in place to ensure equity of ethical approach across the whole institution
- Clear and appropriate procedures to obtain clearly informed consent from research participants should be in place
- Supervisory arrangements for delegated procedures should be clearly in place

Clear managerial arrangements

- ROs should have clearly published and readily accessible procedures for the normal supervision and management of conduct, integrity and ethical issues, and for the reporting by individuals of any concerns about poor practice in these areas
- The procedures should clearly identify the senior person in the RO responsible for ensuring good research conduct, who receives regular reports on these matters, and to whom any bona fide concerns or allegations (supported with appropriate evidence) may be taken
- Systems should include training and development modules to ensure that all researchers are aware of best practice requirements
- There should be clear mentoring and promotional roles for key research managers within the organisation
- Stewardship responsibilities for heads of laboratories and departments should be in place, so that they actively promote and report on activities which ensure best research practice

Raising concerns: reporting and whistle-blowing procedures

- Systems for reporting concerns or complaints should be clearly and publicly advertised, with those who need to report issues fully aware that where they have evidenced concern they will be taken seriously and protected, whether from within or outside the organisation
- Allegations to be investigated must always be made in writing
- The senior person with these responsibilities should have the authority to investigate all allegations without hindrance
- Policies should make clear that allegations must not be made frivolously
- Identity of complainants and subjects of complaint should be subject to appropriate confidentiality
- The procedures for investigating issues should be clearly transparent and fair to all parties

Procedures for informal enquiries and "prima facie" investigations prior to any formal disciplinary charges being established

- These procedures should not be onerous and should be set within the normal organisational/institutional procedures

- A relatively quick decision should be made on the first stage of whether a concern or allegation contains such sufficient evidence to be taken forward to a full "prima facie" investigation – for example this should normally be within 10 working days
- There should be an opportunity for response if the complainant's allegation is not accepted and they believe they have been misunderstood or key evidence overlooked
- Where evidence merits it, procedures should then provide for a more detailed "prima facie" investigation
- Discreet investigations may be desirable at this stage until clear evidence of individual behaviour has been established
- In very serious cases this may be a role for a small panel, but that would be exceptional at this stage
- The investigator should be someone with sufficient knowledge and experience of research, and with relevant experience for initiating and investigating procedures
- The question of suspension may need to be addressed
- If a person is suspended then the appropriate authority within Research Councils UK must be advised.

Formal disciplinary procedures

- This is a stage if formal charges are laid against an individual
- Where there are allegations of serious misconduct there should be consideration of whether panels should have external representation in the interests of transparency
- Formal guidance is available from various sources, and should be followed, including for example the UK RIO Panel

Imposition of sanctions and penalties

- Is an advisory code on appropriate penalties needed?
- How do ROs ensure an equitable approach across institutions?

Reporting of sanctions or penalties which have been completed

- A report to relevant professional bodies may be required
- At present a major issue in UK is that there is no central registry of misdemeanours and sanctions / penalties imposed: should this be established?
- The work of the UK RIO Panel to build a database in this area may also need to be supported and expanded

Reporting cases to expert groups and making public statements

- No codified national approach to this issue exists.
- If criminal issues are involved or in instances concerning professional medical ethics it may be necessary to report matters to the police or the General Medical Council.
- In exceptional cases a public statement may be unavoidable
- Should there be an overarching authority within the UK which oversees and supervises more serious allegations

Finally, we believe that the benefits of establishing national standards, guidance and procedures in each of these areas, in liaison with the work of the UK RIO Panel, should be pursued.

Annex to Appendix 1

Levels of poor or unacceptable conduct might be characterised as below.

We welcome views on whether such distinctions would be seen as helpful or not.

Level 1

- a. Weak procedures and methods which may jeopardise the integrity of the research but not undertaken deliberately or recklessly
- b. Weaknesses which present no major risks to either subjects or policies which they may influence
- c. Failings which may reflect only poor rather than unacceptable practices and therefore only require further training and development rather than any formal disciplinary action.

Level 2

- a. Clear breaches of good practice, including deliberate, reckless or grossly negligent conduct which undermines the acceptability, veracity, or reliability of the research, in part or in whole. Examples might include:
 - i. false claims to experience, qualifications or contribution
 - ii. Misrepresentation of findings to lesser degrees
 - iii. Inappropriate failure to declare relevant conflicts of interest
- b. These may present no risks to subjects, the wider community or the environment
- c. They will warrant some penalty or sanction at institutional level.

Level 3

- a. Deliberate, reckless or grossly negligent conduct which would clearly pose a significant risk in one form or another to the reliability of the research
- b. This may also pose risks to subjects, the wider community, the environment, or to the research reputation of the institution and research in general
 - i. Might include destruction of data
 - ii. Misleading claims of access to data which cannot be verified
 - iii. Fabrication or falsification of data
 - iv. Plagiarism
 - v. Falsification of ownership
- c. This will require the most serious investigation
- d. If proven, is likely to involve interruption or termination of an individual's research career

Level 4

- a. Reckless or deliberate misconduct likely to cause damage to the subjects of research, to the environment, or others
- b. This should always be reported directly to the senior responsible figure at the highest level of the institution who should supervise any investigation
- c. If prima facie evidence is established such cases may also require reporting to other external regulatory bodies.
- d. Where criminal behaviour may be involved they should be reported to the police.

Appendix 2:

Other reference documents consulted in the preparation of this statement

Safeguarding Good Scientific Practice: A joint statement by the Director General of the Research Councils and the Chief Executives of Research Councils (December 1998)

www.ukoln.ac.uk/projects/ebank-uk/scientific-practice.doc

Universal ethical code for scientists (CST report, 2006)

http://www.berr.gov.uk/dius/science/science-and-society/public_engagement/code/page28030.html

BBSRC Statement on safeguarding good scientific practice (revised, 2007)

http://www.bbsrc.ac.uk/publications/policy/good_scientific_practice.html

EPSRC Guide to Good Practice in Science and Engineering Research

<http://www.epsrc.ac.uk/ResearchFunding/GrantHolders/GuideToGoodPracticeInScienceAndEngineeringResearch.htm>

ESRC Research Ethics Framework (July 2005)

<http://www.esrc.ac.uk/ref>

MRC Policy and Procedure for Inquiring into Allegations of Scientific Misconduct (MRC Ethics Series) December 1997 et seq.

<http://www.mrc.ac.uk/PolicyGuidance/EthicsAndGovernance/GoodResearchPractice//index.htm>

NERC Ethics Policy

<http://www.nerc.ac.uk/about/work/policy/ethics/>

STFC Research Grants Handbook

www.so.stfc.ac.uk/rgb

UK Research Integrity Office (UKRIO) Draft Code of Practice for Research (2007)

http://www.ukrio.org/sites/ukrio2/the_programme_of_work/code_of_practice_for_research.cfm

Australian Code for the Responsible Conduct of Research (published by Australian Government, National Health and Medical Research Council, Australian Research Council and Universities Australia) Australian Government 2007, ISBN 18644964324

Danish Research Agency: Report on the rules governing research ethics (May 2003)

Stewards of Integrity: Institutional Approaches to Promote and Safeguard Scientific Practice in Europe (ESF Draft Report to be published April 2008) www.esf.org

Health Protection Agency: Principles of Good Scientific Practice (August 2005)

www.hpa.org.uk

OECD Global Science Forum Best Practices for Ensuring Scientific Integrity and Prevention Misconduct (and particularly the definitions provided therein)
<http://www.oecd.org/dataoecd/37/17/40188303.pdf>

Mayer, T. and Steneck, N., Final Report to ESF and ORI First World Conference on Research Integrity: Fostering Responsible Research (Report of Conference 16-19 September 2007) http://www.icsu.org/5_abouticsu/PDF/WC_final_report.pdf

Committee on Publication Ethics (COPE) flowcharts on managing misconduct
<http://www.publicationethics.org.uk/media/cope-flowcharts-optimal.pdf/view>

General Medical Council:

Confidentiality: Protecting and Providing Information 2004 (www.gmc-uk.org/current/library/conflicts_of_interest.asp)

Seeking patients' consent: the ethical considerations 1998
(www.gmc-uk.org/current/library/consent.asp)

Research: the role and responsibilities of doctors 2002:
(www.gmc-uk.org/current/library/confidentiality.asp)

Conflicts of Interest 2004: (www.gmc-uk.org/current/library/research.asp)