



**Higher Education Services
Research
& Ethics Policy**

July 2025

DOCUMENT INFORMATION AND VERSION CONTROL

Name of policy/procedure:	Higher Education Services Research & Ethics Policy
Document owner:	Academic Registrar
Date of creation:	28 th July 2025
Equality Impact Assessment date and reference:	28 th July 2025
Date of last review:	28 th July 2025
Reviewed by:	Prof. Dr Alison Watson
Date of next review:	28 th July 2028
Related documents:	Brunel University (BU) Research Ethics Brunel University of London Roehampton University (UR) Research Research Environment and Ethics University of Roehampton, London

Version	Author	Date	Brief summary of changes
1	A. Watson	28/07/25	Original version

Contents

1.0 Introduction.....	4
2.0 Risk-Based Approach.....	4
3.0 Generic Ethical Approval.....	5
4.0 Organisation-Based Research.....	5
5.0 Informed Consent.....	6
6.0 FutureLearn's Ethical Approval Process.....	6
7.0 The Role of the Learning, Teaching and Assessment Committee.....	6
8.0 Research Misconduct.....	7
9.0 How to Deal with Allegations of Misconduct.....	7
10.0 Procedure for Staff.....	8
11.0 Procedure for Students.....	9
12.0 Procedure for Consultants.....	9
13.0 Further Considerations.....	10
14.0 Support for Complainants and Researcher(s).....	10
15.0 Monitoring.....	11
Appendix.....	12
Research Ethics Application Form.....	12
Dissertation/Project Proposal Form.....	17

Higher Education Services Research & Ethics Policy

1.0 Introduction

1.1 This policy outlines the classification of research projects, (which may include dissertations or consultancy reports), conducted at FutureLearn based on their potential to cause harm to individuals or organisations involved in the research. Projects are assessed according to three risk levels: **minimal**, **low**, and **high**. The level of risk determines the extent of scrutiny required and may influence the time needed to obtain ethical approval.

1.2 This policy does not include those students who are under an OPM sub-contractual arrangement, for example, Brunel University and Roehampton University.

- Brunel University (BU) [Research Ethics | Brunel University of London](#)
- Roehampton University (RU) [Research | Research Environment and Ethics | University of Roehampton, London](#)

1.3 Research posing minimal or low risk can typically be approved by the Dissertation Module Leader (ML). Projects deemed high risk must be referred to the Learning, Teaching and Assessment Committee (LTAC). All research conducted by FutureLearn staff is automatically reviewed by LTAC. Students must obtain ethical approval before beginning any research project. This process primarily applies to research conducted as part of a dissertation or research project. As part of the approval process, students will be required to complete relevant documentation, such as an [application form](#).

2.0 Risk-Based Approach

2.1 An ethical assessment is required before any research is undertaken, and approval gained. The extent of the process to be followed is dependent on the level of risk associated with it. The nature of research activities undertaken by FutureLearn students will in the main be relatively low risk. The purpose of this ethical approval system is to take a risk-based approach to the approval process. In doing so it seeks to classify the risk of any research project in terms of the individuals involved and the subject area of research. It is impossible to draft a policy that covers all eventualities and the examples given below should be regarded as indicative only. Where there is any doubt as to the category to be applied the policy requires that we err on the side of caution and apply the higher weighting.

2.2 High Risk Research is research activity that may pose significant risk either to the researcher or to the participants. It is not expected that this will arise frequently although where research is done among subordinates care must be taken because the power relationship arising from a dual role of, for example, lecturer and researcher can have an impact on students and colleagues, and it is therefore placed in this category as risk research which will require approval from LTAC.

2.3 Risks to the Researcher. Examples of areas which may be considered as high risk include any research:

- I. undertaken in a medical setting even where this does not include reference to patients. In such cases the student should forward the approval of the institution and confirmation that it has either been ethically approved or does not require such approval.
- II. undertaken in a setting where the researcher is in a position of authority or influence over participants.

- III. involving vulnerable groups.
- IV. involving individuals who might be deemed incapable of making an informed decision to participate within the terms of the Mental Capacity Act 2005. In such cases advice and, where necessary, approval will be sought from an NHS Research Ethics Committee or the Social Care Research Ethics Committee.
- V. involving prisoners.
- VI. involving children under 18 years of age.
- VII. where participants may be under duress or coercion to participate e.g. where a gatekeeper only allows certain people to be approached.
- VIII. where gatekeepers insist on being present in interviews.

2.4 Sensitive Topics of Research. These include but are not limited to:

- I. sexual behaviour or orientation
- II. illegal or political behaviour
- III. research that involves subjecting the participants to higher risks than they would experience in everyday life (such as higher levels of psychological stress, anxiety, humiliation or more than minimal pain)
- IV. research involving deliberate deception or that conducted without the participants full and informed consent.
- V. research involving intrusive interventions – e.g. administration of drugs, substances.
- VI. vigorous physical exercise, hypnotherapy etc; research that has the potential to invoke legal action against the researcher or FutureLearn.
- VII. research that involves offering participants incentives to take part that exceed reimbursement of basic costs of participation i.e. travel costs and any out-of-pocket expense.

2.5 Low Risk Research involves all activity that includes working with groups or individuals that do not fall into the high-risk category.

2.6 Minimal risk normally includes the use of material that is within the public domain and would cover all desk-based research activity. Research that requires observation, for example counting footfall in a shop, where individuals cannot be identified, and data is aggregated also falls into this category. Research that involves changing a process within a work setting but does not meet any criteria in 2.3 or 2.4, for example the researcher is a member of staff and not a manager or working with a vulnerable group.

3.0 Generic Ethical Approval

3.1 For modules that involve large numbers of students conducting very similar and closely defined projects, for example group reports or short-term work-related projects, general ethical approval can be sought to cover all students involved. This would be the responsibility of the module leader who would be required to prescribe the methodology and any constraints. This should include reference to inter alia: informed consent; use of inducements; anonymity; and the keeping of data. Approval will be by the Programme Leader (PL). If the PL believes that the work is potentially high-risk it must be referred to LTAC.

4.0 Organisation-Based Research

4.1 This is any work undertaken within an organisation. This must be approved by that organisation. This is the case irrespective of whether the organisation is named within the research or not. Written approval to conduct the research must be obtained prior to commencement. Where other stakeholders are involved then approval from them should also be sought. For example, a piece of research based

in-company that involved a survey of trade union members would require approval from both the organisation and an appropriate person in the trade union.

5.0 Informed Consent

5.1 One of the principal issues involved in conducting ethical research is gaining the full informed consent of all research participants. The following section discusses what is meant by informed consent. Even though it is expected that most FutureLearn student research will be minimal or low risk there is still a need to gain informed consent in the latter case. This would normally be achieved by production of a document for participants that states:

- what the research is for
- why it is being conducted
- who will benefit
- how data will be stored and used
- how anonymity will be assured
- how and up to what point a participant can withdraw consent
- a contact email address or telephone number at FutureLearn.

Consent should be obtained by a signature on the participant information sheet or, in the case of a recorded interview, a verbal acceptance.

6.0 FutureLearn's Ethical Approval Process

6.1 Ethical research issues will form a key element of all modules where research is undertaken. It will be the responsibility of the Dissertation ML to ensure that relevant issues are presented to students and that they understand the risk-based nature of approval processes. Prior to commencing any research, approval must be obtained. All students will be required to complete the FutureLearn Ethical Approval Form in addition to any internal process undertaken within their institution.

6.2 The Dissertation ML or named person(s) will be responsible for determining the risk category that a proposal falls into. In the case of the dissertation then this will be in conjunction with the supervisor. Low and minimal risk projects may be approved by the Dissertation ML. This consent must be recorded on a form that sets out the parameters of the research. In the case of a Dissertation ML seeking general ethical approval, consent must be sought from the PL. FutureLearn will ensure that an appropriate form through which the student can apply for approval will be granted. This will allow for the identification of any ethical issues and the way they have been addressed. High-risk projects will be referred to LTAC. When approval is granted, it will be the responsibility of the Dissertation Supervisor or Dissertation ML (as appropriate) to ensure that the student acts within the terms of the consent. Where there are significant deviations, the student should reapply for approval.

7.0 The Role of the Learning, Teaching and Assessment Committee

7.1 LTAC will comprise senior members of the FutureLearn academic community with experience of conducting research. Appointments to LTAC will be made by the Academic Standards and Quality Committee. Where projects are referred, details will be sent to three members of the LTAC, nominated by the Chair of LTAC who will collectively decide. One panel member will be nominated as the Chair, and it will be his/her responsibility to ensure that a decision is made and communicated.

7.2 The student must send LTAC full details of the research activity being undertaken with a detailed statement of how this will meet ethical standards. These should be sent to quality@futurelearn.com.

Reference points: [Ethical-Guidelines-for-Educational-Research-5th-edition.pdf](#)
[The-Concordat-to-Support-Research-Integrity-2025.pdf](#)
[european-code-of-conduct-for-research-integrity_horizon_en.pdf](#)

Supporting documentation from the subject organisation should also be provided to include details of any ethical approval process within that organisation or the student's own organisation. Where such processes exist then LTAC will require confirmation that the host organisation has given approval and will normally accept this as confirmation that ethical standards have been met. Approval may be unconditional or with conditions. Where an application is rejected, reasons must be provided. In the event of an appeal against a decision the matter will be referred to the Academic Standards and Quality Committee who may take external advice before deciding, this must be sent in writing to quality@futurelearn.com.

8.0 Research Misconduct

8.1 FutureLearn supports the principles which underpin the European Code of Conduct for Research Integrity (2023) and the UUK (2025) Concordat to Support Research Integrity. FutureLearn research is committed to the principle of the pursuit of truth. FutureLearn seeks to build a positive environment for research where the principles that underpin responsible research practice are part of the everyday experience of our researchers, students, and collaborators. These principles of research integrity include honesty, objectivity, openness, integrity, carefulness, respect for intellectual property, confidentiality, responsible publication, responsible mentoring, respect for colleagues, social responsibility, non-discrimination, competence, legality, animal care and protection for human research participants.

8.2 FutureLearn's commitment to research is reviewed and monitored by the Learning, Teaching and Assessment Committee, acting on behalf of the Academic Standards and Quality Committee.

Relevant policies that support this policy include:

- [Student Terms and Conditions](#)
- [FutureLearn's Privacy Policy](#)
- [Health and Safety Policy](#) to inform safe conduct of research activities.
- [Data Protection Policy](#)
- [Student Disciplinary Procedure](#)

8.3 The UUK (2025) Concordat for Research Integrity states: research misconduct can take many forms, including:

- **Fabrication:** making up results or other outputs (e.g. artefacts) and presenting them as if they were real.
- **Falsification:** manipulating research processes or changing or omitting data without good cause.
- **Plagiarism:** using other people's material without giving proper credit.
- **Failure to meet ethical, legal, and professional obligations:** for example, failure to declare competing interests; misrepresentation of involvement or authorship; misrepresentation of interests; breach of confidentiality; lack of informed consent; misuse of personal data; and abuse of research subjects or materials.
- **Improper dealing with allegations of misconduct:** failing to address possible infringements such as attempts to cover up misconduct and reprisals against whistleblowers.

8.4 Resources to support researchers to design, undertake and report research with integrity can be found in the programme information and through the support of supervisors.

9.0 How to Deal with Allegations of Misconduct

9.1 The procedures are designed to apply to current staff, students, and consultants of FutureLearn. The procedures are only applicable in regard to misconduct, which is alleged to have occurred during the time

Reference points: [Ethical-Guidelines-for-Educational-Research-5th-edition.pdf](#)
[The-Concordat-to-Support-Research-Integrity-2025.pdf](#)
[european-code-of-conduct-for-research-integrity_horizon_en.pdf](#)

that they have been employed (as staff) or registered (as students) by the FutureLearn. Where registered with a partner, only the student will follow the partner university procedures. The procedures do not apply to persons who are employed by other organisations, even if those individuals were engaged in collaborative research with staff of FutureLearn. FutureLearn does not have powers to investigate former employees or students who are now employed elsewhere.

9.2 The FutureLearn procedures will be applied in response to complaints received in writing from either internal or external persons or organisations, sent to the Academic Quality Lead, quality@futurelearn.com. The procedures are conducted as confidentially as is reasonably practicable. The confidential nature of the proceedings is maintained provided this does not compromise either the investigation of the misconduct allegations, any requirements of health and safety or any issue related to the safety of participants in the research. This is essential in order to protect the complainant, the researcher(s) and others involved in the process.

10.0 Procedure for Staff

10.1 Stage One: Initial Screening

Any allegation of research misconduct is a serious matter and should not be undertaken lightly, frivolously or in a vexatious manner. An allegation made in good faith should be reported directly to the Head of Programmes. They decide, after consultation with the Chair of LTAC, whether the allegation falls within the scope of the procedure and whether a full investigation is warranted. If the Head of Programmes decides that a formal investigation is not warranted, they record the justification for the decision and inform the complainant and the researcher(s). A record is kept with the Academic Quality Lead.

10.2 If the Head of Programmes decides that a formal investigation is warranted, they will inform Global University Systems HR who will provide advice relating to the staff disciplinary procedure. The individual will be informed that an allegation has been raised as part of this process. The Head of Programmes will arrange for all relevant research records and materials to be immediately sequestered and lodged securely in the Academic Quality Office. If the allegation relates to a perceived risk to health or safety, then the Head of Programmes acts to be sure that any such risk is moderated and managed.

10.3 Stage Two: Formal Investigation

The process for conducting investigations in the staff disciplinary procedure should be followed, including the right of representation where appropriate. The Head of Programmes, in consultation with HR, will nominate an investigation manager who will, under the provisions of the staff disciplinary procedure, usually be the researcher's line manager. The purpose of the formal investigation is to make a thorough evaluation of all the relevant facts and to collate any evidence. The investigation should maintain the highest standards of integrity, accuracy, and fairness. All proceedings must be conducted with sensitivity and confidentiality.

10.4 It may be necessary for the investigating manager to consult with up to three 'specialists'/appropriately qualified persons during the investigation process. Examples could include:

- An employee who holds a senior research position within FutureLearn.
- An employee with research experience relevant to the case who should be able to provide technical expertise.
- A member of the professoriate from a partner university.

These individuals may be invited to any investigation meetings as appropriate.

10.5 Having established the facts, the investigating manager should, in consultation with People Services, decide whether:

- To take no further action.

- The matter should be dealt with outside of the formal disciplinary procedure, or
- The matter should be presented to a formal disciplinary hearing.

Following an investigation, the outcome will be communicated to the researcher in writing within one week by the Head of HR. This will set out the findings of the investigating managers' conclusions and subsequent steps to be taken with a clear and reasonable timescale. Copies of the outcome will be provided to the Head of Programmes.

10.6 Stage Three: Disciplinary Hearing

If the outcome of the formal investigation is to proceed to a formal disciplinary hearing the process for conducting hearings in the staff disciplinary procedure should be followed, including the right of representation where appropriate. One or more of the three specialists' roles invited to the formal investigation (outlined in Stage Two above) may be invited to the hearing to clarify any of the points raised.

10.7 Stage Four: The Decision and Sanctions

The Chair of the disciplinary hearing will consider, what, if any, disciplinary action to issue. Appropriate actions may include the following:

- No disciplinary action is appropriate.
- To issue a first written warning.
- To issue a final written warning.
- Recommendation to dismiss with notice or to dismiss summarily.

Other outcomes may be considered in appropriate circumstances, for example, action short of dismissal, to which all parties must agree. This may include, for example, demotion.

10.8 Appeal

An appeal against a disciplinary decision should be submitted in writing (email is acceptable) and should be received within seven working days of the receipt of the letter, setting out the nature and grounds of appeal and addressed to the Head of HR. The process for handling appeals is set out in the staff disciplinary procedure.

11.0 Procedure for Students

11.1 Students registered with FutureLearn are expected to contribute to a positive learning environment and maintain standards of behaviour and engagement that support the wider community. Research misconduct allegations made against taught postgraduate courses as part of their programmes of study will follow the procedures outlined in the [Academic Integrity and Misconduct Policy](#).

11.2 Research misconduct allegations made against students as part of their wider involvement in the research community at FutureLearn will follow procedures detailed when students do not comply with the Student Code of Conduct which specifically references student research activities. Students who are on programmes with requirements for professional conduct are in addition expected to adhere to the Professional Conduct and Professional Suitability procedures.

12.0 Procedure for Consultants

12.1 Research that is undertaken as part of a commissioned or sub-contracted agreement with FutureLearn is expected to be conducted in a professional manner that accords with principles of responsible scientific practice.

Reference points: [Ethical-Guidelines-for-Educational-Research-5th-edition.pdf](#)
[The-Concordat-to-Support-Research-Integrity-2025.pdf](#)
[european-code-of-conduct-for-research-integrity_horizon_en.pdf](#)

12.2 All such commissioned or sub-contracted work should be subject to a formal consultancy agreement produced by the GUS central legal counsel.

12.3 It is the responsibility of the research project lead who is responsible for commissioning the consultant to verify the robustness of the research service provided by them. In the event of any termination of contract the project lead should consider whether any breaches as set out in 8.3 have been committed.

13.0 Further Considerations

13.1 In the event of a registered health or social care professional, or scientist regulated by the code of conduct of a professional body, the Chair of a disciplinary hearing should notify the appropriate registering/regulatory body of the outcome of any case where the researcher(s) have been found guilty of misconduct. This may trigger a separate disciplinary procedure of the regulatory body with regard to the fitness for practice of the researcher(s) concerned. This is very important. Failure to report might be deemed as placing the public at risk through continued bad practice. If the regulatory body decides to strike off the researcher(s) then FutureLearn may be obliged to dismiss or re-deploy the researcher(s). In the case of a student, the regulatory body may not be willing to register the student or may decide to terminate registration.

13.2 Other actions that may be required or be considered appropriate either by the chair of a disciplinary hearing or those involved in investigating an allegation of research misconduct could include:

- Retraction/correction of articles in journals.
- Withdrawal/repayment of funding and possible further investigations of fraud.
- Notifying patients/patients' doctors of any potential medical issues that may arise.
- Notifying other employing organisations.
- Notifying other organisations involved in the research.
- Adding a note of the outcome of the hearing to a researcher's file for any future requests for references; and/or
- Review internal management /or and/or supervisory procedures for research.

13.3 If the researcher(s) is found not guilty of the allegations, FutureLearn will take all reasonable steps to restore the reputation of the researcher(s) concerned.

14.0 Support for Complainants and Researcher(s)

14.1 Where allegations have been found (in full or in part), or found to be mistaken but not frivolous, vexatious and/or malicious, then appropriate support, guidance and acknowledgement should be given to the complainant, given that their role in the process will probably have been stressful and may well have caused friction with colleagues. The Chair of LTAC with Head of Programmes and the researcher(s) should take whatever steps they consider necessary to support the reputation of the Complainant.

14.2 Where allegations have not been found (in full or in part), the Chair of LTAC, and the Head of Programmes should take such steps as are appropriate, given the seriousness of the allegations, to support the reputation of the researcher(s) and any relevant research project(s). Appropriate support and guidance should be given to the researcher(s), given that his/her role in the process will probably have been stressful and may well have caused friction with colleagues.

14.3 If the process has found that the complainant's allegations were frivolous, vexatious, and/or malicious, the investigating manager or Chair of a disciplinary hearing may consider invoking the

disciplinary process against the complainant. If the complainant is a student, this would be handled through the Student Disciplinary Procedure; if a member of staff is the complainant, then the Staff Disciplinary Procedure would be invoked. If complainants are known to have subsequently moved to a research-related role in a different employing organisation, then their employer would be informed.

15.0 Monitoring

15.1 This policy will be monitored by the Head of Programmes and formally reviewed every three years.

Appendix

Research Ethics Application Form

All research conducted by FutureLearn students requires ethical approval. The application should be sent to your supervisor with your research proposal and any supporting documentation such as a recruitment invitation letter or guide, recruitment flyer (online/offline), participant information sheet, informed consent form, permission letter form an organisation to use their premises, participant instruction guide, questionnaire, measures, interview questions, debrief form, and any supporting or additional documentation that will be provided to the participants, or those helping with the research such as gatekeepers and assistants.

Secondary Research Only (Answer up to and including Question 3)
Complete information up to and including Question 3 if you are conducting ONLY secondary research and can answer YES to the following question:

This investigation will NOT involve the collection of data from human participants, though it may collect data about individuals from published matter (e.g., previously published interviews or behavioural data). Once the application and research proposal are reviewed and approved by your Supervisor, it will be sent to the Module Leader (ML)/Programme Team Leader (PL) for final approval. **You cannot collect data until final approval has been provided by the ML/PL.**

Please complete the information below.

Date Submitted	
Programme being studied	
Module Title	
Student name and student number	
Supervisor name	
Project Title	
Project Summary	
Research Method	
What are the desired outcomes of the research?	
1. Are you required to use a professional code of ethics and conduct relevant to your profession (e.g. British Psychological Society, Health Care Professions Council National Health Service, Ministry of Defence, the Law Society)	
2. If yes, have you read the relevant professional code of ethics and conducts?	
3. Are you sourcing secondary data? (e.g. Information from web sites, journal articles, archives)	

THIS IS THE END OF THE FORM TO BE COMPLETED IF YOU ARE UNDERTAKING SECONDARY RESEARCH. IF CONDUCTING PRIMARY RESEARCH, PLEASE COMPLETE THE REST OF THE FORM.

Primary research is used if your investigation involves the collection of data directly from human participants, rather than depending on data collected from previously completed research, and this can be in the form of a questionnaire, survey, interview, or experiments.

All forms for primary research **MUST** accompany this Ethics form, including a **full** draft of the questionnaire, interview questions, survey, or experiment.

PLUS:

- Participant Information Sheet
- Participant Informed Consent Form
- Participant Debrief Sheet
- Evidence of organisational approval (where relevant)
- Recruitment poster/invitation letter or email

These forms can be found in the Module handbook.

A proviso is to be used if all of the correct paperwork has been submitted, and this includes a questionnaire that addresses the research aims and objectives, but which requires some minor amendments such as phrasing of questions, typos, grammatical errors and so on. Therefore, the form can be approved as long as the conditions of the proviso are met. Guarantee of the changes being met can be authorised by the supervisor and this will save going through the whole proposal/ethics approval process again. The supervisor **MUST** see the proviso changes before the student uses the instrument.

4. Are you using an external research instrument or validated scale? (e.g. survey/psychometric)	
5. Are you sourcing primary data involving participants (e.g. surveys, interviews, focus group, Internet forums)?	
6. Are you dealing with sensitive data (e.g. personal data, organisational data, those with vulnerable groups)? If yes, please outline how this data will be stored securely to ensure compliance with data protection.	
7. Are you sourcing secondary data? (e.g. Information from web sites, journal articles, archives)	
8. Does the study require DBS (Disclosure and Barring Service) checks? **Please note that unless already working with this population, permission will not be granted to students to data collect from this population) If yes, please provide serial number, date obtained and expiry data	
9. Does the study involve direct contact with:	

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Vulnerable adults (e.g. learning difficulties, dementia, living in residential care) ● Those under the age of 18 ● Adults in prison/remanded in custody/on bail. <p>If yes, please outline the participant group</p> <p>**Please note that unless already working with this population, permission will not be granted to students to data collect from this population)</p>	
<p>10. Can you guarantee the full security and confidentiality of data collected?</p> <p>If not, please outline reasons</p>	
<p>11. Please outline how you will ensure anonymity and confidentiality of data</p>	
<p>12. Will you be responsible for destroying the data after the research is complete?</p> <p>If yes, at what date will the data be destroyed?</p> <p>If not, who will be responsible?</p> <p>**Please note that data should be destroyed as soon as possible (when full data usage has been completed) but no later than 3 years from data collection.</p>	
<p>13. Will all participants receive information as to why the research is being conducted and what their participation will involve?</p> <p>If no, please state reasons</p>	
<p>14. Will all participants be asked to give informed consent before the study starts?</p> <p>If no, please state reasons</p>	

<p>15. Will all participants be told of the data being collected and how the data will be used?</p> <p>If not, please state reasons</p>	
<p>16. Will all participants be told that they do not have to participate in the research?</p> <p>If not, please state reasons</p>	
<p>17. Does the study involve deception?</p> <p>If yes, please provide details</p>	
<p>18. Is there any risk that the research may lead to physical/psychological harm or disclosure of criminal activities/convictions?</p> <p>If yes, please outline and explain what you will do to reduce risks</p>	
<p>19. Is there any significant risk that participants may disclose the harming of others or the harming of themselves?</p> <p>If yes, please provide details and actions you will take</p>	
<p>20. Are you proposing to recruit participants who are students or staff of FutureLearn?</p> <p>YES/NO</p> <p>If yes, please provide details of any potential conflict of interest and how this will be mitigated</p>	
<p>21. Employees of organisations?</p> <p>If yes, how will permission be gained from the organisation?</p>	

<p>22. Students through educational institutions?</p> <p>If yes, how will permission be gained from the institution?</p> <p>Participants in residential care, social care, nursing homes?</p> <p>If yes, how will permission be gained from the organisation and individuals/carers?</p>	
<p>23. Adults in prison, in custody, on remand?</p> <p>If yes, how will permission be gained from the organisation and individuals?</p>	
<p>24. Will any of your research involve online data collection?</p> <p>(e.g. online surveys, Facebook, LinkedIn, Twitter)</p> <p>If yes, how will permission be obtained to collect data if necessary?</p>	
<p>25. Will you be using a survey software (e.g. Google Forms)?</p> <p>If yes, please provide details</p>	
<p>26. Are payments/incentives being offered to participants?</p> <p>If yes, please provide details</p>	
<p>27. Will you tell participants that payment/incentives do not affect participants' right to withdraw their data?</p>	

Dissertation/Project Proposal Form

Student Name:		Supervisor Name:	
Student Number:		Programme:	
Project title:			
Start and end dates of research:			
Proposed activity – aims, objectives, research question(s), and state how it is novel			
Methodology – rationale, data selection and collection, recruitment, participant demographics, analytical process			
References			
Project management			

Table: Project timeline and key outputs

Month	Activity
Supervision Meetings	
Research Data Management Plan (Describe the data you expect to acquire or generate during this research project, how you will manage, describe, analyse, and store the data and what mechanisms you will use to share and preserve your data.)	
Planned outputs/publications/research datasets/impact/dissemination	

<p>If successful, I undertake to carry out the research according to the University’s Ethics code of Practice and will be required to complete an Ethics checklist – see relevant forms detailed under Primary Research (Applicant’s signature required)</p>	<p>.....</p>
<p>Date and signature of Supervisor approval</p>	<p>.....</p>