Solent University Research Ethics Policy and Procedure

Approved by Academic Board July 2023

Contents

Statement of Principles

1. The University's Ethics Policy is set out in the list of Principles shown below. The implementation and monitoring of this Policy is the responsibility of the University Ethics Committee, as detailed in

Section 3D of the Academic Handbook[1]. This policy is to be reviewed yearly during the University Research Ethics Committee (UREC) Spring meeting. Each ethics standing/specialist panel shall promote procedures for ensuring the implementation of the policy and report annually to the University Ethics Committee.

2. To support the University's Strategy 2025[2] in respect of Research and Knowledge Exchange, the Ethics Policy aims to promote values that underpin an inclusive community which recognises openness and respect within all aspects of university life. In relation to ethical considerations all members of the University have the right to raise issues with their standing/specialist panel representative on the University Ethics Committee.

3. These Principles are applicable to all staff and students at Solent University and any limited companies set up under its auspices. Where the term 'departments' is used, for ease and consistency, this encompasses all of the following: departments, institutes, centres and teams. It is a fundamental principle that all staff and students engaged in teaching, research, and innovation adopt a continuing personal commitment to act ethically, to encourage ethical behaviour in those with whom they collaborate and follow the standing/specialist panel and University Ethics Policy and procedures.

4. Should a conflict arise between the Solent University Ethics Policy and that of a relevant professional or statutory body, a request may be put forward to the University Ethics Committee, including a rationale, for any deviation from the University Policy.

5. 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). Departments are responsible for ensuring that students and staff complete an ethics review where required and obtain approval before commencing any data collection. The policy relates to all research carried out at or in conjunction with Solent University – whether funded or unfunded – involving human participants, animal subjects, or involving data relating to directly identifiable human subjects (whether living or recently deceased); it also applies to research which does not involve human participants such as financial data, conducted by principal researchers. It does not relate to other ethical judgements. For the purposes of this policy, the term 'principal researcher/PI' refers to members of the Solent's community including academics, contract research staff, professional services staff, postgraduate researchers, Master's students, and undergraduate students.

6. As a Higher Education establishment the University adheres to the relevant concordats and guidelines for research and ethics, for example: the British Educational Research Association (BERA), the Economic and Social Research Council (ESRC) and British Medical Association (BMA).

Policy

[1] https://staff.solent.ac.uk/official-documents/quality-management/academic-handbook/3d-research-innovation-and-enterprise-committee.pdf
[2] https://www.solent.ac.uk/strategy-2025

Research ethics review procedure

1. Where research involves human participants (for example, for interviews, focus groups, surveys, observations, etc.), or involves data relating to directly identifiable human subjects (including user-generated data on social media platforms), research is considered medium/high risk and will be referred to the relevant panel or committee.

2. 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[3], which are: Respect for persons (and their autonomy), Beneficence, Non-maleficence, Distributive justice (ensuring benefits and burdens are shared equitably).

3. Departmental deputy chairs and panel members will be selected by the Heads and Associate Heads of each department. Ethics applications considered Medium and High Risk will be fielded to the panel members by the deputy chair.

4. Ethical approval must be obtained via the online ethical review form[4] guidance on how to complete the form can be found on the ethics and integrity portal page[5]. The form will allow researchers to provide specific details of their research and submit supporting documents, such as consent forms and surveys. Applications for ethics review will be categorised as follows;

5. **Low:**
   Low risk research may consist of the following;

   - Research that does not involve humans or living animals in any way
   - Does not involve sensitive materials or topics that might be considered offensive, distressing, politically or socially sensitive, deeply personal or in breach of the law (for example criminal activities, sexual behaviour, ethnic status, personal appearance, experience of violence, addiction, religion, or financial circumstances);
   - Does not have a detrimental impact on the environment, habitat or species; and
   - Does not involve the development for export of 'controlled' goods regulated by the Export Control Organisation (ECO)

   Student researchers will have their applications reviewed by their supervisors. Staff researchers' applications will be reviewed by the Ethics Standing Panel for the department. Researchers will receive an automatic notification of any comments, approvals, or rejections. If an application is not deemed to be low risk, then it will progress to the next stage of the review process.

6. **Medium:**
   Research that is not considered low risk is approved through the Departmental Ethics panel, below are some examples.

   - Primary data involving humans i.e Interviews, surveys, focus groups, observations of

[3] https://www.hhs.gov/ohrp/regulations-and-policy/belmont-report/index.html
[4] Currently https://ethics.app.solent.ac.uk/. Please note as we develop the app this link may be updated
[5] https://www.solent.ac.uk/research-innovation-enterprise/research-at-solent/support/ethics-and-integrity

people, etc.

- User generated data (e.g., from discussion forums, social media platforms, vlogs or blogs, comments on posts or articles)
- The collection of any personal data/identifiable information (e.g., names, email addresses, IP addresses, social media profiles or meta-data, visual material, etc.), or use of any secondary data that include any personal data/ identifiable information
- Any other information that could identify (or potentially lead to the identification of) a living individual. 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.
- The potential that findings/conclusions/publication may have damaging repercussions for any individuals (reputation, stigma, bullying) or groups with protected characteristics
- Research where there may be a detrimental impact on the environment, habitat or species
- Any other reason why the research might raise ethical issues You must obtain approval of your ethics review before you commence any data collection

Both student and staff researchers with projects deemed medium risk will have their research reviewed by the departmental ethics panel.

7. **High:**
High risk applications are deemed to be those where the research:

- Will involve vulnerable[6] groups or sensitive topics
- Will involve children/minors
- May involve the development for export of 'controlled' goods
- Will involve living animal subjects
- Might induce emotional or psychological stress, anxiety or humiliation
- Involves deception of participants or that is intentionally conducted without their full and informed consent at the time the study is carried out
- Might have negative repercussions for individuals or groups
- Requires permission of a gatekeeper[7] for initial access to participants (where involvement of the gatekeeper might raise issues of whether participants' involvement is truly voluntary);
- Will involve more than minimal risk of harm (whether emotional or physical) to the participants or the researcher(s)
- Research conducted overseas

Please note this is not an exhaustive list.

High risk applications in most cases can be reviewed by the departmental panel but the panel may refer projects to University Ethics Committee (UEC) on a case-by-case basis for advice or review if there are specific concerns.

8. Where cohorts of students are undertaking projects as part of their coursework, and these projects are expected to stay within the parameters of low risk outlined above, the course leader may submit a single consolidated ethics review form, via the online ethics system for the cohort that covers the types of projects the students will be conducting. This is to prevent a large buildup of applications coming in at peak times of the year.

9. Any queries regarding the ethics review procedure should be directed to the Research

[6] Vulnerable as defined in point 20 below
[7] As defined in Annex A below

Ethics and Integrity officer at ethics@solent.ac.uk in the first instance.

10. The Request for Ethical Approval Form will be submitted to the supervisor (student researchers only) or Chair of the relevant Ethics Standing/Specialist Panel via the Solent Ethics App[8]. Additional and relevant information may also be submitted, as appropriate, for example the proposed research questionnaire, information about informed consent, written communication with the gatekeeper, etc[9]

11. The Chair of the relevant Ethics Standing/Specialist Panel will appoint two members of the Panel from the most appropriate discipline/service and together they will undertake the Ethical Review. The Chair should ensure that the two members, given their position, role or duty within the Department/Hub/Service, have no interest which might affect, or be perceived as being capable of affecting, their judgement.

12. The Chair may also appoint one additional member of staff outside of the Panel membership to undertake Ethical Review when there is a requirement for specialist/expert knowledge not available to the panel membership. This would particularly apply to collaborative/cross-disciplinary projects. The appointment is valid for the duration of the said review only.

13. Should a Deputy Chair wish to apply for ethical review for their own project, their application should be submitted to an alternative department/service via the App[10]. Applications under these circumstances should first be brought to the attention of the Ethics and Integrity Officer, so they can advise which department to submit to. Appointments under these circumstances are valid for the duration of the said review only.

14. Researchers will receive an outcome of their initial application within 10 working days. If approvers require further information or revisions, the approver may request this via the App, once the researcher has provided the additional information, the approver has a further 10 working days to inform the student of their decision.

15. The Ethics Review process leads to three kinds of decisions:
    - Approved (ethically sound, permission to proceed);
    - Declined, revise and resubmit (suitable changes required)[11]; or
    - Rejected (Study cannot be conducted - not suitable as a research study)

External Review and collaboration

16. In some instances, research may fall under the rubric of other external 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 third parties and collaboration section of the Solent Ethics App. The researcher should provide a copy of the letter of ethics approval from the external body. Full ethical review will not be required in addition to this, but a record of

[8] Applications are reviewed by panellists from their own department only except where this poses a conflict of interest (see point 13 for procedure)

[9] Currently this is sent to ethics@solent.ac.uk we hope the improved app will be able to allow for users to upload documents

[10] This also applies to panellists conducting research where there are not sufficient panellists unconnected to the project within the departmental panel

[11] It should be noted that there is no limit to the number of revisions and this number will not affect the perceived validity of the study

the external approval will be kept on file[12].

17. Where research involves more than one institution, each institution retains formal responsibility for overseeing the ethical review of research conducted under its auspices. Researchers should seek approval and accept the decisions made by the Research Ethics Committee of both institutions.

18. The terms of the research and innovation activity being undertaken on behalf of a sponsor must be agreed in advance. Wherever the work is undertaken in collaboration with other institutions, either in the UK or abroad, it is essential to ensure that the policies of those institutions meet the standards of the University's Ethics Policy. The terms will usually include the specification of the research and innovation, the roles and responsibilities of the person carrying out the activity. The need for confidentiality or non-disclosure agreements must be negotiated in advance.

Psychology, Nursing studies, and Sport Science

19. This policy and procedure document applies to all conducting research at Solent, in light of this, the previous Psychology Ethics Committee (PEC) will be brought under this institution-wide policy. Members of the committee and standing panel may remain in place if they wish to, the department will now operate as any other department at Solent.

20. Students and staff engaging in research within these fields are required to fill in an additional section of the ethics review form with questions specific to their sector.

Amendments

21. Occasionally researchers need to make amendments to a study that has already received ethics approval. All amendments will require a new ethics form to be submitted by the researcher. Where the researcher is a staff member they should contact the ethics panel, student researchers should contact their supervisor with details of the amendment, to let them know that the new form has been submitted. The form contains a tick box to reflect whether an application is an amended/revised form or band new.

Vulnerable groups

22. As outlined in point 6 above, research involving vulnerable groups is automatically considered high risk

23. Please note that Solent follow the ESRC[13] definition of vulnerability as follows: 'Vulnerability may be defined in different ways and may arise as a result of being in an abusive relationship,

[12] Please note; the full ethics form for Solent will need to be completed for record and audit purposes, however, it will not require full assessment by the ethics panel. The chair or panellist will check the external review section of the form and if all is in order, approve the application.

[13] Economic and Social Research Council definition https://www.ukri.org/councils/esrc/guidance-for-applicants/research-ethics-guidance/research-with-potentially-vulnerable-people/

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.'

24. Conversely, participants may appear to belong to a vulnerable group under the above definition, but do not self-identify as vulnerable. Care should be taken not to assume that a participant is vulnerable because, for example, they identify as disabled. We acknowledge that not all research subjects who fall into a specific vulnerability category identify as such, but that in this case the researcher should act on the assumption that the sample group (all research subjects) is.

Research involving children

25. As outlined in point 6 above, research involving children and/or minors is automatically considered high risk.

26. Where staff or students are involved in regulated activity with children, the relevant DBS checks are undertaken by People and Development or by the panelists. Any research involving the requirement of a DBS also has to be a Solent approved Enhanced DBS (applicable to professional practice courses and where there are coaching placements). Any staff, volunteers or student ambassadors that do not have a valid DBS check should not participate unsupervised in a regulated activity (as defined by the DBS criteria) with children or vulnerable adults.

27. As outlined in more detail below, where gatekeepers are approached in research involving children, consent can only be given if a parental assent form has been signed.

Informed consent and age of consent

28. Ethical conduct in research and innovation demands respect for the rights of others directly or indirectly affected by the research. For human participants, both their physical and personal autonomy should be respected. However, whilst it is recognised that much scientific research involving the use of human participants will, by its very nature, often conceal from participants the true purpose of the enquiry or experiment, this concealment should be at the minimum level essential to conduct that research. There should also be no reasonable expectation that harm would come to participants and that it should conform to the requirements of relevant professional bodies and any legal requirements. Additionally, participants should be fully informed and briefed upon completion with opportunities to be informed of the findings. Other than these circumstances, participation in the research and innovation should be on the basis of fully informed consent and participants' rights to privacy should be guaranteed. Written consent should be obtained where appropriate.

29. There should be no coercion of any kind and, where remuneration is offered, this should be declared and carried out in an ethical manner. Care should be taken that it is not offered as an inducement to surrender ethical rights or accept risk of physical or psychological harm. Any remuneration should therefore only be at a rate appropriate to recompense the individual concerned for their time and expenses.

30. At the onset of the investigation, investigators should make plain to participants their right to withdraw from the research at any time, irrespective of whether payment or other inducement

has been offered.

31. Persons carrying out the research and innovation should consider the ethical implications of that activity, including the physiological, psychological, social, political, religious, cultural and economic consequences of the work for the participants, possible observers and society prior to its commencement.

32. Where participants are not in a position to give informed consent, the person carrying out the scholarly activity should have regard to the advice of the appropriate body. Under the Mental Capacity Act, no one gives consent on behalf of a person lacking capacity. Instead, the researcher is required to seek advice from a consultee on what the wishes and feelings of the person might be and whether they should take part. The consultee gives advice, not consent in law.

33. All research and innovation involving children under the age of 18 requires the informed consent of parents (or those in loco parents), or the single consent of a person or gatekeeper for a group of children **only** if a parental assent form has been signed. Where real consent cannot be obtained due to impairments in understanding or communication, advice must be sought from the appropriate standing/specialist panel representative of the University Ethics Committee.

Deceptive and covert scholarly activity

34. While it is recognised that there is a continuum of covert – overt research and innovation whereby the person carrying out the research and innovation is required to keep the content of the research and innovation to him/herself, the person/s carrying out the research and innovation should endeavour, wherever possible and practicable, to avoid the use of deception in their research and innovation.

Anonymity and legal consideration

35. The anonymity and privacy of participants in research and innovation should be respected. Personal information relating to these participants must be held in a confidential and secure place in line with GDPR. For further information refer the Research data quick checklist[14] and Solent's data protection policy[15]. Further queries can be directed to the Information Rights & Records Senior Officer reachable at information.rights@solent.ac.uk

36. In the event that confidentiality and/or anonymity cannot be guaranteed, the participant must be warned of this in advance. Should the investigator find themselves in the position where they are required by law to break any undertaking of confidentiality, they should seek guidance from the Chair of the University Ethics Committee.

37. The agreement on intellectual property should be made clear at the outset when writing the terms of the agreement and in line with the Solent University's Intellectual Property Rights Policy

38. The constraints of the contract must not compromise the overriding principles of non-malfeasance and beneficence, legal obligations, and any pre-existing rights.

[14] Found at the bottom of this document.
[15] https://staff.solent.ac.uk/official-documents/policy-governance-and-information/data-protection-policy.pdf

Research conducted outside the UK

39. Any student or staff member conducting research abroad must complete a Risk Assessment form to be submitted to Health and Safety; and Seek advice whether directly from the United Kingdom Foreign Office or via their website to ensure the safety of the destination being visited. Further reasonable steps must be made to inform the destination country of the intention to conduct research within their territory(ies). Steps to be taken must be outlined by the researcher in the relevant section of the ethics form.

40. University sponsored research carried out abroad must uphold the ethical standards outlined in this policy while also being conscious of local expectations, practices, and laws. Any research that would require ethical review when carried out in the UK should be subject to appropriate ethical review when carried out overseas. To decide whether this is the case, researchers who wish to rely on an overseas ethical review process should seek confirmation from the Solent research ethics committee to ensure that the overseas process is in line with this policy. Researchers should consult their departments in the first instance before applying for ethical approval.

Funding

41. While the guiding principle of Solent's research funding stance is to generate funds to facilitate research, there are situations where it is not appropriate for Solent to accept money from a particular funder, either in general, or for a particular project where such funding might conflict, or be inconsistent, with the aims, objects or activities of Solent, as set out in our Solent Values statement or elsewhere.

42. In considering whether to accept funding, particular attention should be given to the question of whether doing so could conflict, or readily be perceived to conflict, with the independence or integrity of the researcher, of the researcher's research team or department, or Solent, or otherwise conflict with the aims, objects and values at Solent.

Staff Development

43. The Research and Innovation Office is responsible for monitoring the work of the Standing/Specialist Panels, continuing the work of ethics training and awareness, in association with Heads of Department, and submitting written reports to the University Ethics Committee three times a year.

44. Research ethics must be taught to all students in lectures or seminars prior to any research being planned or conducted.

45. Staff involved in research in any way, this includes reviewing staff or student ethics applications must also have undertaken the ethics training available on SOL. Ethics Panelists and Deputy Chairs will have specific training for their roles via the research office in addition to the SOL training.

Appeals

46. Should the Committee reject a proposal the researcher has the right to request that the decision is considered by an Ethics Appeals Panel.

47. This process is to be used sparingly and by discretion of the University Ethics Committee. To request an appeal, researchers must first contact the Ethics officer by emailing ethics@solent.ac.uk. Requests will then be referred to the UEC. The decision made by the UEC is final.

Researcher, departmental and university responsibilities

48. 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 Specialist 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.

49. 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 of Low risk or Higher risk ethics applications approved 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

- **Auditing of ethics submissions**
  - that student ethics review forms have been submitted where required and have been approved by the appropriate supervisor
  - that staff ethics review forms have been reviewed/approved by the appropriate departmental/faculty ethics approver.

50. Departments must manage their ethics standing panels according to the needs of the department. There should be sufficient standing panel members that the number of ethics applications coming in can be actioned within the 10-day window. Panel members and deputy chair are to be selected by Associate Heads and reviewed yearly.

51. The Research Ethics Committee will periodically[16] conduct a selective audit of current research projects. 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. 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

[16] Three times per year, unless a case arises which requires urgent UEC review.

body that ethical approval has been revoked.

The Environment

52. All research and innovation should be conducted in a sustainable way with regard to the environment. Any research and innovation activity which may cause detriment to the environment, habitats or species must carry out an environmental impact assessment and a statement as to how any detrimental effects will be mitigated.

Misconduct

53. In the context of research and innovation, the University defines misconduct to include the following, whether deliberate, reckless or negligent:

    - Failure to obtain appropriate ethical approval before the commencement of the project;
    - Deception in relation to the proposal submitted; and
    - Supervisor's negligence in providing appropriate ethical advice when fast tracking ethical approval for a student's project.

54. Any individual who believes that an act of misconduct relating to the ethical approval of research or innovation has occurred or is occurring should notify the Chair of the University Ethics Committee, detailing the precise nature of the allegation and whom this concerns. The Chair of the University Ethics Committee will liaise with the Department concerned. Any misconduct will be examined in line with the Research Misconduct Policy[17]

[17] https://staff.solent.ac.uk/official-documents/quality-management/academic-handbook/4t-staff-research-misconduct-procedures.pdf

Annex A

A project is defined as an activity that involves the collection of primary data.
An investigator is defined as a student or staff member undertaking research or innovation activity.

A principal investigator (PI) is defined as a student or staff member taking responsibility for leading a research/innovation project.

Human participants are defined as including living human beings, and human data and records (such as, but not restricted to medical, genetic, financial, personnel, criminal or administrative records and test results including scholastic achievements).

Documentary material already in the public domain include, for example, published biographies, newspaper accounts of an individual's activities, published minutes of a meeting, interviews broadcast on radio, television or online, diaries or letters in the public domain, and historical records authorised for public access by record offices.

Academic audit is a process 'to investigate the effectiveness of academic policies, procedures, or practice (…) to protect University standards, or enhance the student learning experience, or improve the quality of course provision and/or operational effectiveness'.

A gatekeeper is a professional who runs an organisation through which participants are accessed, as well as a service provider, a caregiver, a relative or a guardian.

Solent Policies and referenced sources

Solent guidance:

Current Handbook
https://staff.solent.ac.uk/official-documents/quality-management/academic-handbook/3d-research-innovation-and-enterprise-committee.pdf

DBS guidance
https://staff.solent.ac.uk/official-documents/people-and-development/guidelines-for-dbs-checks.pdf

Environmental Policy
https://students.solent.ac.uk/official-documents/estates-and-facilities/solent-environmental-policy.pdf

GDPR Policy
https://staff.solent.ac.uk/our-organisation/gdpr-at-solent

Intellectual Property Policy
https://staff.solent.ac.uk/official-documents/research-innovation-and-enterprise/intellectual-property-rights-policy.pdf

Open research data policy
https://staff.solent.ac.uk/official-documents/research-innovation-and-enterprise/open-research-data-policy.pdf

Research misconduct policy
https://staff.solent.ac.uk/official-documents/quality-management/academic-handbook/4t-staff-research-misconduct-procedures.pdf

Safeguarding Policy
https://students.solent.ac.uk/official-documents/student-services/safeguarding-policy.pdf

Research Integrity page
https://www.solent.ac.uk/research-innovation-enterprise/research-at-solent/support/ethics-and-integrity

Strategy 2025
https://www.solent.ac.uk/strategy-2025

External sources Referenced:

Belmont Report
https://www.hhs.gov/ohrp/regulations-and-policy/belmont-report/index.html

UKRI guidance on Vulnerable participants
https://www.ukri.org/councils/esrc/guidance-for-applicants/research-ethics-guidance/research-with-potentially-vulnerable-people/

Review schedule and version history

Review interval	Next review due by	Next review start
Annually		

Version	Date	Approved by	Notes
1.1	April 2023	University Research Ethics and Integrity Committee	Completed review of policy and procedure, merged the documents, and added annex/ notes and research data checklist

Contacts:

Position	Name	Email	Notes
RKE Ethics & Integrity, Compliance & Impact Officer	Georgia Croucher	georgia.croucher@solent.ac.uk	Author

Research data quick checklist

READY **When you are planning your research**	**- Begin thinking about your managing/storing your data** **- Clarify whether your data provider, research funder or research partners have specific data security requirements and whether Solent needs to sign off any formal agreements for access to the data**
STEADY **Before you start collecting or using data**	**- Complete and submit your ethics application** **- Write a Data Management Plan or review your existing DMP, see** https://staff.solent.ac.uk/official-documents/research-innovation-and-enterprise/open-research-data-policy.pdf **for more info** **- Fill in any documentation or forms required by your department e.g. Consent forms, participant information sheets**
GO **When you start research**	**- Send queries about data management, storage or security to** information.rights@solent.ac.uk **- Update your DMP and your Department with any changes to your plans** **- Send general ethics queries to ethics@solent.ac.uk**
STOP **When your research project ends**	**- Archive and publish and/or delete any datasets (including copies) in accordance with your DMP, Project-level data security document and funder requirements** **- Once data has been anonymized, archived, or published, think about the secure destruction of original data.**