



Institiúid Ard-Léinn | Dublin Institute for
Bhaile Átha Cliath | Advanced Studies

DIAS CODE OF GOOD RESEARCH PRACTICE

Version 1.0

17

th June 2020

Foreword

Reflecting its unique mission, DIAS is recognised globally as a force for excellence in fundamental research. Nationally, DIAS is the original centre of excellence and needs to maintain the highest standards of good research practice. This is absolutely necessary for DIAS to strengthen Dublin, and Ireland, as a home for intellectual leadership, independent critical enquiry, and innovative frontier research.

The values of DIAS are excellence in all that activities; freedom and tenacity in the pursuit of understanding; leadership and steadfastness for our disciplines; collegiality and respectful collaboration; openness and social responsibility; integrity and probity, and inclusiveness and diversity. In this regard, DIAS is committed to observing the highest standards of research integrity and expects all its researchers to follow the highest ethical standards in the conduct of their research. This code sets out general principles of good research practice and defines what is regarded as unacceptable research conduct. The code applies to all research staff and scholars and those who hold honorary or adjunct positions with the Institute.

All researchers conducting research under the auspices of DIAS are required to:

- Adhere to the principles of Good Research Practice set out in this policy
- Comply with all relevant requirements of Irish law, including licensing requirements.
- Familiarise themselves with any additional guidelines relevant to their discipline e.g. Intellectual property rights, research ethics.

It is the responsibility of School Directors, Heads of Section, Senior Professors and Research supervisors to promote good research practice in their respective sections/research groups and ensure adherence to appropriate standards. The mentoring and training of staff is an important element in this process.

Research Integrity (RI) is at the centre of attention on the international research landscape. Following publication of the revised European Code of Conduct for Research Integrity (2017) and the revised National Policy Statement on Ensuring Research Integrity in Ireland (2019), the DIAS Code of Research Conduct has been updated to ensure alignment with both the national and European policy. The DIAS Code of Good Research Practice aims to help realise this responsibility and to serve the DIAS research community as a toolkit for self-regulation.

References

DIAS Strategy (2018-2022)

Research Integrity Science Foundation Ireland <https://www.sfi.ie/funding/sfi-policies-and-guidance/integrity/>

European Code of Conduct for Research Integrity, European Science Foundation and ALL European Academies (ALLEA), 2017.

National Policy Statement on Ensuring Research Integrity in Ireland: Research Integrity National Forum, Irish Universities Association, Technological Higher Education Association, August 2019.



1. INTRODUCTION
2. PRINCIPLES OF GOOD RESEARCH PRACTICE
3. ETHICAL APPROVAL
4. COMPETENCE
5. RESPONSIBILITY
6. INTEGRITY
7. RESPECT FOR THE RIGHTS & DIGNITY OF RESEARCH PARTICIPANTS
8. RECORDS & DATA MANAGEMENT
9. DISSEMINATION
10. PROCEDURE IN CASES OF SUSPECTED RESEARCH MISCONDUCT/DISPUTES
11. ADDITIONAL PROVISIONS



CODE OF GOOD RESEARCH PRACTICE DUBLIN INSTITUTE FOR ADVANCED STUDIES (DIAS)

1. INTRODUCTION

1.1 In alignment with the European Code of Conduct for Research Integrity¹ (the “EU Code”), the *DIAS Code of Good Research Practice* (the “Code”) applies to research in all scientific and scholarly fields. While different disciplines may use different approaches, they each share the motivation to increase our knowledge of ourselves and the world in which we live. DIAS is recognised globally as a force for excellence in fundamental research and, nationally, DIAS is the original centre of excellence. It is the goal of DIAS to push the boundaries of current understanding in our specialist disciplines and to conduct fundamental research to the highest international standards.

1.2 DIAS intends to provide a neutral dedicated research space and a conducive intellectual environment for local and international researchers to conduct advanced studies, explore ideas, and engage in unconstrained thought. DIAS aims to enable researchers at all career stages to flourish and fulfill their research potential, and to train talented scholars in advanced research.

1.3 DIAS has a responsibility to ensure that all research carried out under its auspices meets the highest ethical standards while taking account of the law and the public interest.

1.4 This Code addresses the issues involved in the proper conduct of research, and provides guidance on the standards expected.

1.5 DIAS is committed to ensuring the highest standards of integrity in all aspects of research, founded on basic principles of good research practice to be observed by all researchers.

The EU Code specifies four basic principles that underpin all research integrity and good practice in carrying out research, which are endorsed by DIAS. These are principles that all scientific and scholarly researchers and practitioners must observe directly in performing their own individual research, and in dealings with research partners and the audience that receives their research reports. These principles are:

- **Reliability** in ensuring the quality of research, reflected in the design, the methodology, the analysis and the use of resources.
- **Honesty** in developing, undertaking, reviewing, reporting and communicating research in a transparent, fair, full and unbiased way. (see Para. 6)
- **Respect** for colleagues, research participants, society, ecosystems, cultural heritage and the environment.
- **Accountability** for the research from idea to publication, for its management and organisation, for training, supervision and mentoring and for its wider impacts.

1.6 All research conducted in DIAS must be consistent with the forgoing principles and with Irish law and policy, including licensing requirements, and with this and related DIAS policies.

1.7 Researchers have a responsibility to make themselves aware of and ensure that all relevant requirements of Irish law and DIAS Policy are met.

¹ https://ec.europa.eu/research/participants/data/ref/h2020/other/hi/h2020-ethics_code-of-conduct_en.pdf



1.8 This Code is aligned with the *National Policy Statement on Ensuring Research Integrity in Ireland* (“the National Policy Statement”²), which has been adopted by the Irish Universities Association, DIAS and others, and DIAS affirms the commitments contained therein.

1.9 This Code adopts the definitions contained in the National Policy Statement. If any conflict or ambiguity arises between it and the National Policy Statement, this Code shall prevail.

1.10 The Code applies to:

- researchers (including School Directors Senior Professors, Professors, Research Fellows, Postdoctoral Researchers, Research Scientists, Postdoctoral Scholars, PhD Students, Research Associates, research-related staff and visiting researchers) and other staff involved in the research process (including technical and administrative staff³) employed by DIAS, whether in DIAS, or while at another institution;
- scholars, interns and work experience students;
- adjunct faculty
- any persons, with honorary or adjunct positions or otherwise involved in research within, or on behalf of or accommodated within DIAS;

1.11 The term “researcher” is used throughout the Code to refer to any or all of the above categories, as appropriate.

1.12 Events may occur where there is possible infringement of this Code by a person who is not an employee or scholar of DIAS, such cases should also be addressed by the respective employer, as appropriate.

1.13 DIAS expects all researchers to work within this Code. The Code sets out general guidance, but it is recognised that principles of good research practice may apply differently in different disciplines.

1.14 If researchers have any doubt concerning the applicability of a particular clause of the Code they should consult with their School Director, Registrar (CEO), Chairman of the Governing Board of the respective School, as appropriate.

1.15 In addition to the Code, researchers should make themselves familiar with any guidelines that are relevant to their own discipline; for example, policies relating to intellectual property, conflict of interest, data protection and research ethics.

² The *National Policy Statement on Ensuring Research Integrity in Ireland*, is available at <https://www.iua.ie/publications/national-policy-statement-on-ensuring-research-integrity-in-ireland-2/>

³ Members of this group of staff are subject to this Code commensurate with their role in research activity or in any research process or output in which they have participated. Their contribution to the research may be acknowledged in accordance with Section 6.11



1.16 A **Research Integrity Officer**⁴ shall be appointed by the DIAS Council and report to the Registrar (CEO) and will have the functions conferred on him or her under this Code and the Institute for Advanced Studies Act 1940. If the Research Integrity Officer is:

- a) the subject of the complaint; or
 - b) is conflicted in any way regarding the nature or source of the complaint; or
 - c) for any other reason cannot act in respect of a particular complaint under this Code,
- the Registrar (CEO) shall appoint an ad hoc Research Integrity Officer to manage the complaint in accordance with this Code.

1.17 Research misconduct includes but is not limited to (EU Code section 3.1):

- ***Fabrication of data***
- ***Falsification of data***
- ***Plagiarism***

FFP includes, for example,

- Making up results and recording them as if they were real
- Selectively excluding data from analysis
- Misinterpreting data to obtain desired results (including inappropriate use of statistical methods)
- Manipulating images in publications
- Producing false data or results under pressure from a sponsor
- using other people's work and ideas without giving proper credit to the original source, thus violating the rights of the original author(s) to their intellectual outputs.

These forms of violation are considered particularly serious since they distort the research record. There are further violations of good research practice that damage the integrity of the research process or of researchers. In addition to direct violations of the good research practices set out in the EU Code, examples of other unacceptable practices include but are not confined to:

- **Data related Misconduct** including,
 - not preserving primary data
 - poor data management and/or storage
 - withholding data from the scientific community
- **Research Practice Misconduct** including,
 - Using inappropriate (e.g., harmful or dangerous) research methods
 - Poor research design
 - Experimental, analytical, computational errors
 - Violation of human subject protocols
 - Concealment of research misconduct
- **Publication related Misconduct** including,
 - Claiming undeserved authorship
 - Denying authorship to contributors
 - Artificially proliferating publications (“salami- slicing” and “self-plagiarism”)
 - Failure to correct the publication record
 - Including authors without permission

⁴ In accordance with the *National Policy Statement on Ensuring Research Integrity in Ireland* – page 27

- Selective citing to enhance importance of finding
 - Establishing or supporting journals that undermine the quality control of research ('predatory journals')
 - Grossly exaggerating the importance and practical applicability of findings
- **Personal Misconduct** in the research setting including
 - Inappropriate personal behaviour,
 - Harassment, bullying
 - Inadequate supervision, mentoring, counselling of researchers
 - Insensitivity to social or cultural norms
 - Misusing seniority to encourage violations of research integrity
 - Delaying or inappropriately hampering the work of other researchers
- **Financial and other Misconduct** including,
 - Peer review abuse e.g., non-disclosure of conflict of interest, unfairly holding up a rival's publication
 - Misrepresenting credentials or publication record
 - Misuse of research funds for unauthorised purchases or for personal gain
 - Making an unsubstantiated or malicious misconduct allegation

2. PRINCIPLES OF GOOD RESEARCH PRACTICE

2.1 DIAS cannot be prescriptive about its approaches to solving particular research problems. However, all researchers, whatever their discipline, are required to understand, and observe where appropriate, the general principles presented in Para 2.2, below.

2.2 Good research practice includes the following, which form major headings in the remainder of this document:

- *competence* (Para. 4: participation only in work which the researcher is competent to perform);
- *responsibility* (Para. 5: creation of a positive research climate);
- *compliance with standards and procedures* (Para. 5.5);
- *managing research projects* (Para. 5.11);
- *supervision and mentoring* (Para. 5.16);
- *integrity* (Para. 6: honesty; openness; proactive problem solving; accuracy; objectivity; acknowledgement of contribution; declaring conflicts of interest; whistle-blowing);
- *respect for the rights and dignity of research participants* (Para. 7: general respect; privacy and confidentiality/anonymity; informed consent; avoidance of harm);
- *data management* (Para. 8: applies particularly to research which generates outcomes which can be described as "data". ownership of data; record keeping; data storage);
- *dissemination* (Para. 9 : academic freedom and protection of intellectual property; publication practice);and
- *reproducibility*; the ability of an experiment or study to be duplicated, either by the same researcher or by someone else working independently.

2.3 This Code should be regarded as setting minimum standards and the lack of mention of particular acts or omissions should not be taken as conclusive in any adjudication on professional conduct.



3. ETHICAL APPROVAL

3.1 Research involving human participants, raises particular ethical concerns. Approval from the Governing Board of the respective school will be required. Approval from other regulatory bodies may also be required.

3.2 Non-clinical research involving human participants (including behavioural experiments, interviewing and surveying) must be approved by the Governing Board.

3.3 Research which requires ethical approval must not commence before approval has been granted.

3.5 If a researcher proposes to extend a research project or deviate from approved procedure, a fresh application for approval or an amendment to the original ethics application must be made and approved by the relevant ethics committee.

4. COMPETENCE

4.1 Competence is defined as the ability to apply knowledge and skills to achieve intended results.

4.2 Researchers must actively maintain professional competence and knowledge within their areas of expertise.

4.3 Researchers must always be mindful of the limits of their own training and expertise⁵.

4.4 Researchers must take into account the state-of-the-art in developing research ideas .

4.5 Researchers must design, carry out, analyse and document research in a careful, well considered manner⁶.

4.6 Researchers must recognise and manage potential harms and risks relating to their research⁷.

4.7 Research protocols must take account of and are sensitive to relevant differences in age, gender, culture, religion, ethnic origin and social class.

4.8 Peer review (evaluation of scientific, academic or professional work by others working in the same field) requires that the reviewer/referee be expert in the subject under review, and if researchers consider themselves to be insufficiently expert in an area on which they have been asked to comment, they must make this clear, and are normally expected to return the material unread.

5. RESPONSIBILITY

Research Climate

5.1 It is the responsibility of the DIAS Council, School Governing Boards, School Directors, Senior Professors and Registrar (CEO) and other relevant senior staff, both research and support, to ensure that an environment is created which allows research to be conducted in accordance with good research practice. This responsibility includes the possibility of intervention where necessary to uphold this Code.

⁵ EU Code Section 2.3

⁶ EU Code Section 2.3

⁷ EU Code Section 2.4



5.2 The individuals identified above are responsible for establishing a research climate of mutual cooperation, in which researchers at all levels are encouraged to develop their skills and in which the open exchange of ideas is fostered.

5.3 All researchers must ensure that the laws prohibiting discrimination are complied with .

5.4 Reasonable accommodation should be afforded to staff or students who object on grounds of conscience to participation in particular lines of research .

Compliance with Standards and Procedures

5.5 Research misconduct is least likely to arise in an environment where good research practice (e.g. documentation of results, peer review of research, regular discussion and seminars) prevails and where there is adequate supervision at all levels. The School Directors, Senior Professors and supervisors of researchers are responsible for the implementation and promotion of principles of good research practice (Para. 1.5 and 2.2), and to ensure adherence to appropriate standards.

5.6 Researchers must also be aware of and observe the principles of good research practice as outlined in Para. 1.5 and 2.2.

5.7 Researchers must observe, where relevant, standards published by learned societies and other professional bodies.

5.8 Researchers must be aware of and stay abreast of governmental and institutional regulations and any other regulations, standards or policies, including national, trans- national (e.g. EU) and international legislation, in proposing, conducting and reporting research.

5.9 Researchers are required to comply with any relevant audit or monitoring procedures, whether internal or external. Examples of such procedures include examination of the management of specific research projects, and compliance with the requirements of external sponsors, of this Code or the National Policy Statement.

5.10 Researchers across the entire career path, from junior to the most senior level must undertake periodic training in ethics and research integrity⁸.

Managing Research Projects

5.11 Researchers must take all reasonable actions to ensure compliance with sponsor, institutional, legal, ethical and moral obligations in managing projects.

5.12 Researchers are expected to familiarize themselves with the terms and conditions of any research contract or agreement entered into by DIAS on their behalf.

5.13 Researchers must follow established DIAS financial procedures, including procurement, and must practise economy in the use of resources.

⁸ EU Code Section 2.2



5.14 Principal investigators⁹ must ensure that projects operate within their allocated budget, and that no penalties are incurred by failure to meet sponsors' requirements (for example, through late submission of reports).

5.15 Principal investigators must ensure, in liaison with HR, that the stipends and salaries of research personnel are aligned with the relevant pay scales approved by DIAS or relevant funding agency scale that all staff positions are in line with DIAS career structure, including approved recruitment procedures.

Supervision and Mentoring

5.16 School Directors, Heads of Section, Senior Professors and research supervisors must mentor their team members and offer specific guidance and training to properly develop, design and structure their research activity and to foster a culture of research integrity.

5.17 Supervisors have an extended responsibility to nurture the appropriate intellectual, technical, ethical and career development of staff, undergraduate students, postgraduate students and other supervisees.

5.18 Supervisors must ensure that students and other new researchers understand good research practice lies with all members of the research community, but particularly with School Directors, Heads of Section, Principal Investigators, Senior Professors and research supervisors. Good practice includes mentoring early career researchers in their new environment .

5.19 Supervisors are responsible for supporting the overall progress of their students and research staff. In the specific context of postgraduate students who are registered in universities in Ireland or the relevant jurisdiction, they must follow good supervisory practice as laid out in the *Irish Universities Quality Board/Quality and Qualifications Ireland 'Good Practice Guide'*¹⁰ on the organisation of PhD programmes.

5.20 All new researchers and postgraduate research students must receive appropriate training and mentoring. Training on research integrity must be provided for, and attended by, all researchers with appropriate attendance records maintained. Training may also involve relevant principles of research design, and the principles set out in this Code.

5.21 Researchers must ensure that all persons who are involved in the conduct of research under their supervision are adequately trained and perform their responsibilities competently.

6. INTEGRITY

Honesty

6.1 Researchers must not claim any level of competence that they do not possess, and must take all reasonable steps to ensure that their qualifications, capabilities and views are not

⁹ A **Principal Investigator** is the lead researcher on a proposal and research project who manages the delivery of the project, leads the research team and ensures the project is conducted in line with DIAS policies and procedures.

¹⁰ IUQB/QQI 2009



misrepresented by others. If such misrepresentation takes place, the individual(s) affected must take the necessary steps to correct it.

6.2 Researchers must be honest about their own actions in research and in their responses to the actions of other researchers. This requirement applies to the whole range of research work, including planning and design, applying for funding, generating and analysing data, writing, publishing results, grant and paper reviewing, and acknowledging the direct and indirect contribution of colleagues, collaborators and others.

6.3 Under no circumstances may researchers engage in plagiarism, fabrication of results or piracy .

6.4 Researchers must not falsify (e.g. misrepresent, exaggerate or distort) their findings.

Openness

6.5 DIAS recognises the need for researchers to protect their own research interests and any relevant intellectual property and confidential information belonging to industry collaborators or sponsors in the process of planning their research and obtaining their results; however, DIAS encourages researchers to be as open as possible in discussing their work with other researchers and with the public.

6.6 Once results have been published, DIAS encourages researchers to make relevant data and materials as open as possible but closed as necessary in line with FAIR principles and consistent with any ethical approval/consent and intellectual property rights applicable to data or materials.

Proactive Problem Solving

6.7 In the case of any discrepancies arising where policies, regulations or contractual terms and conditions are unclear or appear to contradict one another, researchers must take active steps to resolve the discrepancies.

6.8 It is a researcher's duty to ensure existing copyrights are not infringed.

Accuracy

6.9 Researchers must ensure that all publication and presentation of material arising from research is correct and accurate. If it subsequently becomes clear that these conditions are not met, the researcher must take appropriate steps to correct or retract the information in all outlets where it has appeared. Where appropriate, external/funding agencies must also be informed.



Objectivity

6.10 Researchers must always be prepared to question the outcome(s) of their research. While acknowledging the pressures of time and resources under which researchers often have to work, DIAS expects research results to be checked before being made public. It is important that ideas can be challenged and tested. Equally, it is important that researchers or research groups must not become subject to such commercial pressures (e.g. constraints imposed by a funding agency) that the normal processes of academic inquiry cannot take place.

Acknowledgement of Contribution to the Research

6.11 Appropriate assignment of authorship is an important facet of good research practice. DIAS requires that all those listed as authors must have made a significant contribution to the work, are familiar with its content, and can identify their contribution to it. The practice of honorary authorship is unacceptable.

6.12 It is good practice to discuss authorship at the start of collaborative projects, rather than when submitting for publication/presentation. All those who have made a significant contribution to the work should be included as authors, and the ordering of names should reflect the weight of individual contributions. However, it is recognised that there is no uniform convention across disciplines for doing so.

6.13 In all aspects of research, the contributions of formal collaborators and all others who supported the research, directly or indirectly, must be properly acknowledged, including the supplier of funding where appropriate. This provision applies to any circumstances in which statements about the research are made, including supplying information about the nature and process of the research, and publishing the outcome.

6.14 Every co-author is answerable in respect of any complaint or suspicion of research misconduct associated with any research paper.

6.15 In certain instances staff members who have contributed to the work, while not formally authors, may be acknowledged in the publication(s).

Conflict of Interest

6.16 Researchers must comply with the provisions of national *Conflict of Interest Policy* which includes declaration of conflicts of interest.

6.17 A researcher asked to serve as a reviewer/referee must declare any possible conflict of interest, whether real or perceived, such as competitive, collaborative or other close relationship with one or more of the authors under review, or a close professional or commercial interest in the work. If there is any real or perceived conflict of interest, the researcher must not participate further in the review process, and must return the material unread. The researcher may consult with the Research Integrity Officer if any such circumstances arise.

6.18 All information made available to reviewers/referees must be treated in the strictest confidence, and they must not take advantage of any information obtained as a result of their role, e.g. either using ideas or material contained therein or presenting the information as their



own. In particular they must not pirate unfunded grant applications, or make use of unpublished work without the author's permission.

6.19 In no case should reviewers/referees accept any bribe or inducement.

6.20 Researchers must take particular care with sponsored research to avoid any bias in the interpretation of results, or any explicit or implied pressure or inducement which would compromise the integrity of the research or the results.

Whistle-Blowing/Disputes

6.21 DIAS takes seriously any allegation of research misconduct. Any member of DIAS who believes that an act of research misconduct has occurred or is occurring should bring it to the notice of the Chairman of the Governing Board of the respective School.

6.22 While 6.21 is the ordinary mechanism for notification of issues of research misconduct, it may be done under the *DIAS Protected Disclosures Policy*.

6.23 Allegations of research misconduct or infringements of this Code will be dealt with initially by the Chairman of the Governing Board of the respective School under Para.10, and under the Institute for Advanced Studies Act 1940; School of Celtic Studies Establishment Order 1940; School of Theoretical Physics Establishment Order 1940; School of Cosmic Physics Establishment Order 1947 (and Amendments thereof) where relevant.

6.24 If a research integrity-related dispute arises between persons to whom this Code applies, the dispute may be referred to the Chairman of the Governing Board of the respective School under Para.10.

7. RESPECT FOR THE RIGHTS & DIGNITY OF RESEARCH PARTICIPANTS

General Respect

7.1 Researchers who work with human participants must have appropriate regard for the participants' moral and cultural values, and avoid or refuse to participate in research which is disrespectful of participants' legal, civil or moral rights.

7.2 Researchers must give particular attention to safeguarding the rights and dignity of vulnerable individuals and groups who participate in their research .

Privacy and Confidentiality/Anonymity

7.3 Intrusion into the privacy of participants must be kept to the minimum necessary to fulfil the purposes of the research.

7.4 Researchers must ensure that they fulfil all legal requirements under the Data Protection Acts 1988, 2003 and 2018 and the General Data Protection Regulation.



7.5 Confidentiality and anonymity are important principles in dealing with data from participants. The term “confidential” usually refers inter alia, to the identity of participants, which should normally be kept private. It is inappropriate to use this term to refer to information which will be published: the appropriate term in this case is “anonymous”.

7.6 Confidentiality/anonymity (as appropriate) of personal data relating to participants must be protected through implementation of appropriate safeguards. Where participants’ identities need to be retained for matching of data purposes, they must be encoded and the cipher held separately and securely. Where relevant, researchers must seek appropriate data security/management advice in relation to encryption/anonymisation.

Informed Consent

7.7 Researchers must obtain prior consent from participants, except where the absence of consent is permitted by law or governmental/institutional regulation, or is explicitly approved by the appropriate ethics committee. The form of consent may vary according to the circumstances. However, for it to be valid, the researcher must ensure that participants:

- have the capacity to consent;
- are provided with all information regarding the research that may affect their willingness to participate, in language that they can understand;
- have been given sufficient time and opportunity to discuss and comprehend the risks and benefits of their participation;
- are aware that participation is voluntary and that they may withdraw at any time;
- have been assured that not participating or withdrawing will have no effect on their subsequent treatment;
- are not under inappropriate pressure to participate;
- understand that they may ask questions and will be given answers regarding their participation;
- are advised on what form their data will be stored in and for how long;
- have an opportunity to withdraw data relating to themselves;
- understand that the intention is to publish the outcomes of the research; and
- understand that in some cases research might be in collaboration with a commercial partner.

7.8 Informed consent must be sought in writing, unless alternative means have been approved by the appropriate Governing Board of the respective School)

7.9 In circumstances where the participant is legally incapable of providing consent or is a child, the researcher must obtain consent from the participant’s legal guardian (as distinct from next of kin) in line with best practice as defined by the appropriate Ethics Committee. In this regard see also Section 7.7, above.

For such consent to be valid, the researcher must also:

- explain to participants in language that they can understand what they are being asked to do;
- seek their agreement to take part in the research; and
- ensure that their best interests are protected.

7.10 Unobtrusive observation raises ethical questions regarding informed consent and invasion of privacy. Researchers must satisfy the Governing Board of the respective School that the gain in knowledge justifies the risk to the human dignity of the participants.

7.11 It is recognised that, in addition to expenses, financial or other inducements to participate may be necessary in order to carry out some kinds of research. Care must be taken to ensure that any such inducements are modest and do not constitute an undue inducement to persuade people to act against their better judgement. It must also be approved by the relevant ethics committee.

Avoidance of Harm

7.12 Studies should be designed to minimise potential risks and maximise potential benefits to research participants, and ensure that benefits to participants and society outweigh the risks.

7.13 Participants in research must be selected in a fair way. This means that, in general, stigmatised/vulnerable groups may not be selectively targeted to participate in research with potential risk, and privileged groups may not be selectively targeted to participate in potentially beneficial research. While focus on specific population groups is essential for certain research programmes; in these cases, justification of this focus within the ethics approval process is required. Fair selection also requires that, as far as possible, those who bear the risks of research must be in a position to enjoy its benefits.

7.14 Research must be conducted to the highest possible health and safety standards, safeguarding research participants, collaborators, and the general public. Research must adhere to current safety practices and legal requirements.

7.15 Researchers working with children must comply with relevant guidelines¹¹.

8. RECORDS & DATA MANAGEMENT

General

8.1 It is recognised that research data and records can take many forms, however, the principles below must be applied where relevant.

8.2 Researchers working with data have a responsibility to familiarise themselves and comply with the relevant DIAS School Research Data Management Policy and the *General Data Protection Regulation* (the “GDPR”). The GDPR directly imposes obligations on organisations, bodies and individuals involved in processing of personal data. Researchers working with personal data have a responsibility to ensure that any such data are handled in accordance with these obligations.

¹¹ For example, *Children First: National Guidance for the Protection and Welfare of Children* (Department of Children and Youth Affairs, 2011).



8.3 Where data underlies published findings researchers have a responsibility to ensure access to data is as open as possible, as closed as necessary, and where appropriate in line with the FAIR Principles (Findable, Accessible, Interoperable and Re-usable) for data management¹².

Data Management Planning

8.4 Researchers should consider the treatment and management of their data before, during and after a research programme, including identifying roles and responsibilities relating to data management¹³.

8.5 At a minimum, the researcher must, from the outset of the research programme, address ethical, legal and intellectual property issues that may apply to data used or created in the course of the research.

Record Keeping

8.6 Throughout their work, researchers are required to keep clear and accurate records of research procedures followed and results obtained, including interim results. Doing so is necessary, not only as a means of demonstrating proper research practice, but also in case of subsequent queries about either the conduct of the research or the results obtained. Record keeping is also important for the protection of intellectual property rights

8.7 Laboratory notebooks must be kept, where appropriate, and each key document and any changes should be signed and dated.

Retention of Records and Data

8.8 Data and records generated in the course of research must be kept securely in paper or electronic form, as appropriate, and back-up must always be kept for data and records stored on a computer. Data and records must be stored in such a way that permits a complete retrospective audit, if necessary.

8.9 Post-project DIAS expects data and records to be stored securely for a minimum period of ten years after the completion of a research project, in line with general audit requirements, as well as any additional retention requirements required through external contracts or funding unless there is clear rationale why they should not be held (e.g. GDPR). It is

¹² www.go-fair.org, <https://op.europa.eu/en/publication-detail/-/publication/7769a148-f1f6-11e8-9982-01aa75ed71a1/language-en/format-PDF/source-80611283>

¹³ As a basis for capturing this information, DIAS recommends the Science Europe Core Requirements of Data Management Plans
https://www.scienceeurope.org/media/jezhknoo/se_rdm_practical_guide_final.pdf



the responsibility of the Principal Investigator to ensure that data retention meets with the requirements of the funding body in such cases.

8.10 If Principal Investigators leave DIAS, for whatever reason, before the required period of data retention expires, they have a responsibility to ensure that the data and records are securely held by DIAS.

8.11 If postdoctoral researchers or postgraduate students leave DIAS, for whatever reason, before the required period of data retention expires, they must leave all original research records (for example, laboratory books) with the Principal Investigator.

9. DISSEMINATION

Research Freedom and Protection of Intellectual Property

9.1 DIAS supports the freedom to publish research findings.

9.2 DIAS will take whatever action it deems necessary and possible to support academic freedom in the event that external funders exert pressure to suppress results which they perceive to be detrimental to their interests.

9.3 In negotiating contracts with external funders, the right to publish the results should be protected. It is the responsibility of the Office of the Registrar (CEO), on behalf of DIAS, in consultation with the individual researcher, to ensure that adequate terms have been agreed.

9.4 There may be occasions when a legitimate request for deferral of publication is made (for example, where an industrial partner wishes to safeguard intellectual property). DIAS expects that the period of deferral should not normally exceed six months.

9.5 DIAS regards appropriate protection of intellectual property rights (IPR) as important. Researchers must clarify issues of IPR at the outset, particularly in the case of collaborative research, and they should pay due regard to refraining from publication or disclosure until it is clear that any necessary protection has been secured.

Publication Practice

9.6 Researchers must make all reasonable attempts to present their research to the research community through peer-reviewed papers, books, presentations or other suitable media and, where appropriate, to the public. Research of suitable quality should be published and/or made available in a form that is appropriate to the particular discipline concerned and the target audience. Most academic journals give detailed guidance to authors on format and any house rules concerning issues such as redundant or secondary publication.

9.7 Where research participants have been involved, it may be appropriate to inform them of the outcome of the study.

9.8 Where applicable, authorisation for publication of results must be sought from the Principal Investigator. Authorization should cover both the content of the publication (integrity of results,



adequacy of internal peer review, appropriate protection of intellectual property rights, appropriate authorship) and the intended place of publication.

9.9 In general, except where there is an alternative contractual arrangement in place, research findings must not be reported in the public media before they have been reported to a research audience of experts in the field of research – preferably by publication in a peer-reviewed journal or in an authored book, published by a reputable publisher.

9.10 While describing research inevitably involves the use of discipline-specific terms, it is always good practice to use as clear and accurate language as possible, without recourse to unnecessary jargon. Clarity is particularly important when communicating with a lay audience.

9.11 Researchers must include in their publications a statement declaring any conflicts of interest (cf. Para. 6.16).

9.12 Researchers must avoid artificial proliferation of publications. (See Section 1.17, above.)

9.13 Where data underlies published findings researchers have a responsibility to ensure access to data is as open as possible, as closed as necessary in line with the FAIR Principles (Findable, Accessible, Interoperable and Re-useable) and consistent with any ethical approval/consent and intellectual property right applicable to the data or materials. Such data should be placed in a trusted repository and assigned a persistent identifier (e.g. a DOI) to ensure long-term preservation, access and citation.

9.14 Where applicable, in dissemination of research findings, steps should be taken to enable independent reproducibility.

9.15 Researchers should consider negative results, or results which do not support a research hypothesis, to be as valid as positive findings for publication and dissemination¹⁴.

9.16 Researchers must issue corrections or retract work if necessary, the processes for which are clear, the reasons are stated, and researchers are given credit for issuing prompt corrections post publication¹⁵.

9.17 While in many instances the Principal Investigator for a research project is an author (often the senior author on publications), in some disciplines early career researchers, postdoctoral researchers or PhD students working on the project, publish independently of the Principal Investigator. It is recognized that even when the Principal Investigator is not an author, the Principal Investigator has academic responsibility for the research publications from the team.

10. PROCEDURE IN CASES OF SUSPECTED RESEARCH MISCONDUCT/DISPUTES

10.1 Complaints of possible infringements of this Code and requests for the resolution of research integrity related disputes, should be made in writing and addressed to the Chairman of the Governing Board of the respective School with copy to the Research Integrity Officer.

10.2 This may also be governed by the *DIAS Protected Disclosures Policy*.

¹⁴ EU Code Section 2.7

¹⁵ EU Code Section 2.7



10.2 The Chairman of the Governing Board of the respective School will acknowledge receipt of such complaint or request within five working days and will advise the complainant/requestor of the procedure to be followed, following consultation with the Registrar (CEO). Any procedure implemented following this consultation will be fair, comprehensive and conducted as expeditiously as possible, without compromising the accuracy, objectivity or thoroughness of any such procedure, ordinarily completed in four months.

10.3 A complainant who raises an allegation of research misconduct will, where possible and consistent with the natural justice entitlements of the respondent, be provided with an opportunity to review the responses to the allegation and to provide any further information or documentation necessary to support their case.

10.4 Unless and until the contrary is proven, a person accused of research misconduct will be presumed to be innocent. As a corollary, a person will not have any penalty imposed as a result of an accusation of research misconduct unless and until the allegation is proven. Notwithstanding the foregoing and depending on the circumstances, the continued use of DIAS premises and facilities by the respondent(s), may be temporarily suspended or curtailed by the Registrar(CEO) on the recommendation of the Governing Board of the respective School at their absolute discretion pending the outcome of a preliminary review and any follow-up processes; solely as a holding exercise and not as a sanction.

10.5 A complainant will not suffer any penalty for making an allegation of research misconduct in good faith. However disciplinary action will be taken against complainants found to have made allegations in bad faith.

10.6 The policy of DIAS is, where the Chairman of the Governing Board of the respective School considers it appropriate, to attempt to resolve issues or disputes outside the disciplinary procedure through a preliminary investigation, i.e. informally. The Chairman of the Governing Board of the respective School may seek, at any stage before the application of a disciplinary procedure, to resolve informally any matter regarding performance or conduct which might be subject to this procedure. Where appropriate, at the discretion of the Chairman of the Governing Board of the respective School, this may involve a process of mediation. Where the Governing Board of the respective School does not consider it appropriate to attempt to resolve the dispute informally, the appropriate procedures as set down below will apply thereafter together with any relevant legislation.

10.7 All allegations will be investigated in the strictest confidence but it may sometimes be necessary to disclose the identity of the person making the complaint to the person who is subject to the complaint for the allegation to be investigated fully.

10.8 Throughout the course of an investigation, investigative procedures will be conducted in a manner that is fair to all parties, and in accordance with relevant laws. Respondents will be provided with the opportunity to present their argument(s) or explanation(s) in both written and verbal form. In addition, respondents will be afforded the opportunity to review any response(s) to their argument(s) or explanation(s) and to provide further information or documentation in support of their case.

10.9 **STAFF MEMBERS AND SCHOLARS:** *Complaints or allegations of research misconduct against serving staff member(s) and scholars.* Complaints or allegations of potential research misconduct against a staff member(s) shall be processed in accordance with 10.11 below.

10.10 **OTHERS SUBJECT TO THIS CODE:** *Complaints or allegations of research misconduct against persons who are not serving staff members or current students at the time of the complaint or allegation and accordingly not subject to DIAS's disciplinary procedures:* If such a



complaint or allegation of research misconduct is made against a person who is not a serving staff member or current student at the time of the complaint or allegation, the Chairman of the Governing Board of the respective School may conduct a review. Any such review will be conducted in a timely manner. If, following the review, the Chairman of the Governing Board of the respective School is satisfied that there is sufficient evidence of research misconduct he/she may, following consultation with the Registrar (CEO), notify the Gardai (if appropriate) and other institutions, which have a legitimate, material interest in the outcome, of the matter. Depending on the circumstances, the continued or future use of DIAS's premises and facilities by the respondent, may be suspended pending the outcome of the review and, as a possible outcome of the review, terminated or curtailed by the Registrar (CEO) on the recommendation of the Governing Board of the respective School at their absolute discretion.

10.11 If the preliminary investigation finds that there is prima facie substance to a complaint, a formal investigation will be carried out by a sub-committee appointed by the Governing Board. The Committee may co-opt additional members, who may be external, to provide expert advice on particular questions if necessary. Members of the committee must have no conflict of interest in the case.

10.12 The person or persons who are facing a formal investigation will be informed in writing of the allegation and of all the evidence supporting it and will be allowed full opportunity to comment before the investigation is concluded.

10.13 The Committee will report on its conclusions to the Governing Board. If the panel has found evidence of misconduct the Governing Board will take appropriate action, whether informal or formal in accordance with the Institute's disciplinary procedure. If the Governing Board determines that dismissal is warranted, a recommendation to this effect will be sent to the Council of DIAS.

10.14 A person may appeal against the Governing Board's decision arising from a formal investigation by writing to the Chairman of Council within ten days of receiving notification of the outcome of the formal investigation. The Council will appoint an Appeal Board to review the decision. The Appeal Board may have external representation in the interests of objectivity.

10.15 Where an allegation of misconduct relates to externally funded research, DIAS will have regard to the guidance issued by the relevant funding body and will advise the funding body of any investigations underway and keep them updated on progress with the case.

11. ADDITIONAL PROVISIONS

11.1 ***Frivolous, vexatious and malicious complaints and allegations:*** If the Governing Board of the respective School concludes that a complaint was frivolous, vexatious and/or malicious, (s)he may recommend that action be taken against the complainant under the appropriate DIAS disciplinary procedures having regard to the complainant's status as a student or a member of the staff of DIAS.

11.2 ***Sanctions and Appeals:*** The disciplinary sanctions available to DIAS may include, but are not limited to, one or a combination of the following: verbal warning; written warning; final written warning; disciplinary suspension; demotion; and dismissal. There is no right of appeal against the decision of the Governing Board of the respective School in relation to preliminary procedures. Respondents will have a right of appeal under 10.14 or appropriate disciplinary procedures in the event that further action is taken thereunder.



11.3 Representation: In any investigative procedure, the respondent(s) will be given the opportunity to bring a representative to any meeting(s) or interview(s) associated with the procedure.

11.4 Retention of Correspondence: All correspondence between the Research Integrity Officer, members of the investigating panel, the complainant(s) and the respondent(s) during the course of an investigative procedure will be stored in both hard copy and soft copy format.

11.5 Confidentiality: The identity of the Respondent(s) is confidential to the preliminary review committee. Where possible, any disclosure(s) to third parties in relation to an investigation procedure should be made on a confidential basis. Where an obligation arises to inform third parties of research misconduct allegations, such obligations(s) must be fulfilled at the appropriate time through the correct mechanism.

11.6 Before an investigative procedure is initiated, signed conflict of interest declarations and declarations of confidentiality will be obtained from the Research Integrity Officer, members of the investigating panel, and any other persons who may be capable of influencing the outcome of the investigation. Terms of Reference regarding the investigation process will be prepared by the Research Integrity Officer and circulated for comment to the relevant stakeholders in advance of the commencement of any investigation process.

Additional Operational Information

Administrative Support: An administrator will be assigned to assist the Research Integrity Officer in the administration of investigations. The Administrator's role will be limited to providing administrative support to the Research Integrity Officer and will not play any role in influencing the substance of the investigatory processes or outcomes. The Administrator will be subject to the provisions of this Code and to the same confidentiality requirements as the investigating panel members.

Confidentiality and security: The content and attachments of all outgoing emails and messages in an investigation will be encrypted in order to protect the privacy of the information being sent to external individuals.

Selection of External Panel: At either the preliminary investigation or the disciplinary hearing stage relating to a research integrity issue, involvement of external experts with disciplinary expertise to support investigations as appropriate is envisaged. An assurance of strict confidentiality and no conflict of interest will be a key priority in identifying external experts. Selection of the experts will be made by the Chairman of the Governing Board of the respective School supported by the investigating sub-committee.

