PARVATHANENI BRAHMAYYA (P.B)
SIDDHARTHA COLLEGE OF ARTS AND SCIENCE
VIJAYAWADA

Policy Name: Code of ethics to promote the Research

Originating/Responsible Department: Principal

Approval Authority: Academic Council

Preamble

The purpose of this Policy is to establish principles to guide the design, ethical conduct and ethics review process of research involving humans and animals. It outlines the scope of application of the Policy and the approach to research ethics review that flows from the core principles – Respect for Persons, Concern for Welfare, and Justice. The preferred approach to research ethics review is a proportionate approach. The research ethics board (REB) tailors the level of scrutiny by an REB to the level of risk presented by the research, and assesses the ethical acceptability of the research through consideration of the foreseeable risks, the potential benefits and the ethical implications of the research, both at the stage of the initial REB review and throughout the life of the project (continuing ethics review).

Ethics and plagiarism are the significant components in research and publication. Sometimes it is to be observed that researchers claim others work as their own, which will degrade the reputation of the individual/institution.There is every need to assess the academic/research work of the student/researcher scholar/ researcher who produce their work in the form of Project reports, Seminar papers, Research papers, Research proposals and thesis work. Especially the research work in the form of papers/projects should go through the process of plagiarism and has to maintain high academic and production standards. The research work produced would be thoroughly assessed for their viability across the globe and needs to reach the highest success.

Objective

The main objective of this stratagem is to promote the research and research publications and prevention of misconduct including plagiarism in R&D. We take some extra measures to ensure that the work is at par with the National/International standards professional type setters which are engaged to bring about the best of results. The Authors are made responsible for their research work carried out, presentation and results are expressed. The institution deplores and dejects the violation of code of ethics which is dishonest and immoral infringing the copyrights act of intellectual property rights.

Definitions

For the purposes of this Policy:

"Agency" means the funding agency, foundation, organization, sponsor or other Person, public or private, international, national, provincial or foreign, supporting in whole or in part any Research, or which has oversight of any Research.

"Agreements" includes all international project agreements, licensing agreements, research agreements, research contracts, research grant agreements, service agreements, shareholder agreements, clinical trial agreements, confidentiality agreements, material transfer agreements, partnership program agreements, collaborative research development agreements, inter-institutional research agreements and industrial research chair agreements and any document accessory to such agreements.

"Data" includes all information or records of any sort related to the application for, performance of, data obtained from, conclusions and outcomes reached in the research in question including but not limited to formulae, discoveries, inventions, raw numbers, algorithms, products, compositions, processes, protocols, methods, tests, patterns, interviews, transcripts, surveys, publications and reports.

"Hazardous Research" includes but is not limited to any research that involves hazardous materials which pose a significant physical or health hazard to individuals or facilities, any research which involves significant hazardous procedures or activities; any research that occurs in hazardous environments.

"Plagiarism" means the appropriation of another person's ideas, processes, results or words without giving appropriate credit. Of growing concern is the act of 'self-plagiarism which occurs when an author publishes a paper with passages or paragraphs that the same author has previously published, but without attribution.

"Regulatory Framework" includes national, sate and municipal laws, the regulations, policies and guidelines of the college and of agencies relating to the conduct of research, as they may exist from time to time.

"Research" includes all forms of funded and unfunded scholarly, scientific and related activities based on intellectual investigation aimed at discovering, interpreting, revising, disseminating or publishing knowledge, whether conducted on campus or off campus.

"Research Misconduct" includes, but is not limited to the definitions of the funding agencies for such misconduct, for example: fabrication, falsification, unlawful destruction of research records, plagiarism, redundant publications, invalid authorship, inadequate acknowledgement, mismanagement of Conflict of Interest: or any other conduct that constitutes a significant departure from the ethical and other standards that are commonly accepted within the relevant

research community for proposing, performing, reporting or reviewing research or treating human and animal research subjects, but does not include honest errors or differences of interpretation or judgment relating to data or results that are reasonable in light of the circumstances in which they are made or reached.

"Researcher" means any Carleton faculty member, emeritus faculty, staff, student, adjunct scholar, fellow and chair, paid and unpaid research associates and assistants, and any person in a like position, who conducts or advances research in that capacity, or (b) who accesses college students or staff as human research participants; (c) any other person who conducts or advances research as connected with the college; and (d) any person who conducts research using college resources (whether research space, materials, equipment, or human resources).

Scope of Research Ethics

The following defines the general categories of research that require REB review in accordance with this Policy, subject to the exceptions set out further on in this Policy.

Article 1.1 The following requires ethics review and approval by an REB before the research commences:

a. research involving living human participants;
b. research involving human biological materials, as well as human embryos, fetuses, fetal tissue, reproductive materials and stem cells. This applies to materials derived from living and deceased individuals.

Application The scope of this Policy is restricted to the review of the ethical conduct of research involving humans. The scope of REB review is limited to those activities defined in this Policy as "research" involving "human participants."

For the purposes of this Policy, "research" is defined as an undertaking intended to extend knowledge through a disciplined inquiry and/or systematic investigation. The term "disciplined inquiry" refers to an inquiry that is conducted with the expectation that the method, results, and conclusions will be able to withstand the scrutiny of the relevant research community. For example, a study seeking to explore the narratives of teens coping with mental illness would be evaluated by the established standards of studies employing similar methods, technologies and/or theoretical frameworks.

A determination that research is the intended purpose of the undertaking is key for differentiating activities that require ethics review by an REB and those that do not (see Article 1.5). It is important to note that choice of methodology and/or intent or ability to publish findings are not factors that determine whether or not an activity is research requiring ethics review. For the purposes of this Policy, "human participants" (referred to as "participants") are those individuals whose data, or responses to interventions, stimuli or questions by the researcher, are relevant to answering the research question.

Human participants are unique among the many parties involved in research, because they bear the primary risks of the research. These individuals are often referred to as "research subjects." This Policy prefers the term "participant" because it better reflects the spirit behind the core principles: that individuals who choose to participate in research play a more active role than the term "subject" conveys. As well, it reflects the range of research covered by this Policy, and the varied degree of involvement by participants – including the use of their data or human biological materials – that different types of research offer. The core principles of this Policy – Respect for Persons, Concern for Welfare, and Justice – help to shape the relationship between researchers and participants.

Where researchers seek to collect, use, share and access different types of information or data about participants, they are expected to determine whether the information or data proposed in research may reasonably be expected to identify an individual. For the purposes of this Policy, researchers and REBs shall consider whether information is identifiable or non-identifiable. Information is identifiable if it may reasonably be expected to identify an individual, when used alone or combined with other available information. Information is non-identifiable if it does not identify an individual, for all practical purposes, when used alone or combined with other available information. The term "personal information" generally denotes identifiable information about an individual. The assessment of whether information is identifiable is made in the context of a specific research project..

In some cases, research may involve interaction with individuals who are not themselves the focus of the research in order to obtain information. For example, one may collect information from authorized personnel to release information or data in the ordinary course of their employment about organizations, policies, procedures, professional practices or statistical reports. Such individuals are not considered participants for the purposes of this Policy. This is distinct from situations where individuals are considered participants because they are themselves the focus of the research. For example, individuals who are asked for their personal opinions about organizations, or who are observed in their work setting for the purposes of research, are considered participants.

For the purposes of this Policy, human biological materials include tissues, organs, blood, plasma, serum, DNA, RNA, proteins, cells, skin, hair, nail clippings, urine, saliva and other body fluids. Materials related to human reproduction include embryos, fetuses, fetal tissues and human reproductive materials. Embryo means a human organism during the first 56 days of its development following fertilization or creation, excluding any time during which its development has been suspended, and includes any cell derived from such an organism that is used for the purpose of creating a human being. Fetus means a human organism during the period of its development beginning on the 57th day following fertilization or creation, excluding any time during which its development has been suspended, and ending at birth. Fetal tissue includes membranes, placenta, umbilical cord, amniotic fluid and other tissue that contains genetic information about the fetus. Human reproductive materials mean a sperm, ovum or other human cell, or a human gene, as well as a part of any of them. The term "human biological materials" may be considered, for the purposes of this Policy, to include materials related to human reproduction.

When in doubt about the applicability of this Policy to a particular research project, the researcher shall seek the opinion of the REB. The REB makes the final decision on exemption from research ethics review.

Research Exempted from REB Review

Some research is exempt from REB review where protections are available by other means. This Policy allows the following exemptions from the requirement for REB review, as outlined below.

Article 1.2 Research that relies exclusively on publicly available information does not require REB review when:

a. the information is legally accessible to the public and appropriately protected by law; or
b. the information is publicly accessible and there is no reasonable expectation of privacy.

Application For the purposes of this Policy, publicly available information is any existing stored documentary material, records or publications, which may or may not include identifiable information. Some types of information are legally accessible to the public in a certain form and for a certain purpose, as specified by law or regulations: registries of deaths, court judgments, or public archives and publicly available statistics (e.g., Statistics India public use files), for example. In India, all publicly available archives (national, provincial or municipal) have policies governing access to their records. An archival record or database that is subject to restrictions, such as those under access to information and privacy legislation or contractual restrictions imposed by the donor of the records, may also be considered publicly available for the purposes of this Policy.

Research that relies exclusively on information that is publicly available, or made accessible through legislation or regulation, does not require REB review. Exemption from REB review for research involving information that is legally accessible to the public is based on the presence of a legally designated custodian/steward who protects its privacy and proprietary interests.

REB review is also not required where research uses exclusively publicly available information that may contain identifiable information, and for which there is no reasonable expectation of privacy. For example, identifiable information may be disseminated in the public domain through print or electronic publications; film, audio or digital recordings; press accounts; official publications of private or public institutions; artistic installations, exhibitions or literary events freely open to the public; or publications accessible in public libraries. Research that is non-intrusive, and does not involve direct interaction between the researcher and individuals through the Internet, also does not require REB review. Cyber-material such as documents, records, performances, online archival materials or published third party interviews to which the public is given uncontrolled access on the Internet for which there is no expectation of privacy is considered to be publicly available information.

Exemption from REB review is based on the information being accessible in the public domain, and that the individuals to whom the information refers have no reasonable

expectation of privacy. Information contained in publicly accessible material may, however, be subject to copyright and/or intellectual property rights protections or dissemination restrictions imposed by the legal entity controlling the information.

However, there are situations where REB review is required.

There are publicly accessible digital sites where there is a reasonable expectation of privacy. When accessing identifiable information in publicly accessible digital sites, such as Internet chat rooms, and self-help groups with restricted membership, the privacy expectation of contributors of these sites is much higher. Researchers shall submit their proposal for REB review.

Where data linkage of different sources of publicly available information is involved, it could give rise to new forms of identifiable information that would raise issues of privacy and confidentiality when used in research, and would therefore require REB review.

When in doubt about the applicability of this article to their research, researchers should consult their REBs.

Article 1.3 REB review is not required for research involving the observation of people in public places where:

a. it does not involve any intervention staged by the researcher, or direct interaction with the individuals or groups;
b. individuals or groups targeted for observation have no reasonable expectation of privacy; and
c. any dissemination of research results does not allow identification of specific individuals.

Application For the purposes of this article, observational research is used to study acts or behaviour in a natural environment. It does not refer to observational methods used in epidemiological studies.

When designing their research, researchers shall pay attention to the environment in which observation takes place, the expectation of privacy that individuals in public places might have, and the means of recording observations. Researchers shall also determine whether the use of this information in the dissemination of research results (e.g., through publications, photographs, audio recordings, or video footage of groups or particular individuals) will allow the identification of individuals observed in public places. When in doubt, researchers should consult the REB prior to the conduct of such research.

Article 1.4 REB review is not required for research that relies exclusively on secondary use of anonymous information, or anonymous human biological materials, so long as the process of data linkage or recording or dissemination of results does not generate identifiable information.

Application Secondary use refers to the use in research of information or human biological materials originally collected for a purpose other than the current research purpose.

Rapid technological advances facilitate identification of information and make it harder to achieve anonymity. These activities may heighten risks of identification and possible stigmatization where a dataset contains information about or human biological materials from a population in a small geographical area, or information about individuals with unique characteristics (e.g., uncommon field of occupational specialization, diagnosis with a very rare disease). Where the researcher seeks data linkage of two or more anonymous sets of information or human biological materials and there is a reasonable prospect that this could generate identifiable information, then REB review is required.

Activities Not Requiring REB Review

The following distinguishes research requiring REB review from non-research activities that have traditionally employed methods and techniques similar to those employed in research. Such activities are not considered "research" as defined in this Policy, and do not require REB review. Activities outside the scope of research subject to REB review, as defined in this Policy, may still raise ethical issues that would benefit from careful consideration by an individual or a body capable of providing some independent guidance, other than an REB. These ethics resources may be based in professional or disciplinary associations, particularly where those associations have established best practices guidelines for such activities in their discipline.

Article 1.5 Quality assurance and quality improvement studies, program evaluation activities, and performance reviews, or testing within normal educational requirements when used exclusively for assessment, management or improvement purposes, do not constitute research for the purposes of this Policy, and do not fall within the scope of REB review.

Application: It refers to assessments of the performance of an organization or its employees or students, within the mandate of the organization, or according to the terms and conditions of employment or training. Those activities are normally administered in the ordinary course of the operation of an organization where participation is required, for example, as a condition of employment in the case of staff performance reviews, or an evaluation in the course of academic or professional training. Other examples include student course evaluations, or data collection for internal or external organizational reports. Such activities do not normally follow the consent procedures outlined in this Policy.

If data are collected for the purposes of such activities but later proposed for research purposes, it would be considered secondary use of information not originally intended for research, and at that time may require REB review in accordance with this Policy.

Article 1.6 Creative practice activities, in and of themselves, do not require REB review. However, research that employs creative practice to obtain responses from participants that will be analyzed to answer a research question is subject to REB review.

Application Creative practice is a process through which an artist makes or interprets a work or works of art. It may also include a study of the process of how a work of art is generated. Creative practice activities do not require REB review, but they may be governed by ethical practices established within the cultural sector.

Relationship between Research Ethics Review and Scholarly Review

Article 1.7 As part of research ethics review, the REB shall review the ethical implications of the methods and design of the research.

Application The primary test to be used by REBs in evaluating a research project should be ethical acceptability and, where appropriate, relevant disciplinary scholarly standards.

Traditions for scholarly review vary among disciplines or fields of research, including the stage at which scholarly review occurs, and this needs to be taken into account by REBs. The extent of the scholarly review that is required for biomedical research that does not involve more than minimal risk will vary according to the research being carried out. Research in the humanities and the social sciences that poses, at most, minimal risk shall not normally be required by the REB to be peer reviewed.

REBs should normally avoid duplicating previous professional peer-review assessments unless there is a good and defined reason to do so. It is to be noted that for specific types of research (e.g., clinical trials) REBs should respect the relevant guidelines[2] that require REBs to evaluate the scientific aspects of the research as part of their research ethics review.

Researchers have a role to play in demonstrating to their REB whether, when and how appropriate scholarly review has been or will be undertaken for their research. REBs may request that the researcher provide them with the full documentation of scholarly reviews already completed.

Where scholarly review is required,

- an REB should consider what scholarly review has been applied to a particular research project (e.g., by a funder or sponsor, or for student research by the research supervisor or thesis committee, or by a permanent peer review committee where it exists);
- if scholarly review as indicated by the relevant disciplinary tradition has not yet been done, and there is no body available to do it, the REB should consider the following mechanisms in satisfying itself that scholarly review of the research is completed:
    - establish an ad hoc independent peer review committee;
    - if the REB has the necessary scholarly expertise, assume complete responsibility for the scholarly review. In assuming this responsibility, the REB should not be driven by factors such as personal biases or preferences, and should not reject

proposals because they are controversial, challenge mainstream thought, or offend powerful or vocal interest groups.

REB Review Shall Be Continuing

Article 1.8 Following initial REB review and approval, research ethics review shall continue throughout the life of the project.

Application The primary goal of REB review is to ensure the ethical acceptability of research involving humans that falls within the scope of this Policy. Following the initial REB review and approval, the ethics review shall continue to ensure that all stages of a research project are ethically acceptable in accordance with the principles of this Policy.

Continuing ethics review by an REB provides those involved in the research process (in particular, researchers and REBs) with multiple opportunities to reflect on the ethical issues surrounding the research. This reflection can show whether the stated risks, or other unknown risks, were incurred and how they affected the individual and collective welfare of participants. This reflective practice is intended to enable both researchers and REBs to be more effective in protecting participants in current and future research. This practice is especially important in new and emerging fields, where the ethical implications are not yet well understood. Here, reflection should involve an ongoing dialogue among REBs and researchers, as appropriate, to enable the practices surrounding research ethics to evolve as needed to comply with the principles of this Policy.

In the conduct of their approved research, should unanticipated issues arise that may increase the level of risk or have other ethical implications, researchers shall report them to their REB in a timely manner. Researchers shall also submit to their REBs in a timely manner requests for changes to their approved research.

Plagiarism:

Plagiarism constitutes unethical scientific behavior and is never acceptable. Proper acknowledgement of the work of others used in a research work must always be given. Further, it is the obligation of each author to provide prompt retractions or corrections of errors in published works.

There are varying degrees of plagiarism warranting different consequences and corrective action, listed below from most to least serious:

1. Verbatim or nearly verbatim copying or translation of a full paper(s), or the verbatim or nearly verbatim copying or translation of a significant portion(s) of another paper(s);
2. Disclosing unpublished data or findings without permission, even if attributed;
3. Unaccredited verbatim or nearly verbatim copying or translation of individual elements of another paper(s);
4. Unaccredited paraphrasing of pages or paragraphs from another paper(s);

5. Credited verbatim copying or translation of a major portion of a paper without clear delineation (e.g., quotes or indents).

Possible types of Ethical violations:

1. **Conflict of Interest:** Any action that may result in a conflict of interest must be fully disclosed. When objectivity and effectiveness cannot be maintained, the activity should be avoided or discontinued.
2. **Disputes about authorship:** Proper authorship representation is generally a matter for the involved parties to resolve.
3. **Duplicate Submission:** Duplicate submission abuses the resources of all affected journals, including the valuable time of editors, reviewers, and staff, and is unprofessional and unacceptable.
4. **Fabrication or misrepresentation of data or results:** Any incidence of fabrication or misrepresentation to be an extremely serious breach of professional conduct, with potentially severe ethical and legal consequences.

Publication Ethics Committee:

The Publications Ethics Committee is responsible for developing and monitoring policies and guidelines related to publishing ethics, in matters pertaining to possible violations and assisting with investigations of alleged violations. The degree of corrective action will be commensurate with the degree of plagiarism.

Disciplinary Action:

The Publication Ethics Committee which comprises five members team will establish and take care of the issues and complaints regarding the plagiarism and will submit the report after thorough investigation and recommends the disciplinary action to be imposed within a period of 3 weeks from the day of compliant. The member comprises:

1. Principal: Chairman
2. Member Coordinator (R&D): Secretary
3. Respective Head of the Department: Member
4. Subject Experts: 2 Members

Standard working procedure for Research & Publication:

A standard working procedure is a set of instructions which are followed by the employees and students to perform the duty properly and consistently to achieve high quality result. It is to describe the procedure of reviewing and getting the approval for apparent publication.

Responsibility:

The Applicant of the concerned

Documents need to be produced:

1) Plagiarism report by Turnitin, Crosscheck or any authorized (Maximum 20%)
2) No Objection certificate from Co-authors
3) Copy right form from author(s)