UNIVERSITY OF KISUBI

RESEARCH ETHICS POLICY

MAY 2019

1.0 INTRODUCTION

University of Kisubi (UniK) is a private University owned by the Ugandan province of the Brothers of Christian Instruction, an international religious congregation that has a long history of education of the youth. The present-day UniK was founded on 15th August 2004 as Kisubi Brothers Centre of Uganda Martyrs University (KBUMU) when the above mentioned Brothers signed a Memorandum of Understanding with Uganda Martyrs University. On 27th March 2009, the National Council for Higher Education (NCHE) granted KBUMU the constituent college status to become Kisubi Brothers University College (KBUC), a Constituent College of Uganda Martyrs University. Then on 29th June 2015, the same NCHE granted KBUC authority to operate as a fully-fledged licensed private University.

University of Kisubi (UniK) is committed to maintaining the highest ethical standards and principles in the conduct of its research. This Policy sets out the general principles underpinning the University's approach to research ethics.

Nothing in this Policy shall be interpreted in a way that is contrary to the Charter. The Charter shall have primacy should this Policy be found to be in any respect contrary to it.

The University Research Ethics Policy (henceforth, the Policy) provides a general framework for research ethics practice at University of Kisubi (henceforth, the University), including the University Research Ethics Committee.

The Policy conforms to all related legislation, e.g. the Constitution of the Republic of Uganda (1995 and its amendments) and relevant Acts of Parliament. The Policy is consistent with research ethics procedures and systems of key external institutions, e.g. professional associations, Uganda National Council for Science and Technology (UNCST), and local authorities.

2.0 DEFINITIONS

Research: Any type of systematic investigation, testing and evaluation designed to develop or contribute to generalisable knowledge" in accordance with UNCST, 2016.

Research ethics: the protection of human and animal subjects in the planning, conduct and reporting of research (Resources for Research Ethics Education, 2016).

3.0 RESPONSIBILITIES

The Vice-Chancellor shall have the final say on all questions as to the interpretation of this Policy.

Researchers are expected to familiarise themselves with the Research Ethics Policy. The researcher should observe the principles and procedures of good ethics practice in all aspects of his/her work before commencement of and during the conduct of the research.

In the case of Student-led research, it is the responsibility of programme and/or course unit leaders/coordinators, research project supervisors, to make students aware of the Policy.

Student researchers should follow School/Faculty research guidelines and ensure their research conforms to the necessary codes of ethical conduct.

The Policy will be relevant to:

a) Academic Staff responsible for research and the Research Ethics Committee in the University;
b) Academic Staff and Students seeking ethical approval for proposed research projects;
c) External organisations who support or engage with the University on research-related matters;
d) The wider public.

4.0 PURPOSE

The University Council, delegates to the Senate all of its powers in relation to academic work and standards so that, subject to the terms of the Charter and to the powers reserved to the Council, the Senate is the principal body responsible for the academic work and standards of the University.

The Senate may make, modify, or revoke Regulations and policies in respect of research governance and standards. This Policy sets outs the general principles to be followed by Academic Staff, Students and the University in relation to research ethics.

5.0 BENEFITS

The policy:

a) Sets out the University's overall position on research ethics;
b) Provides a framework to inform Research Ethics Committee of good research ethics practice;
c) Harmonizes research ethics procedures and systems across the University;
d) Helps to embed a culture based on best practice principles, therefore strengthening commitment to high-quality, transparent and accountable research practices;
e) Reinforces how research ethics link closely with the University's Strategic Plan

6.0 OBJECTIVES

6.1 To promote ethical principles among students and staff in conducting research

The Policy recognises and advocates the use of the following ethical principles:

A. *Prevention of harm:* Academic Staff and Students (henceforth 'researchers') *should avoid* psychological, physical, legal, social, and economic harm to all research participants. Both the design of research and its conduct should ensure integrity, quality and provide benefits that outweigh potential risk or harm. Researchers must also take

steps to protect their own physical and psychological well-being during the research process.

B. *Informed consent*: The researchers should obtain informed consent for a research study. It requires open and honest communication between the researcher and the study participant. Document readability and its comprehension should be emphasised. This minimizes harm to research participants. Consent should be given freely without force or coercion. Participants should be given the opportunity to ask questions about their involvement in the study before securing consent. Where the study involves more than a one-off research interaction, such as the case in the use of longitudinal research methods, it may be necessary to seek approval from participants/actors at more than one juncture of the study.

Informed consent information must be given in a language which is understood by the patient or study subject (or authorized representative) and that for most situations informed consent be given in writing. Including research participants with limited English proficiency (LEP) in any study, will require the researcher to provide translations of Informed Consent Forms for approval by the Research Ethics Committee (REC). The researcher should provide evidence of accurate translation to local languages. Informed Consent Form translations must be submitted along with a certificate of translation accuracy. The Certificate of Translation Accuracy verifies that certified linguists were used and that a process (preferably a certified process) was employed while performing the translation.

A translation of the Informed Consent Form will be required where:

i. The research participant can read and understand English at the sixth grade level (USA), Primary 7 (Uganda) or higher, then they do not need a translated version and the Informed Consent Form may be administered in English.
ii. The research participant cannot read English, but understands spoken English, then it is possible to have someone read the Informed Consent Form to them with a witness present

and then document their ability to understand with signatures from the individual, the person reading the form and the witness.

iii. The research participant cannot read English, but is fluently literate in another language, then a translated version of the Informed Consent Form and all accompanying information should be given to that individual.

iv. The research participant cannot read or understand written or spoken English, and also cannot read the alternate language, but understands it orally, then the translated version of the Informed Consent Form should be read for that individual and the use of the alternative language orally should be documented. In this instance a witness should also sign the form along with the subject and the person acquiring informed consent.

v. Informed Consent Forms must include a specific person, telephone number, e-mail address and contact information of someone involved with the study to answer questions regarding participant rights, injury and the study or procedure. The contacts should be communicated in a language that participants understand.

C. *Informed Assent Form:* An Informed Assent Form does **NOT** replace a consent form signed by parents or guardians. The assent is in addition to the consent and signals the child's willing cooperation in the study. A translation of the Informed Assent Form will be required as stated in (b) above where applicable.

D. *A Right to withdraw**:*** Much as the participants provide consent, participants retain the right to withdraw this consent.

E. *Minimising risk with vulnerable participants*: A "vulnerable participant" is any individual who lacks the ability to fully consent to participate in a study. These include pregnant women and foetuses, minors, prisoners, persons with diminished mental capacity, people who are ill or bereaved, and those who are educationally or economically disadvantaged. Other groups may be considered vulnerable because of the context, e.g. unemployed, migrants, and refugees. Inability to consent does in the case of protected adults does not limit participation in a study but instead requires that additional safeguards and consent procedures are followed. This will be determined by a Research Ethics Committee on case-by-case basis.

F. *Respect for participants:* Researchers should aim to conduct research that is respectful of: national and international law, gender differences, all groups in society, and, marginalised/disadvantaged groups.

G. *Confidentiality:* The confidentiality of information supplied by research participants and any agreement to grant anonymity to respondents should be respected. Where it is not possible or fitting to provide all information necessary for informed consent, it should be provided at an appropriate juncture once the participant has made the contribution to the study. It is essential that all sensitive, classified and /or personal data are disposed of appropriately in line with legal and funder requirements.

H. *Appropriate use of rewards and incentives:* Payments can be to reimburse expenses, to compensate for time, inconvenience and possible discomfort, to show a token of appreciation for participants' help, or to pay for people's help. The use of payment as an 'incentive' to participation is controversial and should be left to the discretion of the researcher and the REC. Payment is acceptable where it is an incentive for research participation, rather than only taking part because of the reward, or they cannot refuse such rewards. The researcher should:

i. Ensure that participants who choose to withdraw from the research will still receive payment; consider carefully any cases where there is concern that people are consenting because of payment and not because they wish to take part;

ii. The amount of payment, if any, should be reasonable, based on the complexities and inconveniences of the study.

iii. Ensure the amount of payment is NOT based on the risk of study participation;

iv. Not use payment as a form of coercion or present undue influence for initial or continued participation in the study

v. Anti-discriminatory: Researchers should act in a manner that is anti-discriminatory.

6.2 To promote ethical conduct and behavior of researchers and recipients

The Policy also recognises and advocates the use of the following principles in relation to academic conduct.

a. *Reciprocity:* Research should be based on the creation of outcomes for the common good.

b. *Accessibility*: Researchers should aim wherever possible to disseminate their findings in the public domain and through learning and teaching roles at the University.
c. *Independence*: Researchers should not distort research design and/or findings to suit funder requirements. Research shall be undertaken subject to the principle of academic independence. Where any conflicts of interest or partiality arise, these must be clearly stated prior to ethical approval being obtained.
d. *Specified use of research funding*: Researchers must not use funding for purposes other than that specified in their grant award.
e. *Safe and secure data management*: Steps must be taken to retain all research materials gathered (including physical and visual data), in a safe and confidential space, for a minimum period of five years. Where it is necessary to keep data for long periods of time, data should be stored wherever possible in an electronic format and kept password protected on a University server. Through the informed consent process, participants should be informed about how study data will be managed and how it will be retained.
f. *Three Rs*: Research involving animals should aim at conforming to the principles of Replacement, Reduction and Refinement, and as may be required by the law of the land.
g. *Ethical bioprospecting:* Researching the commercial use of natural resources must be respectful of indigenous cultures, and take account of relevant international agreements (e.g. Nagoya Protocol).
h. *Conform to the Universal Declaration of Bioethics, American Psychological Association (APA) and Human Rights principles*: Researchers should subscribe to universal guidelines covering all issues in the field of bioethics.

7.0 SCOPE

The policy shall:

a. Provide a framework for the conduct of ethical procedures and systems for the University Research Ethics Committee;
b. Set out core principles that inform the duty of care a researcher owes to research participants, and the duty that the University owes to both participants and researchers;

c. Conform with all related legislation, e.g. the Constitution of the Republic of Uganda (with its current amendments) and relevant Acts of Parliament, professional associations, Uganda National Council for Science and Technology, and local authorities;
d. Conform with the fundamentals of academic freedom;
e. Cover all forms of academic and student research, as well as situations involving the development and interpretation of existing knowledge within a professional setting (i.e. consultancy work) and the interpretation and application of knowledge within a professional setting (i.e. professional practice);
f. Cover research involving the capture of all-manner of data and materials including data gathered from digital research.

8.0 CROSS INSTITUTIONAL AND INTERNATIONAL RESEARCH

Provided that research approval procedures equivalent to that of the University have been applied, research led by external collaborators (Uganda or abroad) is not required to go through further ethical approval.

However, researchers should ensure that a copy of the research ethics approval is obtained and stored for future reference. Approval on this kind should be on the basis that the ethical approval procedures of collaborating institutions meets or exceeds that of the University.

9.0 SECURITY-SENSITIVE RESEARCH

Where research involves security-sensitive material, researchers must ensure that appropriate legal requirements are met including appropriate permissions. The researchers involved in security – sensitive studies **must** ensure that they have suitable encryption and storage systems in place before research commences. Researchers shall seek the approval of Uganda National Council of Science and Technology (UNCST).

10.0 ETHICAL APPROVAL

Ethical approval is required for all proposed research, with further approval or re-approval required, should significant details change on commencement of the proposed research project. Also, pilot research is subject to ethical approval. Ethical approval for research at the University is the responsibility of Research Ethics Committee.

11.0 TRAINING

i. University Research Ethics Committee is responsible for facilitating appropriate research ethics training through the respective heads of departments.
ii. Researchers and students must undertake appropriate training or experience in the ethical implications of research and on all aspects of this Policy.
iii. Research ethics-related misconduct by researchers is covered by the Human resource Manual. The consequences of such misconduct could involve academic staff being subject to the University's Disciplinary Policy.
iv. If you are in doubt about the scope of applicability of this Policy, or about the appropriate ethical review, you should seek advice from a Head of Department/School/Faculty.

12.0 RELATIONSHIP OF THE LEAD RESEARCHER/PRINCIPAL INVESTIGATOR WITH REC

i. The Principal Investigator (PI) and the research team shall be responsible for determining what ethical issues emerge from the proposed project and for obtaining ethical approval of the project.
ii. All research involving human participants and animal studies is subject to ethical approval.
iii. Research that does not involve humans but raises ethical issues or concerns is also subject to ethical approval.

iv. Researchers are responsible for ensuring the project is undertaken as approved by the University research ethics approval process and in compliance with any legal or organisational requirements.

v. Any major divergence from the approved project must be subject to further ethical approval and the researcher is responsible for acquiring further ethics approval before continuing with the research.

13.0 MISCONDUCT

Research ethics-related misconduct by students is covered by Academic handbooks of the University. Examples of research ethics-related misconduct include:

a) Misappropriation of another's intellectual property by plagiarism or breach of confidence as a reviewer;
b) Misrepresentation of research findings by deception or lying;
c) Obstruction, including withholding, destroying or falsifying evidence;
d) Unfairly influencing witnesses or interviewees;
e) Breach of confidentiality required by external contracts;
f) The deliberate commercial exploitation of ideas of others without acknowledgement and, where necessary, informed consent; and,
g) Failing to comply with statutory or institutional regulations, including ethical review

13.1 Complaints procedure

Any complaint of misconduct in research concerning a University member of staff or student or regarding the University's ethical review process must be made to the Director of Research for an initial assessment of the nature and severity of the complaint.

The misconduct policy, definitions and procedure for investigating an allegation of misconduct will be referred to the Research Code of Conduct policy.

14.0 OTHER UNIVERSITY POLICIES AND GUIDELINES

The university may issue policies or guidelines for staff and students on such issues such as: informed consent, internet research, recruiting online participants, recruiting vulnerable participants, and recognition of another institution's ethics approval.
Any policy approved by the Senate will be published in accordance with the University's publication scheme.

15.0 EXTERNAL CODES

Researchers must adhere to any regulations laid down by their professional body and any legal requirements relating to their research, such as Acts of Parliament or statutory regulations.
Reference should, in addition, be made to different funder and professional ethical codes in relation to different subject areas where this is appropriate.

16.0 LINES OF RESPONSIBILITY

The Vice-Chancellor shall be responsible for the effective working, management and good order of the University in accordance with the Charter, Statutes and Ordinances and such powers as are delegated by the University Council.

17.0 MONITORING AND EVALUATION

a) Senate shall approve this policy. The Director in charge of Research through Senate shall periodically review this Policy in terms of its currency and effectiveness and ensure that it is published in accordance with the University publication scheme.
b) UniK REC will submit a written annual report to Senate for review. This will be done through the Director of Research.
c) The annual report will contain summary data on the projects reviewed (number, discipline/ type, outcome of review process); information on any strengths, issues or trends identified; and a random sample of approved applications and, in some cases, disputed applications as well.

d) UniK REC will routinely submit minutes of its meetings to Senate through the Director of Research. In addition, UniK REC will submit an annual report.
e) The Senate will ensure a system of monitoring of projects in place and shall report on its findings and recommendations.

18.0 ETHICAL FUNDING POLICY

It is University policy not to accept donations or funding that it judges to be illegally obtained or to risk adversely affecting its reputation or compromising its academic freedom or integrity, as may be determined by the University Senate.

19.0 RESEARCH ETHICS REVIEW SYSTEM

19.1 Process for the ethical research review

While the University Senate is responsible for overseeing and monitoring the ethical review process, the Research Ethics Committee is responsible for the ethical review of research project applications and the operation of the ethical review system in accordance with the guidelines laid down by UNCST.

19.2 Review of risk

Upon receipt of an application, the Research Ethics Committee shall assess the likelihood and magnitude of risks, and consider the risk of harm. For staff-led and graduate research projects, this process will be carried out by two reviewers appointed by the Chair of REC.

Where the actual or potential risk of harm to participants and others affected by the staff-led and graduate researcher proposed research is minimal, the reviewers shall carry out a light-touch review.

Should there not be sufficient information for a decision on the level of risk to be made, the application will be returned to the applicant and a request made for more detail to be supplied.

19.2.1 Minimal risk criteria

> Minimal risk is defined as the probability and magnitude of harm or discomfort anticipated in the research if not greater in and of themselves than those ordinarily encountered in daily life or during the performance of routine physical or psychological examinations or tests. In this context, minimal risk in "daily life" refers to those risks encountered in the daily lives of the subjects of the research, and not the general population.

The University requires all researchers to examine their proposals and determine the risk of harm before presenting it to the Research Ethics Committee. The levels of harm may be described as confidentiality risk and physical harm, confidentiality risk and social harm, confidentiality risk and legal harm, and confidentiality risk and economic harm.

A researcher who is involved in studies that may require mandatory disclosures, particularly where state law requires that certain types of researchers report particular activities, such as child abuse, they should obtain appropriate informed consent from such participants. The informed consent procedures should adequately describe these reporting obligations, to ensure participants make an informed decision.

19.3 Feedback

Where a proposal does not meet the expected ethical standards or changes are required, the REC will give feedback on what needs to be done. The decision made for each proposal, and the grounds on which it was made, should be recorded and provided to the researchers.

19.4 Generic approval

For some undergraduate research, generic approval may be offered by the faculty Dean. In such instances of generic approval, the applicant researcher should comply with the established protocol when research is being conducted.

19.5 Ethics review for collaborative research

Where a joint research project with another institution is proposed, the lead principal investigator at University of Kisubi shall submit an application to seek ethical approval.

In cases where the co-applicant is at UniK (and the lead principal investigator is at another institution), the University of Kisubi co-applicant and the University shall jointly submit an application to seek ethical approval, ensuring that the ethics approval from the other institution is attached with the ethics application (if it is made available).

In addition, it should be noted that compliance with ethical principles which may be regarded as appropriate in the jurisdiction where the research is being undertaken is not a substitute for ethical approval from the University of Kisubi.

19.6 Referral to senate

When an issue of principle arises, the REC may refer the application to Senate for guidance and will continue with the ethics review once guidance is provided. Senate may seek guidance from UNCST to obtain clarification on the risk involved.

19.7 Retrospective ethics applications

Research involving human participants should not begin until proper ethical review has taken place and approval given. Retrospective ethical reviews are therefore not permitted.

19.8 Principles underpinning the ethics review system

a) The primary role of Senate and REC in the University is to ensure good ethical practice and protect the dignity, rights and welfare of research participants and researchers.

b) The REC will act in a way that is independent, competent and timely.
c) The REC will act within their terms of reference.
d) The REC will review research proposals in terms of their ethical probity and any discipline-specific ethical issues which may arise.
e) The REC will consider ethical issues arising from the design, outputs and proposed conduct of the research.
f) The REC will be sensitive to the context in which a research study will be conducted
g) The REC will act independently, free from bias and undue influence from any other party.
h) The REC members must declare any conflict of interest which they may have in relation to an application or matter under consideration and withdraw from the proceedings.
i) The REC will maintain records of decisions taken.

19.9 Information in the ethics application

The application used by researchers to apply for an ethics review is found in the office of REC. REC expects that the applicant will, as a minimum, address the following criteria:

a) Aims of the research
b) Scientific/academic background of the research
c) Study design
d) Participants – who (inclusion and exclusion criteria), how many, how potential participants are identified and recruited, vulnerable groups
e) Methods of data collection
f) Methods of data analysis
g) Methods of data storage
h) Response to any conditions of use set by secondary data providers
i) Principal investigator's summary of potential ethical issues and how they will be addressed
j) Benefits to research participants or third parties
k) Risks to participants or third parties
l) Risks to researchers

m) Procedures for informed consent – information provided and methods of documenting initial and continuing consent
n) Expected outcomes, impacts and benefits of research
o) Dissemination (and feedback to participants where appropriate)
p) Measures taken to ensure confidentiality, privacy and data protection

19.10 Membership

REC will be formed in accordance with principles of equality and non-discrimination. The Committee shall be multi-disciplinary, including at least one member outside the institution, one whose primary concerns are in scientific areas and one whose concerns are in none scientific areas led by a Chair. The Chair of the Committee is appointed by the Vice Chancellor of the University. The appointment shall be for three years in the first instance, with the possibility of renewal for another three-year-term if deemed appropriate. In some instances, the appointed members of a REC may be asked by the Vice chancellor to elect a Chair and Vice-Chair. At all times, the appointed members shall elect a Vice-Chair. One external member, appointed by the other members present, may act as Chair in the absence of the REC Chair and Vice-Chair.

19.11 Review

REC will consider applications on a regular basis. It is expected that an initial review of the ethics application by the two reviewers or authorising supervisor (in case of undergraduate student projects) will happen within three weeks of a complete and valid application.
A final decision is expected to be given not later than 60 days from date of submission of a complete and valid application, unless there are special circumstances warranting a longer time for a decision.

19.12 Quorate

The Committee must be quorate before making a decision on any application which has more than minimal risk, that is, as a minimum; the majority of the members of the Committee must have reviewed and commented on the application.
For projects that involve more than minimal risk, the REC will endeavour to seek the opinion of the lay member before making a decision, to ensure independence of judgment.

19.12 Meetings

Although decisions may be made via virtual communication, the Committee may convene a face to face meeting to discuss an application, review ethics review progress, asking the applicant to attend in order to clarify an application and other matters falling within the remit of the Committee. The REC should meet at least once a year to conduct an annual review.

19.13 Expert advice

Where appropriate, the REC may seek further advice through an expert opinion.

19.14 Decisions

The REC may make one of the following determinations:

a) to request changes or revisions
b) to approve the project without amendment,
c) to approve the project conditional upon amendment
d) to reject the project
e) refer to another committee with or without advice

19.15 Significant amendments

Following ethics approval and the commencement of the project, any significant change to the question, design, methodology or conduct over the course of the research project should be submitted as an amendment to the original application for re-approval by the REC.

Where a change to the question, design, methodology or conduct of the project is significant, it could have a potential impact on the welfare, dignity and rights of the participants or researcher. Examples of significant changes may include proposing:

a) a different method to recruit participants
b) a different method to obtain consent
c) a new lead researcher or
d) a different place to conduct the research.

20.0 Review of the Research Ethics Policy

a) The Policy shall be reviewed whenever deemed necessary. The Senate is responsible for regularly reviewing and updating this Policy to ensure it takes into account current guidelines and relevant legislation.
b) The Committee will oversee light-touch reviews annually to include minor revisions and updating of references. Where the need for more major revisions to all or part of the Policy is identified, the Committee will be responsible for revising the policy and requesting approval from the University Senate.

21.0 RELATED POLICIES & NATIONAL GUIDELINES

Related policies

i. UniK Human resource manual
ii. UniK Undergraduate Academic students' handbooks

Other applicable guidelines

i. UNCST, Research Registration and Clearance Policy and Guidelines, July 2016
ii. Nagoya Protocol
iii. UNESCO's ethical policy on science and technology
iv. UNESCO (2016). Universal Declaration on Bioethics and Human Rights. UNESCO
v. U.S. Department of Health and Human Services, 1981

vi. Questions and queries related to this Policy should be directed towards the Chair of Senate.

22.0 DEFINITIONS

Child

The University classifies anyone under 18 years as a member of a protected group.

Digital research

The uses of digital technologies to change the way research is undertaken and make it possible to tackle new research challenges. For example, digital research includes researching social media, mobile computing and working, analytics and big data, cloud computing and the consumerisation of Information Technology.

Harm

A person's actions causing physical harm to another (including sexual abuse); a person's actions causing psychological harm to another, e.g. causing fear, alarm, or distress, or negatively affecting self-esteem; a person doing something illegal which adversely affects someone else's property, rights, or interests e.g. theft, fraud, or extortion.

Participant

A person who serves as a source of data for research

Protected adult

Adults aged 18 years and above who are unable to safeguard their own well-being, property, rights or other interests and may therefore be or are at risk of harm or; because they are affected by disability, mental disorder, illness or physical or mental infirmity, are more vulnerable to being harmed than adults who are not so affected.

Vulnerability

Participants are considered vulnerable if they are children, persons lacking capacity, individuals in a dependent or unequal relationship.

The "**Policy**" refers to the Research Ethics Policy

For consistency, definitions and meanings of other key words in the Research Ethics Policy (such as Principal Investigator, student, research and researchers) shall have the same meaning and definition as those found in other University policies of UniK.

Researcher or 'You'

Refers to an individual involved in research, including, but not limited to: Staff in any of the University's job families (teaching and research, technical and experimental, management and administration, and community and operational), including Honorary Staff and Emeritus Professors;

Staff visiting from other institutions undertaking or supervising research at or for the University; and undergraduate and graduate students (both taught and research), whether registered here or on temporary placement.

This term also covers those involved in fundraising, providing consultancy, innovation, commercial and analytical services and those involved in the setting up and running of University spin-out companies.

Research

According to the internationally accepted OECD Frascati Manual, it is defined as "Creative work undertaken on a systematic basis in order to increase the stock of knowledge, including knowledge of man, culture and society, and the use of this stock of knowledge to devise new applications" [sic]. This includes, but is not limited to; funded and unfunded research projects, consulting within and outside the University, and exploitation and knowledge transfer activities. This Code applies to all research and consultancy activity undertaken by University staff and students in collaboration with

other organisations, such as collaborative research projects, and to individuals from other organisations who are undertaking or supervising research at or for the University.

Principal Investigator or 'PI'

Refers to the lead investigator – generally the main holder of the research funding or leader of a project or, for multi-institution projects, the University of Kisubi lead investigator

Supervisor

Includes any person or persons responsible for oversight of other researchers

Head of Department

Refers to the Head of the academic unit to which a researcher belongs. It can include Schools, Faculties, Departments, Research Centres and other academic divisions within the University.

Student

Refers to any person who has registered with the University for a study programme. It may include undergraduate, graduate taught and graduate research programmes. This also includes students from elsewhere visiting as part of an exchange or similar programme.

Research Student

Is a student who is registered on a research-based study programme.

Research Funder

Covers any organisation or person that provides research funding to the University, and can include private or public sector organisations, charities, non-governmental

organisations, commercial and business organisations as well as government agencies both local and international.

Research Funding

Covers all forms of external funding in support of research and enterprise activities including research grants and contracts, philanthropic donations, consultancy and industrial research contracts and grants in kind providing access to external expertise, facilities, equipment, etc

POLICY VERSION AND HISTORY

Version Number	**Date of approval**	**Revision Required**	**Approving Authority**	**Brief description of Amendment**
V.1.0	2019		The Senate	N/A