

Presentation of data from NITCAR projects by members of collaborations Version 1.0

Summary guidance: apart from routine, non-confidential internal presentations, collaborators should contact project leads prior to giving presentations.

Following a query from a project lead on an issue of etiquette related to presentation, the Management Committee has discussed guidance on what it feels is acceptable and should be encouraged with regard to presentation of project data, and what it feels may be unacceptable. The following is the result of these discussions.

1. NITCAR supports quality research, audit and service evaluation projects. A major part of the value of such projects is their communication to others. Presentation of protocols or preliminary data may sometimes further these goals, but they may sometimes compromise the overall integrity, credibility or ability to generate impact from work. Dissemination of information about ongoing projects will usually generate interest in these projects and increase their potential impact, but we acknowledge that on rare occasions competition with another project may require confidentiality.
2. Joining a collaborative project is an undertaking to work collectively to increase the impact of individual input. The collaboration begins with a discussion of the question to be answered and formulation of a protocol, and so data collected in accordance with the protocol have already benefited from involvement with the collaboration and do not represent a stand-alone effort.
3. It is normal academic practice to keep interested parties in one's own institution up to date with ongoing work, except for rare occasions when an overriding need for confidentiality requires an overall result to be embargoed (this is sometimes the case with results intended to be published in high impact journals or that are likely to generate a race to "scoop" the result). Indeed, both courtesy and the practicalities of co-operating with others in an institution are likely to require local dissemination of the goals and activities of local collaborators. It is also likely that presentation of preliminary local results from some of our projects (especially audit projects) are likely to drive purely local changes, and so timely presentation of these results is to be encouraged. Discussion of local data collection activities is good practice. Discussion of local results in a local setting is in most cases to be encouraged, and although it would be courteous to inform a project lead when doing this, normally seeking permission would not be required. Dissemination of overall results in the local setting is in many cases likely to be beneficial but it would be usual to ensure that a project lead is aware that this is planned when this is presented other than as a summary of a presentation given publicly and is prior to journal publication of a study.
4. Formal dissemination of results beyond the local setting is likely to impact on others in a collaboration and is likely to be seen, regardless of who is presenting, as representing the entire collaboration. Such dissemination should therefore only take place with the

knowledge and consent of the project lead (and would usually be acting on the project lead's behalf). The project lead may wish to inform other members of a collaboration when such dissemination is planned so that they are prepared to respond to any enquiries that arise as a result.

5. Formal dissemination of local results outside the local setting and separately from collected collaborative results raises issues over authorship (because of the contribution of the collaboration to the way in which data are collected) and possible issues of dual publication, with the potential to bias the research record. In almost all cases this is therefore likely to be unacceptable, and in some cases it may even represent research misconduct. Collaborators who feel that an exception may apply should discuss the case with the project lead, who may wish to take advice from the Management Committee.
6. Rarely, local results may give an angle on a topic that differs from the focus of the main collaborative study. In such cases separate dissemination may be appropriate. It is likely that it would only be possible to determine that the angle is truly separate when the main study has been disseminated and data or analysis not used. In this case, it would be appropriate to discuss follow-on presentations or publications with the project lead, who may wish to take advice from the Management Committee.