

 The Geological Society	The Geological Society of London REGULATIONS	Number : R/FP/7 Issue : 7 Date : 17/06/15 Page : 1 of 8
	CODES OF CONDUCT	Approval Authority COUNCIL

1. OBJECTIVE

To ensure that there are Codes of Conduct and that Fellows are informed of them.

2. SCOPE

This Regulation covers the definition of the Codes of Conduct, provides guidance on their contents and explains the actions that the Society may take if Fellows breach the Codes.

3. RELATED REGULATIONS

Reference should be made to the following related Regulations:

Regulation R/FP/6: Disciplinary Procedures

4. THE CODES

4.1 THE CODE OF CONDUCT

The Code of Conduct is Annex A to this Regulation. Fellows may propose changes to the Code of Conduct to the Secretary (Professional Matters) at any time and these shall be considered by the Professional Committee (PC).

The Code of Conduct shall be reviewed annually by the PC to ensure that it remains relevant and the PC may propose amendments to the Code. Amendments to the Code of Conduct shall be approved by Council as amendments to this Regulation.

4.2 The Code of Publishing Ethics

The Code of Publishing Ethics is Annex B to this Regulation. Fellows may propose changes to the Code of Conduct to the Secretary (Publications) at any time and these shall be considered by the Publications and Information Committee (PIC).

The Code of Publishing Ethics shall be reviewed annually by the PIC to ensure that it remains relevant and may propose amendments to the Code. Amendments to the Code of Publishing Ethics shall be approved by Council as amendments to this Regulation.

4.3 Other Codes of Conduct

The Geological Society, European Federation of Geologists, Institute of Materials, Minerals and Mining and the Institute of Geologists of Ireland jointly developed the Mineral Reporting Code for the UK, Ireland and Europe, the precursor to the current PERC Standard downloadable from www.percstandard.eu (see also www.geolsoc.org.uk/mineral-reporting). Adherence to the reporting requirements, professional standards and correct use of definitions in the PERC Standard are binding on Fellows of the Geological Society, whether or not they have the qualifications and experience required to be a "Competent Person" as defined in the Standard.

The European Federation of Geologist (EFG) publishes its Code of Conduct on its website: <http://www.eurogeologists.de/index.php?page=168>. It is binding on European Geologists.

The American Association of Petroleum Geologists (AAPG) publishes its Code of Ethics on its website: <http://www.aapg.org/business/codethic.cfm>. It is binding on those Fellows who are also members of the AAPG.

5. GUIDANCE ON THE CODE OF CONDUCT

The Code of Conduct applies to all Fellows of the Society.

Fellows who provide advice to others, whether to clients and employers in a professional capacity, through membership of committees or to the general public directly or via the media, are required, under the Code of Conduct, to restrict such advice to their own areas of expertise. For guidance, the Society considers that a Fellow's areas of expertise are likely to be categorised by some or all of the following:

- (i) a recognised degree or degrees or equivalent qualification in the specialist area;
- (ii) a period of relevant experience in the specialist area;
- (iii) competence in a specific field of geological science that has been recognised through validation of the Fellow by Council as a Chartered Geologist or Chartered Scientist;
- (iv) participation in Continuing Professional Development with specific activities related to the development of the Fellow's professed areas of expertise.

If evidence becomes available to the Society that a Fellow is in breach of the Code of Conduct, the evidence will be examined in accordance with the procedures defined by the Regulations (Disciplinary Procedures; Regulation R/FP/6). Council may remove a Fellow from the Society for a serious breach of the Code of Conduct.

6. GUIDANCE ON THE CODE OF PUBLISHING ETHICS

The Code of Publishing Ethics provides guidance on the proper behaviour of Editors, Authors and Reviewers in the process of scientific publishing in any book, journal or electronic medium published by the Geological Society of London, whether or not they are a Fellow of the Society.

If evidence becomes available that an Editor, Reviewer or Author is in breach of the code, the Publications and Information Committee may take such action as it considers appropriate which may include:

- Refusal to publish papers written by Authors, Reviewers or Editors found to be in breach of the code;
- Referral of complaints against Fellows through the Society's Disciplinary Procedure;
- Removal from relevant editorial boards of Editors found to be in breach of the code;
- Application of sanctions to Reviewers in breach of the code;

Fellows of the Geological Society found to be in breach of the Code of Publishing Ethics will also be in breach of the Society's Code of Conduct.

CODE OF CONDUCT

A.1 PREAMBLE

1. Geology is the science that deals with the composition, structure, resources, history and evolution of the Earth and extraterrestrial systems. In pursuing and applying the science, the practice of geology requires the highest standards of integrity, responsibility and professional knowledge. This Code of Conduct applies to all Fellows of the Geological Society without distinction and is consistent with the *Code of Professional Conduct of the European Federation of Geologists* (currently available from <http://www.eurogeologists.de/index.php?page=168>).

A.2 RELATIONSHIPS

2. Fellows must be honest about themselves, recognising and acknowledging the limitations to their knowledge and professional competence, and be honest in documents (including websites and electronic media) that describe their achievements and capabilities (such as statements of competencies, curriculum vitae, job applications, professional memberships etc.).

3. Fellows must exercise their professional skill and judgement to the best of their ability and must act in all matters towards their clients, employers and all others with whom their work is connected in an honourable and ethical way in keeping with the highest professional standards.

4. Fellows must treat their colleagues and clients fairly and honestly. They must not injure or discredit the professional reputation, personal standing, or business prospects of any others, through harassment, malice, negligence, carelessness or other activities that might in any way cause harm.

5. Fellows must not knowingly compete unfairly with any others. They must refer, or advise reference to, other specialists if the employer's or client's interests would be better served by others.

6. Fellows must not claim credit for the work of others, through plagiarism or other practices.

A.3 BEHAVIOUR

7. A Fellow who is not Chartered must, if called upon to act in an expert professional capacity, ensure that a client/employer is aware of their status and that their professed competence has not been independently verified.

8. Fellows must express opinions without bias, without vested interest and in accordance with the established rules of behaviour appropriate for the circumstances (e.g. those that govern work as an expert witness). All possible conflicts of interest must be declared in advance.

9. Fellows must not presume to be experts in fields other than their own, or accept professional obligations that they are not competent to discharge.

10. When advice is sought or proffered, Fellows should provide reliable and objective opinions consonant with their knowledge and ability, and make clear to the recipient any possible dangers or serious consequences inherent in the neglect of advice.

11. Fellows must not be negligent in the practice of geology, and must take all reasonable precautions to avoid any act of commission or omission which might endanger life, adversely affect the health and safety of others, result in needless financial loss, or endanger or damage the natural and/or built environment.

12. Fellows must act on the basis of knowledge and honest conviction. They must never alter or deny the existence of evidence in order to strengthen an argument. Advice must be based on the scientific or technical evidence with the limitations clearly explained.

A.4 PUBLIC INTEREST

13. Fellows must consider the implications of their conduct in the context of the public good.

14. All Fellows are expected to maintain and develop their competencies through Life Long Learning or Continuing Professional Development at all stages in their career.

A.5 SCOPE (OUTSIDE THE UNITED KINGDOM)

15. Fellows working outside the UK must abide by the Code of Conduct. If a recognised code exists locally, Fellows should adhere to it provided that its scope and standards are in addition to those of this code.

B. CODE OF PUBLISHING ETHICS

Scientific publication is the main channel of communication of data, information and ideas to the global scientific community and to society at large. It is a process that is self-regulated, relying heavily on peer review and the integrity of all those involved – namely authors, editors and reviewers. This code of ethics is written to provide guidance on the proper behaviour of editors, authors and reviewers in the process of scientific publication in any book or journal published by the Geological Society of London. It draws heavily on a similar code of conduct drawn up by the Geological Society of America.

B.1. COUNCIL AND THE PUBLICATIONS AND INFORMATION COMMITTEE

1.1. Council is responsible for appointing a Publications Secretary who acts for and reports to Council on matters relating to Society Publications and chairs the Publications and Information Committee

1.2 The Publications and Information Committee sets policy for all Geological Society publications and appoints the Chief Editors of Society journals and book series

B.2.EDITORS, ASSOCIATE EDITORS AND GUEST EDITORS OF BOOKS

The term editor as used below refers to Chief Editors, Subject Editors, Advisory Editors, and other Editorial Board members when delegated to serve in an editorial capacity.

2.1. Editors of books and journals are expected to carry out editorial duties in a manner consistent with policies set by Council and with the Charter and Bye-laws of the Society. They should work closely with the appropriate Geological Society Publishing House staff.

2.2 Editors have full responsibility for editorial and technical decisions on journal and book content. Society Officers and Members of Council should not intervene or comment on editorial decisions on individual manuscripts unless specifically requested to do so by the responsible editor.

2.3 Editors will give manuscripts unbiased consideration.

2.4 Editors should process manuscripts promptly and diligently.

2.5 Editors must ensure that all articles are subject to peer review before acceptance. In most cases two reviews should be sought. The editor or other members of the editorial team can act as reviewers where they are appropriately qualified. If an article is substantially changed after revision or if new material is added, this must undergo further review.

2.6 The editor has sole responsibility for acceptance or rejection of a manuscript. Manuscripts should be subject to peer review, but the editor may exercise his/her own discretion to reject a manuscript for a particular reason (e.g. outside the remit of the journal, of poor scientific or presentational quality, contents previously published elsewhere, etc.)

2.7 The editor and editorial staff should not disclose information about submitted manuscripts except to reviewers, associate editors, editorial board members, and Geological Society Publishing House staff.

2.8 Responsibility for manuscripts submitted by an editor should be delegated to another editor or editorial board member. If an editor is listed as an author on an article, however minor his or her input, he or she cannot be involved in the review process for that article.

2.9 The editor should not handle manuscripts for which there is a real or perceived conflict of interest. Examples include, but are not restricted to, past or current collaboration, past or current employer or employee, past or current graduate supervisor or supervisee, personal or family relationship, institutional relationship, someone

with whom the reviewer has had a past or on-going scientific controversy, or situations where the editor could stand to gain financially by publication or rejection of the manuscript. In these cases, past means within the past 5 years. In any of these cases, editorial responsibility should be delegated to another editor or editorial board member.

2.10 The editor should not use information, data, theories, or interpretations of any submitted manuscript in her/his own work until that manuscript is in press or published unless the author has given permission to do so.

2.11 If an editor is presented with convincing evidence that the main substance or conclusions of a publication are erroneous, he/she should facilitate publication of a report (e.g., correction, follow-up manuscript, or other appropriate means) pointing out the error and, if possible, correcting it. The report may be written by the person who discovered the error or by the original author, who should be asked if they wish to make a formal reply

B.3. AUTHORS AND CO-AUTHORS

3.1 Manuscripts should contain original, new results, data, ideas or interpretations, and should not have been previously published or be under consideration for publication elsewhere (including electronic media and databases).

3.2 Authors should be encouraged to avoid fragmentation of their published submitted work where practical. For example, full data sets should be published where possible and in press and or unpublished references to data that are germane to the paper should be avoided at all times. Data tables that are too large for print publication should be lodged as supplementary material on the relevant journal web site.

3.3 Authors should inform the editor of related manuscripts under consideration elsewhere and provide copies if requested.

3.4 Fabrication of data, results, selective reporting of data, theft of intellectual property of others, and plagiarism are unacceptable.

3.5 Information obtained privately (for example, in conversation, correspondence, or discussion with third parties) should not be used or reported in a manuscript without explicit permission from the party with whom the information originated. Information obtained in the course of confidential services (for example, refereeing manuscripts or grant applications) should be treated similarly.

3.6 Manuscripts will contain proper citation of works by others, especially publications of the original hypotheses, ideas, and/or data upon which the manuscript is based.

3.7 Data and/or samples (especially unusual or rare materials) upon which a publication is based should be made available to other scientists, except in special circumstances (patent protection, privacy, etc.), in the manuscript or through accessible data repositories, databases, museum collections, or other means when requested.

3.8 Authorship

3.8.1 Authorship should be limited to those who have made significant contributions to the concept, design, execution or interpretation of the work reported in a manuscript; others who have contributed should be acknowledged.

3.8.2 Author order should be agreed on by all authors as should any changes in authors and order that occur while the manuscript is under review or revision. Changes in authorship must be submitted to the assigned scientific editor and must be approved by all authors involved.

3.8.3 Authors and co-authors should review and ensure the accuracy and validity of results prior to submission; co-authors should have the opportunity to review the manuscript before submission.

3.9 Authors should reveal to the editor any potential conflict of interest (for example, a consulting or financial interest in a company), that might be affected by publication of the results contained in a manuscript. The authors should ensure that no contractual relations or proprietary considerations exist that would affect the publication of information in a submitted manuscript.

3.10. Authors are encouraged to disclose major funding sources (for example, government agencies, private foundations, private industry, universities) for reported research.

3.11. Prepublication via internet or other methods is prohibited.

3.12 Authors are bound by the copyright policy of the publisher, as specified at the time of original manuscript submission.

B.4 REVIEWERS

4.1 A reviewer should disclose any real or perceived conflict of interests to the editor before agreeing to write a review. Examples include, but are not restricted to, past or current collaboration, past or current employer or employee, past or current graduate supervisor or supervisee, personal or family relationship, institutional relationship, someone with whom the reviewer has had a past or on-going scientific controversy, or situations where the reviewer could stand to gain financially by publication or rejection of the manuscript. In these cases, past means within the past 5 years. The responsible editor will decide if the conflict is severe enough to prevent the reviewer from writing a fair, objective review.

4.2 A reviewer should decline to review a manuscript if he/she feels technically unqualified, if a timely review cannot be done, or if the manuscript is from a scientific competitor with whom the reviewer has a conflict of interest as defined above (section B4.1).

4.3 Reviewers should be encouraged, but not required, to declare their identities. The editor will endeavour to preserve anonymity should a reviewer elect to remain anonymous. (However, it is the responsibility of anonymous reviewers to maintain their anonymity by using an appropriate means of communication, bearing in mind that many software packages automatically attach source identities both to files and corrections to existing files).

4.4 Reviewers should treat the manuscript as confidential.

4.5 Reviewers should ask the editor for permission to discuss the paper with others for specific advice, giving names and reasons for such consultation.

4.6 Reviewers should not pass the manuscript to another to carry out the review without permission from the editor.

4.7 Reviewers should not use information, data, theories, or interpretations of the manuscript in their own work until that manuscript is in press or published unless the author has given permission to do so.

4.8 Reviewers should clearly support and justify the basis for their review analysis.

4.9 Reviewers should alert the editor to similar manuscripts published or under consideration for publication elsewhere in the event they are aware of such. However, it is the responsibility of the editor, not the reviewer, to decide on the proper course of action once so informed.

B.5 SAMPLE AND DATA COLLECTION

5.1 Samples used for data or illustrations in articles submitted to the Geological Society of London must have been collected in a responsible manner in compliance with the Geologists' Association Geological Fieldwork Code (http://www.geolsoc.org.uk/Education-and-Careers/Resources/~media/Files/GSL/shared/images/education_and_careers/Gower_Field_Guide/GAfieldworkcode.ashx)

or, where appropriate, with their Code of Conduct for Rock Coring
(<http://www.geologistsassociation.org.uk/downloads/Code%20of%20conduct/GARockCoringGuide.pdf>)

5.2 Data from samples that have been collected without permission from protected sites are not acceptable and should not be used in any paper submitted to the Geological Society of London. Where material from protected sites is used, authors must provide evidence that permission to collect samples was obtained.

B.6 BREACHES OF THE CODE BY FELLOWS

6.1 Complaints may arise against Fellows who are authors, editors and reviewers, all of whose conduct is covered by the Code of Publishing Ethics. All complaints received will be reviewed in full under the direction of the Secretary (Publications) in order to decide if there is evidence of a material case warranting further investigation.

6.2 In instances where there are found to be grounds for a detailed investigation the Executive Secretary will deal with the matter in accordance with Regulation R/FP/6.

6.3 Authors, reviewers or editors found to be in breach of this code will be informed in writing of the decision and any actions which may result. Where the breach is considered to constitute professional misconduct, the offender's affiliation institution might also be notified.

6.4 Sanctions applied may include refusal to publish papers by authors, reviewers or editors who are found to be in breach of this code. Where such breaches are considered to be serious, a ban on publishing with GSL might be permanent or last for several years.

6.5 Editors found to be in breach of this code will be required to resign from the relevant editorial board and may be banned from future membership of any editorial board that reports to the Publications and Information Committee.

B.7 BREACHES OF THE CODE BY NON-FELLOWS

7.1 Complaints of breaches of the code by non-Fellows will be reviewed in full under the direction of the Secretary (Publications).

7.2 Following a decision that there are grounds for investigation the complaint will be investigated under the direction of the Secretary (Publications) following procedures agreed by the Publications and Information Committee and drawing on guidance from COPE (Committee on Publication Ethics) where appropriate.

7.3 Authors, reviewers or editors found to be in breach of this code will be informed in writing of the decision and any actions which may result. Where the breach is considered to constitute professional misconduct, the offender's affiliation institution might also be notified.

7.4 Sanctions may include a refusal to publish papers by authors, reviewers or editors who are found to be in breach of this code. Where such breaches are considered to be serious, a ban on publishing with GSL might be permanent or last for several years.

7.5 Editors found to be in breach of this code will be required to resign from the relevant editorial board and may be banned from future membership of any editorial board that reports to the Publications and Information Committee.