

Faculty Human Ethics Advisory Group (FHEAG) Reviewer's Checklist: for Low-Risk Ethics Applications

The Checklist Process

1. Have you attended to the issues below? Yes/No
2. The section of the application form where potential issues affect ethics approval. (Please note: these are the issues identified, which the FHEAG feels needs to be addressed as part of the review/approval process.
3. Comments by Reviewer, fed back to Investigators after review.

Section 1: Project details:

* Aims and justification adequate? i.e. do we know what the project is about and how it will be implemented?

- 1.3: Is the summary in Plain English?
- 1.4: Aim of and Justification for the Research?
- 1.5: Method outline adequate?
- 1.6: Researchers qualifications, experience & skills complete?
- 1.7: Independent Contractors being used?
- 1.8: Research Location?
- 1.9: Monitoring procedures adequate?
- 1.10/1.11: Approval needed from other locations or HRECs?

* Additional comments regarding Section 1?

Section 2: Participant Details & Potential Issues:

2.1: University students? Voluntary consent and no prejudice to academic results if they choose not to participate

Special groups

- Children? See Ch. 4 of Statement
- NESB? Info sheet and research process OK in English? Translation needed?
- Intellectual disability or mental illness? See Ch. 5
- Highly dependent on medical care? See Ch. 6
- Patient or client of professional? Collectivity? See Ch. 8
- ATSI? See Ch. 9
- Participants' capacity to provide informed consent uncertain?
- Special permission needed to involve people in the research?

2.3: Justification of Participant Numbers adequate?

2.4: Recruitment

- Any special exclusion or inclusion of participants according to defined criteria?

- Method of identification and recruitment OK?
- Any compensation being offered?

2.5: Any dependent relationships? e.g. student/teacher? See Ch. 7

2.6: Payment or incentives being offered?

- Must not be significant enough to be an inducement to participate

* Additional comments regarding Section 2?

Section 3: Information for Participants and Informed Consent:

* Do the PLS and Consent Form/s meet all requirements of the guidelines?

* Additional comments regarding Section 3?

Section 4: Privacy and Confidentiality Potential issues:

* Are these questions clearly answered on the application form?

(Note: researchers frequently confuse confidentiality with anonymity!)

* Is any special advice regarding anonymity or confidentiality needed on the info sheet or consent form?

* Additional comments regarding Section 4?

Section 5: Data Storage, Security and Disposal and Potential Issues:

* University regulations observed?

* Additional comments regarding Section 5?

Section 6: Potential Conflict of Interest:

* Any issues identified?

* Compliant with code of conduct for research?

* Additional comments regarding Section 6?

Other comments:

* Are there handwritten comments/typographical errors marked on the application form that need to be copied and returned to researchers?

- Yes - is returned to investigators for amendment
- No - is forwarded to the FHEAG Chairperson for signature and sent on to Humanities and Applied Sciences Human Ethics Sub Committee (HAPS HESC).