

AVONDALE ETHICAL REVIEW PROCESSES

ETHICAL REVIEW PROCESS
Human Research Ethics Committee

LOW RISK APPLICATION

MORE THAN LOW RISK APPLICATION

Researcher submits completed HREC Application Form to research.ethics@avondale.edu.au. Forms and submission deadlines are located on Avondale's Ethics Approval webpage.

Low risk applications may be processed by expedited review at the discretion of the

Human Research Ethics Committee Chair.

ETHICAL REVIEW EXEMPTION

Human Research Ethics Committee

NEGLIGIBLE RISK + EXISTING, NON-IDENTIFIABLE DATA

J

Researcher submits completed Ethical Review Exemption Form to research.ethics@avondale.edu.au. Forms are located on Avondale's Ethics Approval webpage.

1

REJECT

HREC Secretary emails HREC

decision to applicant.

Researcher submits

HREC Amendment/Extension

Request if changes are required.

HREC Chair (or nominee) completes a preliminary assessment of the application to ensure it is complete.

Researchers may be required to provide further information, make amendments or adjust the risk level before the application is accepted for review.

EXPEDITED REVIEW

HREC Secretary arranges two HREC members to review application.

HREC members review application and make a recommendation.

HREC COMMITTEE REVIEW

HREC Secretary tables application for review at next HREC meeting.

Full **HREC** reviews application and makes a recommendation.

AMENDMENTS REQUIRED

HREC Secretary emails applicant the 'HREC Response Form'.

Researcher makes amendments and resubmits updated application with changes highlighted, as well as their response to the points raised in the 'HREC Response Form'.

HREC Chair (or nominee) conducts final review of resubmitted application and decides on an outcome.

APPROVE

HREC Secretary issues Letter of Approval to applicant by email.

Researcher commences project data collection, noting the approved completion date and annual report deadline provided.

Researcher submits

HREC Annual Report for tabling at HREC each year until completion.

Researcher submits

HREC Final Report upon project completion.

Project records updated as complete and Final Report tabled at HREC

RISK

LEVELS OF RISK

Negligible risk – where there is no foreseeable risk of harm or discomfort; and any foreseeable risk is no more than inconvenience

Low risk – where the only foreseeable risk is one of discomfort

More than low risk – where the risk, even if unlikely, is more serious than discomfort

TYPES OF RISK

Harm

- physical (injury, illness, pain)
- psychological (feelings of worthlessness, distress, guilt, anger, fear, humiliation)
- social (damage to relationships, discrimination, stigmatism)
- economic (imposition of direct/indirect costs)
- legal (discovery and prosecution of criminal conduct)

Discomfort

- body (minor side-effects of medication, minor discomfort when measuring blood pressure)
- mind (minor anxiety induced by an interview)

Inconvenience

 such as filling in a form, taking part in a street survey, giving up time to participate in research

GAUGING RISK

Consider:

- the kinds of harm, discomfort or inconvenience that may occur;
- the likelihood of these occurring;
- the severity of any harm that may occur.

MINIMISING RISK

Researchers have an obligation to minimize risk to participants. They must assess the research aims, their importance, and the methods by which they can be achieved.

BENEFITS & RISK

Research is ethically acceptable only when its potential benefits justify any risks involved in the research.

MANAGING RISKS

This requires that:

- researchers include, in their research design, mechanisms to deal adequately with any harms that occur; and
- a monitoring process is in place and carried out.

The greater the risk to participants in any research for which ethical approval is given, the more certain it must be both that the risks will be managed as well as possible, and that the participants clearly understand the risks they are assuming. (1)