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| FORM 1, 2019Application form for conducting research involving either primary, or a combination of primary and secondary human participant dataAppendix 1SUBMISSION CHECKLIST (COMPULSORY) |

Adherence to the application guidelines/check list below is required to ensure a streamlined application process. If you tick **No** or **Not Applicable**, please provide the reason under **Comments**. Refrain from using the term ‘not applicable’ in the checklist unless the item indeed does not apply to your study. **Refer to the Policy on Research Ethics and the Standard Operating Procedure on Research Ethics Risk Assessment.**

Submit the application in a **MS WORD format, with all the supporting documents either embedded in the application or appended.** This makes the review process easier. The declaration page can be printed, signed by the researcher and the principal supervisor in the case of student applicants, and scanned. Please insert/embed the scanned signed declaration page in the MS WORD application form.

The checklist forms part of the application and **MUST** be submitted. Send it as a separate document with the application form. Only typed applications will be accepted.

All applications **must be submitted electronically**, before or on the due date for submission of agenda items to XXX@unisa.ac.za

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Item** | **Yes** | **No** | **N/A** | **Comments** |
| 1. Has the project already been approved by a higher degrees/scientific committee?
 |  |  |  |  |
| 1. Did you provide a short CV of all the researchers involved in the study, including supervisor(s) in sections **1.1 – 1.4,** to confirm their competence to execute the proposed study?
 |  |  |  |  |
| 1. If you answered ‘Yes’ to any question under **section 2.1**, the application must be submitted to an Unisa Ethics Review Committee that is registered with the National Health Research Ethics Council (NHREC). If you are a student, discuss this with your supervisor. All other applicants can contact the chairperson/secretary identified on page 1 of the application form.
 |  |  |  |  |
| 1. Did you critically consider the potential risks of harm to participants by completing **section 2**? If you answered ‘Yes’ to any of the options under **sections 2.2 – 2.5**, is it fully described in the comments sections?
 |  |  |  |  |
| 1. Does the study involve participants who are particularly vulnerable or unable to give informed consent? (I.e. children, people with learning or other mental of physical disabilities, homeless people, people who are incarcerated, unemployed or otherwise compromised in responding to your questions). In this case, the application must be submitted to a registered Ethics Review Committee.

If you are a student, discuss this with your supervisor. All other applicants can contact the chairperson/secretary identified on page 1 of the application form. |  |  |  |  |
| 1. Is there any potential for perceived or real conflict of interest in your research study according to **sections 2.5, 3.2 and 3.4**? If so, did you describe the measures taken to mitigate this risk.
 |  |  |  |  |
| 1. Did you indicate the risk level of your study in **section 2.6** and justified your choice in **section 2.6 (a)**?
 |  |  |  |  |
| 1. Did you do a risk-benefit analysis of the proposed study by completing sections **2.6 (b) - (f)**?
 |  |  |  |  |
| 1. Are there measures in place to take care of any potential discomfort/inconvenience of participants to promote their welfare? **(section 2.3 f – n)**
 |  |  |  |  |
| 1. Did you obtain gatekeeper permission from the proposed study sites and appended the permission letter(s) **(section 3.1)**? If permission is pending, did you provide an explanation and indicate your planned efforts to obtain the permission?
 |  |  |  |  |
| 1. Are you aware that if you plan to involve Unisa employees, students or data in the study, permission will have to be sought from the Research Permissions Subcommittee after you have obtained ethics approval and before fieldwork activities?
 |  |  |  |  |
| 1. If your study involves a community, did you explain what measures you have taken/will take to consult and collaborate with those communities and/or representative groups? **(see section 3.3)**
 |  |  |  |  |
| 1. Is the project methodology appropriate to achieve the project goals? **(section 4.4 – 4.5)**
 |  |  |  |  |
| 1. Did you give a clear indication of your sampling method, sample size and rationale for the sample size of each proposed group of participants in **section 4.6.2**?
 |  |  |  |  |
| 1. Did you give a clear indication of your inclusion and exclusion criteria in **sections 4.6.3 & 4.6.4**?
 |  |  |  |  |
| 1. Have you provided an explanation of how you will obtain the contact details of each group of participants in **section 4.6.6**?
 |  |  |  |  |
| 1. Have you provided an explanation of how you will recruit each group of participants in **section 4.6.6**?
 |  |  |  |  |
| 1. Is there an unequal relationship between anyone involved in the recruitment that may unduly influence voluntary participation? If so, have you provided an explanation of how you will deal with this in section **4.6.7**?
 |  |  |  |  |
| 1. Have you indicated and inserted/attached all the data collection instruments in section **4.7.1 – 4.7.4**?
 |  |  |  |  |
| 1. If you are making use of a borrowed questionnaire, was approval granted from the original developer(s), and did you insert proof of the approval in section **4.7.1 a (viii)**.
 |  |  |  |  |
| 1. Did you consult a statistician to optimise the validity of the research instrument?
 |  |  |  |  |
| 1. Are you going to make use of a Statistician, External coder, Research assistant(s) and/or Field workers? If so, did you append the necessary confidentiality agreements? **(section 5.2**)
 |  |  |  |  |
| 1. If you are making use of a translator, did you append a letter from a language practitioner certifying the credibility of the translated material? **(section 4.12)**
 |  |  |  |  |
| 1. Have you used Unisa’s official letterhead for any letters, research instruments and/or informed consent documentation? (An external applicant must use the official letterhead of the institution where s/he is registered or affiliated)
 |  |  |  |  |
| 1. Did you describe the process of obtaining informed consent and inserted the information leaflet and consent form in **section 6.1** and **6.2?**
 |  |  |  |  |
| 1. Do your information leaflet and consent form meet the minimum required ethical standards to protect participant autonomy as set out in the checklist provided in **section 6.2**?
 |  |  |  |  |
| 1. Did you ensure that the information provided in the checklist in **section 6.2** is congruent with the contents of the information leaflet and consent form?
 |  |  |  |  |
| 1. Did you ensure that the information provided in the checklist in **section 6.3** is congruent with the contents of the assent form if applicable?
 |  |  |  |  |
| 1. Did you address data security concerns as a measure to protect participants’ privacy in sections **6.4 – 6.6?**
 |  |  |  |  |
| 1. If you plan to share identifiable personal data collected during the study, did you obtain the necessary participant and institutional permission to divulge or re-use the identifiable information in line with the Protection of Personal Information Act No. 4 of 2013 (POPIA) **section 6.5**?
 |  |  |  |  |
| 1. Did you explain in **section 6.7** how you would inform the participants of the findings of the study?
 |  |  |  |  |
| 1. If the study involves vulnerable people or communities, did you provide an explanation of how you will protect them against exploitation in **section 6.8**?
 |  |  |  |  |
| 1. Did you ensure that a professional language practitioner edited the research instruments and informed consent documentation?
 |  |  |  |  |
| 1. Have you ensured that no part of the application is plagiarised from existing published or unpublished works?
 |  |  |  |  |
| 1. Did you append the signed, scanned declaration to the application?
 |  |  |  |  |
| 1. If you are making use of Unisa as a case study, is there a possibility that the findings could negatively affect the image of the relevant College/unit, academic department or Unisa as a whole?
 |  |  |  |  |

**🙦 🙦 🙦**