



# RESEARCH ETHICS MONTHLY

AUGUST 2019

Dear <<First Name>>,

Not you? Or we made a mistake? Send us an [email](#) to let us know.



We extrapolated your name (where possible) from the email address where this edition was sent. If you didn't receive this email directly, the salutation is probably of the first recipient. Please consider subscribing

yourself [at this link](#), because it is incredibly affirming and would be greatly appreciated. Subscribing is free, easy and keeps our in-house internet elf happy. More information about the Research Ethics Monthly can be found on the [blog pages](#).





## Smarter proportional research ethics review

Gary Allen, Mark Israel and Colin Thomson

Too often, there is a danger that ‘expedited ethical review’ (a term not used in the National Statement since 1999) might equate to an approach that abridges the review process to the point where it’s little more than a friendly exchange between peers or a nod to seniority. We won’t call out the well-reported cases where it is hard to fathom how they were granted ethics approval. Such cases should make us uncomfortable, because they are invitations to replace institutional self-regulation with something harsher and unsympathetic.

Don’t get us wrong, we’ve spoken often and enthusiastically about the value of well-designed proportional review arrangements. We have assisted many clients, large and small, to design and implement such arrangements and believe that they form part of a well-conceived review system.

A proportional review arrangement can deliver a review outcome much faster than consideration by a human research ethics committee, but instead of a ‘Claytons’ or mock-review, it should have the following features:

[Read more](#)

# Short and sweet

*We want to hear from you.*

The authors of the two guest posts we were going to publish this month asked if they could provide their pieces late in the year, so just the one story and our standard inclusions. We choose to think of this as good opportunity to ask for your contributions. Perhaps it's only an idea of something you like discussed. Or a problem you've been wrestling with. Maybe you've got the start of an idea that you'd like to co-author with someone from the AHRECS team. Perhaps you feel your team is handling a tough challenge well and you're wondering if to share. **You should.** Drop us a line to [ResearchEthicsMonthly@ahrecs.com](mailto:ResearchEthicsMonthly@ahrecs.com) to chat about it.

## Supporting a constructive voice AND getting access to some great resources

The idea of creating a patrons' area started as a bit of a crazy thought: Would the members of the Australasian human research ethics and research integrity community be willing to chip in a bit to help us cover the behind the scenes costs of keeping the Research Ethics Monthly and Resource Library running and free of commercial sponsorship? Could we create enough 'bonus' content to make that area interesting? <https://www.ahrecs.vip> and <https://www.patreon.com/ahrecs> have already generated some great and loyal support. If you haven't done so already, please become a patron. Subscription through <https://www.ahrecs.vip> only costs \$350 per year, we provide a tax invoice and it can be paid by EFT, credit card or PayPal. Email us at [patrons@ahrecs.com](mailto:patrons@ahrecs.com) if you have any questions.

## Special engagements

*Thrilled to be doing so much exciting work.*

During the last three months we've started engagements with two of the highest ranked research universities in the country, and have continued important work with half a dozen other great institutions. We have conducted work with some 'early journey' research bodies, as well as a couple of NGOs and government departments. This work has included

everything from RIA capacity building to desktop audits and blueprints, from advising on tricky questions to designing proportional review arrangements. If this might be helpful to your institution, drop us a line to [project@ahrecs.com](mailto:project@ahrecs.com) to discuss how we could assist you.

## While you are here...

Did you enjoy this edition? Would you like to support the work we do? If so, please consider helping us cover the cost of matters such as hosting the Research Ethics Monthly and other web development by becoming an AHRECS Patron.

In addition to the warm glow from supporting our work, you will be subscribed for monthly updates of useful material (such as resources for use in your local workshops).

Subscriptions start at USD1/month and USD15/month gives you access to all materials.

A few profiled items from the subscribers' area:

1. Proportional Research Ethics Review – A Human Research Ethics resource
2. National Statement (2007 updated 2018) game: Values and Elements cards – A Human Research Ethics activity
3. Notes from a Scandal: What Happens Once the Inquiry is Over? - Commentary
4. Designing a strong institutional approach to the ethical design and conduct
5. Evaluative practice or human research? - Graphic
6. Notes about establishing a Research Ethics Adviser network - Resource
7. Information privacy in human research – a second resource - ppt with embedded audio by Colin Thomson AM
8. To subscribe and for more information click here - [institution](#) or [individual](#).

Please join us in saying a big thank you to our new Gold Patrons:

- Bendigo Health
- Bond University
- CanTeen
- Central Queensland University
- Edith Cowan University
- Two universities that asked to remain anonymous
- A national research funding body that asked to remain anonymous
- University of Southern of Queensland
- University of Wollongong Ethics Unit
- 5 researchers who asked to remain anonymous

# Things You May Have Missed...

## Our Resource Library

- [Transparent Attribution of Contributions to Research: Aligning Guidelines to Real-Life Practices](#) - Paper
- [Expression of Interest: Consumer Inclusive Research](#) – AHRECS Newsroom
- [Technological Support for Peer Review Innovations](#) – Scholarly Kitchen
- [More detailed guidance on the inclusion/exclusion of retracted articles in systematic reviews is needed](#) - Retraction Watch
- [Journals retract more than a dozen studies from China that may have used executed prisoners' organs](#) - Retraction Watch
- [Fudged research results erode people's trust in experts](#) - The Conversation

## Our Blog

- [Should you be worried about paying children to take part in research?](#)
- [Proportional processes can sometimes be the answer to a few \(apparently competing\) problems](#)
- [The F-word, or how to fight fires in the research literature](#)
- [We respect you... we just don't need to hear from you any more: Should the consumer and their community participate in research as partners instead of just being subjects?](#)
- [Institutional approaches to evaluative practice](#)
- [Conducting research with \(not on\) consumers in health - exploring ethical considerations](#)



Do you know someone who hasn't subscribed yet to the Research Ethics Monthly? Please encourage them to subscribe now and help us grow this community.



Got an idea for a post or a suggestion for a guest? Send an email to [gary@ahrecs.com](mailto:gary@ahrecs.com)



Do you have a view, feedback or some constructive criticism on this or other posts? Every item has comment link so you can have your say and continue the conversation.



---

*Copyright © 2019 Australasian Human Research Ethics Consultancy Services (AHRECS), All rights reserved.*

We hate spam and definitely don't want to bother you with unwanted emails.  
You can [update your preferences](#) or [unsubscribe from this list](#).

This newsletter is authorized by the AHRECS team, [click here](#) for contact and other details.

We would never divulge your details to anyone else, including not disclosing you're a subscriber, without your permission.

