

HSC Policies and Procedures

Rationale

Both the extension of human knowledge and the demands of justice to protect the vulnerable are commitments grounded in the Christian Scriptures and tradition. Exceptional care is required when these two commitments interact. The communal nature of Christian faith also demands our mutual accountability to each other. In all of the expressions of our lives together, including our work and research, these commitments should find their fullest expression.

Anyone performing research on human subjects must identify threats to the rights or wellbeing of persons or groups of persons who participate in that research. The Researcher must then establish appropriate research protocols to protect participants from this potential harm. To guide Researchers in identifying these threats and establishing the necessary protocols, they are required to receive authorization for their research from the Human Subjects Committee.

The Purpose and Scope of the Human Subjects Committee (HSC)

The Human Subjects Committee (HSC) oversees the review and approval of research protocols for research conducted at Garrett-Evangelical related to human subjects. The process of submitting the protocols to the HSC is referred to as the Human Subjects Review (HSR).

The HSC is how Garrett-Evangelical Theological Seminary enacts the following accreditation guideline: “The institution shall define and demonstrate ongoing efforts to ensure the ethical character of learning, teaching, and scholarship on the part of all members of the academic community, including appropriate guidelines for research with human participants.” (ATS, *General Institutional Standards*, 3.3.5)

The purview of the HSC is to review and approve research protocols related to the safety and wellbeing of humans who are participating in research related to Garrett-Evangelical. It is not to review and approve the value, methodology, or feasibility of the research. This is something to be worked out by the Researcher in conjunction with others (e.g., between a doctoral Student and an Advisor).

Research Requiring HSR

The HSC provides the Research Risk Assessment Rubric to help determine the types and levels of risk that a research project may present to participants. The Researcher should score their project on the Rubric. If the risk is low enough, the project may not require HSR approval. See below categories of research projects to see if any further steps are required.

1. Classroom Projects

All courses requiring research with human subjects must include the Research Risk Assessment Rubric in the syllabus and time should be taken in class for the instructor to make Students aware of the possible risks of doing research with human subjects.

In general, classroom research projects will not need to be reviewed by the Human Subjects Research Review Committee because they present low risks to the human subjects. Examples of projects which involve low risk include:

- (a) Recording of data from Subjects 18 or older using non-invasive procedures.
- (b) Anonymous voice recordings for research purposes.
- (c) Participation observation in a public venue such as worship services or other community gathering places.
- (d) Study of existing data, documents, or records.

In the case that an instructor determines that the risk of the classroom assignment is sufficient to require HSR approval, the instructor will submit the classroom assignment to the HSC for review. Once passed, the assignment will be considered approved for all Students taking the course provided the Students follow the approved protocols.

2. Major Student Research Projects

Students at Garrett-Evangelical who seek to engage in major research projects involving human subjects must ensure that their research is authorized under Human Subjects Review at G-ETS. If a Student is doing research with another organization and receives approval from an outside review board, that approval must be submitted to the HSC chair so that it is recorded at Garrett-Evangelical.

Major student research projects include, but are not limited to:

- Doctor of Ministry Projects
- Doctor of Philosophy Dissertations
- MTS major papers
- MDiv final projects

Students engaging in these projects must complete the Research Risk Assessment Rubric to determine the extent of human subjects risk their research entails. Some projects (like DMin Projects) must receive HSR approval regardless of their score on the Rubric. Students should check with their program handbooks and Advisor to determine if this is the case.

3. Faculty Research

Members of the Faculty at Garrett-Evangelical who seek to engage in extended research projects involving human subjects must ensure that their research is authorized under Human Subjects Review either at G-ETS, a sponsoring institution, or funding agency (if the research is done collaboratively with scholars at other institutions). Faculty may submit an HSR application for HSC review.

If a faculty member receives approval from an outside review board, that approval must be submitted to the HSC chair so that it is recorded at Garrett-Evangelical. If there is no outside review board, but the faculty member is doing work on human subjects, the faculty member should use the Research Risk Assessment Rubric to determine whether HSR approval is needed.

4. Outside Researchers Doing Research with Human Subjects at Garrett-Evangelical

If an outside Researcher seeks to do research among human subjects related to Garrett-Evangelical (including, but not limited to, students, faculty, staff, and administrators), the Researcher must receive approval prior to beginning research either from the HSC or from an outside organization's review board. If the Researcher receives approval from an outside review board, the Researcher must submit both a completed Research Risk Assessment Rubric and a copy of the outside review board's approval to the HSC Chair. This will allow the HSC to have on file both the expected risk level of the research and the approval provided by the outside review board.

5. Research with Minors

Research with those seventeen (17) years of age or younger, regardless of the setting for the research, must receive HSR approval. It must demonstrate that it will only be conducted in a way that is minimal risk or that has significant benefits to counterbalance greater risks, per the Research Risk Assessment Rubric. It will also require parental consent. See the Appendix 3 "Parent Permission and Child Assent" for more information.

The Process of Submitting a Research Proposal for HSC Approval

All research requiring HSR approval must be reviewed and approved by the HSC before the research commences. Beginning research prior to approval is an ethical breach by the Researcher and will be submitted to the Dean of Academic Affairs for investigation.

1. Researcher develops conceptualization and design of project. Researcher completes the Research Risk Assessment Rubric to determine the type and extent of human subjects risk their research entails. If the Researcher is a Student, the Student should discuss the outcome of the Rubric with the Advisor. See Appendix 1 for the Rubric.
2. If required by the Rubric, Handbook, or Advisor, the Researcher completes HSR Application and submits it along with all supporting paperwork (Consent Form, data collection instruments, etc.) to the Chair of HSC along with the completed Rubric. If the Researcher is a Student, the Student must obtain the Advisor's approval of the completed application with the Advisor's signature *prior* to submitting the application to the HSC Chair. Note that the Consent Form should directly acknowledge and address the risks illuminated by the Rubric. See Appendix 2 for the Consent Form Checklist.

3. HSC Chair reviews the submitted application to ensure all research protocols are satisfied. If the application is properly completed, HSC Chair sends the application through HSC's review process (which normally involves careful evaluation by a Second Reviewer and vote of the whole committee). HSC Chair records and communicates committee recommendation to the Researcher. If the Researcher is a Student, the recommendation is also provided to the Advisor.
4. If the HSR Application is approved, the Researcher may commence research. If revision is necessary, then Researcher must submit a revised application to HSC Chair, who evaluates and gives final approval in consultation with a Second Reviewer.

Typically, the HSC is no longer involved with the project after its approval. However, the Chair of the HSC or the convened HSC may suspend a study at any time if it is determined that the study requires further review or evaluation. This determination may be made due to an adverse event, noncompliance, or other danger to human subjects. Once a study has been suspended, the convened HSC will review the study and either require changes to the protocol, allow the study to restart, or terminate the study. Although the Chair may suspend a study, only the convened HSC can make the decision to terminate a study.

HSR applications may be submitted on the 1st of each month between September and November in the fall semester, and between February and April in the spring semester. New and revised applications submitted on the 1st of each month will receive committee response by the end of that month.

Required Research Protocols

Researchers must attend to the following five areas of research protocol in order to receive HSC approval. These areas correspond to what is required on the Consent Form Checklist and the areas that are considered in the Human Subjects Review.

1. Protection of Subjects

- Is the Subject assured of anonymity?
- Is there adequate explanation of how data will be stored securely?
- Is the Subject assured of the protection of response data for (at least) three years?
- Is there a clear explanation that the data will be destroyed at a certain point?
- Has the Researcher adequately thought through potential adverse effects? The Rubric will help illuminate these.
- Has the Researcher addressed how they will protect research Subjects from potential violations of the Subject's rights?
- Has the Researcher addressed the different levels of risks to participants of the research?
- Has the Researcher adequately addressed potential conflicts of interest or breaches of confidentiality?
- Is there an adequate plan for dealing with adverse effects?

2. Full Disclosure

- Is there an adequate (clear, accessible) description of the project and its purpose given to research participants (in the consent form)?
- Has the Researcher explained why the particular Subject(s) was/were chosen?
- Is the Subject informed about the potential benefits and risks of the project? The Rubric provides language to explain this.
- Are research Subjects informed that they may opt out of the research at any point without negative consequences? (Is this clearly reflected in the consent form?)
- Is the Subject informed of how the research will be used/reported?
- Is the Subject informed that the research may be published (and, if so, where)?

3. Consent

- Is there a complete consent form that includes all pertinent information (as requested in the “Consent Form Checklist”), with adequate contact information and addressing of the risks illuminated by the Rubric?
- If a conversation is to be recorded, is consent to be recorded included?

4. Mandated Reporting

- Is the Subject informed that Researcher(s) will comply with mandatory reporting requirements?

5. Research Instruments

- Is there inclusion of research tools for review (including, but not limited to, interview questions, surveys/questionnaires, focus group protocols)?

Document developed February 7, 2001: David Hogue, Ken Vaux, & Margaret Ann Crain;
revised February 2006: Jeffery Tribble, David Hogue, Osvaldo Vena, Julie Duncan, Kenneth Vaux;
revised March 2019: Cheryl Anderson, Lucy Chung, Rolf Nolasco, Jim Papandrea, Mark Teasdale, Mai-Anh Le Tran

Appendix 1 Research Risk Assessment Rubric

The Research Risk Assessment Rubric is to determine the type and extent of risk that a proposed research project entails for human subjects. Researchers should complete this rubric before developing the HSR Application and Consent Form so they can address the types of risk illuminated by the rubric in these documents.

Unless otherwise required, a research project that scores entirely as “minimal risk,” does not necessitate HSR approval.

	Minimal Risk Score: 1	Risk with Benefit Score: 2	Risk with No Benefit Score: 3
Psychological Risk	Mental or emotional stress that is no more than ordinarily encountered in daily life or during the performance of routine psychological examinations or tests.	Mental or emotional stress that is more than ordinarily encountered in daily life or during the performance of routine psychological examinations or tests but has clear benefits for participants in research.	Mental or emotional stress that is more than ordinarily encountered in daily life or during the performance of routine psychological examinations or tests and has no clear benefits for participants in research.
Sociological Risk	Relational stress that is no more than ordinarily encountered in daily life or during the performance of routine physical or psychological examinations or tests.	Relational stress that is more than ordinarily encountered in daily life or during the performance of routine physical or psychological examinations or tests but has clear benefits for participants in research.	Relational stress that is more than ordinarily encountered in daily life or during the performance of routine physical or psychological examinations or tests and has no clear benefits for participants in research.
Physiological Risk	Physical stress that is no more than ordinarily encountered in daily life or during the performance of routine physical examinations or tests.	Physical stress that is more than ordinarily encountered in daily life or during the performance of routine physical examinations or tests but has clear benefits for participants in research.	Physical stress that is more than ordinarily encountered in daily life or during the performance of routine physical examinations or tests and has no clear benefits for participants in research.

<p>Spiritual Risk</p>	<p>Stress related to religious beliefs or religious community participation that is no more than ordinarily encountered in daily life or during the performance of routine physical or psychological examinations or tests.</p>	<p>Stress related to religious beliefs or religious community participation that is more than ordinarily encountered in daily life or during the performance of routine physical or psychological examinations or tests but has clear benefits for participants in research.</p>	<p>Stress related to religious beliefs or religious community participation that is more than ordinarily encountered in daily life or during the performance of routine physical or psychological examinations or tests and has no clear benefits for participants in research.</p>
<p>Vulnerability Risk</p>	<p>Stress related to power imbalances between the researcher and research participant that is no more than ordinarily encountered in daily life or during the performance of routine physical or psychological examinations or tests.</p>	<p>Stress related to power imbalances between the researcher and research participant that is more than ordinarily encountered in daily life or during the performance of routine physical or psychological examinations or tests but has clear benefits for participants in research.</p>	<p>Stress related to power imbalances between the researcher and research participant that is more than ordinarily encountered in daily life or during the performance of routine physical or psychological examinations or tests and has no clear benefits for participants in research.</p>
<p>Intrusiveness Risk</p>	<p>Stress caused by research practices that is no more than ordinarily encountered in daily life or during the performance of routine physical or psychological examinations or tests.</p>	<p>Stress caused by research practices that is more than ordinarily encountered in daily life or during the performance of routine physical or psychological examinations or tests but has clear benefits for participants in research.</p>	<p>Stress caused by research practices that is more than ordinarily encountered in daily life or during the performance of routine physical or psychological examinations or tests and has no clear benefits for participants in research.</p>

How to Score the Rubric

Garrett-Evangelical follows the guidelines of the United States Department of Health and Human Services Office of Human Research Protections for determining the risk to human subjects during research. This Office identifies three levels of risk: minimal risk, risk with benefits to the participant, and risk without benefits to the participant.

If the participant is seventeen (17) years of age or younger, the research automatically requires HSR approval. However, if it is minimal risk in relation to all other categories, it still can be approved with the inclusion of parental consent. See appendix on research with minors.

Minimal Risk means that the probability and magnitude of harm or discomfort anticipated in the research are not greater in and of themselves than those ordinarily encountered in daily life or during the performance of routine physical or psychological examinations or tests. [Health and Human Services, Office of Human Research Protections, 45 CFR 46.102(i)]

Determining that a research activity presents no more than minimal risk involves comparing the possible harms or discomforts experienced in normal daily life or during routine physical or psychological examinations or tests with the possible harms or discomforts that will be faced by subjects as a consequence of research participation. The nature of the harms or discomforts (e.g., physical, psychological) should be considered, as well as the chances that they will occur and the seriousness of their impact if they were to happen. Depending on what kind of experience(s) are involved in participation in a specific research activity, it may be easier to compare the anticipated experience of participation in research to the possible harms or discomforts of daily life, or to the possible harms or discomforts of a routine physical or psychological examination or test. Including measures to prevent or decrease the likelihood of harm or discomfort from the research may affect whether the proposed research activity involves no more than minimal risk <https://www.hhs.gov/ohrp/regulations-and-policy/guidance/faq/children-research/index.html>.

If it is determined that the research will involve risk that is more extensive than a person would usually experience in the course of their daily lives or through routine forms of testing, then the Researcher must determine whether the risk offers benefits for the participant or not.

Risks with benefits to the participant means that the research will involve risk that is more extensive than a person would usually experience in the course of their daily lives or through routine forms of testing, but the “risks to [participants] are reasonable in relation to anticipated benefits...[for the participants]. In evaluating risks and benefits, the [Researcher] should consider only those risks and benefits that may result from the research (as distinguished from risks and benefits of therapies [Participants] would receive even if not participating in the research). The [Researcher] should not consider possible long-range effects of applying knowledge gained in the research (for example, the possible effects of the research on public policy) as among those [benefits].” [Health and Human Services, Office of Human Research Protections, 45 CFR 46.111(a.2)]

The benefits must be clearly identifiable, measurable, accessible, and direct to the Participants as a result of participating in the research. The benefits should be in the same category as the risks.

For example, someone may face sociological risk by sharing personal information in a group, but the research structure would be such that this risk is balanced by the possibility of greater intimacy and fellowship within that group as a result of that sharing.

Benefits that are not directly accrued to the Participant should not be included in this category. So, a project that seeks to develop heuristic models for discussing uncomfortable topics in church groups in order to benefit denominational policy would not be a “risk with benefits to the Participant.” While there might be a larger benefit available to the church, the research would not be structured to provide identifiable, measurable, accessible, and direct benefits to the Participants.

Risks without benefits to the participant means the research will involve risk that is more extensive than a person would usually experience in the course of their daily lives or through routine forms of testing, and that will not directly benefit those who participate in it.

In this situation, the Researcher must explain: 1) Why the research being proposed must be conducted in this format rather than in one that offers direct benefits to the Participant. 2) What generalizable and/or long-term knowledge or other benefits will arise from the research that legitimizes putting Participants at risk. [Adapted from Health and Human Services, Office of Human Research Protections, 45 CFR 46.406]

Psychological Risk

This is a risk of causing mental and/or emotional distress for the participant.

Risk factors include asking participants to reflect on personal, private, or sensitive material. Below are examples of risk levels in this category:

Minimal Risk	Sharing commonly known information about self
Risk with benefit to Participant	Participating in classes on a subject the participant knows little about (risk of feeling ignorant, benefit of learning)
Risk without benefit to Participant	Sharing about a traumatic experience

Sociological Risk

This is a risk of causing stress based on how the person relates to those around them. Below are examples of risk levels in this category:

Minimal Risk	Participating in a survey in which only the Researcher sees the answer, or being observed in a public activity where the Participant commonly relates to other people, such as at worship
--------------	---

Risk with benefit to Participant	Sharing about a controversial topic in a group of peers with the possibility of working toward greater understanding within that group (risk of alienation or embarrassment, benefit of greater group coherence)
Risk without benefit to Participant	Sharing about a controversial topic in a group with only the goal of creating a structure for long-term improvement for the church.

Physiological Risk

This is a risk of causing bodily harm, including physical stress caused by exertion or anxiety. Below are examples of risk levels in this category:

Minimal Risk	Meeting together in a place the participant feels their physical wellbeing is safe and that requires no additional physical exertion.
Risk with benefit to Participant	Being part of lengthy meetings or meetings that occur later at night or early in the morning for the sake of spiritual formation (risk of being tired or impatient, benefit of being involved in greater spiritual practices)
Risk without benefit to Participant	Going to a place where a Participant feels unsafe or would have a reason to fear for their physical wellbeing to participate in the research.

Spiritual Risk

This is a risk of causing participants to have negative associations with their faith or with a religious community. Below are examples of risk levels in this category:

Minimal Risk	Observing Participants during routine, public practices of faith, such as during worship or fellowship activities
Risk with benefit to Participant	Being asked to reflect on times of serious doubt related to a Participant's religious beliefs as part of a spiritual formation process (risk of having beliefs shaken, benefit of having doubts addressed so that the Participant's beliefs are stronger)
Risk without benefit to Participant	Being exposed to material that directly attacks the Participant's beliefs or the Participant's chosen religious community to determine effectiveness of said material.

Vulnerability Risk

This is a risk caused by a power imbalance between the Researcher and the participant. Below are examples of risk levels in this category:

Minimal Risk	Researcher is a peer to the Participants or the Researcher only gathers data in existing public spaces where the Participants gather anyway.
Risk with benefit to Participant	Researcher is the pastor of the church where the Participant is a member. The Researcher is gathering information that will be used to improve the Participants experience of congregational involvement (risk of awkward conversations with the pastor, benefit of an improved experience at church).
Risk without benefit to Participant	Researcher is in a professional supervisory position over the Participant. Researcher is gathering information about the overall effectiveness of a program or the organization where they work.

Also, social context and privilege must be considered in ranking this. If the Researcher is part of a socially dominant group while the participant is part of a socially marginal group, that would increase the risk level for the Participant even if the risk was minimal otherwise.

Intrusiveness Risk

This is a risk of the participant having intrusive research practices used on them. Risk factors include whether the project will be conducted in a way that fits within the participant's usual patterns of life. Below are examples of risk levels in this category:

Minimal Risk	Voice recording, taking notes at a public event where the Participant usually attends.
Risk with benefit to Participant	Video recording for the sake of reviewing the Participant's presentation of something (risk of being recorded, benefit of learning how to improve in presenting as a result of analyzing the video)
Risk without benefit to Participant	Conducting a very long survey or interview that will be used to gather data that is amalgamated with many others to address systemic or institutional concerns.

Appendix 2 Consent Form Checklist

Researchers should conform to all of the following items in the Consent Form that they include with their HSR application.

1. Plain and clear language. Easy to follow and understandable by research subjects.
2. Clear **identifying information**:
 - a. Name of researcher(s), institution (Garrett-Evangelical Theological Seminary), and supervising faculty.
 - b. Contact information.
3. Succinct explanation of the **purpose** of the research and why the person is being invited to participate.
4. Succinct explanation of the **procedure/process** of the research.
5. Explicit indication of **time** required for participation.
6. Statement about **voluntary** nature of participation, and how subjects may withdraw from the study or decline participation in specific parts of the study without negative consequences.
7. Statement about potential **risks** and **benefits** of the research based on Research Risk Assessment Rubric. It should be honest and instructive, but not unhelpfully alarmist (e.g., “you may experience pain”).
8. As appropriate, offer **resources or remedies** for those adversely affected by the risks of the project, such as access to a counselor.
9. Statement explaining how you will ensure **confidentiality** and **anonymity** of research. (Subjects may be invited to choose their own pseudonyms.)
10. Statement about **mandatory reporting**, explaining that you will break confidentiality if a participant discloses potential abuse or harm about themselves or others.
11. Indicate how **data** will be stored securely, how long it will be kept, and what will happen to it after the designated hold period. (In keeping with federal regulations, G-ETS policy states: “Research investigators are responsible for retention of research files and informed consent documents for at least three years after completion of the research activity.”)
12. Explanation of how the **results** will be shared.

13. Statement about the **publication** of research data. (If applicable, mention possible usage of research data for other publications in the future.)
14. A simple statement of consent. The statement should include all ways in which participants will have **data collected** from them (e.g., notes taken during interviews, audio recording, video recording).

Sample: “By signing below, you are agreeing to an audiotaped interview for this research study. Be sure that any questions you may have are answered to your satisfaction. If you agree to participate in this study, a copy of this document will be given to you” (Moschella 2008, 97).

Participant’s Signature
Participant’s Printed Name
Date

Researcher’s Signature
Researcher’s Printed Name
Date

Participant gets a copy. Researcher keeps original.

Appendix 3 Parent Permission and Child Assent

This guidance document is intended for Researchers who plan to conduct research involving children as subjects. It is adapted from the CPHS (Committee for Protection of Human Subjects) Guidelines on Parent Permission and Child Assent (University of California at Berkeley, January 21, 2019).

Special ethical and regulatory considerations apply when research involves children as subjects. Children are inherently more vulnerable than adults, requiring a higher level of protection, and are also legally incapable of giving valid informed consent. Thus, the HSC must assure that adequate provisions are made regarding assent of the child and permission of the parent(s) or guardian(s).

Issues related to child assent and parent permission are listed below. If the research involves children, Researchers should submit the *Parent Permission and Child Assent* form with their HSR application. In reviewing such studies, the HSC will apply the requirements found in federal regulations 45 CFR 46, Subpart D, "[Additional Protections for Children Involved as Subjects in Research](https://www.hhs.gov/ohrp/regulations-and-policy/guidance/special-protections-for-children/index.html)." <<https://www.hhs.gov/ohrp/regulations-and-policy/guidance/special-protections-for-children/index.html>>

Definitions:

1. *Children* are “persons who have not attained the legal age for consent to treatments or procedures involved in the research, under the applicable law of the jurisdiction in which the research will be conducted.”
2. *Assent* means “a child’s affirmative agreement to participate in research. Mere failure to object should not, absent affirmative agreement, be construed as assent.”
3. *Permission* means “the agreement of parent(s) guardian to the participation of their child or ward in research.
4. *Parent* means “a child’s biological or adoptive parent.”
5. *Guardian* means “an individual who is authorized under applicable State or local law to consent on behalf of a child to general medical care.”

Child Assent:

The process of asking a child to participate in research should be carefully planned and implemented, using age-appropriate language and methods, for any child who is considered capable of understanding and providing assent. This process should include a clear explanation (verbally, and inwritten form when applicable) that conveys:

- what the study is about;
- why the child is eligible/being invited to participate in the study;
- procedures the child will be expected to take part in;
- potential risks and/or discomforts to the child;
- potential benefits to the child or society;

- that the child is completely free to choose whether or not to participate, and may withdraw at any time without negative consequences;
- an invitation to ask questions at any time; and
- names and contact information (phone numbers, email addresses) of whom to contact with questions

Parent Permission:

The parent(s) play a vital part in the consent process for research involving their child. The Researcher should make every effort to assure that both the parents and child understand the research, and their respective rights, as thoroughly as possible. This includes conveying to parents that they should respect their child's autonomy in this regard (e.g., not exert overt or implied pressure for the child to participate, not indicate anger or disappointment if the child wishes to decline or withdraw from the study). Usually, the parent(s) must be provided with a permission form that meets all requirements for adult consent but is written to refer to the subject as "your child" instead of "you."

Checklist:

1. Plain and clear language. Easy to follow and understandable by research subjects.
2. Clear **identifying information**:
 - a. Name of researcher(s), institution (Garrett-Evangelical Theological Seminary), and supervising faculty.
 - b. Contact information.
3. Succinct explanation of the **purpose** of the research and why the person is being invited to participate.
4. Succinct explanation of the **procedure/process** of the research.
5. Explicit indication of **time** required for participation.
6. Statement about **voluntary** nature of participation, and how subjects may withdraw from the study or decline participation in specific parts of the study without negative consequences.
7. Statement about potential **risks** and **benefits** of the research based on Research Risk Assessment Rubric. It should be honest and instructive, but not unhelpfully alarmist (e.g., "you may experience pain").
8. As appropriate, offer **resources or remedies** for those adversely affected by the risks of the project, such as access to a counselor.
9. Statement explaining how you will ensure **confidentiality** and **anonymity** of research. (Subjects may be invited to choose their own pseudonyms.)
10. Statement about **mandatory reporting**, explaining that you will break confidentiality if a participant discloses potential abuse or harm about themselves or others.
11. Indicate how **data** will be stored securely, how long it will be kept, and what will happen to it after the designated hold period. (In keeping with federal regulations, G-ETS policy states: "Research investigators are responsible for retention of research files and informed consent documents for at least three years after completion of the research activity.")
12. Explanation of how the **results** will be shared.
13. Statement about the **publication** of research data. (If applicable, mention possible usage of research data for other publications in the future.)

14. A simple statement of consent. The statement should include all ways in which participants will have **data collected** from them (e.g., notes taken during interviews, audio recording, video recording).

+++++

PARENT PERMISSION

If you decide that your child* may participate in this study, *please sign and date below*. We will give you a copy of this form to keep for future reference.

*Child Participant Name (*please print*)

Parent/Guardian's Name (*please print*)

Date

Parent/Guardian's Signature

Date

[*If both parents are required to sign, add second set of signature and date lines here.*]

[Participant gets a copy. Researcher keeps original.]