Appendix 3

RGF Risk Assessment Tool

This paper and the tool it describes has been extracted with permission from the *Social Services Research Group, Research Governance Framework Resource Pack*, April 2005.

Introduction

This document describes a simple tool that can be used by CSSRs and others to help them implement research governance arrangements.

Research governance offers safeguards to anyone participating in research and will help to ensure that any study that may be planned is of high quality.

It is important that all research activity is included within the scope of local governance arrangements. This is to ensure that the safeguards and quality standards offered by the framework are offered to all those involved in research. This might include service users, relatives and carers, care professionals or researchers themselves.

However, it is also important that time and resources within the governance process are focussed on research proposals that deserve greatest scrutiny. Whilst some research proposals will offer relatively little or no risk to participants, in other studies there may be a higher risk – for a variety of reasons.

What is the Research Governance Risk Assessment Tool?

The Tool offers a way of establishing the likelihood of harm to research participants and the degree to which the potential for harm has been identified and addressed within a given research proposal. It can help to ensure that the level of scrutiny given to a research proposal is proportional to the likely degree of risk to participants. It relies to a large extent on the professional judgements of those using it. It has been designed with simplicity and ease of use in mind and no claims are therefore made for it being comprehensive in scope.

How does it work?

The Tool helps those appraising a research proposal to consider both the likelihood of harm to participants that may arise due to the nature of the proposed research and the overall level of risk.

Likelihood of harm. The main part of the tool offers a series of statements, presented in rows and columns, against which a given piece of research can

be assessed. The *left hand column statements* are those representing the highest likelihood of harm to participants. Statements found in the *right hand column* are those representing the lowest chances of harm occurring Research proposals can be appraised against each of the statements contained in the rows to form an overall impression of the likelihood of harm to subjects/participants. For example, research proposals in which a large number of the cells in the left hand column appear to best describe the proposal indicate that the study is one in which the chances of harm to participants is likely to be high.

Risk. Likelihood of harm predisposes research participants to greater levels of risk. However, a predisposition does not mean that this greater risk is inevitable. It is important also to consider the extent to which the research proposal identifies and addresses areas likely to give rise to higher chances of harm. If a research proposal identifies and addresses these, then the overall level of risk will be reduced.

To take account of this, *if the review of a research proposal indicates that, for a given row, there is a high chance of harm,* then it is important to consider if there is also a *high level of risk*

At the end of each row there are two cells that describe two logical possibilities if a high chance of harm is identified. For each row, either:

the concerns or issues relating to the area giving rise to the higher chance of harm have been fully addressed in the research proposal, or
the issues concerned have not been fully addressed.

Extent of likelihood of harm to participants as defined in research proposal	+	Extent to which areas of high likelihood or harm are addressed within the research proposal	-	Overall response of those responsible for review of research

The final page of the Tool is intended to record the outcome of the review process and offer recommendations to investigator, sponsors or funders where appropriate, to address any concerns that may be identified.

Who is it for?

The tool can be used in a variety of contexts and settings and by a range of different people. It is primarily designed for use by CSSRs. The way it is used will depend on the local arrangements within which CSSRs respond to the RGF For example:

Title of Proposal ..... **Date** .....

Name of Researcher/Principal Investigator ..... **Ref No** .....

Area	Likelihood of harm (tick boxes to indicate judgement)			Areas of high likelihood of harm addressed?
	High → Low			
Subject/ participant characteristics	Informed consent & ability to withdraw from study not possible or unlikely due to age of child or incapacity of adult. Communication issues arising from language or literacy issues, sensory or speech impairments ☐	Informed consent & ability to withdraw from study possible with support to overcome communication barriers e.g. advocates, translators/interpreters, signers, or technology ☐	Informed consent and ability to withdraw from study fully possible ☐	Concerns about informed consent and communication barriers are fully identified & addressed Concerns are not fully identified or addressed
Researcher competence	Researcher(s) not well qualified with little or no experience or knowledge of either the topic of investigation, the participants or the methods to be used e.g. undergraduate researcher/student project ☐	Researcher(s) reasonably well qualified with experience and knowledge of two out of the three following factors – topic of investigation, the participants/subjects or the methods to be used e.g. non-researcher who has had formal research training who may work in a professional domain offering relevant experience and knowledge ☐	Researcher(s) well qualified with experience and knowledge of all three of the following factors – topic of investigation, the participants/subjects and the methods to be used. e.g. formal research training and/or qualification and/or experience and knowledge gained from working in an appropriate environment ☐	Any lack of competence by the researcher(s) fully addressed Any lack of competence is not addressed

Area	Likelihood of harm (tick boxes to indicate judgement)			Areas of high likelihood of harm addressed?
	High →		Low	
Nature of information being sought	The topic and kinds of information being sought are likely to be regarded as highly personal or sensitive by those from whom it is being collected or about whom it is to be obtained. e.g. criminal records, psychiatric history etc ☐	The topic or the kinds of information being sought include items likely to be considered slightly personal or sensitive by some people e.g. age, ethnicity, income ☐	The topic and kinds of information being sought do not focus on personal information at all e.g. opinions about services received ☐	The need to collect any personal information is fully justified The need to collect this information is not fully justified
Appropriateness of method to subject & quality of research design	The methods are neither appropriate to the subject of the proposed study or the research questions being asked, the need for the study is not established and the project does not have the resources to properly address the research question(s) ☐	The methods may not be appropriate either to the subject of the proposed study or to the main research questions, or the need for research is not established, or the project does not have the resources to properly address the research question(s) ☐	The methods are fully appropriate to the subject of the proposed study and to the research questions being asked, there is a demonstrable need for the study and the resources to carry out the study are sufficient ☐	The case for & resources to do the study exist & methods are fully appropriate to the subject or main research questions The case for & resources to do study are absent & methods are not appropriate to subject or main research questions

Area	Likelihood of harm (tick boxes to indicate judgement)			Areas of high likelihood of harm addressed?
	High → Low			
Methods/nature of data collection	High levels of face to face contact and/or interaction between investigator and participant e.g. participant observation or observation study ☐	Some face-to-face contact and interaction for limited amounts of time ☐	No face to face interaction between investigator and participant ☐	Possible risks arising from high level of contact are identified and fully addressed Possible risks are not identified or addressed
Level of privacy to participant	Not confidential ☐	Confidential ☐	Anonymous ☐	If the study is not anonymous or confidential reasons for this are fully justified & conform to Data Protection Act principles Study is not anonymous or confidential and reasons for this are not fully justified

Area	Likelihood of harm (tick boxes to indicate judgement) High → Low			Areas of high likelihood of harm addressed?
Relationship between investigator & subjects/ participants	Subjects/participants are personally known to investigator & investigator may have other duties or responsibilities towards all or some of the research participants which may create potential conflicts of interest ☐			Conflicts of interest are fully described & consideration given to how to minimise possible effects on study
		Limited information about subjects/participants is provided to the investigator to make the study possible or more reliable ☐		Conflicts of interest are not fully described. Proposal does not adequately consider how to minimise effects on study
			Subjects/participants are unknown to the investigator and cannot be identified ☐	
External considerations	Study is likely to be extremely sensitive ☐			Sensitivities have been fully identified and adequately addressed
		Parts of study may be sensitive ☐		
			No known sensitivities ☐	Sensitivities have not been adequately addressed.

	Comments from review
Subject/participant characteristics	
Researcher competence	
Nature of information being sought	
Appropriateness of method to subject	
Methods/nature of data collection	
Level of privacy to participant	
Relationship between investigator & subjects/participants	
External considerations	
Other comments arising from review e.g. balance of risks & benefits	

Overall adjudication Approval given ☐ Resubmit with minor changes ☐ Resubmit with major changes ☐ Proposal rejected ☐

Signed.....

Date.....

Role/title.....

Guidance & examples

Further information about the categories used in the Tool and some examples are presented below. The information is intended to be indicative and not exhaustive.

Subject/participant characteristics

Some service users may experience particular difficulties in giving informed consent, or in withholding consent. This may be for many reasons, including:

- the age of a child (where the child is very young);
- the incapacity of an adult due to significant learning difficulties, or
- mental health issues including dementia;
- because of barriers to communication arising from language (for people
- whose first language is not English) or literacy (if people cannot read or write);
- because of sensory impairments (for example visual impairment,
- blindness, hearing impairment or deafness);
- because of speech impairments (for example, such as those arising from degenerative illness, or stroke).

The information given to participants to enable them to decide whether to take part should, for example:

- be clearly written so the participant has a full and accurate;
- understanding of exactly what they are consenting to;
- state that they can withdraw from the study at any time without this;
- affecting the services they receive in any way;
- provide information about to whom they may complain, should they need to.

If informed consent is difficult because communication barriers exist the likelihood of harm to research subjects/participants will be greater unless ways can be identified in the research proposal by which these barriers can be overcome. A research proposal has both to acknowledge the issue as well as offer an account of how any identified barriers will be surmounted.

For example, research in which people from ethnic minority groups will form part of the sample should be able to establish the preferred language of those within the sample and ensure that appropriate steps are taken to enable non-English speakers to take part. This might include the use of translated versions of letters, consent forms and postal questionnaires or ensuring that an interpreter is available for interviews. If the study involves children or young people, the provision of information about the project (necessary to ensure informed consent) might need to be made available to the parent/guardian as well as the child, and the information provided to the child or young person written in an accessible style.

Researcher competence

There are several dimensions to the issue of competence. A researcher may:

- be generally inexperienced – for example, if they are a student or someone who is not a professional researcher;
- they may lack any real knowledge of the subject under investigation;
- they may possess little or no experience of working with those people
- from whom information may be collected;
- they may not know about the best methods to use to achieve the
- objectives of the proposed study.

Each of these factors increases the likelihood of harm to participants. For example, those who may be asked to take part may be caused distress or inconvenience because a lack of knowledge of their needs might lead the researcher to use inappropriate methods to obtain the information required. The investigator's reputation may also be affected. In addition, a lack of knowledge may also mean that the research funder would be left out of pocket having committed resources to a study that may already have been completed already elsewhere without the researcher knowing about it, or have sufficient methodological flaws as to be relatively worthless.

If the researcher or researchers to be involved in the study are inexperienced the research proposal should clearly outline where lack of experience or competence may be an issue and what remedies will be applied. For example, if the researchers concerned do not have training in and experience of using the kinds of research methods appropriate to the topic, it may be that they will not be the right people to do the study. If a researcher lacks knowledge of the subject area or topic, they will at the very least, need access to those who do have this knowledge and can share this by offering support and guidance. If the investigator lacks knowledge of a service user group that will be the focus of the proposed study, they may need either to obtain this, or the proposal will need to demonstrate that they have access to sufficient appropriate support to compensate for this gap.

Finally, it is very important that any researcher working directly with service users or with case identifiable data has Criminal Records Bureau (CRB) clearance.

Nature of information being sought

Some research is likely to require the collection of information that might be highly sensitive or personal – for example:

- data relating to criminal records;
- psychiatric history;

- health status etc.

Alternatively, the data may be collected as a result of an invasive procedure of some kind such as a new, perhaps untested, therapeutic intervention.

The need to collect sensitive information of this kind should be fully justifiable and explained in the research proposal.

If the collection of sensitive data is not explained, not justified, or is considered unnecessary by those appraising the proposal, this data should not be collected.

If the collection of this information is justifiable, then a range of other issues relating to the level of privacy to the person about whom the data is collected will apply. This will be considered separately below.

Appropriateness of method to subject, or research questions and the quality of the research design

It's important that the methods used are the most appropriate for the subject of the study. If they're not, the results of the study may be compromised.

Firstly, the need for research should be established. If there is no need for the study there's little point in doing it.

Secondly, it's important that the proposed study has the resources needed to answer the research questions.

For example, a study requiring interviews with large numbers of service users will normally consume more resources than a postal survey of a group of comparable size. The methods should be appropriate to the subject. For example, using focus group interviews as a method of obtaining information about the use that hundreds of people make of a service won't be very useful if what's being sought is reliable information – that is, information that accurately reflects the views of all service users. A better approach would be a postal survey or survey interview using a sample selected in such a way that there can be confidence in the findings. On the other hand, if the purpose of using focus groups is to find out more about the kinds of issues that are important to these service users, a postal survey might be a waste of time as the questions asked might not capture the main issues for users unless the researcher has a detailed prior knowledge of these issues. In this scenario, the method of focus group or unstructured interview would be the more appropriate approach to take.

Methods/nature of data collection

Methods of data collection that involve:

high levels of face to face contact or interaction between the investigator and the subject/participant, or
where the methods are relatively intrusive.

may create situations in which one of those concerned may be placed in a vulnerable position of some kind, or one that may compromise the quality of the study. For example, research designs of this kind, in certain contexts may lead to:

- Risks to the researcher – for example if the research involves visits to the homes of people who are to be interviewed.
- The possibility of misconduct or abuse on the part of the researcher or the possibility that an accusation of misconduct may be made against them.
- A loss of perspective by the researcher arising from a failure to adequately manage fieldwork relationships – for example over involvement in the research environment.
- Stress to those from whom information is being sought – for example through the length of an interview, the timing or location of observations, the number of contacts between the researcher and the persons taking part in the research.

To address potential difficulties of this kind it may be necessary for the proposal to demonstrate how the safety of participants will be ensured. Where appropriate the proposal should also indicate how field researchers would be supported to manage fieldwork relations properly – a particular issue in any action research design.

Level of privacy to participant

If the data is not anonymised at the point of collection, the research proposal should explain why it isn't feasible or appropriate to collect the data in this way. The proposal will need to demonstrate that all stages of the data collection process conform to the standards laid down in the Data Protection Act and the local Caldicott Guardian. For example:

- the security of collected data;
- the method of analysis;
- the way that analysed data will be presented;
- the process by which collected data will be disposed of,

should all be described in any research proposal but are particularly important considerations if data isn't anonymous. Privacy is of the utmost importance if the collected data is of a sensitive or personal kind.

To address concerns about privacy a research proposal should clearly state what level of privacy can be achieved by the study and how this will be explained to subjects/participants. It may be desirable, for example, to state how attempts will be made to minimise the possibility that individuals might be

identified, for example by changing names, or selecting data that cannot be attributed to source. A clear account of:

- how collected data will be stored;
- who will see the collected data;
- how it will be analysed;
- how long collected data will be kept; and
- how it will be disposed of when no longer needed,

should all be included in a research proposal.

Relationship between investigator & subjects/participants

There are particular issues that should be carefully considered if the investigator and the subject/participants of a proposed study are known to one another (for example where a member of staff working in a day centre or residential care setting is asked or wishes to conduct a study of some kind on attendees/residents). Key issues might, for example, include:

- 'Audience effect', in which participant's opinions of, or attitudes toward, the researcher affect their behaviour towards the researcher or their response to questions the researcher may ask.
- An imbalance in power between the researcher and subject/participants may make it very difficult for consent to be withheld.
- There may be a conflict of interest on the part of the researcher arising from vested interests in securing a particular outcome to the study.
- A researcher's prior knowledge of the subjects/participants may affect
- What data is collected/not collected.

To address these concerns any pre-existing relationship between investigator and subjects/participants should be described. Where appropriate the proposal might offer remedies for any potential bias that may occur. For example this might be by ensuring that:

- consent is obtained by someone not known to participants,
- close supervision of the fieldwork process occurs, or
- a third party is used to conduct random 're-tests' to ensure consistency in data collected.

External considerations

Some research is likely to generate much more interest, and be of a much more sensitive nature than others because of heightened media interest, possible implications arising from findings, public concern, or, in local government settings, political agendas.

- There may be a risk that findings may be misinterpreted, by design or by accident.
- There may be pressure to complete the research and publish findings as soon as possible to satisfy demand for information or to support important decisions that may need to be made.
- It may be that the findings of a research study, or the area of investigation is one that key individuals or interest groups may find unpalatable, or alternatively, findings may be exaggerated to suit the agenda of such individuals or groups.

It may not be possible for the investigator or research team to anticipate how a completed study will be received, but an assessment of the policy environment within which the proposed study may be eventually received, and the outcome of research in the same field by others may provide clues. Other ways of addressing external considerations might include the provision of lay summaries of the findings – particularly of complex studies and large reports and being clear about any assumptions or values that may underpin the proposed study. Clarity about how research will be disseminated should be agreed before a study begins to help address these issues.

Other issues

Equalities

Equalities issues are a common thread running through the research assessment tool described here. Particular care is needed on the part of researchers to ensure that research methods do not unintentionally discriminate. After taking any explicit sampling criteria into account, all reasonable steps should be taken to ensure that particular groups of people targeted in a study are not excluded from participation. For example, interpreters or translation services may be required for service users whose first language is not English or who normally communicate using BSL. Questionnaire design should be 'disability friendly' in design. Buildings chosen as venues for focus group work should be fully accessible to people with physical or sensory impairments. Advocates may be needed for people with mental health issues or learning difficulties.

Effects on choice of research topic

An overriding purpose of the RGF is to protect service users from harm arising from unethical or poorly thought out research. It is not intended to prevent research into sensitive topics. Where the proposed topic is deemed to be a sensitive one, distress may be caused to research participants. Research participants able to give informed consent should be asked if they are prepared to accept the possibility that distress may be caused and reminded that they can choose not to take part in the proposed study at any stage. Whilst every effort should be made to ensure that distress does not occur, there may be occasions when the level of distress caused may be outweighed by the potential benefit of the findings. For example, a person with a terminal illness may find the process of taking part in a study of the quality of care provided to people who are dying distressing. However, they may also feel that lessons learned from the study will be of great benefit to others

finding themselves in the same situation at some future time. Where informed consent cannot be obtained, it will be much harder to justify distress because of potential benefit. In any event, it is essential that the researcher/investigator define the potential benefits of the research to enable those responsible for appraising the proposal to weigh up risks against possible benefits.

Acknowledgements
Jo Cooke, Trent Focus; Paul Dolan, Birmingham Social Care and Health; Dr. Carol Lupton, Department of Health; Prof. Jill Manthorpe, Kings College London; Dr. Chris Rainey and Tim Martin of West Sussex Social and Caring Services; Dr. Martin Stevens, Hampshire Social Services; and Sue Williams, Kent Social Services. Their contributions to its design and development are gratefully acknowledged.

Dr. John Woolham
Senior Research Officer
Northamptonshire Community Services Directorate
Northamptonshire County Council
P.O.Box 177
County Hall
Northampton
Jwoolham@northamptonshire.gov.uk

Appendix 4

Sample Online Application Form

Isle of Wight Council

Research Application Form

Please note: Provided you are logged into My Profile you can save the contents of this form at any time. This will enable you to return to the form at any stage, complete and submit it later.

It is a requirement that you send in some additional forms of documentation in order to complement the information provided in this application form. Please ensure you read the Getting Started page before proceeding, paying particular attention to the 'Document Checklist.'

Once the form is complete, please ensure that you print the page containing your unique reference number. This will appear once you hit the 'submit' button to send the form to the service.

You will need to send the print-out of your unique reference number, along with the additional required documents to the following address:

Research Governance Co-ordinator
Community Services
The Guildhall, High Street
Newport, Isle of Wight
PO30 1TY

About You

Forename	martin
Middle name/Initials	
Surname	johnson
Building/house name/number	Guildhall
Street address	High Street
Town name	Newport
County	Isle of Wight
Postcode	PO331PS
Tel number (include area code)	01983 823825
Email address	martin.johnson@iow.gov.uk
Fax	
Current employment	Service Manager, Partnerships. Isle of Wight Council
Your qualifications	MBA, Diploma in Social Work, Diploma in Management Studies.
Your previous research experience	Masters degree level dissertation. Study and practice teacher 1984-1998, Research reviewer for IWC 2005-, Lead manager on a number of service evaluations and consultation studies 1996-. member of the IWC research Governance Board.

About the other people who will be involved with the research

1. Research Supervisor

Please provide the name and contact details of the Research Supervisor:

Job Title	Chief Executive.
Organisation	Isle of Wight Council
Forename	Jo
Middle name/Initials	
Surname	Duckworth
Address	Chief Executives Office, Isle of Wight Council, County Hall, High Street, Newport. PO30 1TY
Tel number (include area code)	01983 821000
Email address	jo.duckworth@iow.gov.uk
Fax	
Your supervisor□s research qualifications and experience	Degree level research 1990, lead manager on high level strategic research and evaluation projects 1990-2005.

2. Lead Researcher

Please provide the name of the Lead Researcher:

Job Title	Service Manager

Name of lead research organisation	Isle of Wight Council
Forename	Martin
Middle name/Initials	
Surname	Johnson

3. Research Team Members

Please provide the names and contact details of the research team members:

Use this space to provide details of the research team members (including fieldworkers)	Lesley Johnson, Public Sector Research Assistant, University of Portsmouth. contact c/o the Lead Researcher.

References

Please provide the names and contact details of two referees who will support the application, giving their opinion of the project and the researchers' competence to undertake the project. (This can include the Research Supervisor). References must be posted in separately to the submission of the electronic application.

NOTE: Referees are not needed where the research sponsor or nominated link manager is the line manager of the applicant.

1. 1st Referee

Job Title	Director of Community Services
Organisation	Isle of Wight Council
Forename	Sarah
Middle name/Initials	
Surname	Mitchell
Address	Isle of Wight Council, County Hall, High Street, Newport, Isle of Wight, PO301TY
Tel number (include area code)	01983 821000
Email address	sarah.mitchell@iow.gov.uk
Fax	

2. 2nd Referee

Job Title	Senior Lecturer
Organisation	University of Portsmouth
Forename	Charles
Middle name/Initials	
Surname	Goddard
Address	University of Portsmouth, Richmond Building, Richmond St, Portsmouth, PO39YH
Tel number (include area code)	01983 823818
Email address	elaine.tracey@iow.gov.uk
Fax	

Research Sponsor

Who will be funding the Research?	Isle of Wight Council

Please provide the name and contact details of the Research Sponsor:

Job Title	Community Leisure Development Manager
Organisation	Sports Unit, Isle of Wight Council
Forename	Lee
Middle name/Initials	
Surname	Matthews
Address	Sports Unit, Guildhall, High St, Newport, Isle of Wight, PO301TY
Tel number (include area code)	01983 823818
Email address	lee.matthews@iow.gov.uk
Fax	

About the Research

Title of the research project	Evaluation of the satisfaction of people with a Learning Disability who have participated in community based sport as part of their activities funded by Individual Budgets.
A brief abstract of the project - please provide a brief abstract describing your project objectives and methodology. This text will be uploaded into the Social Care Institute for Excellence (SCIE) national online research database (max 100 words)	The Isle of Wight Council has piloted and facilitated a range of new daytime and evening activities for people with a learning disability who have individual personal care budgets. The Council has commissioned a study of the impact on user satisfaction with the new daytime activities. The study focusses on the piloting of community based sporting activities and the satisfaction of service users and carers who have engaged with these activities. The study will present a qualitative comparative assessment of satisfaction covering the activities and their impact on dailky living.
Aims and Objectives of the project (max 100 words)	Provide commissioners and service users/carers who have Individual Budgets, with a comparative assessment of satisfaction with community sporting activities commissioned and facilitated by the Council.
When do you propose to start this research?	12th December 2007
Planned project completion date	12th March 2008
Brief description of the methods to be used	1. Quantitative assessment of take up and provision. 2. Piloting of questionnaires, survey methods and focus group formats with service users, carers and service providers. 3. Quantitatively identify a survey sample. 4. Survey period using sampled questionnaires and focus groups. 5. Feedback findings to particpants, commssioners and service provviders.
Will your project involve participants over the age of 16 unable to give informed consent to their involvement or the use of their identifiable personal information?	

*If yes, please ensure that you have contacted the Research Governance Co-ordinator prior to the submission of this application.

Have you included a copy of your research proposal with this application?	(•) Yes ( ) No ( ) Draft
Does your Proposal address the issues raised in the online IWC RGF 'Research Proposal Guide?'	(•) Yes ( ) No ( ) Partly
Will your research involve you talking directly to council or sponsoring organisation staff, service users, their families or carers?	
If yes, do you and all members of your research team have up to date CRB certificates?	(•) Yes ( ) No
Will the research involve you handling infomation that identifies individuals?	(•) Yes ( ) No

Checklist

Please provide the following documents with your application	

*List of any other documents provided:

1. Literature Review	4.
2.Letter of support from MENCAP "In Control"	5.
3.	6.

Declaration

It is a condition of using the IWC Research Governance process that;

Once approval to proceed on social care based projects has been given, the Council will upload the title and abstract information on the Social Care Institute for Excellence (SCIE) online research database.

On completion of these projects, a final abstract indicating outcomes will be required for the SCIE online database. On completion of all projects, a copy of the research or evaluation report, together with an abstract of findings will be required of applicants for the sponsoring organisation and the RGF library.

If there any reasons why you are unable to agree fully to this (e.g. copyright issues) please set out these reasons here	

To the best of my knowledge the information provided in this application and supporting documentation is accurate. If any significant changes are made to the research or the proposal I will inform the CouncilCis Research Co-Ordinator at the earliest opportunity.

Signed.....

Name.....

Date.....

Data Protection Act 1998

This application may be monitored by the Isle of Wight Council for regulatory, quality control or crime detection purposes. Information from this application will be processed in accordance with the Data Protection Act 1998 for the purpose of processing your particular enquiry/request. The Isle of Wight Council ("the Council") is the data controller. By completing this form you consent to the Council contacting you by email or nominated contact method in relation to your enquiry/request.

The information contained in this application may, in exceptional circumstances, be subject to disclosure to third parties under either the Data Protection Act 1998 or the Freedom of Information Act 2000 to the extent the law allows and in accordance with the Isle of Wight Council's Access to Information Policy. Disclosure will only be made where in all the circumstances it would be fair to do so and in the public interest.

Please note that the Council may process your information in the absence of consent for the purpose of crime prevention or detection so far as is in accordance with the law.

Sometimes we may use your information to keep you informed about services, goods or relevant issues that we believe may be of interest to you. If you wish to receive this information for these purposes please tick this box ☐

To improve the quality of other services that we provide to you the Council wishes to hold your non-sensitive personal information on a secure central database. This will enable all Council services to use this information when they are providing a service to/for you. If you wish your non-sensitive personal information to be held by the Council please tick this box ☐

Please now ensure that you print the page containing your unique reference number.

To complete the application process, you will need to send the print-out of your unique reference number, along with the additional required documents to the following address:

Research Governance Co-ordinator

Community Services

The Guildhall

High Street

Newport

Isle of Wight

PO30 1TY

Appendix 5

Expert Guide to Research Methods

Isle of Wight Council and other Councils in the South East of England have collaborated to produce a guide to research methods for reviewrs and researchers.

Isle of Wight Council employees involved in a council research or teaching programme can be given access to the guide.

Reviewing and Reading Social Care Research: From ideas to findings (SEARIG, 2009) is a copyrighted guide to the many issues and methods available to researches. While it is grounded in social care, the content can be applied to almost any public sector research that would involve the users of public services and the people who work in them.

If you gain access to this guide, please remember that it is subject to strictly adhered-to copyright and it should not be reproduced in whole or part, used or referred to without direct and clear reference in any subsequent work.

To get access to this very comprehensive and informative reference work and guide, please contact the council's lead manager for the RGF.

Appendix 6

Glossary of Terms

If you would like to see more terms appear in this glossary, please contact the council's lead manager for the RGF.

Main/Principal Researcher	The person designated as taking overall responsibility for the design, conduct and reporting of the study.
Nominated Link Officer	A named council officer, usually an experienced manager, appointed by the sponsor organisation to act on its sponsor responsibilities. The person provides a link between the council and the researcher. This person's role is to facilitate access to research participants and to oversee and monitor the progress of the research on behalf of the council. S/he is not responsible for providing support and advice about the research itself.
Research	Any work which involves collecting information from or about service users, their relatives and carers and employees of the Council. It includes surveys, focus groups, consultations, reviews, evaluations, Best Value audits, and student projects. It does not involve the routine collection of management information.
Research Governance Co-ordinator or 'the manager in the council responsible for the RGF'	The Council Officer who is the official point of referral for all prospective research applicants.
Research Governance Board	The partnership body responsible for considering any research proposals that involve direct or indirect access to service users, their families/friends or carers. Membership comprises the Research Co-ordinator, Council staff, representatives from other organisations and users of Council services. The Board is only convened as required.
Research Supervisor	The person responsible for the management of the researcher(s) and the research.
Research Team	Other researchers who, with the Main Researcher, comprise the people conducting the study and includes field workers.
Sponsor	An organisation (often likely to be the council) taking the primary responsibility for: • ensuring the design of the study meets applicable standards. • that arrangements are in place to ensure appropriate conduct and reporting.

	• that all the necessary agreements are in place and are documented. The sponsor is usually, but does not have to be, the main funder. The sponsor might be a local authority, a University or a research foundation. Local Authorities are automatically a sponsor of research that involves services users, their families and carers and the local authority's staff. The sponsor will be represented by a Manager who will fulfill the role of Nominated Link Officer (see below)