|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
|  | image preview   |  | | --- | |  | |
| **Newcastle University** | **Full Ethical Review Form** |
| *(Version 2.1)* |  |
| **Section 1:** | **Applicant Details** |
| *Mandatory Section* |  |
|  |  |
| Applicant Name | *Polly Reichelt (aka Eriol Fox)* |
| Contact Email | *P.Reichelt2@newcastle.ac.uk* |
| Academic Unit | *School of Computing* |
| Project Type | *Student Project* |
| *Additional details for non staff projects* |  |
| Type of Degree Programme | *Postgraduate Research (e.g. PhD)* |
| Module Code | *8050P* |
| Supervisors Email | *rachel.clarke@newcastle.ac.uk* |
| Supervisors Academic Unit | *School of Computing* |
|  |  |
| **Section 2:** | **Project Details** |
| *Mandatory Section* |  |
|  |  |
| Project Title | *Observing Human-centred Design Contributions to Humanitarian/Human Rights Open Source Software: What collaborations, conversations, processes and cultures are at play between designers, OSS projects, humanitarian/human rights organisations and their beneficiaries.* |
| Project Synopsis | *The purpose of this research is to critically explore how human-centred design is currently practiced and understood between by the people who create and maintain Humanitarian/Human Rights related Open Source Software (HOSS) and users of the HOSS. In addition, how do human-centred designers themselves, engage with and contribute to HOSS and why. The aim of this critical exploration is to better understand what practices support a collaborative, inclusive and human-centred design process for the HOSS and if the use of the HOSS and relationship to the HOSS, by the beneficiaries, is changed through these human-centred design practices.   This specific observation study is to first observe 3 hackathons that fit the following criteria:  1. The hackathon work will be done on an OSS with a license. 2. The hackathon has a design presence to it e.g. has asked for design contribution or mentioned design in some clear way 3. The hackathon encourages and facilitates participation from technologists that identify as part of the community that the OSS benefits e.g. Refugees for refugee related technology 4. The hackathon organisers agree for the hackathon to be observed and agree to the processes laid out in this ethics application.  The second part of this study will be to participate in 1 hackathon that also covers the above criteria.  I will capture and measure the information and data from observations of the hackathon to compare and analyse differences and similarities across a number of metrics such as: Collaboration, successful issue/task completion, participation of designers etc.  Examples of these hackathons are: https://twitter.com/TechfugeesK/status/1458399295120580608 https://www.federationof.tech/hackathon https://devpost.com/hackathons?order\_by=deadline&search=humanitarian https://thehaguepeace.org/haguehacks/the-hague-hacks-festival/   The second piece of the observational study practice is to observe how the non-live, text-based humanitarian and human rights OSS tool repositories of 'issues' (tasks for OSS developers and other contributors) develop their discussions and understanding of design and designers along with what processes, methods and tools designers use to encourage collaboration along with any communications platforms outside of these repositories. Repositories are open and public and can be observed without notifying the communities, however many of these communities use communications platforms that are either open (matrix https://matrix.org/) or IRC chats (https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Internet\_Relay\_Chat)* |
| Project Start Date | 2021-12-05 00:00:00 |
| Project End Date | 2024-12-05 00:00:00 |
| High Risk Flags from Preliminary | 'International' |
| MyProjects Reference | 0 |
| Project Funder Details | Primary: Northern bridge via AHRC  Secondary:  Tertiary: |
| External Collaborators | 0 |
|  |  |
| **Section 3:** | **Existing Ethics, Sponsorship & Responsibility** |
| *Mandatory Section* |  |
|  |  |
| Ethical Approval in place | No |
| Ethical Approval accepted by faculty | N/A |
| No of Approvals uploaded | 0 |
| Approving Body Details: | Name:  Reference:  Date of Approval: |
| NHS Research Sponsor name | 0 |
| NUTH Reference | 0 |
| External responsibility for Project Conduct, Management & Design | Conduct: , , , () Management: , , , () Design: , , , () |
|  |  |
| **Section 4:** | **Project Outline & Proposed Research Methods** |
| *Mandatory Section* |  |
|  |  |
| **4.1 Project Outline and Aims** |  |
| In everyday language, briefly explain the aims of this research including the anticipated benefits and risk. In cases where the use of technical or discipline specific terms is unavoidable please explain their meaning clearly. | This current ethical application is for an ongoing observational stage of the research, to observe designers and Developers/Maintainers of Humanitarian/Human Rights Open Source Software (HOSS) working in the context of humanitarian crisis or human rights activists organisations on their open and public, digital platforms such as GitHub and Gitlab (where they store tasks projects and progress and where the community congregates) and also to observe any asynchronous or synchronous events such as hackathons where community members gather online, in person (covid restrictions permitting).  Insights from observations will help to identify how these actors interact during stages of the development of the HOSS and what key factors are involved in ‘successful’ collaboration between designers, developers, Humanitarian/Human Rights organisations that host the HOSS, subject matter experts/field workers and the beneficiaries of the HOSS’s Humanitarian/Human Rights purpose or outcome e.g. To provide refugees with information on legal settlement procedures and advice when they arrive in a country. The aim and purpose of this research is to critically explore how human-centred design is currently practiced and understood between by the people who create and maintain Humanitarian/Human Rights related Open Source Software (HOSS) and users of the HOSS. In addition, how do human-centred designers themselves, engage with and contribute to HOSS and why. The aim of this critical exploration is to better understand what practices support a collaborative, inclusive and human-centred design process for the HOSS and if the use of the HOSS and relationship to the HOSS, by the beneficiaries, is changed through these human-centred design practices. A separate ethical application has been submitted for semi-structured contextual interviews with Humanitarian/Human Rights organisations. For additional interviews with other stakeholders/actors in this ecosystem and for later case/field studies new ethical applications will be submitted. |
|  |  |
| **4.2 Proposed Research Method** | **(Experimental Design)** |
| In everyday language, please provide an outline of the research methods in a clear step by step chronological order. Noting any pertinent information such as whether the research involves overseas partners and how you will handle the research data. | This research will follow three different methodologies: For research that asks for my own participation with communities I will be combining Liberatory Design with Living Labs methodology. Living labs is a methodology which sits close to open source software processes with co-creation and collaboration at the heart of its processes. Liberatory design is utilised due to it’s intentions to “…help us better understand challenges in highly complex interconnected systems, to see ways systems of oppression are impacting our context, to root our decision-making in our values, to combat status quo” along with Liberatory designs focus on equity, liberation and power structures within a design process. Diaries and auto-ethnographic processes will be used to document my own experiences and observations of how human-centred designers in Humanitarian/Human Rights Open Source Software (HOSS) support inclusive and collaborative ways of engaging with HOSS maintainer organisations and user-beneficiaries. For self-reflective work I will being referencing both Liberatory Design and intersectional Feminist principles and values in research. Intersectional feminist principles and values challenge existing status quo in research and technology and have surfaced in open source investigations literature in recent years. The core question within a human rights or humanitarian context asks - power, who has it and who does not? Observations will be made consistently throughout the requested ethical application time period to monitor any changes. HOSS (like much of OSS) has ‘peaks’ and ‘troughs’ dependant on a number of factors including: Volunteer numbers and coordinators, current political and environmental climate, funding, advocacy and technical trends. Longer term consistent monitoring of human-centred design within projects will be able to account for these variations in activity. I will engage with selected organisations as a researcher and as an ‘open source design contributor’. Becoming part of the contribution ecosystem in order to fully understand the open domain context and any ‘closed’ context relevant to this research. |
|  |  |
| **Section 5:** | **Animals** |
| *Only completed if animals risk identified* |  |
|  |  |
| **5.1 Home Office License** |  |
| Is the work covered by an existing Home Office license? | N/A |
| Reference: | 0 |
| Do you intend to apply for a Home Office License? | 0 |
| Has the Comparative Biology Centre been consulted? | 0 |
| Has the Home Office been consulted? | 0 |
| If your project involves wild caught animals, are permissions in place? | 0 |
|  |  |
| **5.2** Why is the use of animals necessary in this project? | 0 |
|  |  |
| **5.3** What kinds of animals will be used and how many of each? | 0 |
|  |  |
| **5.4** What will happen to the animals during and after the project? | 0 |
|  |  |
| **5.5** Who will be carrying out the project? Briefly describe the relevant experience and expertise of the persons involved? | 0 |
|  |  |
| **5.6** Where will the animals be housed/located? If the animals are being observed in the wild or in establishments such as zoos, has permission been obtained from the appropriate authority? For any work outside the UK, do the standards of animal care and accommodation comply with UK codes of practice? If not explain how they differ. | 0 |
|  |  |
| **5.7** What checks will be made on the animals, how frequently and by whom? What actions will be taken in the event of any adverse effects on the animals? | 0 |
|  |  |
| **Section 6:** | **Humans in a Non-Clinical Setting** |
| *Only completed if humans non-clinical risk identified* |  |
|  |  |
| **6.1 Does the research specifically target / involve participants who are:** |  |
| Adults (over 18 years old and competent to give consent) | 0 |
| Children / Legal minors (anyone under 18 years old) | 0 |
| People from non-English speaking backgrounds | 0 |
| Persons incapable of giving consent | 0 |
| Prisoners or parolees | 0 |
| Recruited through a gatekeeper | 0 |
| Welfare recipients | 0 |
| How many participants do you plan to recruit? | 0 |
|  |  |
| **6. 2** From which source and, by what means do you plan to recruit your participants? | 0 |
|  |  |
| **6.3 Participant Information** |  |
| Will you inform participants that their participation is voluntary? | 0 |
| Will you inform participants that they may withdraw from the research at any time and for any reason?] | 0 |
| Will you inform participants that their data will be treated with full confidentiality and, if published, it will not be identifiable as theirs? | 0 |
| Will you provide an information sheet which includes the contact details of the researcher / research team? | 0 |
| Will you obtain written consent for participation? | 0 |
| Will you debrief participants at the end of their participation (i.e. give them an explanation of the study aims and hypotheses)? | 0 |
| Will you provide participants with a written debriefing too? | 0 |
| If you are using a questionnaire, will you give participants the option of omitting questions that they do not want to answer? | 0 |
| If your work is experimentally based, will you describe the main experimental procedures to the participants in advance so that they are informed about what to expect? | 0 |
| If the research is observational, will you ask participants for their consent to being observed? | 0 |
|  |  |
| **6.4 Participant Consent** |  |
| Please describe the arrangements you are making to inform potential participants, before providing consent, of what is involved in participating in your study and the use of any identifiable data, and whether you have any reasons for withholding particular information. Due consideration must be given to the possibility that the provision of financial or other incentives may impair participants ability to consent voluntarily. | 0 |
| Participants should be able to provide written consent. Please describe the arrangements you are making for participants to provide their full consent before data collection begins. If you think gaining consent in this way is inappropriate for your project, please explain how consent will be obtained and recorded. (A copy of your consent form must be provided with your submitted application) | 0 |
|  |  |
| **6.5 Participant Debriefing** |  |
| It is a researchers obligation to ensure that all participants are fully informed of the aims and methodology of the project, that they feel respected and appreciated after they leave the study, and that they do not experience significant levels of stress, discomfort, or unease in relation to the research project. Please describe whether, when, and how participants will be debriefed. (A copy of your debriefing sheet must be provided with your submitted application) | 0 |
|  |  |
| **6.6 Potential risk to participants and risk management procedures** |  |
| Identify, as far as possible, all potential risks (small and large) to participants (e.g. physical, psychological, etc.) that may be associated with the proposed research. Please explain any risk management procedures that will be put in place and attach any relevant documents in the section below. Please answer as fully as possible. | 0 |
|  |  |
| Supporting Documents attached | 0 |
|  |  |
| **Section 7:** | **Data** |
| *Mandatory Section* |  |
|  |  |
| **7.1** Please describe how data will be accessed, how participants confidentiality will be protected and any other relevant considerations. Information must be provided on the full data lifecycle, from collection to archive. | The participants information will be used to inform the wider understanding of design’s (and designers) place within Humanitarian/Human Rights open source software within a wider technology and innovation context and will inform ongoing research to be produced in a final paper. No information will lead to any possible privacy breach or identification of participants. The results of the project may be used for a future extension project. The information collected from these interviews will inform the wider research on the PhD project stated in the title. Observations of the participants and organisations will be collected in the form of written/typed notes, transcription, video recording and audio recording will be located on a secure laptop owned by the researcher and a fully anonymised version will be hosted on a GitHub repository under the open source Creative Commons Legal Code Attribution-NonCommercial-ShareAlike 2.0 license for written research and GPL or Apache or MIT for any future software code written. Any subsequent written information offered by the participant/s will be located in local documents they have created, on the same secure device they own and sent to the researchers aforementioned secure device and only if they are either currently publicly accessible or written permission has been given to the researcher in order to use as evidence. This observational data is needed in order to ensure a diverse and inclusive account of how people within humanitarian and human rights organisations collaborate with design and designers on their HOSS. Without this first-hand data we're working on past examples and anecdotal data which has questionable validity. The appropriate consent forms, debrief documents, information sheets and supplementary information will be made clearly accessible to subjects of observation and there will be a process that request for removal of information or data will be complied with by the researcher. |
|  |  |
| Supporting Documents attached | 1 |
|  |  |
| **Section 8:** | **Environment** |
| *Only completed if environmental risk identified* |  |
|  |  |
| 8.1 Please provide the locations in which your research will take place, together with the anticipated risks (emissions, destruction of habitat or damage to artefacts etc.), potential damage and mitigating measures planned. | 0 |
|  |  |
| **Section 9:** | **International (non EEA)** |
| *Only completed if international risk identified* |  |
|  |  |
| **9.1** For any research conducted outside the European Economic Area (EEA) the researcher is responsible for ensuring that local ethical considerations are complied with and that the relevant permissions are sought. Please state the location(s) in which your research will take place? | These observations will take place online via open public spaces such as GitHub, GitLab and other chat platforms (IRC, Matrix, Slack, Discord etc.) and/or on video calls via Zoom or another similar, Open Source/Decentralised option of video call software. Therefore participants involved in observations will be located in their own countries/locations which I anticipate are listed below. Due to the remote nature of this work the participants could be in these countries of origin/operation but could also be in another country location at time of the interview. I will ask for permission to capture the country they are in at the time of the interview but they may decline to answer.  Kenya Uganda USA Canada Albania India Indonesia   EEA countries are:  Germany France Netherlands |
| **9.2** Have the appropriate local ethical considerations been complied with and relevant permissions sought? | No - Intending to comply / apply |
|  |  |
| **Section 10:** | **Permissions** |
| *Mandatory Section* |  |
|  |  |
| Please use the table to record details of any licenses or permissions required and / or applied for e.g. Local Authority District, Natural England etc. Ensure you include the reference, status and the date it was granted (if applicable). | 1.Permission / License: , Awarding Body: , Reference: , Date: , Status:  2.Permission / License: , Awarding Body: , Reference: , Date: , Status:  3.Permission / License: , Awarding Body: , Reference: , Date: , Status:  4.Permission / License: , Awarding Body: , Reference: , Date: , Status:  5.Permission / License: , Awarding Body: , Reference: , Date: , Status: |
|  |  |
| Supporting Documents attached | 0 |
|  |  |
| **Section 11:** | **Risk Considerations and Insurance** |
| *Mandatory Section* |  |
|  |  |
| **11.1** What are the potential risks to the researchers themselves? This may include: personal safety issues, such as those related to lone working, out of normal hours working or to visiting participants in their homes; travel arrangements, including overseas travel; and working in unfamiliar environments. Please explain any risk management procedures that will be put in place and note whether you will be providing any risk assessments or other supporting documents. | No personal safety risks known or foreseen for this interview project as part of the research. Minor risk that the researcher might be doxxed or verbally harassed if an observed participant is unhappy with any of the observation process. This is unlikely as most HOSS and events operate a very clear code of conduct and anti-harassment policy. |
|  |  |
| Supporting Documents attached | 0 |
|  |  |
| **Section 12:** | **Human Tissues** |
| *Only completed if Human Tissue's are being used* |  |
|  |  |
| Does your study involve “relevant materials” as defined by the Human Tissue Act (2004)\*? | N/A |
| Will you be storing the material for more than 7 days prior to either: processing the material to remove the cellular component, or transferring the material elsewhere (to non-Newcastle University premises)? | N/A |
| Have you agreed a storage location with the Designated Individual? | N/A |
| Location | 0 |
|  |  |
| **Section 13:** | **Supporting Documentation (not uploaded elsewhere)** |
| *Non-Mandatory Section* |  |
|  |  |
| Supporting Documents attached | 3 |
|  |  |
| **Section 14:** | **Admin Section** |
| *Non-Mandatory Section* |  |
|  |  |
| LimeSurvey Response ID | 16595 |
| Date Completed | 2021-12-06 22:30:21 |
| Number of Documents uploaded | 0 |
| Appropriate Review Committee | SAGE Ethics Committee |
|  |  |