



Regulations  
Faculty Ethics Assessment Committee  
Humanities  
(FEtC-H)  
Utrecht University

*This is an informal translation of a Dutch document. In the event of inconsistencies between this translation and the original Dutch version, the wording of the original Dutch version prevails.*



## Contents

1	Abbreviations and definitions .....	1
2	Purpose and objectives of FETC-H .....	4
3	Composition and appointment procedure .....	5
3.1	Chambers .....	5
3.2	Members .....	5
3.3	Chair .....	6
3.4	Secretary .....	6
3.5	Executive committee .....	6
3.6	Internal and external experts .....	6
4	Research to be assessed .....	8
4.1	Human-related research .....	8
4.2	Human-related big data research .....	8
4.3	Applications approved elsewhere .....	8
4.4	Research by students .....	8
4.5	Amendments .....	9
4.6	Research proposals (preliminary assessment) .....	9
4.7	Post-hoc advice .....	9
4.8	Medical scientific research .....	9
5	Assessment .....	11
5.1	Framework .....	11
5.2	Criteria .....	11
5.2.1	Adequate information for participants and gatekeepers .....	11
5.2.2	Acceptable burden and risks for participants .....	11
5.2.3	Adequate data management .....	12
6	Assessment procedure .....	13
6.1	Approval .....	13
6.2	Research: short route .....	13
6.3	Research: long route .....	13
6.4	Revision .....	13
6.5	Amendment .....	14
6.6	Applications approved elsewhere .....	14
6.6.1	Within the EEA (EU plus Norway, Iceland and Liechtenstein) .....	14
6.6.2	Outside the EEA (EU plus Norway, Iceland and Liechtenstein) .....	14
6.7	Research proposals .....	14



6.8	Period of validity.....	14
7	Confidentiality and impartiality .....	15
7.1	Confidentiality .....	15
7.2	Impartiality .....	15
8	Meetings .....	16
9	Documentation.....	17
9.1	Applications.....	17
9.2	Correspondence .....	17
9.3	Minutes .....	17
9.4	Annual report .....	17
10	Complaints procedure .....	18
10.1	Researchers .....	18
10.2	Participants .....	18
10.3	Disputes .....	18
10.3.1	External reviewer .....	18
10.3.2	Escalation ladder.....	18
	Appendix A. Criteria for long-route research.....	20



## 1 Abbreviations and definitions

Term	Definition
agreement	an ethical condition for the responsible collection and processing of participants' data; not to be confused with consent (see 'consent').
application	description of the proposed research as submitted to the FEtC-H, including accompanying documents for participants and, where applicable, gatekeepers
consent	one of the legal bases for the lawful collection and processing of data from natural persons (GDPR, Article 6.1.a) (in addition to other possible legal bases, see 'consent' in the <a href="#">UU Privacy Handbook<sup>1</sup></a> )
declaration of agreement	declaration in which a participant or gatekeeper declares their agreement with a proposal from the researcher (this may also be a student).
declaration of consent	declaration in which the researcher declares that they have adequately informed the participant, and in which the participant declares that they have been adequately informed and, based on the information provided, consents to participate in the research
EEA	European Economic Area: EU plus Norway, Iceland and Liechtenstein
EU	European Union
FEtC-H	Faculty Ethics Assessment Committee Humanities
gatekeeper	a person who can grant you access to a particular group of participants, e.g. the management of a school, the director of a museum, the leader of a religious community, or an administrator of a private online community.
human-related research	research involving participants with whom the researcher has direct or indirect contact
human-related big data research	research involving data originating from natural persons that has already been collected digitally elsewhere.  Big data research in which those persons are not (directly) approached by the researcher to provide data does not need to be assessed. The <a href="#">MBDO Self-</a>

---

<sup>1</sup> <https://utrechtuniversity.github.io/dataprivacyhandbook/informed-consent-forms.html>



**Term**

**Definition**

	<a href="#">Reflection Guide</a> <sup>2</sup> has been drawn up as a guide for researchers. Examples: data obtained from sources such as mobile phones, smart devices, social media, transaction data or sensors.
information letter	letter to (parent/guardian of) participant or to a gatekeeper, such as the board of an (educational) institution, explaining the research
MBDO	human-related big data research (in Dutch: mensgebonden big-data-onderzoek)
participant	the person who is subject to actions or to whom a certain course of conduct is imposed by the researcher (and, if applicable, the PhD candidate/student) (also referred to as 'test subjects', 'respondents', 'informants', 'observed persons', 'data subjects', etc.)
public interest	one of the legal bases for the lawful collection and processing of data from natural persons (GDPR, Article 6.1.e) (in addition to other possible legal bases, see 'public interest' in the <a href="#">UU Data Privacy Handbook</a> <sup>3</sup> )
research, short route	research that is set up in accordance with the usual standards within the research field, in which no vulnerable groups are involved, no special personal data is collected and there is no deception; see also <i>Appendix A. Criteria for long-route research</i>
research, long route	research that does not meet the definition of short-route research; see <i>Appendix A. Criteria for long-route research</i>
researcher	someone who has obtained a PhD and is appointed to the Faculty of Humanities (and who can approve applications prepared by PhD candidates and/or students for submission).
research project	research consisting of one or more studies, see 'study'.
study	research that is defined in terms of content and time and aims to answer a specific research question, with specific participant groups and specific methods. A study may consist of several trajectories, see 'trajectory'.

---

<sup>2</sup> <https://fetc-gw.wp.hum.uu.nl/en/human-based-big-data-research/>

<sup>3</sup> <https://utrechtuniversity.github.io/dataprivacyhandbook/public-interest.html>



**Term**

trajectory

UU

vulnerable

WMO

**Definition**

part of a study (see above) with a specific group of participants for whom a specific information letter must be drawn up.

Utrecht University

with reduced resilience or increased risk; this concerns, for example, persons with relevant syndromes (e.g. aphasia, dyslexia, or autism), persons lacking legal capacity, minors, refugees, newcomers, prisoners, homeless persons, persons with dementia, and persons from socially disadvantaged groups (e.g. from ethnic, cultural or sexual minorities)

Medical Research Involving Human Subjects Act (in Dutch: Wet medisch-wetenschappelijk onderzoek met mensen)



## 2 Purpose and objectives of FEtC-H

The Faculty Ethics Review Committee for Humanities (FEtC-H) is an independent committee established by the board of the Faculty of Humanities on 1 January 2019.

**The purpose** of the FEtC-H is to promote and facilitate ethically responsible conduct by faculty staff with regard to the rights, safety and well-being of participants in scientific research. The FEtC-H ensures careful and impartial ethical review of scientific research on the basis of the research protocol submitted, the applicable disciplinary professional guidelines and the relevant legislation and regulations.

The FEtC-H is **responsible** for providing independent assessment of individual studies for ethical admissibility insofar as these are conducted under the direct or indirect responsibility of the Faculty of Humanities at Utrecht University (indirectly in the case of external PhD candidates with a supervisor at the Faculty of Humanities).

In its assessment, the FEtC-H considers whether the burden on and risks to the participants outweigh the benefits of the knowledge sought through the research.

By (co-)organising training courses and workshops and publishing guidelines, checklists and template documents, the FEtC-H contributes to the provision of information and the professionalisation of researchers in the field of ethically responsible human-related research.

The FEtC-H provides the Vice-Dean of Research and Impact with solicited and unsolicited advice to promote ethically responsible human-related research within the Faculty of Humanities.



### **3 Composition and appointment procedure**

#### **3.1 Chambers**

The FETC-H consists of two chambers:

- (1) the Linguistics Chamber, where research submitted by a researcher affiliated with the Institute for Language Sciences is assessed, and
- (2) the General Chamber, where research submitted by researchers affiliated with the Institute for Cultural Studies, the Research Institute for Philosophy and Religious Studies, or the Research Institute for History and Art History is assessed.

#### **3.2 Members**

The FETC-H is composed in such a way that it has sufficient diversity in expertise to assess projects submitted for review.

The General Chamber has five permanent members (one researcher from each of the four departments of the Faculty, namely Philosophy and Religious Studies; History and Art History; Media and Cultural Studies; and Languages, Literature and Communication, and the secretary). The Linguistics Chamber has five permanent members (researchers from various research groups within the Institute for Language Sciences and the secretary). The number of members of each Chamber may be adjusted with the approval of the Vice-Dean for Research and Impact.

In addition, the FETC-H has advisory members, namely the faculty data manager(s) and the faculty privacy officer(s).

The members are appointed by the dean on the recommendation of the chair, after consultation with the relevant research director(s), taking into account the aforementioned distribution.

Permanent members (except for the secretary) are appointed for a term of three years, after which they may be reappointed for the same term. The maximum term of office for members is therefore six years.

Membership of the FETC-H shall end:

- a. upon voluntary resignation;
- b. upon termination of employment at the faculty;
- c. upon expiry of the term of appointment.

Other than at their own request, the board may only dismiss a member of the FETC-H prematurely on the basis of a reasoned recommendation by at least two-thirds of the members of the relevant chamber:

- a. if that member fails to fulfil the obligations arising from membership or chairmanship of the FETC-H; or
- b. if that member must be considered to have lost the ability to perform their duties due to their mental state.

After an absence of at least one three-year term, a researcher may rejoin the FETC-H.



### 3.3 Chair

The faculty board appoints one of the members as chairperson on the recommendation of the members of the relevant chamber.

The chairs of the chambers chair the meetings, represent the FETC-H within and outside the organisation (e.g. in university-wide and national project/working groups and network meetings), and are involved in or take the initiative to develop policy on matters concerning the FETC-H.

The chairperson is appointed by the dean. The chairperson is appointed for a term of three years, after which reappointment for the same term is possible. The maximum term of office for the chairperson is therefore six years.

The terms of office for a member and for the chair are not related, but in the event of succession in these roles, a maximum term of office of nine years applies to the member concerned.

### 3.4 Secretary

The secretary is appointed by the faculty board for an indefinite period and is also a member of both chambers.

The secretary assesses applications, monitors assessment deadlines and communicates decisions to the researcher and, if applicable, to the PhD candidate/student. The secretary prepares the meetings, draws up the agenda in consultation with the chair and is responsible for reporting on the meetings. The secretary draws up annual reports together with the chairpersons and represents the FETC-H within and outside the organisation (e.g. in university-wide and national project/working groups and network meetings).

### 3.5 Executive committee

The executive committee of the FETC-H consists of the chairs of both chambers and the secretary. The executive committee meets when necessary.

This executive committee is responsible for:

- preparing consultations with the vice-dean for research and impact,
- drafting the annual report,
- preparing and discussing policy proposals within the FETC-H's field of activity
- discussing complex applications, WOO requests (i.e., requests for information under the Dutch Open Government Act) and similar matters.

### 3.6 Internal and external experts

The FETC-H may seek advice from internal and external experts (from within and outside the Faculty of Humanities, respectively) if this is necessary for sound and careful judgement. To this end, the experts may be invited to provide written advice and/or to participate in the deliberations of the FETC-H.

With regard to the external experts of the FETC-H, the provisions of Chapter 7, *Confidentiality and impartiality* concerning confidentiality and the disclosure of ancillary



positions apply mutatis mutandis.

If an expert is called upon on an incidental basis, the chair or secretary shall ensure that the expert has no interest in the investigation in question and does not perform any relevant secondary functions in that context.

The external experts shall only have access to those documents from the file made available by the FEtC-H on which advice is to be given.



## 4 Research to be assessed

### 4.1 Human-related research

Any research in which data from participants is collected and which is carried out by researchers (or, if applicable, PhD students/students) under the responsibility of the Faculty of Humanities requires the approval of the FETC-H. In order to obtain approval, an application must be submitted, under the final responsibility of a (PhD) researcher, via the [FETC-H portal](#)<sup>4</sup>. The recruitment of participants and/or data collection can only start after the FETC-H has approved the relevant application, i.e. after the researcher has received a formal letter of approval from the FETC-H. See also the sections 6.2 *Research: short route* and 6.3 *Research: long route*.

### 4.2 Human-related big data research

Human-related big data research is not assessed by the FETC-H. As a guide for researchers, an MBDO Self-Reflection Guide<sup>5</sup> has been drawn up for this type of research. However, the FETC-H can be contacted for advice.<sup>6</sup>

### 4.3 Applications approved elsewhere

Applications approved elsewhere for studies that are also carried out at, or at least under the responsibility of, the Faculty of Humanities, must be submitted to the FETC-H for review. This does not apply to research approved by the ethics review committee of another faculty within Utrecht University.

For research approved elsewhere, an application must be submitted in the FETC-H portal, with documents for participants and, if applicable, for gatekeepers. These documents must meet the same standards with regard to ethics, data management and privacy as the sample documents made available by the FETC-H via its website and intranet. See also section 6.6 *Applications approved elsewhere*.

### 4.4 Research by students

Research conducted by students as part of their final project, thesis or internship (BA and MA) will only be submitted to the FETC-H for review in specific cases. The supervising lecturer is ultimately responsible for the research carried out by students under their supervision. This applies to the design and implementation of human-related research by students, which includes: the ethical considerations, data management and privacy aspects of the research carried out by the student. For more information, see the [lecturer's guide](#)<sup>7</sup> (intranet). Students are responsible for complying with the agreements made with their lecturers.

The specific cases are:

- research that the student and/or supervisor wishes to publish in a scientific journal or book, for which ethical approval of the research is required;

---

<sup>4</sup> <https://fetc.hum.uu.nl/>

<sup>5</sup> <https://fetc-gw.wp.hum.uu.nl/en/human-based-big-data-research/>

<sup>6</sup> <https://fetc-gw.wp.hum.uu.nl/mensgebonden-big-data-onderzoek/>

<sup>7</sup> <https://intranet.uu.nl/kennisbank/als-je-student-mensgebonden-onderzoek-doet>



- additional research in the context of a research project (by the lecturer) for which approval has been granted by the FETC-H.

If, in these cases, educational constraints make it impossible to submit a research proposal to the FETC-H *in advance*, the research must still be submitted to the FETC-H *as soon as possible*, and in any case *before the findings are written up for scientific publication*. Supervisors have a special responsibility to closely monitor the ethical aspects of student research that has not yet been assessed by the FETC-H. See also section 4.7 *Post-hoc advice*.

## 4.5 Amendments

Changes to an approved study, such as changes in the population of participants, in the burden or risks for participants, in the recruitment of participants, in data collection, or in the documents to be used, must be re-evaluated by the FETC-H. For example, an amendment must be submitted if an application has been approved, but before or after a pilot study it becomes apparent that the study needs to be set up differently.

These changes must be submitted as an amendment to the relevant chamber. See also section 6.5 *Amendment*.

## 4.6 Research proposals (preliminary assessment)

Research proposals for (awarded) grant applications can be assessed by the FETC-H. NB: this assessment does not give the researcher approval to actually carry out the research. Once the grant has been awarded, separate approval must be obtained for each study (i.e. each (sub)study) in the research proposal, see section 4.1 *Human-related research*. See also section 6.7 *Research proposals*.

## 4.7 Post-hoc advice

No formal approval can be given for a research application for which participant recruitment has already started, or for which data collection has already started or has been completed. In such cases, the FETC-H issues a post-hoc opinion: if the research had been assessed in advance, it would/would not have been approved.

## 4.8 Medical scientific research

Research that falls under the WMO (WMO-regulated research) must be approved by a legally recognised Medical Ethics Review Committee (METC), and not by the FETC-H. Research falls under the WMO if two criteria are met:

1. It is medical scientific research, and
2. Individuals are subjected to procedures or rules of conduct are imposed on them.

Re 1: "Medical scientific research is research that aims to answer a question in the field of disease and health (aetiology, pathogenesis, phenomena/symptoms, diagnosis, prevention, outcome or treatment of disease) by systematically collecting and studying data. The research aims to contribute to medical knowledge that is also applicable to



populations outside the immediate research population."<sup>8</sup>. Research aimed at answering a non-medical research question is therefore not considered medical scientific research and is therefore not subject to the WMO.

Re 2: "In practice, research involving human subjects is only subject to the Act if it infringes in some way on the physical and/or psychological integrity of the test subject."<sup>9</sup>

Research that is subject to the WMO must be reported to and approved by the [METC Utrecht](https://www.metc.utrecht.nl)<sup>10</sup>, and not by the FETC-H.

---

<sup>8</sup> <https://www.ccmo.nl/onderzoekers/wet-en-regelgeving-voor-medisch-wetenschappelijk-onderzoek/uw-onderzoek-wmo-plichtig-of-niet>

<sup>9</sup> <https://www.ccmo.nl/onderzoekers/wet-en-regelgeving-voor-medisch-wetenschappelijk-onderzoek/uw-onderzoek-wmo-plichtig-of-niet>

<sup>10</sup> <https://www.metcutrecht.nl>



## 5 Assessment

### 5.1 Framework

The FEtC-H assesses the ethical aspects of proposed research within the framework formed by all applicable international and Dutch legislation and regulations and ethical guidelines of the various professional fields. See the relevant [page of the FEtC-H website<sup>11</sup>](#).

### 5.2 Criteria

The FEtC-H assesses whether a proposed study meets the requirements for ethically responsible research, using three clusters of criteria:

1. Adequate information for participants and gatekeepers: see section 5.2.1 below.
2. Acceptable burden and risks for participants: see section 5.2.2 below.
3. Adequate data management: see section 5.2.3 below.

In order to design ethically responsible research, applicants must have a basic understanding of relevant concepts. These concepts are listed, with references to explanations, on the [relevant page of FEtC-H website<sup>12</sup>](#).

#### 5.2.1 Adequate information for participants and gatekeepers

Participants must first be adequately informed about the research in which they will participate and must then be able to voluntarily agree to participate in that research. This agreement is necessary from an ethical perspective.

The FEtC-H provides researchers with [examples<sup>13</sup>](#) of adequate information provision (information letters and/or declaration of agreement/consent) for different situations. All documents must be understandable to the target group.

#### 5.2.2 Acceptable burden and risks for participants

The starting point for human-related research is the *do-no-harm* principle. The burden and risks for the subjects must be acceptable, reasonably proportionate to the expected benefits of the research, and reasonably proportionate to any compensation. In addition, the researcher must take into account, among other things, the burden in terms of time spent, work performed, physical discomfort or inconvenience (e.g. prolonged sitting, standing or lying down), and the risks of loss of privacy, adverse effects during and after the research (e.g. loss of self-confidence, loss of impartiality when participating in future research, negative stereotyping).

Where applicable, the burden and risks for third parties must also be taken into account; this may apply, for example, to recorded conversations in which the privacy of third parties (persons mentioned in the conversation between the researcher or, where applicable, the PhD candidate/student and the participant) may be violated.

---

<sup>11</sup> <https://fetc-gw.wp.hum.uu.nl/en/legal-provisions-and-discipline-specific-codes-of-conduct/>

<sup>12</sup> <https://fetc-gw.wp.hum.uu.nl/en/before-you-submit-an-application/>

<sup>13</sup> <https://intranet.uu.nl/en/knowledgebase/documents-ethics-assessment-committee-humanities>



When considering the burden and risks for participants, the researcher must also take into account possible *unexpected* (incidental) findings: for example, a study may reveal that a participant has committed a crime, or that a participant has a previously unknown disability (e.g. low reading skills). The researcher must also take these risks into account.

In some studies, it is not possible to inform participants in advance about the purpose of the study, because that information will undesirably influence their behaviour. In such cases, it may be necessary not to fully inform participants or even to mislead them about the purpose of the research. Participants must then be properly informed about the research in which they participated after it has been completed and must be given the opportunity to withdraw their previously given consent (to participate and, if applicable, to process their personal data). The collected data must be destroyed. Such *deception* places an additional burden on participants and should be taken into account as such.

### 5.2.3 Adequate data management

Researchers and, where applicable, the PhD candidate/student, must carefully store, manage and archive the collected data in accordance with the information provided to the participants and in accordance with the [faculty policy on data management](https://intranet.uu.nl/en/knowledgebase/data-management-policy-faculty-of-humanities)<sup>14</sup>.

---

<sup>14</sup> <https://intranet.uu.nl/en/knowledgebase/data-management-policy-faculty-of-humanities>



## 6 Assessment procedure

The FETC-H assessment procedure is carried out as carefully as possible in accordance with the criteria set out in Article 5.2. The assessment deadlines are also observed as far as possible. As the number of applications is unpredictable and may fluctuate over time, the FETC-H reserves the right to deviate from the stated target deadlines.

### 6.1 Approval

The recruitment of participants and/or data collection can only start after the FETC-H has approved the relevant application, i.e. after the researcher has received a formal letter of approval from the FETC-H. For all applications, the researcher and, if applicable, the PhD candidate/student, must take into account the timelines mentioned below and possible reassessments after revision in their planning. If you have any questions about the GDPR or data management, please consult the [faculty privacy officer](#)<sup>15</sup> and the faculty [data manager](#)<sup>16</sup> before submitting an application to the FETC-H.

### 6.2 Research: short route

Research that, based on the description, is likely to meet the usual requirements of responsible humanities research will be assessed by two members of the relevant chamber. The aim is to provide an assessment within four weeks. If these assessors have doubts about the application, if the application is too complex, or if no agreement is reached between the two members, the application will be discussed by the entire chamber at its next meeting.

### 6.3 Research: long route

Research that is *not* assessed as short route research during the initial screening in the FETC-H portal, or which is determined during the procedure not to be such research, is considered long route research by the FETC-H (see *Appendix A. Criteria for long-route research* for an indication of the criteria used). This means that the application will be discussed by the entire chamber at its next meeting. The meeting dates are published on the FETC-H website. Applications must be submitted at least one week prior to the meeting. The chamber in question will decide on the admissibility of the application by a majority of the votes cast. Decisions can only be taken at a meeting attended by at least half of the members, including the chair and/or the secretary. However, the chair may decide that, in exceptional cases, a written contribution from an absent member is sufficient for the decision-making process.

### 6.4 Revision

Revisions are assessed by members of the relevant chamber outside the meeting of that chamber. In the case of minor corrections, the opinion of the secretary is sufficient. The chairperson and/or secretary may also decide to submit a revision to the next meeting of the relevant chamber. The aim is to give an assessment of a revision within three weeks.

---

<sup>15</sup> [privacy.gw@uu.nl](mailto:privacy.gw@uu.nl)

<sup>16</sup> [datamanagement.gw@uu.nl](mailto:datamanagement.gw@uu.nl)



If revisions remain open for more than six months (no revision received after comments have been sent by FETC-H) and if the researcher has not made a valid request for postponement, the application will be closed and a new application must be submitted.

## **6.5 Amendment**

See also section 4.5 *Amendments*. Amendments are assessed by two members of the relevant chamber. The aim is to provide an assessment of an amendment within four weeks.

## **6.6 Applications approved elsewhere**

### **6.6.1 Within the EEA (EU plus Norway, Iceland and Liechtenstein)**

Applications that have been approved by an ethics review committee of a research institution or college or university within the European Economic Area (EEA) are treated as short-route research, see section 6.2 *Research: short route*.

### **6.6.2 Outside the EEA (EU plus Norway, Iceland and Liechtenstein)**

Applications approved by an ethics review committee of a research institution or university outside the European Economic Area (EEA) will be treated as long-route research, see section 6.3 *Research: long route*.

## **6.7 Research proposals**

If required by the funding body, research proposals for (awarded) grant applications may be assessed by the FETC-H. These applications are assessed by (at least) two members of the relevant chamber, with the aim of sending a decision to the researcher within four weeks.

## **6.8 Period of validity**

The approval by the FETC-H of a proposed study remains valid until the end date or completion of the study specified in the application. In the event of changes in the population of participants, in the burden or risks for participants, in the recruitment of participants, in data collection, or in the documents to be used (such as the information letter), the approval will lapse. Such changes require an amendment (see section 4.5 *Amendments*).



## **7 Confidentiality and impartiality**

### **7.1 Confidentiality**

The FETC-H reports confidentially to the researcher and, if applicable, the PhD candidate/student.

The chair and members of the FETC-H are obliged to maintain confidentiality regarding information that comes to the FETC-H's attention in the performance of its duties and whose confidentiality is explicitly indicated or implicitly apparent from the nature of the information.

The duty of confidentiality continues after termination of membership of the FETC-H.

The duty of confidentiality also applies to other persons involved in the performance of one of the tasks of the FETC-H.

Upon termination of their membership of the FETC-H, members shall destroy any (digital) documents in their possession relating to the activities of the FETC-H.

### **7.2 Impartiality**

In order to avoid conflicts of interest, members of the FETC-H who are involved in any way in a specific application will not participate in the decision-making process for that application. If the application is to be discussed at a meeting, the member concerned will temporarily leave the meeting when the application is discussed.

Where relevant, the chairmanship of the meeting will also be temporarily transferred to a member who is not involved in that research proposal. If a chairperson is involved in an application, the chairperson of the other chamber will sign the formal letter of approval (a.i.).

Members of the FETC-H do not perform any additional functions that are incompatible with the proper performance of their duties and that could compromise their impartiality and the confidence therein. To this end, they disclose all ancillary functions that are incompatible with the proper performance of their duties as members of the FETC-H to the faculty board.



## 8 Meetings

Each of the two chambers meets every four weeks. If necessary, the executive committee may deviate from the fixed meeting schedule.

The secretary convenes the meetings and, in consultation with the chair, sets the agenda. The secretary then ensures that the members of the relevant chamber receive the agenda and other meeting documents in good time. See also section 3.4 *Secretary*.

The meeting schedule is public.

The meetings are closed to the public. The secretary is responsible for taking minutes of the meetings. The minutes are approved at the next meeting, after any necessary changes have been made. The approved minutes are confidential.

The FETC-H provides for ethical review by a minimum quorum of permanent members: for short-route research, two of the permanent members, see also section 6.2 *Research: short route*; for long-route research, at least half of the members, including the chair and/or the secretary, see also section 6.3 *Research: long route*.

If the chamber deems it desirable, it will give the researcher who submitted the application and/or, if applicable, the PhD candidate/student, the opportunity to explain the application at a meeting of the chamber concerned.

If necessary, the FETC-H will consult with other scientific advisory committees from other universities and/or the UU, such as the [University Committee on Scientific Integrity](https://www.uu.nl/en/organisation/talk-in-confidence-report-or-file-a-complaint/talking-to-someone-about-research-integrity)<sup>17</sup>.

---

<sup>17</sup> <https://www.uu.nl/en/organisation/talk-in-confidence-report-or-file-a-complaint/talking-to-someone-about-research-integrity>



## 9 Documentation

### 9.1 Applications

Applications and accompanying documents (including information letters and/or declarations of agreement and/or consent) must be submitted via the [FETC-H portal](#)<sup>18</sup>. The portal is the official repository for applications. Approved applications are placed in a semi-public section of the portal and can be viewed by anyone with a Solis ID at the Faculty of Humanities. Information about approved applications (reference number, title, date of approval and room) is also posted on the [FETC-H website](#)<sup>19</sup>.

### 9.2 Correspondence

Correspondence regarding applications should be sent to the FETC-H mailbox, [fetc-gw@uu.nl](mailto:fetc-gw@uu.nl).

### 9.3 Minutes

The minutes of each meeting are stored on a secure UU server.

### 9.4 Annual report

Both chambers jointly report annually to the faculty board on their activities in the previous calendar year.

---

<sup>18</sup> <https://fetc.hum.uu.nl/>

<sup>19</sup> <https://fetc-gw.wp.hum.uu.nl/en/approved-applications/>



## 10 Complaints procedure

### 10.1 Researchers

In accordance with the provisions of the Dutch General Administrative Law Act (Algemene wet bestuursrecht, Awb; [chapter 9](#) (Dutch only)<sup>20</sup>) regarding the handling of complaints, the FETC-H provides for an internal complaints procedure. In the first instance, objections can be lodged with the relevant chamber, and in the second instance with the faculty board.

### 10.2 Participants

The information letter must state:

- that participants who wish to lodge a complaint about the way in which this research is conducted can contact the secretary of the FETC-H, email: [fetc-gw@uu.nl](mailto:fetc-gw@uu.nl);
- that participants who have a complaint or question about the processing of their personal data can contact the privacy department of the UU ([privacy@uu.nl](mailto:privacy@uu.nl)) or the data protection officer ([fg@uu.nl](mailto:fg@uu.nl)) and that they can also help them exercise their rights under the GDPR;
- that participants who still have a complaint or question about the processing of their personal data after following the above procedure can contact the [Dutch Data Protection Authority](#)<sup>21</sup>.

### 10.3 Disputes

#### 10.3.1 External reviewer

If the FETC-H considers that an application for future research or research that has already commenced poses risks to the participants and/or the researcher(s) and, where applicable, the PhD candidate/student and/or the Faculty of Humanities, and where the FETC-H cannot reach agreement with the researcher on how to minimise these risks, the FETC-H may consult a reviewer. This reviewer is not a member of the FETC-H.

#### 10.3.2 Escalation ladder

If the FETC-H identifies serious risks and is unable to reach agreement with the researcher on how to minimise these risks, or if, after consulting the external advisor (see section 10.3.1 External reviewer), the FETC-H still identifies the risks mentioned therein, the following steps may be taken:

- i. The FETC-H (through the chair of the relevant chamber) reports this dispute to the relevant research director;
- ii. the relevant research director may escalate the matter to the Vice-Dean of Research and Impact;

---

<sup>20</sup> <https://ssr.nl/over-ssr/regelingen/klachtenregeling/algemene-wet-bestuursrecht-hoofdstuk-9-klachtbehandeling/>

<sup>21</sup> <https://www.autoriteitpersoonsgegevens.nl/en>



- iii. The Vice-Dean of Research and Impact may escalate the matter to the Dean of the Faculty of Humanities.



## Appendix A. Criteria for long-route research

The FETC-H strives to assess research as quickly and efficiently as possible, and therefore distinguishes between short-route and long-route research (see the sections 6.2 *Research: short route* and 6.3 *Research: long route* ). The FETC-H portal *automatically* determines, based on a number of criteria, whether an application is likely to be a short route investigation (in which case it will be reviewed by two members on an accelerated basis) or not.

An application will be assessed in the long route in the following cases:

- a. there exists a hierarchical relationship between the researcher or co-researchers and, if applicable, the PhD candidate/student on the one hand and the participant(s) on the other, for example: teacher–student, practitioner–client, dual role researcher (this may also be a student);
- b. participants belong to a potentially vulnerable group;
- c. special personal data is collected;
- d. the researcher indicates that (or has doubts about whether) the research, in part or as a whole, is so burdensome that, *despite the consent obtained*, it could raise questions about ethically responsible research;
- e. the *total* duration of the tasks in the session, excluding breaks and other non-task elements, exceeds the target maximum for that age group (see table):

Age group (years)	Maximum total task duration (minutes)
0 to 3	20
4 to 5	40
6 to 11	60
12 to 17	90
18 to 69	120
70 or older	60

- f. the researcher indicates that (or has doubts about whether) the risks of psychological, physical or other harm from participating in the research are *more than* minimal;
- g. the research uses deception.