



# Western Research

## NMREB Initial Application

### 1.1

1.1 \*If this is the first time you are submitting this particular submission to the REB, select "Initial Submission". If this submission has already been reviewed by the REB and they issued recommendations, select "Response to REB recommendations":

- Initial Submission
- Response to REB recommendations

### 1.2

1.2 \*Complete the Principal Investigator (PI) details:

*Prefix	*First Name	*Last Name
<input type="text" value="Dr."/>	<input type="text" value="Martin"/>	<input type="text" value="Horak"/>
Address	<input type="text"/>	
	<input type="text"/>	
City	<input type="text"/>	
Province/State	<input type="text"/>	
Postcode/Zip	<input type="text"/>	
Telephone	<input type="text" value="x. 85002"/>	
*Email	<input type="text" value="mhorak@uwo.ca"/>	

\*Western Academic Faculty/Department:

Social Sci.-Political Science

Hospital Department/Division:

N/A

### 1.3

1.3 \*Are there any additional study team members (from Western and/or its affiliate institutions) who are working on this study?

- Yes there are additional study team members  
 No other study team members involved

1.3 \*Complete the following information for additional study team members (from Western and or its affiliate institutions) who are working on this study:

Prefix	*First Name	*Last Name
<input type="text" value="Mr"/>	<input type="text" value="Elmond"/>	<input type="text" value="Bandauko"/>
Address	<input type="text"/> <input type="text"/>	
City	<input type="text"/>	
Province/State	<input type="text"/>	
Postcode/Zip	<input type="text"/>	
Telephone	<input type="text"/>	
*Email	<input type="text" value="@uwo.ca"/>	

1.3 \*ROLE and DUTIES assigned by the PI to this individual (e.g. John Doe - Research Assistant - involved in recruitment, interviews and analysis of data.):

This project is Mr. Bandauko's Master's Research Paper project, pursued as a requirement for the MPA program in Local Government. Mr. Bandauko is responsible for all aspects of project design and execution under my guidance and supervision. He has filled out the remainder of this application (which I have checked and approved) and, unless otherwise stated, all references to the researcher and the researcher's activities are references to him.

1.3a \*Are there additional study team members to add?

- Yes  
 No

### 1.4

Date Printed: 8 June 2018

Form Reference: NMREB Initial Application - Honk

Project ID: 111527

Principal Investigator:

1.4 \*Is this study taking place in collaboration with anyone outside Western University and/or its affiliate institutions?

- Yes
- No

## 1.5

1.5 \*Who is the Study Sponsor?

- Industry Sponsored
- External Non-Profit
- External PI
- Local PI
- Self

## 1.6

1.6 \*Is this a student project?

- No
- Yes-Undergraduate
- Yes-Masters
- Yes-PhD
- Yes-Other

## 1.7

1.7 \*Is this research study supported by the United States federal government (including a study funded by a US government agency)?

- Yes
- No

## 1.8

1.8 \*Enter the complete study title:

Civic Engagement in Local Government Policy Processes: A Study of the Rethink London Plan-making Process within the Context of Collaborative Planning Framework

## 1.9

1.9 \*What is the acronym or nickname/short title for the study? (NOTE: The acronym or nickname/short title will be used to identify the study and will be included in all notifications and REB submissions.):

The Rethink London Plan-making Process

## 1.10

1.10 \*Is this study directly related to a previously approved study at this institution (e.g., is this study a sub-study, extension, rollover, subsequent to a pilot study)?

- Yes  
 No

## 1.11

1.11 \*Has the study been reviewed and approved by another REB in Canada?

- Yes  
 No

## 1.12

1.12 \*Does this study involve the London hospitals (see HELP text if you are unsure):

- No this study does not involve the London hospitals  
 Yes this study involves the London hospitals and this form has been exported from ReDA.  
 This study involves the London Hospitals but a ReDA submission has not been completed. NOTE: You cannot submit this application until the ReDA submission has FIRST been completed and you exported from ReDA to WREM.

\*As this study is not taking place in the hospital, type in "Western Research Services" in the below Search User text box:

Name

Email

## 2.1

2.1 \*Briefly describe the rationale for this study in lay language (i.e., why is this study being done)? In your response ensure to include relevant background information. Cite references using in-text citations where appropriate and add the reference list as a separate attachment:

Collaborative approaches to decision-making and planning processes have been widely adopted in other countries, and there is now a growing body of empirical examples and evaluative literature (Leach et al. 2002, Gunton 2003, Frame et al. 2004, Sabatier et al. 2005, Ansell and Gash 2008, Innes and Booher 2010, Morton et al. 2012). Evidence from case studies of collaborative approaches show these processes can generate higher quality, and more creative and durable agreements that are more successfully implemented due to increased public buy-in and reduced conflict. Collaboration can generate social capital, by facilitating improved relationships between stakeholders, generating new stakeholder networks, enhancing communication skills, and co-producing new knowledge with stakeholders (Morton et al. 2011, Podestá et al. 2013). However, collaborative processes are a relatively recent phenomenon, particularly when compared with historical planning and decision-making processes. It is important to apply an evaluative framework to assess the strengths and weaknesses of the Rethink London plan-making process in order to understand how knowledge generated from public engagement and deliberation can be used to develop a legitimate and implementable plan. By so doing, the study makes practical policy contributions to collaborative planning and public governance in local governments. An assessment of the Rethink London process can generate insights and lessons that can be useful for the City of London's drive towards engaged, deliberative and collaborative decision making processes in line with its strategic vision.

Upload any reference sources (if applicable):

## 2.2

2.2 \*Indicate your general research questions and/or hypotheses:

- (a) To what extent did the London plan process exemplify the tenets of collaborative planning?
- (b) To what extent was the Rethink London inclusive of all stakeholders?
- (c) Does public engagement lead to changes in ultimate policies and plan or does it simply legitimize policies?
- (d) To what extent were stakeholders satisfied with the engagement process?

## 2.3

2.3 \*Indicate your study design and methodology by checking off all relevant designs below:

- Quantitative
- Qualitative
- Mixed methods
- Survey research
- Pilot study/proof of concept
- Secondary data
- Cross-sectional
- Longitudinal
- Randomized
- Observational
- Experimental
- Community-based
- Other

## 2.4

2.4 \*Describe your study procedures (i.e., how are you doing it?):

This Study is being conducted in two stages. First, I started by reviewing Literature and background papers to the Rethink London process including Council Reports and Discussion papers that were prepared out of the public engagement process of the policy-making process. Second, I then prepared a set of questions to address the research questions. The interview questions were drafted taking into account the Collaborative Planning Framework, which I intend to use as an analytical framework for this study. The interviews will be conducted with the Rethink Planning Team from the City of London's Planning and Development Division, Councillors who sit on the Planning and Environment Committee and Policy and Strategic Priorities Committee; the project consultant (Lura Consulting staff); Representatives of the development industry such as the London Development Institute among others; and representatives of Residents Groups such as the Urban League of London.

The key informant interviews will be held at the respondents' offices. For example with the Rethink London Planning team, the semi-structured interviews will be done at the London City Hall. The same applies to elected officials. I will also book interview appointments with representatives of the development industry, community organizations, and interest groups and conduct them separately at their respective organizational offices. Lura Consulting is based in Toronto and thus, I will conduct the interviews telephonically. The interview time will be approximately 45 minutes to 1 hour. During the process of data analysis, there shall be follow-ups where necessary to ensure that the research question is sufficiently answered.

## 2.5

2.5 \*Indicate which of the following study instruments will be used in this study:

- Paper survey(s)/Questionnaire(s)
- Online survey(s)/Questionnaire(s)
- Interview(s) Guide
- Focus group(s) Guide
- Non-participant Observation Guide
- Participant Observation Guide
- Other (e.g., visual/auditory stimuli, data collection forms, etc.)
- None

\*Will the interview be audio-recorded?

- Yes
- No

\*Who will transcribe the audio-recordings from the interview(s)?

I will be responsible for transcribing the interviews.

\*Is audio-recording optional or mandatory for the interview(s)?

- Mandatory
- Optional

How will you record the data if participants do not agree to be audio-recorded in the interview(s)?

I would be taking notes in case the respondents do not give consent to be audio-recorded

**Please note that your document name will appear on the approval notices. Ensure you name your document something that reflects what the document is (e.g., debriefing script, date). Avoid using slang, student names, etc. Upload only the clean version here (i.e., not the tracked copy). Do not include "clean" in the document name.**

\*Upload the interview guide attachment (including the general questions/probes):

Type	Name	File Name	Date	Version	Size
Interview Guide	Key Informant Guide_Rethink London Plan-Making Process_Project ID_111 527	Key Informant Guide_Rethink London Plan-Making Process_Project ID_111 527.docx	13/May/2018 12:00:00 AM	2	25.1 KB

\*Of the study instruments being used, clarify which ones are not standardized instruments:

None.

## 2.6

2.6 \*Do you have any supplementary tables or figures to accompany your study procedures description?

- Yes  
 No

## 2.7

2.7 \*Do you have a separate protocol/research plan?

- Yes  
 No

## 2.8

2.8 \*Does this study include any deception or withholding of key information?

- Yes  
 No

## 2.9

2.9 \*Will a debriefing be given to participants in this study?

- Yes  
 No

2.10

---

2.10 \*Will this research take place in a K-12 classroom system or child-care system?

- Yes  
 No

2.13

---

2.13 \*What is the anticipated number of participants and/or what will be the rationale/decision-making framework for ending sampling?

I plan to interview between 10 to 12 key informants, particularly those working in the City of London's Planning and Development Division; officials from Lura Consulting; Elected Councillors; Officials from the Development Industries and Interest Groups. I would end the sampling when I feel the respondents selected represent the spectrum of the key stakeholders involved in the Rethink London process.

2.14

---

2.14 \*What are the inclusion/exclusion criteria?

The key informants to participate will be selected based on their involvement in the Rethink London process. Those that were directly involved will be targeted as they will likely provide rich insights on their experiences with the civic engagement process.

2.15

---

2.15 \*Will study participants be selected based on culture, religion, race, disability, sexual orientation, ethnicity, linguistic proficiency, sex or age?

- Yes  
 No

2.16

---



2.16 \*Will you utilize a screening form/questionnaire to determine eligibility after participants have been recruited?

- Yes
- No

## 2.17

2.17 \*Indicate how the results will be communicated to participants and other stakeholders (e.g.; advocacy groups, scientific community):

### \*To Participants

- Group Debriefing
- End of Study Letter
- Publication
- Participants will be invited to contact researchers
- No Plan
- Other

### \*To Other Stakeholders:

- Thesis/Dissertation
- Presentation(s)
- Publication
- Other
- No plan

\*Specify Other:

Research Report

## 3.1

3.1 \*What recruitment material(s)/method(s) are being used? (select all that apply):

- None
- Brochures, flyers, posters
- Newspaper ad
- Radio ad
- Telephone call script(s)
- Email script(s)
- Website (e.g. Facebook, Twitter)
- Video (recordings will not be reviewed without scripts)
- In-person recruitment
- Recruitment database (e.g. SONA)
- Third-party organization or recruitment company
- Survey Panel (e.g. Mechanical Turk)
- Snowball sampling
- Other

3.1.6a \*Specify how you have access to or will obtain potential participants' email addresses:

Publicly available contact information on the City of London's website, Lura Consulting and on the organizational websites of other stakeholders selected will be used to make preliminary contact.

3.1.6b \*Specify who is making initial contact:

I will be making the initial contact myself.

3.1.6c \*Does the person making initial contact have a relationship with the participant?

- Yes  
 No

**Please note that your document name will appear on the approval notices. Ensure you name your document something that reflects what the document is (e.g., debriefing script, date). Avoid using slang, student names, etc. Upload only the clean version here (i.e., not the tracked copy). Do not include "clean" in the document name.**

3.1.6f \*Upload email script:

Type	Name	File Name	Date	Version	Size
Recruitment Materials	Recruitment e-mail_Elmond Bandauko	Recruitment e-mail_Elmond Bandauko.docx	03/Apr/2018 12:00:00 AM	1	56.1 KB

## 4.1

4.1 \*Is a waiver of the requirement to obtain informed consent being requested for this study?

- Yes  
 No

## 4.2

4.2 \*Indicate the age and/or decision-making capacity of your participants to determine what type of consent is needed (select all that apply):

- Participants are persons aged 18 or older who do not have diminished capacity. Only participant consent is required.  
 Participants are university students (age is not relevant). Only participant consent is required.  
 Participants are aged 13-17 and I will be seeking participant consent only. I do not wish to seek parental/guardian consent.  
 Participants are aged 13-17 and I will be seeking both parental/guardian consent and participant assent.  
 Participants are aged 7-12. Both parental/guardian consent and participant assent are required.  
 Participants are under the age of 7. Parental/guardian consent is required, but formal assent is not required.  
 Participants have diminished capacity (age is not relevant). I will be seeking Substitute Decision Maker (SDM) consent and participant assent (if possible).

## 4.3

Date Printed: 8 June 2018

Form Reference: NMREB Initial Application - Honk

Project ID: 111527

Principal Investigator:

4.3 \*Which of the following forms of consent/assent will be used? (select all that apply):

- Written consent/assent (this is the default option recommended by TCPS II; it provides clear documentation of consent/assent)
- Verbal consent/assent (e.g., for a telephone interview)
- Implied consent/assent (e.g., checking an explicit box indicating consent, accessing the survey, etc.)

**Please note that your document name will appear on the approval notices. Ensure you name your document something that reflects what the document is (e.g., debriefing script, date). Avoid using slang, student names, etc. Upload only the clean version here (i.e., not the tracked copy). Do not include "clean" in the document name.**

\*Upload clean versions of all applicable written letters of information and consent and/or assent forms:

Type	Name	File Name	Date	Version	Size
Written Consent/Assent	LOI and Consent form__111527_Rethink London	LOI and Consent form__111527_Rethink London.docx	08/Jun/2018 12:00:00 AM	3	108.8 KB

#### 4.4

4.4 \*Is there a relationship between the potential participant and the person obtaining consent?

- Yes
- No

#### 4.5

4.5 \*Given your study sample, is it likely that participants may have communication difficulties (e.g., who may need translation, who are illiterate, who may have trouble understanding or producing speech) and who may require special support?

- Yes
- No

#### 5.1

5.1 \*Are there any direct benefits to study participants?

- Yes
- No

#### 5.2

5.2 \*Describe the potential benefits to society:

The Study will provide some lessons and recommendations which Municipalities in Ontario including the City of London can use in designing their community engagement processes which can help better public participation in land-use planning processes and visioning exercises. Improved community engagement processes will lead to effective governance at the local level.

5.3

5.3 Are there any foreseeable potential risks, harms, vulnerabilities or inconveniences as a result of participating in this study?

- Yes
- No

5.4

5.4 \*Is there a foreseeable likelihood that, in the course of this research, you will acquire information that is legally required to be reported (for example, abuse or neglect of a child, reports of harm to self or others, etc.)?

- Yes
- No

6.1

6.1 Based on the information in the Data Security and Confidentiality-Guidance Document, are you collecting any information for the purposes of this study (e.g., including written consent) that could reveal the participant's identity (i.e., directly or indirectly)? (see help text):

- Yes
- No

6.2

6.2 \*Identify all identifiable information that will be collected for this study. (Select all that apply):

- Full Name
- Initials
- Address
- Full Postal Code
- Partial Postal Code
- Telephone Number
- Email Address
- Full Date of Birth
- Partial Date of Birth
- IP Address
- Audio Recording (i.e., any recording of voice)
- Video Recording (i.e., any recording of a person and/or identifiable environment such as a home)
- Photographs (i.e., any photograph of a person and/or identifiable environment such as a home)
- Student Number
- Other

\*Justify Full Name:

The full name shall only be collected for communication and consent purposes only and will not be attached to interview transcripts

\*Justify Telephone Number:

The Telephone will be used to make follow up calls in case there might be information gaps during the data analysis and report writing stage.

\*Justify Email Address:

The email address will be used for scheduling interviews, that is sending the interview invitation as well as to collect signed consent in the case of telephone interviews

\*Justify Audio Recording:

Audio Recording of interviews will be useful in capturing the entirety of the discussion, without losing any useful information.

### 6.3

---

6.3 \*Indicate how study participants will be identified in the study records (e.g., study number, pseudonym):

I will use labels such as 'municipal official 3'

### 6.4

---

6.4 \*Will there be a unique code linking identifiers to the study participant?

- Yes
- No

\*Explain why the study data must remain identifiable:

Participants' identifiers are kept confidential and not directly attached to data. That is a Master List will be used to list the participants' identifiable information and labeled by their unique ID such as municipal official as stated in 6.3.

6.5

6.5 \*Indicate the extent to which the study participant is able to withdraw their data from the research study and any limitations on the withdrawal:

The participants are free to call me if they feel like withdrawing their information/data at any given point.

6.6

6.6 \*How will study participants' data be reported in the dissemination of results (e.g., aggregated data, identifiable descriptors, de-identified descriptors, co-authors, direct quotes, etc.):

I will use generic labels such as 'municipal official'

7.1

7.1 \*\*Will you be physically transporting or electronically transmitting any [identifiable or de-identified] study records outside Western and/or its affiliate institutions? (e.g., audio recordings, questionnaires, interview transcripts, signed consent forms, etc.):

- Yes
- No

7.2

7.2 \*Will the transportation or transmission of study records conform to the requirements of the Data Security and Confidentiality-Guidance Document, Section A - Transportation and Transmission of Study Records?

- Yes
- No

7.3

7.3 \*Will any individuals/groups/organizations outside of the study team have access to identifiable study records?

- Yes
- No

## 8.1

---

8.1 \*How are you storing your study records?

- Paper
- Electronic
- Both (Paper and Electronic)

## 8.2

---

8.2 \*Will the storage of study records conform to the Data Security and Confidentiality-Guidance Document, Section B - Storage, Retention and Destruction of Study Records?

- Yes
- No

## 8.3

---

8.3 \*Will someone other than the local Principal Investigator be retaining the study data?

- Yes
- No

## 8.4

---

8.4 \*Confirm that the study records will be retained by the PI for a minimum of 7 years as per regulatory guidelines (e.g., granting agency guidelines):

- Yes

## 8.5

---

8.5 \*Will you be retaining identifiable information for longer than 7 years?

- Yes
- No

## 9.1

---

9.1 \*Will participants receive any of the following? (select all that apply):

- Compensation for participation
- Incentives for participation (e.g., performance-based)
- Reimbursement for expenses that participants will accrue
- Entry into a draw
- None of the above

## 10.1

---

10.1 \*Is this study funded?

- Yes
- No

## 11.1

---

11.1 \*Will the PI or Co-Investigator(s) or anyone connected to them through their interpersonal relationship (including their partners, family members, or their former or current professional associates) receive any personal financial benefit in connection with this study?

- Yes
- No

## 11.2

---

11.2 \*Will the PI or Co-Investigator(s) or anyone connected to them through their interpersonal relationships (including their family members, friends, or their former or current professional associates) receive any personal (financial or otherwise) benefits including patent or intellectual property rights, royalty income, employment, share ownership, stock options, etc?

- Yes
- No

## 11.3

---

11.3 \*Is the PI or Co-Investigator(s) aware of any other community relationships, academic interests, financial partnerships, or economic interests (e.g., spin-off companies in which researchers have stakes or private contract research outside of the academic realm) or any other incentives that may compromise their integrity, independence or ethical duties in the conduct of the research?

- Yes
- No

## 11.4

---



11.4 \* Is the PI or Co-Investigator(s) aware of any institutional conflicts of interest (financial or non-financial) that may have an impact on the research?

- Yes
- No

## 11.5

---

11.5 \*Does the PI or Co-Investigator(s) or anyone connected to them through their interpersonal relationships (including their family members, friends, or their former or current professional associates) have any proprietary interest in the product under study or in any entity that is sponsoring or otherwise supporting the conduct of the study?

- Yes
- No

## 11.6

---

11.6 \*Will or does the PI or Co-Investigator(s) or anyone connected to them through their interpersonal relationships (including their family members, friends, or their former or current professional associates) have any association or connection with an entity that is sponsoring or otherwise interested in the outcome of the study? (e.g., consultant, advisor, board member, employee, director, etc.)

- Yes
- No

## 11.7

---

11.7 \*Are there any other real, potential or perceived conflicts of interest to declare to the REB?

- Yes
- No

## 12.1

---

12.1 12.1 \*Upload Principal Investigator Response to REB request for modification letter (if applicable):

Type	Name	File Name	Date	Version	Size
REB Response Letter	Response to REB Recommendations_Martin_Horak_Elmond Bandauko_Project ID_111527	Response to REB Recommendations_Martin_Horak_Elmond Bandauko_Project ID_111527.docx	15/May/2018 12:00:00 AM		23.5 KB
REB Response Letter	RESPONSE to REB Recommendations_Martin_Horak_Elmond Bandauko_Project ID_111527	RESPONSE to REB Recommendations_Martin_Horak_Elmond Bandauko_Project ID_111527.docx	27/May/2018 12:00:00 AM	2	24.9 KB
REB Response Letter	RESPONSE to REB Recommendations_Martin_Horak_Elmond Bandauko_Project ID_111527 (1)	RESPONSE to REB Recommendations_Martin_Horak_Elmond Bandauko_Project ID_111527 (1).docx	08/Jun/2018 12:00:00 AM	3	25.8 KB

## 12.2

12.2 If changes have been made to a previously submitted consent/assent form at the request of the REB, please upload track-changes versions of all proposed consent and/or assent forms (e.g. screening, main, optional), if applicable:

Type	Name	File Name	Date	Version	Size
Tracked Changes Document	LOI and Consent form_Project ID_111527	LOI and Consent form_Project ID_111527.docx	08/Jun/2018 12:00:00 AM	3	109.9 KB

## 12.3

12.3 If changes have been made to a previously submitted study instruments/stimuli (e.g., survey, questionnaire, interview guide, focus group guide, observation guide, etc.) at the request of the REB, please upload the track-changes version(s):

Type	Name	File Name	Date	Version	Size
Tracked Changes Document	Revised Areas of Inquiry_Rethink London policy Process_111527	Revised Areas of Inquiry_Rethink London policy Process_111527.docx	13/May/2018 12:00:00 AM	2	26.1 KB

## 12.4

12.4 If changes have been made to a previously submitted recruitment material at the request of the REB, please upload track-changes version(s):

## 12.5

12.5 If changes have been made to a previously submitted other participant materials (e.g., debriefing document, screening document, etc.), at the request of the REB, please upload track-changes version(s):

## 12.6

---

12.6 Upload any additional materials requested by the REB (if applicable):

## 12.7

---

12.7 Provide any additional comments for the REB to consider (if applicable):

## 13.1

---

13.1 \*Please confirm that if this is the first time you are submitting this particular application form to the REB, select "Initial Submission". If this application form has already been reviewed by the REB and they issued recommendations, select "Response to REB recommendations":

- Initial Submission
- Response to REB recommendations

## 13.3

---

### 13.1 \*Principal Investigator OR Delegate Signature:

#### The

**Principal Investigator may choose to sign off electronically on all re-submissions(i.e., response to REB recommendations) or he/she may delegate this task to another qualified individual. NOTE: The PI is still fully responsibility for the scientific and ethical conduct of the study at this institution.**

- I attest that the is application as submitted is in compliance with the TCPS (2nd edition of Tri-Council Policy Statement: Ethical Conduct for Research Involving Humans); AND with all other applicable laws, regulations or guidelines:
- I attest that, to the best of my knowledge, the information in this application is complete, current and accurate;
- I attest that this application contains the current and complete protocol, including, if applicable, any sub-studies;
- I acknowledge that I am responsible for promptly reporting any of the following to the REB:
  - modifications or amendments, such as changes in PI, changes in Co-investigator (if applicable), specific required changes to the Letter of Information/consent form, etc.;
  - all local reportable events that meet the REB reporting criteria, including but not limited to local unexpected, serious adverse events (SAEs), privacy breaches, protocol deviations and any new information that may adversely affect the safety of the participants or significantly affect the conduct of the study;
  - progress report (renewal/ continuing review form), annually or as often as requested by the REB;
  - completion or termination (e.g., End of Study Form);
- I certify that REB approval and all external and local institutional approvals will be obtained before the study will commence;
- I certify that the research team will adhere to the protocol and consent form as approved by the REB unless to eliminate an immediate safety hazard to participants and in accordance with any conditions placed on the REB approval;
- I certify that all information provided in this application represents an accurate description of the conduct of the study.

#### **Privacy and Security**

##### **Acknowledgement:**

- On behalf of all members of my research team, I recognize the importance of maintaining the confidentiality of personal health information (PHI)/Personal Information (PI) and the privacy of individuals with respect to that information;
- I will ensure that the PHI/PI is used only as necessary, to fulfill the specific study objectives and related study questions described in the application approved by the REB. This includes all conditions and restrictions imposed by the REB and the institution in which the study is being conducted, governing the use, security, disclosure, return or disposal of the study participants' personal information;
- I agree to take any further steps required by the REB or the institution to ensure that the confidentiality and security of the Freedom of Information Protection of Privacy Act (FIPPA), its accompanying regulations, and the Tri-Council Policy Statement.

**Signed:** This form was signed by Dr. Martin Horak (mhorak@uwo.ca) on 08/Jun/2018 14:29



**Letter of Information and Consent.**

**Project Title:** Civic Engagement in Local Government Policy Processes: An Assessment of Rethink London Plan-making Process within the Context of Collaborative Planning Framework

Researcher's Name: Elmond Bandauko  
Department of Political Science, The University of Western Ontario  
Mobile: xxx-xxx-xxxx Email: [@uwo.ca](mailto:@uwo.ca)  
Supervisor: Prof. Martin Horak  
Associate Professor, Department of Political Science  
The University of Western Ontario  
Tel: 519.661.2111 ext. 85002  
Email: [mhorak@uwo.ca](mailto:mhorak@uwo.ca)

*NOTE: Text in this letter that is subject to change for different interview subjects is noted in square brackets [ ...].*

Dear [*insert name*],

My name is Elmond Bandauko I am a graduate student in the Department of Political Science at the University of Western Ontario. Under the Supervision of Professor Martin Horak (Associate Professor in the Department of Political Science, University of Western Ontario), I am conducting an academic study on the Rethink London public engagement process. I would like to conduct an interview with you to discuss your insights and experiences regarding the Rethink London process.

The study that I am conducting aims to understand the extent to which Rethink London exemplifies the tenets of collaborative planning and a broader understanding of the design of and implementation of the engagement process. I seek to understand how this process has been successful and effective in terms of the following factors (i) inclusive representation (ii) principled negotiation & respect (iii) effective process management, (iv) facilitation of the process (v) purpose & incentives of the engagement process (vi) voluntary participant and commitment and accountability

As part of the study, I am conducting confidential interviews with key individuals, such as you, who have been involved in the Rethink London community engagement process. I have selected you because [*insert basis for selection, be it documentary information or referral by another interview subject – eg., your professional involvement as a technical lead on Rethink London provides inside perspective on the process in terms of experiences, challenges and success stories*] Given your experience as [*mention relevant policy involvement, eg., involvement in designing the Rethink London community engagement plan*], I would like to focus our discussion in particular on the following issues: [*complete as appropriate – e.g.,*

*1. Your assessment of key actors and their roles in Rethink London Community Engagement process in 2011-2013; 2. Your understanding of the recruitment approaches used in recruiting participants for the various community conversations and visioning sessions].*

I hope that the interview will provide you with the benefit of a useful opportunity to reflect on the issues I mention above. The results of this research will be used to prepare a Masters Research Paper. The results of this research are likely to enhance my understanding of collaborative policy-making processes and how different stakeholder interests play out during the engagement process and the impact of such on decision-making. If you would like the copy of the Research Report made available to you, please let me know during the interview and I will be happy to do that.

I ask for about 45 minutes to an hour of your time. The interview will be confidential, and you will not be identified by name in the resulting published work, but rather by a descriptive label that you will help choose at the end of the interview (eg., “municipal official”). I will do all I can to protect your anonymity as a research subject, although there is a chance that some readers may be able to identify you based on views cited in the resulting written work. I anticipate no risks to you as a result of participating in the interview. The researcher will keep any personal information about you in a secure and confidential location for 7 years. A list linking your descriptive label with your name, email address and telephone number will be kept by the researcher in a secure place, separate from your study file. . Representatives of The University of Western Ontario Non-Medical Research Ethics Board may require access to your study-related records to monitor the conduct of the research.

I would like, with your consent, to make an audio recording of our interview to ensure that I have a wholly accurate record of it. The interview shall be held at the offices at the time we shall agree. There might be potential for follow up interviews during the data analysis phase of the research process in case I might need additional information to adequately address the research questions.

You will be asked at the start of our interview to confirm whether you consent to audio recording. If you decline recording, notes will be taken. The information that you share with me in the interview will be used only for the purposes of this study. Audio recordings will be stored in encrypted form on a password-protected computer. These recordings will be retained indefinitely. If at any point in the future I would like to draw on the information you give us for future academic work, I will contact you in advance to request your consent to do so.

If you agree to be interviewed, you will speak with me who has sent you the e-mail invitation to participate in this study.

Participation in the interview is voluntary. You may refuse to participate, refuse to answer any questions or terminate the interview at any time. You do not waive any legal right by consenting to this study.

On the next page of this document, you will find a consent form. If you agree to conduct an interview in person, you will be asked to sign the form before the interview begins. In case of a telephone interview, I will request you to sign the consent form and return via email. This is only for phone interviews. For face to face interviews, I will bring a copy of the consent form for you to sign at the beginning of the interview.

Many thanks in advance for considering this request. If you have any questions at all, please feel free to contact me using the following information.

Yours sincerely,

Elmond Bandauko Graduate Student, Master of Public Administration (MPA)

Department of Political Science, Local Government Program

University of Western Ontario

Cell: xxx-xxx-xxxx

e-mail: [@uwo.ca](mailto:@uwo.ca)

Supervisor: Professor Martin Horak

Associate Professor, Department of Political Science

University of Western Ontario

Tel: 519.661.2111 ext. 85002

Email: [mhorak@uwo.ca](mailto:mhorak@uwo.ca)

If you have any questions about your rights as a research subject you may contact:

Office of Human Research Ethics

The University of Western Ontario

Tel: 519-661-3036

Email: [ethics@uwo.ca](mailto:ethics@uwo.ca)

This letter is yours to keep for future reference

**Civic Engagement in Local Government Policy Processes: An Assessment of Rethink London Plan-making Process within the Context of Collaborative Planning Framework**

**Interview Consent Form**

- I. I have read the information letter sent to me, have had the nature of the study explained to me and I agree to participate. All questions have been answered to my satisfaction.
- II. I consent to the recording of this interview \_\_\_\_\_ (check here)  
I do not consent to the recording of this interview \_\_\_\_\_ (check here)
- III. I consent to being identified by my role in the final report (e.g., municipal official or stakeholder) ..... (check here)  
I do not consent to being identified by my role in the final report (e.g., municipal official or stakeholder) ..... (check here)
- IV. I consent to the use of direct quotations in the final report.....(check here)  
I do not consent to the use of direct quotations in the final report ..... (check here)
- V. I consent to the use of information provided for future academic work..... (check here)  
I do not consent to the use of information provided for future academic work.... (check here)
- VI. I wish to be identified directly in dissemination of research findings..... (check here)  
I do not wish to be identified directly in dissemination of research findings..... (check here)

Interview Participant \_\_\_\_\_

Signature \_\_\_\_\_



Date \_\_\_\_\_

Interviewer \_\_\_\_\_

Signature \_\_\_\_\_

Date \_\_\_\_\_

## RECRUITMENT EMAIL



### **Subject Line: Invitation to participate in research**

Dear *[insert name]*,

I would like to invite you to participate in a study that I am conducting. *[NB: This recruitment e-mail will be sent by me]*. Briefly, the study focuses on the Rethink London, 'a community engagement process that was used in the review of the City of London's Official Plan. It aims to assess the extent to which the Rethink London public engagement process exemplifies the tenets of collaborating planning, how inclusive the process was; the contributions and degree of influence of different actors among other themes.

I would like to conduct an interview with you, lasting 45 minutes to one hour, to discuss your insights and experiences regarding the planning and development of *[insert name of relevant project experiences– e.g. Design of the Rethink London community engagement plan]* in London. We can conduct the interview in person at a time and place that we mutually agree on, or – if preferable to you – over the phone.

I hope you will be willing and able to participate in this research. If you are interested in participating, please read the attached letter of information and then get in touch with me by e-mail or telephone so that we can arrange a time and place for the interview. I look forward to the prospect of speaking with you and hearing your knowledge and insights.

Thank you,

Elmond Bandauko, Graduate Student  
Department of Political Science, University of Western Ontario  
email [@uwo.ca](mailto:@uwo.ca)  
phone number

**Supervisor: Professor Martin Horak**  
Associate Professor, Department of Political Science  
University of Western Ontario  
Tel: 519.661.2111 ext. 85002  
Email: [mhorak@uwo.ca](mailto:mhorak@uwo.ca)