



Ethic Committee Meeting Minutes Tuesday 5th November, 09:30, IF – 3.02

Attendees: Peggy Seriés (Chair), Chris Lucas, Arno Onken, Kami Vaniea, Victoria Lindström, Sam Bishop (secretary)

Apologies: Lexi Birch-Mayne

	Summary	ACTION
1.	<p>Previous Meeting – This constituted the first official meeting of the Ethics Committee (previously known as the Ethics Panel) and as such there were no previous minutes to approve.</p>	
2.	<p>Matters arising from previous meetings (when the committee was known as the Ethics Panel)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - The legal implications of research taking place without ethics approval were discussed. There was no clear understanding of these might be and it was agreed that external advice was needed. - The Committee had been asked to review a Research Committee paper on data management plans but this did not reach the committee in time for discussion at this meeting and so was deferred to December. - Currently only one Committee member has editing access to Qualtrics. Due to the fact Qualtrics will be replaced by Infonetica in the future, all members should not have access it but it will be useful for at least one extra members to be given editing rights. CL noted that he had prior Qualtrics experience and would be happy to do this. <p>Action – Seek advice on legal implications of research going ahead without Ethics approval.</p> <p>Action – Research Committee paper on data management plans to be distributed to the committee ready for discussion at the next meeting in December.</p> <p>Action – VL to contact Maria Wolters to give CL editing rights to Qualtrics.</p>	<p>VL</p> <p>VL</p> <p>VL</p>
3.	<p>Application Review</p> <p>The following matters were raised during the course of the application review:-</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - The matter of how long an ethics approval lasts and under what circumstances does research need re-approval from the ethics committee was discussed. It was noted that there would be different requirements for level 1 and level 2 cases. Level 1 applications should not need re-approval for a significant amount of time (5-10 years) as long as there is no meaningful change to the research and even if there is a note to the Ethics committee should suffice to judge whether a new application is needed. For Level 2 cases; as long as the original application was reviewed by two committee members and there is no meaningful change to either the investigative team or the research itself then there should be no need for re-approval. But, due to the sensitive nature of these types of cases, they should be dealt with on a case by case basis. Advice to this effect should be put onto the Ethics webpages. - Group projects – Advice and guidance is required to be put up on the Ethics webpages concerning ethics applications for student group projects and whether projects are suitable to be grouped into a single application or not. 	

	<p>Action – Revise Ethics webpages to include advice on Ethics re-approval. Statement to be drafted for approval at December meeting.</p> <p>Action – Revise Ethics web pages to include advice on group project applications. Due to committee members current teaching workloads this will be deferred to a committee meeting early in 2020.</p>	<p>VL</p> <p>KV</p>
4.	<p>Committee remit and webpages</p> <p>Victoria Lindström gave a short presentation on the committee remit and the new Ethics Committee website. The following points were raised: -</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Some minor inaccuracies on the website were noticed and these will need correcting. Action – Correct website inaccuracies. - Length of committee membership – There was broad agreement that membership should last at least 2 years with no upper bound, that there should be at least one long-term member of the committee to ensure continuity and that the committee should be consulted on any changes to its membership. - New appointees – The committee emphasised it should be consulted on any new appointments, that new appointees should receive training and that they should have some prior ethics experience; for instance, at the very least they should have had an ethics application successfully approved in the past. - Staff representation on the committee – The Committee noted that they would welcome research-only staff representation but it would be important to have at least one research and teaching staff member. It was felt that there was no need for broad representation from all areas of the school as some Institutes have greater ethics needs than others but if any areas feel under-represented then the committee would welcome volunteers. - In attendance members – It was agreed that invitations should be sent to members of the School to join the committee as ‘in attendance’ members. This should include the Deputy of Research, the Deputy Director of the Graduate School and the UG4 and Masters Project Coordinators. Action – The Deputy Director of the Graduate School and the UG4 and Masters Project Coordinators to be invited to join Committee as ‘in attendance’ members. Deputy Director of Research has been invited and agreed. - External member – It was noted that it would be important to have someone on the Committee from outwith the School. There would be no requirement for this member to regularly attend meetings but they would be there to help the committee in areas that it lacks expertise in (e.g., medical data) or where there is a possible conflict of interest. It was suggested that certain members of the PPLS Ethics Committee would be suitable candidates. Action – Contact PPLS Ethics Committee member to ask if they would be willing to join the committee as an External Member. - It was noted the Committee will be reporting to the Strategic Committee with some items going to the Research Committee for discussion. - Currently the Committee is unclear on whether it will need extra members to deal with any possible workload as it has yet to go through one full cycle of the yearly process. If it ends up that more members are required the Committee would like to know when the deadline for requesting this is. Action – Advice from the Director of Professional Services to be sought on the deadline for requesting more Committee members. 	<p>VL/SB</p> <p>PS/VL</p> <p>PS</p> <p>VL</p>
5.	New Qualtrics functionality	

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - A new piece of functionality has been introduced to Qualtrics and applicants can now add pdfs to their applications. This will need testing to see if it is working with the current Ethics application set-up. Action – CL to test pdf functionality in Qualtrics before December Committee meeting. (VL to include this in a Qualtrics actions email.) - The option to indicate REC approval received previously from elsewhere was discussed. The indications are that a question on this already exists but Qualtrics’ internal logic may be broken in this instance. This will need reviewing. Action – Qualtrics logic on the question of prior REC approval to be reviewed. (VL to include this in a Qualtrics actions email.) 	<p>CL/VL</p> <p>VL/KV /MW</p>
6.	<p>Review of Ethics Code of Conduct</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - It was noted that there is currently some confusion of what the School’s Ethics Code of Conduct is. The Committee accepted VL’s proposal to adopt a similar model to what is taking place in the School of Geosciences; that is, the main points from the Concordat should be taken and turned into a set of ‘Guiding Principles’ that will replace the Code of Conduct. The Head of Research Services is currently reviewing the Concordat and VL will match current highlighted points against new concordat for approval by committee as “guiding principles”. <p>Action – VL to liaise with the Head of research Services concerning the Concordat and present suggested “guiding principles” at the December meeting.</p>	<p>VL</p>
7.	<p>AOB</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - It was noted that there some actions for the Ethics Committee that were set during the last research Committee. These included actions on training PIs in the application procedure and promoting the Ethics process. It was noted that due to current workloads these actions will not be able to be met at the moment. It was agreed to defer to them to the next Committee meeting. Action – Defer Research Committee actions to the December meeting. - Maria Wolters is still on the Ethics mailing list. It was suggest that Maria is kept on as an “internal advisor” to the panel, but is removed from the ethics committee mailing list with the intent to reduce workload. Action – Chair to advise Maria Wolters on removal from Ethics mailing list; VL to remove from list. - DPIA training for Committee members. This is a University wide issue so the committee would like to see what lead the University takes before taking action itself. - An issue had been raised been raised in the ethics application process with regards to the question on confidential or personal data. There was some confusion over whether this encompasses confidential commercial data that does not include personal data. There was agreement that it does not and the relevant question in the application process should be revised to exclude commercial confidentiality as long as it does not include personal data. Action – Question on confidential and personal data in Qualtrics to be revised to exclude commercially confidential data. (VL to include this in a Qualtrics actions email.) - Clarification was sought on the timing of Ethics approval and submission of funding approval. The Committee agreed that this was not something for it to decide upon as it involves a number of factors that do not come under its remit. Action – VL to discuss with Head of Research Services the required timings for Ethics applications from a funding application. 	<p>ALL</p> <p>PS/ VL</p> <p>VL/KV</p> <p>VL</p>

8.	Date of next meeting: Tuesday 3 rd December 2019, 09:30 – 11:00, in IF-1.16	