



## ETHICS COMMITTEE Minutes

02 February 2021 9:30 – 11:00  
MS Teams

**Attendees:** Peggy Serié (Chair), Kianoush Nazarpour, Arno Onken, Kami Vaniea, Victoria Lindström, Sam Bishop (secretary).

**Apologies:** Lexi Birch-Mayne

No.	Item	Action
1.	Approval of Previous Minutes The minutes of the previous committee were approved as a fair representation of the meeting.	
2.	Matters Arising from previous meeting <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• <b>Qualtrics PDF functionality</b> Update from KV on Qualtrics PDF upload (KV) – ongoing, action carried forward.</li><li>• Rolling action - <b>PS/VL to push for clarification on issues and implications surrounding Privacy Shield and data management.</b> Action carried forward – <b>PS to follow up on earlier email to UoE DPO.</b></li><li>• <b>Issue of university wide DPIA for Qualtrics to be raised in discussions with the DPO.</b> Action carried forward (as above).</li><li>• <b>SB to ask computing support if functionality can be added to RT</b> - Computing support has advised that some additional functionality can be added to RT including automatic emails for approved applications. A draft of the email will be sent to the committee for approval and then sent to computing support for implementation. <b>Action: VL to draft template for automatic response email in RT and once approved by the EC SB will contact computing support for implementation.</b></li></ul>	KV PS/VL PS/VL VL/SB
3.	Application review – standing item There were no matters arising from this item.	
4.	Application review best practice <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Impartiality - The question of impartiality was raised and what should be done where it may be compromised in the process of application reviewing; e.g. where the ethics reviewer has a connection to the applicant (professional or otherwise) or the applicant is a member of the EC itself. It was noted that the committee has a number of external members who can assist in reviewing applications if there is any question on impartiality being compromised.</li></ul>	



	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Ethics Level – Two main points were raised in a discussion on Ethics levels; 1) the ethics level framework and how to classify ethics applications under the framework (see item 5), and 2) noting the ethics classification for applications within the RT system. For point 2 it was noted that the Qualtrics application form may have a facility where it can classify applications based upon what questions the applicants answer and if it does this should be able to feed directly into RT. <b>Action – KV to investigate if Qualtrics can automatically classify applications under the ethics level framework and if this information can be fed into RT. If so, Level 2 applications to be flagged by VL to two reviewers, at time of ticket assignment.</b></li> </ul>	KV
5.	<p>Ethics level framework</p> <p>Following on from item 4 there was a discussion on the ethics level framework and how to classify applications. Currently there is some uncertainty on exactly how to apply the framework. It was noted that college and the university should be giving detailed guidance on this but that some guidance does exist on the old ethics self-assessment form. <b>Action: PS to press College to provide detailed guidance on the ethics level framework.</b> <b>Action: VL to find the ethics self-assessment form to source guidance that can be used in the interim until College guidance obtained.</b></p>	PS VL
6.	<p>Outreach</p> <p>Prompted by a query from College about how ethical research is being promoted in the School the EC made an assessment of what current measures are in place. While some good practices are in place it was agreed more should be done. It was suggested that a webinar/workshop could be created that could be tailored to different audiences to promote ethical research. While this would take some work to set up, once created it would be relatively easy to repeat and change for different audiences. The committee agreed to create the webinar and KN offered to lead. It was noted the School’s Research Day in May could be a good venue for the initial offering of the workshop (pending DoR and DDoR approval). <b>Action: KN to draft webinar/workshop on ethical research and source potential speakers. Proposal should be sent to DoR/DDoR for approval for inclusion in May’s Research Day.</b></p>	KN
7.	<p>AOB</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Currently all EC members are receiving email notifications every time an application is submitted instead of just the ones they are assigned. This should not be happening and the cause should be investigated. <b>Action: VL to investigate problem with ethics application email notifications.</b></li> <li>Inf-ethics emails – It was noted that sometimes it is unclear which committee member should be responding to emails sent to the Inf-Ethics email address. This combined with the volume of emails involving applications means that sometimes queries are going unanswered. VL agreed to monitor Inf-Ethics email to ensure all queries are dealt with.</li> </ul>	VL



	<b>Action: VL to monitor Inf-Ethics email to ensure all queries are responded to, by EC members.</b>	VL
8.	Date of next meeting: Tue 02 March 2021, 9:30-11:00	