



Senate

Paper Title	Executive Summary – Research Ethics Committee.
Outcome requested	Senate is asked to note the above.
Points for Senate members to note and further information	As stated.
Questions for Senate to consider	N/A
Regulatory/statutory reference points	Work outlined in Points 5, 8, 10 and 11 will be carried out with reference to <i>The Concordat to Support Research Integrity</i> . Work outlined in Point 9 will be carried out with reference to Universities' UK <i>Guidelines on Security Sensitive Data</i> .
Strategy and risk	N/A
Reporting/consideration route for the paper	N/A
Authors	Hazel Covill, Research Ethics Administrator
Sponsor	Elizabeth Hall, Chair – Queen Mary Research Ethics Committee.

ETHICS OF RESEARCH COMMITTEE

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

A full set of the minutes will be available online (following confirmation at the next meeting of the Committee) at the following URL:

http://www.arcs.qmul.ac.uk/academic_board/research_ethics_committee/index.html

Alternatively, contact the Secretary of the Committee: Hazel Covill h.covill@qmul.ac.uk

Date of Meeting: 10th July 2013

Main Items Discussed

1. Committee Membership

The Chair informed members that Professor Ian Walden would be replacing Professor Chris Reed (at the end of 2013) as a nominee from the School of Law.

2. Review of the Year

The Chair asked members for their views on the workings of the Committee, after one year of its extended remit, and the Review Panels which also have now been running for a year. No problems or issues were raised, and members confirmed that they were happy with the current system. The extended remit has been incorporated into the workings of QMERC and members were happy to assist the College with policy work.

The Administrator reported that researchers were appreciative of the additional meetings that have resulted from extending the panels, and that this has helped to manage the cap on applications.

3. Cap of the number of protocol amendments.

The Chair asked for member feedback on whether the number of amendments that could be approved for any one study should be capped. This not just to reduce workload; but also to encourage researchers to submit disciplined studies and to lower the risk of project creep.

Members agreed that researchers should be restricted to one substantial amendment (such as would require the study being re-reviewed by a panel) and two minor amendments (of the type that can be approved via Chair's Action) e.g. short time extension, additional researchers etc.

4. Arrangements for Scheduled Audits

a) Fast Track System

The audit of the above was arranged (with three Committee Members assigned). Members agreed that this audit would henceforth be placed on *all* March agendas so that the results could be reviewed each summer.

b) Sports Medicine Generic Approvals

The first scheduled audit of the two generic approvals held by the Department of Sports Medicine was arranged (with three Committee Members assigned): regular audit being a condition of approval for these studies.

5. Training in Research Ethics and Governance for Staff and Students.

Members considered and assessed a report on training in research ethics for staff and students; which had been presented to, and noted with no problems, by the Vice Principal's Advisory Group. They provided feedback as to the question of whether some training in research ethics should be mandatory, (either for all staff and research students, or for specific groups).

While members agreed that training was rightly considered mandatory for all new PhD students (and accordingly logged as part of their milestones) they did express concern that staff training requirements should not be imposed inflexibly. For example, any requirement that training must have been undertaken before a grant application could be made (particularly a first grant) might be unduly onerous.

6. Assessment Offences and Research Misconduct for Research Students.

Members considered and assessed the above policy; which had been noted by the Research Degrees Programmes and Examinations Board, who recommended that this be viewed as a guidance document as opposed to policy.

Members made several advisory points with regard to clarifying the document.

7. Ethics – PG Certificate in Aesthetic Medicine (Referral to QMREC)

Members welcomed a draft SOP received from the Blizzard Institute pertaining to the delivery of the Postgraduate Certificate in Aesthetic Medicine Clinical day. Members considered and advised on the document; highlighting areas that require clarification and amendment.

8. QMREC Ethics Policy Statement Update.

The College Policy on Research Ethics requires updating in light of the new extended remit of QMERC (and related Terms of Reference) and the requirement to adhere to the *Concordat to Support Research Integrity*. Therefore, a draft copy of a revised policy was circulated to members for consultation over the summer.

9. Universities UK guidance on Security Sensitive Data

Members noted a report from the College's Records and Information Compliance Manager regarding a conference concerned with new guidelines published by Universities UK on the oversight of security sensitive research material.

The Committee considered that this guidance was relevant to the work of the Research Data Management Task and Finish Group in developing college policy on research data management, access to data and secure storage. Accordingly, members agreed to ask that the Task and Finish Group take this guidance into account when revising the Research Data Management Policy.

10. Research Policy Development Update.

a) Data Management

Members noted the Research Policy Development Update from Professor Bill Spence and the significant work and consultation detailed, as well as the inclusion of several QMERC members into the new Task and Finish Group, set up to review data policy and its implementation.

b) Open Access

Members noted the draft policy on Open Access Principles and Guidance, formulated in the response to UK Research Councils (RCUK) new policy on open access to research outputs which are funded by the Research Councils.

c) Intellectual Property

Members noted an updating report from the Director to Technology Transfer and Queen Mary Innovation, regarding intellectual property. Members supported the work undertaken to update the College's Policy and increase its relevance and enforceability, including the setting up of the Task and Finish Group.

11. International Partnerships Ethical Policy

Members noted the report on the above, which has been approved by Senate, and that further work was planned in relation to educational partnerships.

Hazel Covill
Research Ethics Administrator – 22nd August 2013.