BOURNEMOUTH UNIVERSITY   **CONFIRMED**

SENATE

UNIVERSITY RESEARCH ETHICS COMMITTEE (UREC)

MINUTES OF A MEETING HELD ON 11 JUNE 2012

Present: Dr R Chapman (Chair)
                  Mr S Beer; Dr E Craig; Dr D Lilleker; Dr G Roushan.

In Attendance: Ms Julia Hastings Taylor (Secretary); G Rayment (Committee Clerk).

Apologies: Dr J Cobb Mr J Francis; Mr D Gobbett; Dr M Hind.

1.   **MINUTES OF PREVIOUS MEETING (8 February 2012)**

       The minutes of the previous meeting were approved as an accurate record.

1.1   **Matters Arising**

       Matters arising had been actioned or were dealt with under other agenda items (below).

2.   **RDU UNIVERSITY RESEARCH ETHICS REVIEW AND PROPOSED WEB-BASED ETHICS FORM**

2.1   The Chair informed members that the draft report of the research governance review
       was currently with the Pro Vice Chancellor for consideration and was not yet available
       to the Committee for discussion. The Committee would not, therefore, be able to
       recommend the document to the Senate for consideration and approval at its meeting
       on 20 June. Instead, it would be submitted to the next meeting of the Committee in
       October with a view to submitting it to the Autumn Senate meeting. It was agreed that
       the report would also be submitted to the members for comment electronically in
       advance of the October meeting (possibly during the Summer), to ensure that adequate
       time was available to consider it in some detail. Dr Chapman confirmed that he would
       continue to act as Chair of the Committee in a caretaking capacity pending the
       agreement and implementation of the review.

       > **ACTION:** To make the research governance review report available electronically to
       > members for comment and on-line discussion once the draft has been agreed with the
       > Pro Vice Chancellor. It will then be discussed in full at the Committee's next meeting on
       > 3 October 2012 prior to submission to Senate.
       >
       > **ACTION BY: Secretary**

2.2   In advance of the report being presented, the Secretary had circulated copies of a
       proposed web-based ethical approval form and invited comments from Members. This
       was based on the current ethical approval checklist and/or Economic & Social Research
       Council (ESRC) guidelines. Questions relating to Health & Safety had been removed
       as these were subject to separate compliance measures under COSHH. New
       questions had been added regarding Data Protection and situations involving a
       'gatekeeper' acting on behalf of respondents. The form was designed to be 'collapsible'

in format with the user only being prompted to complete the sections relevant to their particular requirements. The form would be completed by the researcher for submission along with the initial proposal, but would not be added to the database until it had been approved by the supervisor. The IT team had confirmed that, once constructed, the web-based form could be easily amended should revisions arise from any future review.

2.3   Members debated the amount of detailed information on the courses included in the 'drop-down' box under the 'School and Framework' heading. Some felt that this level of detail was unnecessary and that it might be sufficient to just record the School. Students may not recognise the courses as listed and it was noted also that research centres were being re-aligned/re-structured and would need to be aligned with the relevant departments. It was also noted, however, that the information would form a stand-alone database and that, for this information to provide useful detailed analysis, it would be necessary to include information such as the relevant degree programme.

2.4   After further discussion it was agreed that the information requested should be the School followed by the Status (Undergraduate (UG), Postgraduate Taught (PGT), Postgraduate Research (PGR), Staff), and if UG status were selected then the programme and level would be requested. Some Schools (including Applied Sciences and the Media School) would also benefit from collecting programme/level data on PGT research projects. The Secretary would e-mail School Ethics Representatives separately on this point to clarify the requirements for each School.

2.5   Members briefly debated the assumption that the form would be completed only by level H students and staff, noting that data collection also took place amongst level I students. It was felt this may lead to UG teaching involving research that was not being ethically approved. Members agreed that this was an issue which required further consideration, but that this would be best considered as part of the Committee's comments on the wider research governance review.

2.6   Members discussed the question "Is your research project funded?" and the Secretary explained that the information would be accessible by the Research & Knowledge Exchange Operations team, who would only release funds once an ethical checklist had been completed.

2.7   Members noted the question "Is your research solely literature based?" and debated whether this would include non-print media, such as on-line social networks or broadcast materials, such as news programmes. It was agreed to add further information on the definition of 'literature' to include anything which is published in the public domain and any non-public archive materials to which the research has been given authorised access.

2.8   It was agreed that the question "Will your research project involve human participants as primary sources of data…" should be amended to "Will your research involve interacting with human participants…". Further information on informed consent would also be provided (via a link or 'roll-over' information box).

2.9   Members agreed that the proposed new question "Will the study require the co-operation of a gatekeeper for initial access to the groups or individuals to be recruited?" should be retained.

2.10   The questions regarding the use of 'drugs, placebos or other substances' and 'tissue samples' were discussed. It had been confirmed with the Human Tissue Authority that the School of Applied Sciences does not require a licence to store human tissue samples. Therefore this question was likely to only apply to research HSC research under the NHS National Research Ethics Services (NRES) governance. It was suggested that these questions might be amended to ask (if the initial answer was 'yes') why the project was not being conducted under NRES procedures.

2.11   It was agreed that a single text box should be provided at the end of the section on research involving human participants, which sought further information on any sub-questions to which the answer 'yes' had been given. This would be more concise that having a text box under each sub-question.

2.12   Members agreed to the inclusion of a new question "Will you have access to personal information that allows you to identify individuals OR access to confidential corporate or company information..?". It was noted that this may also apply to literature reviews. The question might also be amended to include a question on whether the researcher had been granted permission to access the personal information.

2.13   Members agreed to the inclusion of the question "Will your research involve experimentation on any of the following: animals, animal tissue, genetically modified organisms?", noting that 'organisms' included plants.

2.14   Members agreed that the question "Is it likely that your research project will put any of the following at risk…?" should be replaced with a final 'catch-all' question which asked if the researcher had any other issues to declare, listing the relevant examples (i.e. risks to living creatures, stakeholders, participants, the environment, institutional reputation etc.).

2.15   All other elements of the form, not specifically referenced above, were agreed as drafted.

ACTION: To amend the web-based ethical approval form taking into account these comments.

ACTION BY: Secretary

---

3.   **MATTERS RAISED BY SCHOOL ETHICS REPRESENTATIVES**

3.1   There were no matters raised by School Ethics Representatives.

4.   **ANY OTHER BUSINESS**

4.1   The Chair updated Members on NHS Trusts seeking to gain University Trust status. Work was proceeding on the merger of Bournemouth and Poole Hospitals and the resulting new hospital would be seeking University Trust status. The work to implement this had been divided into a number of themes and the Chair was leading on the 'Research' theme. It was anticipated that the resulting system would dovetail NHS and the University's research processes, with the NHS handling any research ethics issues in respect of NHS employees.

Dates of future meetings

Wednesday, 3 October 2012	12.30 – 14.00	Committee
Wednesday, 6 March 2013	12.30 – 14.00	Committee
Wednesday, 12 June 2013	12.30 – 14.00	Committee

.

Geoffrey Rayment
Committee Clerk
UREC-1112-Minutes 11 June 2012