**Minutes of a meeting held on Wednesday 12 February 2014, 12:30, PG142**

Present: Mr J Stevens (Chair): Dr K Appleton; Mr S Beer; Dr D Lilleker; Dr G Roushan; Prof H Schutkowski; Mrs S Collins; Mr D Gobbett; Dr M Hind; Ms E Jack; Mr S Beer; Dr I Jones; Dr R Edwards; Mrs J Hastings Taylor (Secretary); Ms J Schofield (Clerk).

In Attendance: Prof B Richards.

Not in attendance: Dr V Culpin; Prof V Hundley; Dr N Speith; Dr C Hodges.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **1** | **Welcome and Introductions** |
|  |  |
|  | The Chair welcomed members to the meeting and the Secretary introduced Ms J Schofield who would in future act as Committee Clerk. |
|  |  |
| **2** | **Minutes from previous meeting (2 December 2013)** |
|  |  |
| 2.1 | The minutes were approved as an accurate record. |
|  |  |
|  | **Action and Progress Log** |
|  |  |
| 2.2 | AECC/BU Ethical Agreement (minute 2.6): The Secretary confirmed that we are still awaiting further information regarding whether BU is responsible for AECC student research conduct. A request for further clarification has been sent to the Academic Partnerships Team. Mrs S Collins queried whether BU could simply state that we would expect all partner institution students to comply with our requirements and as such BU should ask for an acknowledgement from the partner institutions that they have complied. The Chair acknowledged that that seemed sensible. |
|  |  |
|  | **ACTION:** Liaise further with the Academic Partnership Team and partner institutions to identify best way forward regarding student research conduct responsibility.**ACTION TO BE TAKEN BY:** Mrs J Hastings Taylor |
|  |  |
| **3** | **Research Ethics Restructure Update** |
|  |  |
| 3.1 | The Chair invited the Secretary to present an update on the research ethics restructure. |
|  |  |
| 3.2 | The Secretary reported that everything was going well and there had been positive feedback from the Schools after consultation meetings. As a result of the feedback, changes have been made to the process and the Schools are happy with the concept. The Secretary noted that the additional IT development was going ahead as planned and the changes would be ready for the 28 February implementation date. |
|  |  |
| 3.3 | Mr S Beer commented on how he and Prof H Schutkowski had been approached by Prof M Bennett to chair the two Panels. They in turn had approached the Deans to ask for recommendations for panel members, with the presumption that the prospective members had already discussed the positions with their prospective Deans. Mr S Beer reiterated that a pragmatic approach was taken with regards to Panel membership and he highlighted that he wanted the Committee to be fully aware of how the Panels were brought together. |
|  |  |
| **4** | **UREC and Research Ethics Panel Terms of Reference and Membership** |
|  |  |
| 4.1 | The Chair proposed minor changes to the wording of the UREC Terms of Reference (noted in the Action note below). There was a discussion as to the meaning of the word ‘senior’ with regards to academics status, and it was decided to remove the word when referring to ‘six academics’. |
|  |  |
| 4.2 | Prof H Schutkowski spoke about the membership of the UREC and suggested that it be used as an opportunity to develop staff. Mr S. Beer spoke about the terminology used, suggesting ‘Schools’ might need to be changed now we have a new Faculty. The Chair then suggested the change to be ‘School/Faculty’ to allow for future University changes. |
|  |  |
| 4.3 | The Committee approved the UREC Terms of Reference barring the actioned changed are made. |
|  |  |
|  | **ACTION:** Amend the UREC Terms of Reference to: ‘at least one from each School…’; ‘A maximum of three independent lay members…’; remove ‘senior’ when referring to ‘six academics’; add ‘Faculty’ to ‘School’; copy the duration section from the Research Ethics Panel Terms of Reference; ensure the duration section only applies to academic members. **ACTION TO BE TAKEN BY:** Mrs J Hastings Taylor |
|  |  |
| 4.4 | The Secretary presented the Research Ethics Panel Terms of Reference and confirmed that the Panels would report to UREC and UREC reports to Senate.  |
|  |  |
| 4.5 | Confidentiality was raised as an issue, and there was a discussion as to what should be included in the Panel minutes and whether they should be published online. The Chair referred to the ‘termly reports to UREC’ made by the Panels and stated that therefore minutes wouldn’t actually have to be submitted, and therefore confidentiality might be preserved. The resultant discussion included whether or not names should be included in minutes and the need for confidentiality for research projects. The Chair asked what BU’s policy is on publishing this data. The Secretary stated the policy was that they should be as open as possible. The Chair then said that we should have a record of what’s allowed and what isn’t. It was suggested that instead of using names when relating to research projects, just the research ethics ID could be used instead, to allow for auditing. It was agreed to do this, and to see if there was any resultant need for openness. The Chair then asked whether everyone was happy with the Panel Terms of Reference and there was no disagreement. |
|  |  |
| 4.6 | The Chair asked whether the Committee are happy with regards to membership. The Secretary confirmed the need for six academics. Mr S Beer confirmed he would no longer be representing the School of Tourism, but that Dr Ian Jones would take over with an alternate. Dr R Edwards confirmed she would continue to represent the Research & Knowledge Exchange Office. Dr G Roushan confirmed she would no longer represent the Business School on UREC. The Secretary then suggested that the student who had applied to be Post Graduate Researchers representative, Jeffrey Wale might take over, with Dr S McKeown to be named the alternate. Prof H Schutkowski stated he wished to step down from UREC and suggested that at least two alternate members of the Panel should be drawn from the Applied Science part of the Faculty. The School of Health & Social Care deferred their decision on membership until later as only one member is required. Dr K Appleton confirmed she will continue her membership on both UREC and the Panel. Dr D Lilleker confirmed he would be standing down from UREC as the Media School representative. The Secretary will discuss replacements with Prof I MacRury. |
|  |  |
|  | **ACTION:** Confirm UREC membership**ACTION TO BE TAKEN BY:** Mrs J Hastings Taylor |
|  |  |
| **5** | **Research Ethics Code of Practice** |
|  |  |
| 5.1 | The Chair confirmed the Research Ethics Code of Practice had been approved in December and will be implemented on 28 February alongside the ethics restructure. |
|  |  |
| **6** | **UREC Recruitment** |
|  |  |
| 6.1 | The Secretary confirmed there had been two applicants for the position of Post Graduate Researcher representative, Jeffrey Wale and Sheetal Sharma, and one applicant for the position of Independent representative, John Oram. Dr R Edwards noted that whilst Ms S Sharma is currently taking part in a lot of BU initiatives and is also writing up her thesis, she would be an excellent student representative. The Chair suggested that both Ms S Sharma and Mr J Oram should be accepted and to see how it progresses and this was approved. |
|  |  |
|  | **ACTION:** Inform UREC applicants of membership.**ACTION TO BE TAKEN BY:** Mrs J Hastings Taylor |
|  |  |
| 6.2 | As an aside, Mrs S Collins queried whether there is any way of measuring members’ performance. For example, what would happen if a lay member consistently missed UREC meetings. The Chair stated that he would address the issue with the member, perhaps after consulting other senior members of the Committee. |
|  |  |
| **7** | **Project Review: Marie Curie EXTREMISM & SMARTETHIC** |
|  |  |
| 7.1 | The Secretary confirmed that Prof B Richards had been asked to attend the meeting at 13:30 and asked whether there was anything to discuss prior to his attendance. Dr K Appleton asked whether there was a reason he had been asked to submit to UREC. The Secretary confirmed the EC is now much stricter with regards to ethics and so UREC had to give ethical approval officially as part of a range of the EC’s terms and conditions. Although Dr Lilleker had previously approved the checklist for this project in September 2013, the project had since changed and the EC requires UREC approval. The Chair noted the ethics submission covers recruitment, informed consent, privacy & confidentiality and unexpected findings from fieldwork. |
|  |  |
| 7.2 | The Chair welcomed Prof B Richards to the meeting. |
|  |  |
| 7.3 | A discussion arose as to the use of consent forms with focus groups and it was noted that the two projects had similar issues and that in the checklist the appropriate box had not been ticked when later it had been noted that audio/visual interviews might be made. The Secretary stated that UREC needed to ensure that the issues raised by the EC had been covered by Prof B Richards. The Committee agreed that Prof B Richards would need to both amend the ethics checklist and be specific about how any interviews will be addressed for both projects and once this had been done, the Chair could then approve the ethics checklist. Further discussion covered whether or not any permission would need to be gained by BU’s IT department if extremist websites were to be accessed. |
|  |  |
| 7.4 | It was agreed that Prof B Richards would resubmit his amended ethics checklist on or after 28 February. |
|  |  |
|  | **ACTION:** Prof B Richards to resubmit amended ethics checklists on or after 28 February for the projects EXTREMISM & SMARTETHIC.**ACTION TO BE TAKEN BY:** Prof B Richards |
|  |  |
| 7.5 | The Committee then discussed whether a checklist would be needed for each strand of the project, but the general consensus was that the requirement was just one ethics checklist per project.  |
|  |  |
| **8** | **School of Tourism Research Ethics Committee Minutes – Referral to UREC** |
|  |  |
| 8.1 | Dr I Jones asked how other representatives managed students’ non-completion of ethics checklists. Other representatives suggested not marking student dissertations without an attached approved ethics form. It was suggested this issue should be raised initially with academic staff involved in the course to find the best way forward. |
|  |  |
| **9** | **Matters raised by School Ethics Representatives** |
|  |  |
| 9.1 | There were no matters raised by School Ethics Representatives. |
|  |  |
| **10** | **Any other business** |
|  |  |
| 10.1 | There was no other business. |
|  |  |
|  | **Date of next meeting:**  |
|  |  |
|  | Wednesday 21 May 2014, 12.30, Room PG142 |