SENATE AND UNIVERSITY BOARD

RESEARCH ETHICS COMMITTEE

MINUTES OF A MEETING HELD ON WEDNESDAY 25 NOVEMBER 2009

Present: Rev Dr D Hart (Chair)

Dr J Cobb; Dr C Dickson; Mr J Francis; Mr D Gobbett; Dr P Johnstone;

Mr M Hind; Dr D Lilleker; .Dr G Roushan;

In Attendance: Dr R Chapman; G Rayment (Committee Clerk).

Apologies: Prof J Fletcher; Dr I Hanson; Dr B Newland; Mr N Richardson;

ACTION

1. MINUTES OF PREVIOUS MEETING (25 JUNE 2009)

Minutes of the previous meeting were approved as an accurate record.

2. MATTERS ARISING

Item 6: Ethics WebPages. The Research Ethics webpage was now available at www.bournemouth.ac.uk/researchethics. Members were asked to provide feedback on the site to Dr Dickson. It was suggested that the link to the checklist be made more prominent.

Other Matters Arising had been actioned.

3. COMMITTEE CHAIR

The Chair announced that he would be stepping down as Chair of the Committee and introduced Dr Robert Chapman whose appointment as the new Chair had been approved by the Vice-Chancellor and the PVC(R&E). Dr Chapman introduced himself and summarised his experience in the field of research governance, including his role as Head of Research at Royal Bournemouth & Christchurch Hospitals and Chair of the Dorset Research Trust Forum. He had also worked on collaborative projects with HSC and had some familiarity with the University's structure and processes.

4. RESEARCH DATA STORAGE

Dr Dickson informed the Committee of the outcomes from the Sub-Committee on Research Data Storage which had agreed that a centralised data storage facility would be the most appropriate way forward. They had also agreed principles for both active research and the archiving of completed research. Work to confirm the legal requirements regarding the sharing of data with third parties was ongoing and Jeremy Swain had offered to provide Q&A sessions on data protection and adherence. KPMG (internal auditors) had not yet provided any details of their good practice standards and no other HEIs had provided details of their experiences of being audited for data storage compliance. A further Sub-Committee meeting would be arranged to discuss implementation.

5. CODE OF PRACTICE FROM THE UK Research Integrity Office (UKRIO)

Dr Johnstone commended this document to the Committee. Although it was not specifically about ethics issues, it did provide good practice guidance on preventing misconduct. The document was largely geared towards postgraduate research but could also be applied to undergraduate research. The document had been well received by staff in HSC and was available through the research support website.

6. REMIT OF ETHICS REPRESENTATIVES

Dr Dickson explained that there was currently no written remit for School Research Ethics Representatives and sought members' views on what such a remit should contain. It was suggested that it should included the requirements to attend School Research Committees (where research ethics should be a standing agenda item); to communicate UREC decisions to the Schools and viceversa; to provide guidance on ethical issues within schools; and to review approvals when appropriate (and refer them to UREC where necessary). Any remit should also link to the UREC Terms of Reference (attached at Annex A). A draft remit would be presented to the Committee for consideration.

CD

7. TRAINING FOR ETHICS REPRESENTATIVES

Dr Dickson explained that training had been provided for UREC members two years ago (by representatives from Keel University) and asked whether further training was now required for the benefit of new members or to update the training previously received. It was agreed that this would be helpful, particularly training which would help to implement the Code of Practice. UREC should received general training whereas Schools should be responsible for providing more context specific training for their own staff. It was recognised that there was a need to spread the word that adherence to the new code of practice was a mandatory requirement and members discussed some of the difficulties they had encountered in doing this. To this end it was agreed that the PVC(R&E) would be approached to raise the issue with Deans and Deputy Deans and make it clear that the new Code of Practice took immediate effect and that they had a duty to champion good research ethics practices. In future a programme of road shows might be used to disseminate the Code of Practice to staff and students. Any further suggestions for training topics should be sent to Dr Dickson by 24th December.

PJ/CD

8. PROCEDURES FOR ETHICAL APPROVALS

The Chair suggested that now that work on the Code of Practice was complete, the Committee might consider the process for UREC approvals of specific projects which were referred to it. Members had raised a number of questions regarding this process which required further consideration. This item would be placed on the agenda for a future meeting.

9. SUBSCRIPTION TO RESEARCH ETHICS REVIEW

Members agreed that the Research Ethics Review was a useful document (currently circulated in hard copy) and Dr Dickson agreed to ask the Library to purchase a subscription to the electronic version of this journal and make it widely available.

10. ANY OTHER BUSINESS

Dr Hind sought the Committee's guidance on the requirement for CRB checks, specifically in relation to an undergraduate project looking at nutrition in schools. The members advised that CRB checks would be appropriate for anyone working with schoolchildren and they would expect the schools themselves to make clear that they required such checks. Dr Hind was also advised to investigate the

requirements of the Independent Safeguarding Authority, whose procedures ran in tandem with the CRB process.
Members thanked Rev Dr Hart for his time as Chair and the work undertaken on behalf of the Committee.
Date of next meeting
The next meeting will take place at 12.30pm on Wednesday 24 February 2010.
Geoffrey Rayment Committee Clerk REthicsC_Minutes_11_09_GRdraftv1
REUNCSO_MINUTES_11_09_GRAIAITV1
Approved as a true and accurate record:
Dr R Chapman (Chair)

MH

RESEARCH ETHICS COMMITTEE

Terms of Reference

Purpose: Ensure University research and enterprise activities are in line with sound ethical practice

- 1. To formulate, maintain and keep under review the research ethics policy in line with best practice:
- 2. To approve or otherwise research and enterprise proposals remitted to it from School Research and Enterprise Committees requiring ethical approval;
- 3. To maintain a register of all University research and enterprise projects with ethics approval;
- 4. To review and monitor the impact of ethical considerations on the quality of education;
- 5. To promote, review and monitor all research ethics related staff development activities.

Membership

A maximum of four co-opted members with research experience who may not be Bournemouth University staff. At least one member of the co-opted members must have experience of research ethics issues. One of the co-opted members to be appointed as chair A senior representative of Student & Academic Services to be nominated by the Director. A Research Ethics representative nominated by each School Research & Enterprise Committee A representative of the Centre for Research & Enterprise A member of the Graduate School Up to 3 members of the University Board nominated by the Chair of the Board..

Specific Policy Responsibilities

To monitor University research activities at both undergraduate and postgraduate level and to consider individual requests for ethical approval

Chair

External (that is, not a University staff member) appointed by the Chair of Senate

Deputy Chair

A Professor

Secretary

Member of Student & Academic Services representing Research.

Co-Options

Quorum

50% + 1

Minimum Number of Meetings

3 per annum

Reporting Line

Senate

Current Sub-Committees

None

Minutes

Copies of all minutes to be submitted to Senate and held by Student & Academic Services. Minutes to be published on University staff and student portals