Minutes of the CAPHRI Research Quality Assurance Committee,

2nd February 2024

**Present:** Laure Wynants, David Shaw, Mark Spigt, Tim Schouten, Bjorn Winkens, Carmen Dirksen

**Apologies**: Bart Penders, Sandra Zwakhalen

1. Search for new quality officer

DS steps down in June but as yet no replacement quality officer has been identified. DS reported that CAPHRI director was to remind management team to think of candidates. MS reported no further progress.

*Action: MS to raise at next management meeting.*

 *DS to follow up with CAPHRI management.*

2. Expiry of terms of QAC members

LW pointed out that BP’s and SZ’s three year terms end in September 2024. DS pointed out that as per the new procedures set out for QAC terms can be renewed once, though these members have served for over five years in total. It was decided that LW will inform these members of the expiry of their term but that renewal one more time remains possible if they wish to remain. If both wish to step down, a new member for the committee will be sought, preferably with a link/expertise in scientific integrity.

*Action: LW to contact BP and SZ.*

3. Non-WMO ethics review and related matters

DS updated on the committee on progress regarding ethics review of non-WMO projects at UM and MUMC. There is now closer collaboration on this between METC and FHML-REC, and the plan remains to develop a shared portal. In relation to this, the faculty research office has raised the issue that neither ethics committee systematically deals with quality assurance issues such as data protection, and may wish to set up a separate quality assurance mechanism, as these are separate issues from ethics review. Both METC and FHML-REC agree that the quality of ethics review should not be diluted at either institution; ultimately further capacity may be required to give full ethics review to all hospital-based non-WMO research.DS will liase with METC and CTCM on these issues in his capacity as FHML-REC chair.

4. Open science

LW suggested that greater emphasis on open science would improve the research quality webpages, specifically by mentioning the open science framework (which can register all types of study), potentially linking to the library’s Taverne publication service, and linking to open science resources. DS agreed and said that a new section of the website could be devoted to open science and incorporate and enhance existing information on protocol registration, sharing syntaxes and transparent reporting. The committee agreed.

CD pointed out that we could also link to the open science policy which is mentioned in the research code (which should also be linked to.) BW added that a statistical analysis plan could be included at the registration phase as well. MS suggested including information about predatory journals; DS pointed out that not everyone can afford open access fees. The committee agreed these points could also be covered.

*Action: DS to revise text and integrate existing sections under new Open Science section, and share draft with committee for revisions/comments.*

5. Knowledge security and external collaboration

DS explained the university’s approach to knowledge security and the need to seek approval of certain collaborations, saying that this should also be mentioned on the research quality webpages. CD agreed and said there is a section on this in the new research code. It was agreed that as well as linking to the code specific advice on managing collaborations, contracts and conflicts should be given on RQ webpages. The committee agreed there should be a new website section on External Collaborations.

*Action: DS and MS to develop text for new section of website.*

6.Audit updates

DS reported that 2023 saw almost as many audits as the previous three years combined. Response rates have improved with follow-up from CAPHRI administration. DS mentioned the idea previously discussed of giving researchers a document to show their project was audited; this idea will be kept under development. DS suggested adding text to website saying that any researcher who wants their project audited can contact the quality officer to arrange this.

The terminology of “audit” was also discussed; an alternative might be quality assurance review, which sounds less authoritarian. This will be discussed further at next meeting.

*Actions: LW to add this to agenda for next meeting.*

*DS to add “contact quality officer if you want your project audited” text to website*

7. Any other business

CD said that CTCM now has an FHML intranet page (in addition to the MUMC+ intranet page and external website) that the link on the RQ webpage should lead to.

*Actions: CD to send link to DS*

6. Next meeting.

The next meeting of the QAC will be in September 2024.