**Minutes of the CAPHRI Quality Assurance Committee, 26th January 2023**

**Present:** Laure Wynants, David Shaw, Mark Spigt, Bart Penders, Gerard van Breukelen, Bjorn Winkens

**1. Committee Membership**

LW welcomed BW to the committee and members introduced themselves.

**2. Approval of text data management options for website**

Committee read over the proposed text; BP suggested mentioning Datahub UM affilitation. MS pointed out that CTCM services not really free for UM reseachers and DS said he’d clarify that with CTCM. LW said we should also mention open source OSF/Dataverse (assistance via library).

*Action: DS to revise text and circulate to committee before posting on website.*

**3. Vouchers as compensation in research**

DS raised the issue of vouchers for research participants requiring tax details to be shared with finance office and tax authorities. It was decided that this was not a QA issue.

**4. Committee procedures: update committee operating procedures and student representatives of QAC**

DS said that the procedures had been shared with the CAPHRI director and would be presented at the next School Council meeting. PhD representatives were enthusiastic about finding a PhD student to join the committee and will advertise using text provided by DS.

*Action: DS to present procedures at School council and continue to liaise with PhD representatives regarding finding a PhD student member of QAC.*

**5. Outreach update**

DS explained that the offer of a webinar for external PhD students was accepted by PhD representatives but that they wanted to open it to all PhD students. DS agreed but said focus would be on external students.

*Action: DS to arrange date for webinar with PhD students.*

**6. Any other business**

Proposed change in audit process

DS explained that a change in the audit process had been suggested by Silvia Evers, whereby audits would be conducted of all projects within a budget line. It was felt that this would improve the rate at which staff agreed to participate in audits.

BP said this would be a big change and a large workload – approx. 10% of CAPHRI projects per budget line would need to be audited.

MS said this would still involve reluctance from BBs to participate in audits.

DS pointed out that “unofficial” projects without external funding would still have to be audited separately.

BP said proposal is good for external accountability but that “unofficial” projects are less monitored/accountable and may be more important in terms of audit.

The committee agreed that focusing on one BB at a time may not be advantageous as a broader spread of auditing across research lines would be preferable.

The committee concluded that it would be better to use list of ongoing projects provided by CAPHRI central office to better target projects. Asking CAPHRI administration to invite and remind people could also improve participation rate. The committee also suggested potentially copying in the CAPHRI director/other representatives when inviting researchers to participate in an audit. MS suggested changing email wording to make it clearer that audit is part of CAPHRI processes.

GvB also suggested using PhD track as another source of data about ongoing projects; participation in audit could even become mandatory part of PhD process (eg. After one year).

BP said maybe give a type of “certification” for people whose projects have been audited, to show that it’s a beneficial process. LW suggested having an option for people to volunteer for audit on the website.

*Action: DS to feed back QAC’s views on changing audit procedure to CAPHRI management and consider how best to implement other suggestions.*

CAPHRI evaluation

MS said external review committee will probably want to talk to LW and DS about the work of QAC. It might be helpful for the committee to have a table with number of requests, responses and audits conducted.

*Action:* DS to collate statistics regarding audit request, reply and participation rate.

Meta-research

LW mentioned the issue of meta-research and BP and DS said that such research should be subject to the usual procedures.