**Minutes QAC September 2021**

**Present:** Laure Wynants,David Shaw, Mark Spigt, Bart Penders, Sandra Zwakalen, Gerard van Breukelen, Carmen Dirksen

1. Round of introductions for the new chair. LW and others gave short introductions including their involvement in the committee.

2. DS summarised the previous meeting’s minutes and updated on actions taken since the last meeting. The minutes were accepted.

3. Outreach events. DS updated on the main outreach events so far, including the PhD Student Winter School and the Research Quality Webinar. DS said the two topics that should be covered in future events are data protection and the audit procedure. BP pointed out that data protection might be of interest to all researchers, while more senior staff would perhaps be more interested in the audit procedure, so there might be different audiences. MS suggested talking about audit to school council, and that it would be good to do the winter school again; SZ added every two years might be good idea and that she had had lots of questions about audit so that would be a good topic. DS and CD said that the idea of doing a combined presentation at the CAPHRI day would still be a good idea, but it seems difficult to get a slot and MS agreed.

DS suggested that the planned email informing staff about the audit procedure could include an invitation to an audit workshop. LW suggested that a prerecorded video might be better initially. LW pointed out that while PhD students are well catered for, postdocs and other new staff don’t always get the same support, and it would be good if information about the research quality system were provided to new staff. MS said the webinar is good way of catching such staff. It was agreed that departments should be asked to include the link to the QA website as part of info provided to new staff.

*ACTION: DS to discuss event possibilities with Hanneke Trines.*

*ACTION: DS to ask department heads to mention QA to new staff.*

4. Audit reports. DS introduced discussion of whether Budget Managers (BM) were the best people to share audit reports with in addition to researchers, and suggested that heads of department (HoD) might be better as that is a more fixed role and everyone knows their HoD while they might not know their BM. The committee discussed this at length. CD said it would be helpful to revisit the main reasons for sharing the reports beyond the researchers themselves. DS said it was to ensure transparency and accountability, and to enable follow up if any problematic issues were identified. The main purpose is information, not “escalation”. BP said it’s important that it’s not the quality officer who directly identifies problems and added HoD would be a stable and simple option but it would still leave the issue of who to send audit reports of HoD projects to. Whereas HoD share a managerial responsibility for research quality, BM fit in better with the CAPHRI organizational structure. MS pointed out that the Research Leaders had said that Budget Managers was the best option. GvB pointed out that BMs may be in different department from researcher being audited – in which case the HoD should be involved. DS suggested that for more senior staff such as HoD the audit reports could be shared with the QAC. MS suggested involving BMs before the audit to see if they want to be involved but CD and DS disagreed, saying that this could disrupt the audit process. SW suggested sharing reports with BMs periodically rather than after each audit but BP pointed out that there shouldn’t be too many audits in any case.

Ultimately it was decided to provide Budget Managers with audit reports as originally planned, and to inform all CAPHRI staff of this via email. CD suggested that Maurice Zeegers could send the email informing staff about the audit procedure, and DS said that it would be good to inform BMs informally first of the planned procedure.

*ACTION:**DS to move forward with informing BMs and then CAPHRI staff (once plans for video/invitation to event to also be included in email are finalised).*

5. Data management. The Committee discussed which information and links on data management should be included on the QA website. CD suggested that a UM data management page would be the best link to use. DS said he had added a link to the datahub page on data management plans as previously decided. CD said Datahub is largely a data broker, whereas MEMIC and CTCM provide support and advice at all stages. MS said there is so much information available that researchers can get lost and suggested creating a guide to get researchers on the right track. DS said that might be difficult; CD said that would be the wrong approach as CTCM and MEMIC use the “no wrong door” principle. DS said that that’s a useful principle worth mentioning on the website. GvB pointed out that misleading advice is sometimes given to researchers and that data cleaning is also an important part of data management. It was agreed that it might be helpful to post links to MEMIC, CTCM and datahub on the data management page, with advice about which service is most likely to be appropriate for different types of research. DS mentioned that the issue of datasharing should also be addressed on the website.

*ACTION: DS to look at resources and consider best way to present information on webpage in advance of next meeting.*

6. Research integrity. The committee briefly discussed whether research integrity should be part of the activities of the committee and/or mentioned on the QA website. BP reminded the committee about the UM Platform on Research Integrity. GvB said integrity is closely linked to quality but it was again agreed that it would be too much to add integrity to the QAC’s remit. However, integrity can be briefly mentioned on the QA webpages with a link to the UM integrity and research code pages.

*ACTION: DS will add this text to website.*

7. The next meeting will take place in January 2022.