**QAC Minutes January 2022**

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

1. The minutes of the previous meeting were accepted.

2. Membership of the Quality Assurance Committee: LW raised the issue of the three-year term for members of the committee and asked BP and MS if they were happy to serve a second term. Both agreed. DS suggested drafting an official procedure for committee operations including length of term and potential incompatibility of some roles, eg. The Chair or Quality Officer should not be a Head of Department or Research Leader. The Committee agreed and BP suggested a two-term limit, which was endorsed with the possibility of extending beyond that in the interests of continuity if new members are joining the committee around the same time.

*Actions: LW to ask SW if she too wishes to serve a second term*

*DS to draft formal procedures for committee for discussion at next meeting.*

3. Audit reports: DS updated on progress with audit reports. Fifteen projects have been audited so far and although things have improved, response rates to invitations to audit could be better. MS suggested obtaining testimonials from those who found the audit a positive process for a potential article in the CAPHRI newsletter.

*Action: DS to speak to Hanneke about including impressions of audits in CAPHRI newsletter*

4. Arising from one audit was a topic for the committee’s consideration: formulating a policy on potential simultaneous application to FHML-REC and for a non-WMO certificate from an METC. DS explained that some researchers had been regarding a non-WMO statement as a type of ethics approval and regarding that as sufficient. In fact CAPHRI policy is that all non-WMO studies should be submitted to and approved by FHML-REC. MS said that he saw no benefit in applying to both; DS replied that it might expedite the process for some researchers to do both at the same time rather than one after the other. MS warned that FHML-REC’s workload could increase as a result of encouraging people to apply for both. It was decided that the QA webpage should advise that obtaining a non-WMO declaration is not necessary, but that if researchers do plan to seek it is reasonable to apply for that at the same time as submitting an application to FHML-REC.

*Actions: DS to add text to this effect to webpage and also discuss this issue with the Chair of FHML-REC.*

4. Outreach events: DS provided an update on outreach, having given a 2-hour webinar for 15 PhD students in Health Services Research the previous day. A second annual CAPHRI webinar is planned for late March, with a focus on the audit process. Staff from Datahub are interested in giving a webinar for CAPHRI staff on data management. BP suggested that doing similar workshops for other departments might be useful, and it was agreed that this should be done for all staff in a department, not only PhD students. MS suggested that it might be worth mentioning frequent audit issues on the audit section of the website to raise awareness.

*Action: DS to email department heads to ask if they’d be interested.*

*Action: DS to compile common issues.*

*Action: DS to speak to Hanneke about including impressions of audits in CAPHRI newsletter*

5. Data management. At the previous meeting it was agreed DS would look at providing a simple guide for researchers, given that there are at least three potential providers of data management support. DS reported that from the providers’s websites (MEMIC, Datahub and CTCM) it’s not obvious which types of research they specialise in, with the exception that CTCM obviously focuses on clinical trials and WMO research. GvB said that in his experience CTCM is mainly for hospital and MEMIC for faculty. LW suggested that a table giving an overview of what each provider offers would be helpful. DS said that it would make sense to deisgn a table with the information we seek and circulate that to the providers. It was agreed that it should cover not only different types of research, including systematic reviews, surveys, qualitative research, and clinical trials, but also different stages of research (design, conduct, post-project storage) and different data services: data management, protection, storage data cleaning. LW added that the cost of services is also important.

*Action: DS to draft table for circulation and initially share with Carmen Dicksen before circulating to all providers.*

6. Research integrity – addition to website. DS advised the committee that following the previous meeting the following text has been added to the QA website main page: “Scientific integrity is also an extremely important aspect of research, but does not fall under the CAPHRI quality assurance system as UM has its own regulation and guidance on integrity, as well as a Platform for Research Ethics & Integrity” along with links to these resources.

7. LW mentioned the recent Stakeholders meeting on Scientific Integrity (organized by the FHML/MUMC+ platform Scientific Integrity). DS said it was an interesting discussion but there was nothing specific to bring to the committee’s attention. BP pointed out that there are two UM platforms; the FHML one and the UM-wide one. On a related topic, GvB remarked that the (supposed) distinction between scientific and research integrity can be confusing for researchers, and also that some of the UM guidance that the QA pages link to can also be confusing. BP said UM planning complete redesign of webpages so changing things might be tricky in short term. GvB said it should be made clear that research integrity and scientific integrity should be treated as synonyms for practical purposes.

*Action: DS to add point about scientific/research integrity being very similar to website.*

*Committee as a whole should take action to highlight confusing research guidance within UM.*

8. Annual report CAPHRI. DS has written and LW approved the final report which can now be shared with the CAPHRI director and the School Council/research leaders. DS said that in the past it was presented to the council or RLs and asked whether this should continue; it was felt that this was a useful opportunity to inform staff.

*Action: DS to email to Chantal and Sylvia and suggest report could be presented at next school council.*

9. LW mentioned the upcoming meeting with Sylvia Evers (Scientific Director CAPHRI) to introduce the QAC.

**Appendix**

Hallo Laure,

Hebben jullie binnen de commissie nog gesproken over de afgelopen zittingstermijnen? Gaan deze leden nog door voor een 2e termijn?

Ik hoor het graag, dan stuur ik ze nog een formele bevestiging daarvan.

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Leden Commissie Kwaliteitsbevordering Onderzoek** | | |  |  |  |
| Laure Wijnants | 10-05-21 | Voorzitter | 3 jaar | 1e | 10-05-24 |
| Bart Penders | 01-10-18 | Lid | 3 jaar | 1e | 30-09-21 |
| Sandra Zwakhalen | 01-10-18 | Lid | 3 jaar | 1e | 30-09-21 |
| David Shaw | 01-06-19 | Quality officer | |  |  |
| Carmen Dirksen | 01-01-20 | lid | 3 jaar | 1e | 01-01-23 |
| Gerard van Breukelen | 01-01-20 | lid | 3 jaar | 1e | 01-01-23 |
| Mark Spigt | 10-05-21 | lid | 3 jaar | 1e | 01-10-21 |

Hartelijke groet,

Chantal