



## Ethics Approvals (Human Participants) Sub-Committee HPSC14-M1

---

Minutes of the meeting of the Ethics Approvals (Human Participants) Sub-Committee held on Monday 27 January 2014.

**Members:** Dr S Mastana(Chair), Dr C Butler, A Chandra, Dr A El-Hamalawi(ab), T Ellis(ab), Dr R Ferguson(ab), Dr M Inglis(ab), C Moore, Dr S Porter(ab), Dr C Tileaga(ab).

**In attendance:** Mrs Z Stockdale (Secretary)

**Apologies:** Y Al Wazir, Dr A El-Hamalawi, Dr M Inglis, T Ellis, Dr S Porter, Dr R Ferguson, Dr C Tileaga.

---

### 14/1 Minutes

The Minutes of the meeting of the Sub-Committee held on 17 October 2013 (HPSC13–M10 were confirmed as a true record.

### 14/2 Matters Arising from the Minutes

#### 2.1 Lay membership for the Sub-Committee 2014-15

It was confirmed that lay-members were still needed for the Sub-Committee. The Secretary confirmed that the recruitment of lay-members would form part of the alterations actioned from the ethical review.

**Action: Secretary**

#### 2.2 Storage of data

It was again confirmed that this issue would be considered as part of the ethical review process.

**Action: Secretary**

### 14/3 Action Between Meetings – HPSC14-P1

It was confirmed to the Sub-Committee that three research proposals had been approved by Chair's action since the last meeting, and outwith the Sub-Committee/Proposal meetings.

### 14/4 External Review of Ethical Processes at Loughborough University HPSC14-P2

The Sub-Committee considered the external review performed by Dr Carl Edwards. It was noted that if the Sub-Committee's remit was to alter to accommodate the full consideration of the scientific, ethical and statistical aspects of each proposal, this would greatly increase the time required for meeting preparation and the meetings themselves. It was recommended that to reduce workload in the proposed structure, work from Undergraduate and Postgraduate Taught student projects should be considered at a School level, with only PhD and higher studies to be considered at the Sub-Committee level. Continued quality of procedures would be assured via the central online system, which would allow the Secretary and HPSC Membership to monitor proposals and devolved meetings.

It was also noted that obtaining a Quorum of seven for each meeting may be difficult when some meetings currently struggle to reach the required three and five respectively.

It was noted that the scientific review of applications may demoralise applicants as they are experts in their field and so the Sub-Committee could be seen as 'second

guessing' their work. It was also noted that the level of scrutiny and remit of scientific review should be clearly established so that expert/external members were fully aware of what is requested of them.

If a devolved system were to be established, training of the School Groups should be established in addition to Sub-Committee member training.

It was noted that the success of most of these changes hinged around the implementation of an online system for ethical process and approvals. Without the online system, a lot of the other changes would not be successful.

It was noted that the process of notification regarding amendments to approved studies should be formalised as part of the review implementation.

Finally, it was noted that the Health and Safety Committee should receive the same Annual Report sent to the Ethics Committee, to ensure all Committees formally communicated with each other.

The Sub-Committee approved the implementation of the review, assuming that the online system would be bought and installed.

**Action: Secretary**

#### **14/5 Alterations to Ethical Clearance Checklist – HPSC14-P3**

The suggested alterations were approved by the Sub-Committee. The Secretary would ensure the revised Checklist was added to the HPSC website.

**Action: Secretary**

#### **14/6 Applications for Ethical Clearance**

#### **Research Proposals**

The Sub-Committee considered and approved 20 research proposals and 1 generic proposal at this Main Sub-Committee meeting. The Sub-Committee also considered and approved 50 research proposals in the November and December Proposal meetings.

#### **14/7 Any Other Business**

##### **14.8.1 – CCFR Query**

The Centre for Child and Family Research (CCFR) had a query regarding opt-in/opt-out for an evaluation they had been asked to perform for the NSPCC. The NSPCC felt it would be suitable to use an opt-out approach for the study, but the CCFR had used an opt-in approach to this point.

The Sub-Committee advised that if NSPCC would be controlling the data of the potential participants (e.g. they are making first contact) and that the study was requesting the families to complete a survey, then an opt-out approach would be acceptable. If the CCFR would be obtaining participant data before they had agreed to participate and/or there was a mixed methods methodology (e.g. case studies, visits, focus groups etc.) then the opt-in method was preferred.

#### **14/8 Dates of Main Meetings in 2014-15**

10 April 2014