Minutes of the CAPHRI Quality Assurance Committee, 30st January 2020

Present: D Shaw, M Spigt, S Zwakhalen, C Dirksen, G van Breukelen (separate meeting)

1. Minutes of the previous meeting; 1 Oct 2019

There are no comments on the minutes. Regarding the website. The update of the new CAPHRI website was delayed due to the cyber attack. It is now scheduled for march 2020. Regarding the start of the auditing. David has scheduled several introductory sessions with departments. Also, he will be presenting for all PhD-students of CAPHRI on Jan 30.

2. Implementation plan

No further comments.

3. Annual report

No further comments.

4. Committee’s objectives, individual members, scope of ‘quality assurance’

The committee’s objectives have been discussed. The initial objective was to develop the quality assurance system. Since the employment of David, as quality officer, the objective has changed. Now the committee will monitor David’s activities in implementing the QA system within CAPHRI and will advise him when needed. In addition, the committee will monitor whether the QA system needs to be updated.

5. Auditing by PI/supervisor rather than by project

David explained his approach of contacting PIs to start the auditing. The committee agrees with this approach, although the unit of auditing will always be on project level.

6. Datahub Maastricht

A link to DataHub will be provided in the chapter “Privacy, data storage and handling”.

7. Implications of the cyberattack for QA

Our system states that data needs to be stored on the secured network of Maastricht University. However, the cyberattack showed that our servers might not be so safe. How this will be handled from a UM perspective will be more clear in the near future. We can all monitor this aspect to see whether our QA system needs to be changed.

8. Inclusion of relevant guidelines for statistics and methodology

We discussed whether a new chapter should be included in our QA system where advice is given to take into account relevant guidelines for good research; for example CONSORT, or STROBE guidelines. We decided not to add a new chapter on this, because this would change the scope of the QA system. Now all the chapters can be audited and adherence to methodological or statistical guidelines cannot be checked by our quality officer. In addition, the amount of ‘good research’ guidelines is endless, so the system can never be sufficient in this aspect. This will also be made more explicit on the website; a statement on what the QA system entails and what not, and that it will not audit methodology. Gerard will look into the chapter about protocol registration. If the protocols for the suggested repositories are not detailed enough, we could consider adding required fields for protocols in this chapter. Gerard will look into this, and if he sees a need for change, he will come with a proposal for the next meeting, so that the committee can decide on it.