

Joint Clinical Research Board

Monday 9th March 2020
Room 3.04, Garrod Building, Whitechapel

Members present:

Amrita Ahluwalia (AA) – by telephone
Coleen Colechin (CC)
David Collier (DC) – for Rhian Gabe
Sandra Eldridge (SE)
Hemant Kocher (HK) – by telephone
Gerry Leonard (GL)

Nick Lemoine (NL) - by telephone
Jo Martin (JM)
Kieran McCafferty (KM) – by telephone
Rupert Pearse (RP) - Chair
Steffen Petersen (SP)
Tim Warner (TW)

In attendance:

Sven Bunn (SB)
Nick Good (NG)
Mays Jawad (MJ)

Jo Morgan (JMO)
Neeta Patel (NP)

Apologies:

William Ajala
Rob Bennett
Mark Caulfield
Alistair Chesser
Sharon Ellis
Rhian Gabe

Deanna Gibbs
Charlotte Hopkins
Stephen Kelly
Mauro Perretti
Shakila Thangaratinam
Anthony Warrens

Agenda Item	Action
<p>1. Minutes and Actions from the last meeting</p> <p>The minute of the last meeting was. Actions from that meeting:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> (i) NG to circulate the Life Science Board TORs with membership list included. Completed. (ii) MJ to amend the Healthy Volunteers guidelines to make it explicit that these apply to all types of same-taking scenarios. Completed. (iii) RP will then take the paper to BHRB and SMD Executive for agreement. Completed. (iv) Following that, NG to publicise the paper, circulating it to research leads and featuring it in the R&D News Bulletin. This was completed; it featured in the 28th January R&D News Bulletin. (v) AS to email RP with her issues about the lack of engagement and he will then forward those to Sarah Jensen, creating a paper trail and establishing links. This specific action completed but it was recognised this is an ongoing matter. (vi) NG to contact SB, ask him to meet JM and introduce him to Jo’s PA. Completed. 	

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> (vii) RP said that he will talk to Alistair Chesser, Sharon Ellis and Colin Bailey about the proposed JRMO move and ensure the group is kept up to date with matters. These concerns have been noted and the moves are ongoing (see below) (viii) NG to summarise concerns raised about the move, and email these to RP as an aide-memoire. Completed. (ix) The March meeting will review whether mandating attendance by clinical leads is necessary. Discussed – see below. (x) NG to schedule 3 JCRB meetings for 2020. Completed. 	
<p>1. COVID-19 guidance for researchers</p> <p>RP said that in the light of recent developments he had drafted guidance which had been circulated to all research leads earlier today. It was also being placed on the JRMO website on a page that will be dedicated to updates relating to the new virus.</p> <p>RP stressed that this was general guidance, the JRMO would provide help, but essentially decisions to suspend studies are individual clinical decisions that are down to research leads and their teams. He asked if there were any questions about this guidance.</p> <p>NL asked whether home working on research was appropriate. RP said this would be an individual risk-based decision. AA asked whether this would address personal staff concerns. RP said that this sits alongside advice from Queen Mary and Barts Health HR, Public Health England and DHSC. JMO asked if there was particular advice for studies in set-up. RP said that the guidance is they can go ahead but leads need to be mindful of possible issues relating to their study and to developments. It was agreed that site approvals can go ahead, on a stack-up ready-to-go basis, but that we do not want to get caught recruitment missing metrics. RP said that whilst we may have a 3-month stop this should not be turned into 6-months just because of too hasty decisions.</p> <p>It was agreed that contracts and finance should not take the lead in stopping studies but the JRMO needs to be involved in the process. It was agreed that NG should be the single point of contact, triaging matters and keeping a record.</p> <p>ACTION: RP and NG to review as necessary and keep the COVID-19 guidance for researchers up-to-date on the JRMO website.</p>	RP & NG
<p>2. Life Sciences update</p> <p>SB had circulated a set of updating slides. He reported that there had been much activity since the last update to the JCRB. He had been to Japan and South Korea in relation to the work and there were community schemes starting in Newham, including a Digi-pathology AI programme led by Capital Enterprises, designed to link researchers with possible funding.</p> <p>The university's Enterprise Zone is moving into the current JRMO location soon, leading the way for future innovation and spin-outs. The Precision Medicine Programme is about to launch, the second phase of which will be a Trust research environment.</p>	

<p>MJ asked whether AI-related research projects had been through the JRMO prior to set-up. She said that if they are research studies they need formal review and approval in the normal way, including someone determining if it is research as defined. RP said that some of this work is not research, involving only data reviews, and we do not wish to over-regulate matters, but standard procedures do need to be followed. He and SB thought that whilst this had not necessarily been understood when the LS team was establishing itself it was now. SB said that LSI matters were somewhat of a grey area, research-wise, and there were many learning curves.</p> <p>CC said that matters need to be kept under review according to their merits. Innovation must not be stifled but all potential AI projects need to be review case-by-case. For example, she is aware that Vicky Byers in the JRMO has been involved in work for the Precision Medicine Programme.</p>	
<p>3. Principal Investigator Scheme</p> <p>RP reported that 12 people had been appointed under this scheme which was launch 2 weeks previously. It is early days and there will be a slow build-up as job planning is proving more complex than had been anticipated. He said that he is already getting enquiries about next year but that will depend on this year’s success. NL asked how long awards are for. RP said that agree for 12 months but can be renewed for a further 12 months if a person looks set to become self-sustaining, or they can be dropped. He further said that as the take-up of awards are being staggered and somewhat delayed so will the end-dates, leading to a roll-over; there could, for example, be 50:50 roll-over and new awards next year. Present difficulties would be taken into account.</p>	
<p>4. JRMO move update</p> <p>CC reported that the current thinking was the JRMO would move into Empire House in May 2020, with a further move to Dept W in early 2021. It appeared almost certain that Charterhouse Square would keep its JRMO presence and drop-ins on the Whitechapel campus would be established. One ongoing matter is that CRC staff cannot be accommodated in Dept W, although in the short-term they will be housed in Empire House. Discussions around this are ongoing with the Trust.</p> <p>ACTION: CC or Sharon Ellis to return to JCRB with a further update on the proposed JRMO moves at the next meeting.</p>	<p>CC/ Sharon Ellis</p>
<p>5. Barts Health PI investigator accounts</p> <p>RP reported that some researchers and research groups are sitting on substantial nest-eggs and the Trust's Chief Finance Officer has identified these as funding that could be used for wider research-related benefits. The sums involved are being checked and so far look to be much less than the CFO had anticipated. GL said that his guess is that the Finance Dept was looking at all these accounts together having noticed that a few were holding larger amounts; the vast majority of these accounts do not trigger any audit-related concerns.</p> <p>ACTION: RP asked that all researcher leads feedback to their groups that questions about Barts Health PI accounts have been asked and that accounts should be reviewed with an eye to reducing the use of them as ‘savings accounts’.</p>	<p>All research leads</p>

<p>As an Action from the Barts Health Research Board CC is establishing a small working group of key stakeholders to develop options on the suitable distribution of research funding currently in PI accounts, to ensure better ongoing oversight and management and to circulate those thoughts.</p>	
<p>6. Attendance at these meetings</p> <p>RP asked if there was a general feeling about the usefulness of these meeting, their frequency or any other related views.</p> <p>NL said that he thought this a very useful meeting that covers matters that are not specific to SMD or the Trust. Others agreed. The history of teleconference issues was raised although it was agreed this had been less of a problem to date and was particularly not an issue at this meeting. There was a suggested that dial-in alone was problematic for such a long meeting.</p> <p>ACTION: NG to explore options for video-conferencing at future JCRB meetings including a possible relocation to the Abernethy Building which seemingly has video-conferencing facilities.</p> <p>It was also noted that attendance at this meeting, both in the room and on telephone links, was well above problem levels. Overall it was agreed that there was a need to ensure that attendance is as easy as possible before considering ‘naming and shaming’.</p> <p>RP noted that the date for the November meeting would need to be changed as he cannot make that.</p> <p>ACTION: NG to revisit the planned date of the November meeting.</p>	<p>NG</p> <p>NG</p>
<p>7. Matters arising from JRMO Information reports</p> <p>NL said that there seems to be a drop-off in the number of studies. He asked if this is correct. MJ said that yes there has been a drop but not as great locally as the CRN had been anticipating.</p> <p>RP asked if we are still meeting targets and how do we compare with other sites. GL said that we are 1% down on our accrual targets, which is about average.</p> <p>NL asked if we have over-recruiting studies and MJ confirmed we do; approve a fifth of all studies over-recruit. There was discussion around this. JM felt that there was an understandable degree of caution on the part of researchers given that they are penalised for under-recruiting. NL agreed that the system rather perversely discourages optimism. RP commented that site set-up is always the complicated part and the focus needs to be enabling prompt, safe site set-up.</p>	
<p>8. AOB</p> <p>(a) Joint Research Management Policies.</p> <p>GL had tabled a short paper following discussion with Alistair Chesser and others. The policies as currently presented on the JRMO website imply that they are reviewed every 2 years. The last full review was in 2016, although some policies have changed because of localised reviews. Since then we have held-off a review because of Brexit as that will</p>	

<p>change many legal and structural regulatory regime/ underpinning factors. It now looks likely that we will have a newly established framework in place by the end of 2020 so it is appropriate and timely to state publically that we will not review these policies until that time.</p> <p>It was agreed that we should formally extend for this limited period but RP said a full review in 2021 (or sooner if the future regulatory regime becomes apparent sooner) is vital. GL agreed with that and stressed this was not about an indefinite delay but about avoiding the impression to third parties that we were indifferent to our own policies.</p> <p>ACTION: NG to update the JRMO website with a short statement explaining the reason for delaying the usual 2-year review date for the Joint Research Management Policies.</p> <p>ACTION: JCRB to review the status of the Joint Research Management Policies review delay at its November meeting.</p> <p>(b) CQC inspection. It was very briefly noted that a CQC inspection of Barts Health is taking place in June. Research would be an issue but details of exact location, date and focus are currently unknown.</p>	<p>NG</p> <p>NG</p>
<p>(c) Next meeting: 7th July 2020, 2 pm</p>	
<p>(d) Summary of forward Actions</p> <p>(i) RP and NG to review as necessary and keep the COVID-19 guidance for researchers up-to-date on the JRMO website.</p> <p>(ii) CC or Sharon Ellis to return to JCRB with a further update on the proposed JRMO moves at the next meeting.</p> <p>(iii) RP asked that all researcher leads feedback to their groups that questions about Barts Health PI accounts have been asked and that accounts should be reviewed with an eye to reducing the use of them as ‘savings accounts’.</p> <p>(iv) NG to explore options for video-conferencing at future JCRB meetings including a possible relocation to the Abernethy Building which seemingly has video-conferencing facilities.</p> <p>(v) NG to revisit the planned date of the November meeting (as RP cannot make the planned date).</p> <p>(vi) NG to update the JRMO website with a short statement explaining the reason for delaying the usual 2-year review date for the Joint Research Management Policies.</p> <p>(vii) JCRB to review the status of the Joint Research Management Policies review delay at its November meeting.</p>	<p>RP/NG</p> <p>CC/ Sharon Ellis</p> <p>All research leads</p> <p>NG</p> <p>NG</p> <p>NG</p> <p>NG</p>