

Notes and actions from IPC CSG Executive Meeting 10th January 2012



Present

Sara Kenyon (SK), Alison Brodrick (AB), George Bugg (GB), Rachel Collis (RC), Kirsty Dundas (KD), Ruth Hewston (RH), Kim Hinshaw (KH), Julie Jomeen (JJ), Lee Middleton (LM), Julia Sanders (JuS), Andy Ewer (AE), Tina Lavender (TL), Andrew Weeks (AW), Lucy Ingram (LI)

Apologies: Jenny Drew (JD), Tim Draycott (TD), Jane Sandall (JaS), Isabelle Karimov (IK)

Recruitment of additional service users

JD has unfortunately had to resign from the group due to work commitments.

It was agreed that the local Research Design Service, Maternity Services Liaison Committee and CLRN would be contacted together with the RCOG Service User Group and the Cochrane collaboration to see if anyone interested in joining the group could be identified. RH also felt confident she could identify interested individuals.

It was agreed that the ideal composition of the Group should be to have the same number of service users on the Group as there are obstetricians and midwives so the objective would be to identify another three service users making the total five.

SK to contact identified Groups

Feedback from Chairs of CSG's meeting

The request for a confidentiality agreement had been feedback to the RCOG who convene the CSG's- and would be investigated.

Appropriate GCP and consent training for clinicians

The need to provide internet access to an appropriate GCP training for clinicians had been identified at the previous CSG meeting and this was now being taken forward by SK and LI. SK had contacted the NIHR Training Manager for GCP and had been directed to the local CLRN. Work was currently underway to development a toolkit which would be brought to the next CSG meeting on 18th May. Once agreed approvals would be sought from the RCOG and NIHR.

Feedback on review of proposals from previous meeting

After debate it was agreed that the scoring draft proposals was not really helpful to researchers so it was agreed

- Scoring would only be undertaken, unless requested, when the proposal was finalised and immediately prior to submission for funding.
- The summary form would be amended, with subject headings remaining but feedback would also include
 - What we liked about your project
 - How you could improve your project
 - What additional information we would like to know about your project
- Researchers would have the opportunity to feedback their comments after review but there would come a point where further review would not be helpful to researchers.

The importance of researchers being available (either by phone or in person) to clarify and discuss their projects was emphasised.

This was 'work in progress' and likely to need further refinement.

Attendance at BMFMS in Glasgow 19/20th April 2012

After discussion it was agreed a flyer was probably the most effective and inclusive method of communication. It would go out in delegate packs, be circulated to BMFMS and the Working Group to update the community of progress over the last year.

SK to draft for comment

The remainder of the meeting was taken with discussion of research proposals.

Date of next meeting 18th May 2012.