

AUSTRALASIAN ETHICS NETWORK AEN CONFERENCE

10 May 2023 - Preconference Workshops

11 - 12 May 2023 - Conference

Jasper Hotel, Melbourne, Victoria



AEN CONFERENCE 2023 PROGRAM

Wednesday 10 May 2023

07:30 - 08:30	PRECONFERENCE WORKSHOP REGISTRATION OPEN	
Workshops	Room 3 & 4	Room 8
08:30 – 12:30 (Inc M/Tea)	<u>Workshop 1</u> Upskilling Workshop for Research Ethics Professionals Dr Nitya Phillipson, Murdoch Children's Research Institute, Elizabeth Hill, Victoria University & Jennifer Rowland, Macquarie University	<u>Workshop 2</u> Human Research Ethics Committee Chairs Roundtable Dr Karolyn White, Macquarie University & Professor Richard Chenhall, The University of Melbourne
LUNCH BREAK		
13:00 – 17:00 (Inc A/Tea)	<u>Workshop 3</u> The Victorian Aboriginal Health, Medical and Wellbeing Research Accord: What Does it Mean for Ethics? Ms Olivia Payne, Victorian Aboriginal Community Controlled Health Organisation (vaccho)	<u>Workshop 4</u> Upskilling for New Committee Members Prof Lynn Gillam, Clarissa Martin, & Suzana Kovacevic, The University of Melbourne

all populations have fair access to the benefits of research and RECs should facilitate inclusion of different populations in research, perhaps even if they cannot or have not consented. In this talk I will consider the tension between inclusion and protection in two case studies: (1) the use of health data or biological samples for research without consent and (2) research with patients who lack capacity.	Thursday 11 May 2023			
Conference Chairs: Prof Lynn Gillam & Prof Richard Chenhall09:30 – 10:30Keynote Speaker: Associate Professor Angela Ballantyne Department of Primary Health Care & General Practice, University of Otago WellingtonInclusion, trust and consent in research ethics What is the main role of RECs – to protect potential research participants from harm or to facilitate socially valuable research? Research ethics has traditionally taken a protectionist stance, with a primary focus on avoiding and minimising research harm. On this view, research is optional, and RECs should be conservative about including any populations in research. Research can be seen as essential to the provision of evidenced based medicine in the future – saving lives and improving wellbeing. On this view, it is important the all populations in research, perhaps even if they cannot or have not consented. In this talk I will consider the tension between inclusion and protection in two case studies: (1) the use of health data or biological samples 	08:00 – 09:15	CONFERENCE REGISTRATION		
Associate Professor Angela Ballantyne Department of Primary Health Care & General Practice, University of Otago Wellington Inclusion, trust and consent in research ethics What is the main role of RECs – to protect potential research participants from harm or to facilitate socially valuable research? Research ethics has traditionally taken a protectionist stance, with a primary focus on avoiding and minimising research harm. On this view, research is optional, and RECs should be conservative about including any populations in research without their express consent. More recently, there has been growing recognition of the social value of research. Research can be seen as essential to the provision of evidenced based medicine in the future – saving lives and improving wellbeing. On this view, it is important the all populations have fair access to the benefits of research and RECs should facilitate inclusion of different populations in research, perhaps even if they cannot or have not consented. In this talk I will consider the tension between inclusion and protection in two case studies: (1) the use of health data or biological samples for research without consent and (2) research with patients who lack capacity.	09:15 – 09:30			
What is the main role of RECs – to protect potential research participants from harm or to facilitate socially valuable research? Research ethics has traditionally taken a protectionist stance, with a primary focus on avoiding and minimising research harm. On this view, research is optional, and RECs should be conservative about including any populations in research without their express consent. More recently, there has been growing recognition of the social value of research. Research can be seen as essential to the provision of evidenced based medicine in the future – saving lives and improving wellbeing. On this view, it is important the all populations have fair access to the benefits of research and RECs should facilitate inclusion of different populations in research, perhaps even if they cannot or have not consented. In this talk I will consider the tension between inclusion and protection in two case studies: (1) the use of health data or biological samples for research without consent and (2) research with patients who lack capacity.	09:30 – 10:30	Associate Professor Angela Ballantyne		
Jession Chair, Front Ville Gillard		What is the main role of RECs – to protect potential research participants from harm or to facilitate socially valuable research? Research ethics has traditionally taken a protectionist stance, with a primary focus on avoiding and minimising research harm. On this view, research is optional, and RECs should be conservative about including any populations in research without their express consent. More recently, there has been growing recognition of the social value of research. Research can be seen as essential to the provision of evidenced based medicine in the future – saving lives and improving wellbeing. On this view, it is important that all populations have fair access to the benefits of research and RECs should facilitate inclusion of different populations in research, perhaps even if they cannot or have not consented. In this talk I will consider the tension between inclusion and protection in two case studies: (1) the use of health data or biological samples		

	Function Hall	Room 3 & 4
	Subtheme - Research Ethics and Integrity	Subtheme - Research Ethics and Integrity
	Chair: Kandy White	Chair: Prof Richard Chenhall
11:00 - 11:25 11:25 - 11:50	National Statement Review: Where we are and what's next <i>Mr Jeremy Kenner, NHMRC</i> Keeping the PEACE: Applying an interview model	Not a Lottery – A process for random selection for clinical trial participation <i>Ms Sophie Gatenby, The Royal Children's Hospital and Ms</i> <i>Katherine Lieschke, Murdoch Children's Research Institute</i> What is human research ethics training for?
	to research integrity investigations Dr Nitya Phillipson, Murdoch Children's Research Institute	Dr Mark Hooper, Tricky Goose Training
11:50 – 12:15	Building together: A scoping review to inform better consenting practices for the most vulnerable in healthcare research Associate Professor Kristen Gibbons, Metro South Health	Lessons learned from an ethics and governance model of a multi-collaborator cancer proteomics program. Dr Priya Duggal, Children's Medical Research Institute
12:15 - 13:15	LUNCH	
13:15 - 14:15	Panel Session - Dealing with ethical challenges	of incidental findings in research
	 Research that collects data about participants' bodies or physical function may produce incidental findings – information about a participant that was not intentionally sought out, but has nevertheless come to light. Genetic testing and genomic sequencing, MRI or other imaging are well-recognised examples, but even more mundane activities such as measuring blood pressure or heart rate can produce unexpected results. Some incidental findings might have clear, immediate and actionable implications for a participant's health, but the significance of others can be quite uncertain. The possibility of incidental findings raises a number of questions about what is ethically required in planning research studies, and carrying them out. In this session, a panel of researchers and research ethicists will lead an interactive discussion of these tricky questions, including: When is a plan for managing incidental findings ethically required? Only when such findings are easily foreseeable and quite likely, or even when the chances are remote or merely theoretical? Does the possibility of an incidental finding count as a risk (possible harm) to participants Should all incidental findings be communicated to individual participants, or is it ethically acceptable not to disclose some findings (if they are of minor or uncertain significance)? Should participants be asked at the outset if they want to receive any incidental findings? But what if they say no, and something actionable is found? What is a supportive enough plan for communicating incidental findings? Are there minimum standards? Is there some research that should not be done because the possibility of incidental findings would be too distressing or harmful to participants? 	
14:15 - 14.20	Session Chair: Prof Lynn Gillam MOVE TO BREAKOUT SESSIONS	
	Function Hall	Room 3 & 4
	Subtheme - Research Ethics and Integrity Chair: Dr Nitya Phillipson	Subtheme - Research Ethics and Integrity Chair: Suzana Kovacevic
14:20 - 14:45	NHMRC's Research Quality Strategy: Achievements and next steps <i>Ms Jillian Barr, NHMRC</i>	Developing HREC guidelines for reviewing and supporting First Nations Research Professor Marilynne N Kirshbaum & Ms Hayley Germaine, Charles Darwin University
14:45 - 15:10	Health research for all: A dedicated resource to drive inclusive health and medical research <i>Ms Tehani Paiva & Dr Helene Kammoun, Murdoch</i> <i>Children's Research Institute</i>	Can research ethics codes be a conduit for justice? An examination of Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander guidelines in Australia, and the VACCHO accord Associate Professor Deborah Zion, Victoria University
15:10 - 15:35	Improving Data Management Planning using Infonetica Dr Shannon Smith & Jennifer Rowland, Macquarie University	
15:35 - 16:00	AFTERNOON TEA	

16:00 - 17:00	Panel Session – Ethical issues in data management- balancing privacy, cyber security, open access		
	and public trust.		
	Human research ethics committees and researchers are increasingly being required to consider complex issues in human research data management, with a range of ethical and legal considerations surrounding sensitive data for research. Many institutions, funding agencies and publishers are now explicitly requiring research data to be shared, however recent public cyber attacks and data breaches have impacted on the community's trust and confidence in data security. This panel session will explore some of the key considerations for researchers and ethics reviewers in collecting, managing and sharing sensitive research data ethically and legally.		
	Panellist:		
	Associate Professor Angela Ballantyne, University of Otago Wellington		
	Dr Fiona Lynch, Murdoch Childrens Research Institute		
Clarissa Martin, The University of Melbourne			
	Keith Russell, Australian Research Data Commons (ARDC)		
	Session Chair: Jennifer Rowland		
17:00 - 19:00	CONFERENCE WELCOME RECEPTION		

Friday 12 May 2023			
08:00 - 08:50	CONFERENCE REGISTRATION		
08:50 - 09:00	Welcome		
	Conference Chairs: Prof Lynn Gillam & Prof Richard Chenhall		
09:00 - 10:00	Keynote Speaker		
	Professor Ingrid Winship		
	Chair, NHMRC Australian Health Research Ethics Committee		
	How do HREC's move with the times?		
	The second decade of the 21st century brings a host of new developments in and challenges for Australian researchers and HRECs. The expansion of research that involves sharing or linkage of data or use of social media is one example of this. Challenges include the way that benefit and risk are defined and assessed, the viability of individualised consent and the way that human research is governed. In addition, research involving artificial intelligence and machine learning, gene editing and other techniques used in genomic research will require the need for new expertise and, potentially, new models for assessing the ethical appropriateness and scientific merit of research. The Australian Health Ethics Committee of the National Health and Medical Research Council, is currently considering these important issues.		
	A streamlined, harmonised, and predictable operating environment is essential for a vibrant health and medical research ecosystem. On a structural level, work led by the Australian Government Department of Health and Aged Care in collaboration with all governments is delivering several initiatives aiming to address long-term challenges. These include a nationally consistent approach to accreditation of health service organisations conducting clinical trials and work to develop a One Stop Shop approach for health-related human research, including clinical trials. Work is also underway to develop an accreditation scheme for human research ethics committees that participate in the National Mutual Acceptance scheme to strengthen the acceptability of ethical reviews across jurisdictional borders. There is also scope for the extension of the scheme to include appropriately accredited ethics committees operating across more diverse settings. The solutions to these challenges are a 'work in progress.' This presentation will elaborate on the issues and invite you to contribute to this work.		
10:00 - 10:30	MORNING TEA		

	Function Hall	Room 3 & 4	
	Subtheme - Keeping up with Data	Subtheme - Research Ethics and Integrity	
	Chair: Vivienne Moyle	Chair: Kandy White	
10:50 - 11:15	Health Studies Australian National Data Asset	A strong human research ethics advisor network:	
	(HeSANDA)	promoting and enhancing a university culture of	
	Ms Katie Ozdowska, University of Melbourne and	responsible research conduct	
	Dr Rhys Williams, Australian Research Data	Ms Elizabeth Hill, Victoria University	
	Commons		
11:15 – 11:40	Negotiating Withdrawal of Consent	Increasing data and research integrity via RDMOnline	
	Ms Anne Walsh & Mr Alex Stewart, Queensland	training	
	University of Technology	Dr Shannon Smith & Dr Paul Sou, Macquarie University	
11:40 – 12:05	'But the data is already public': When is ethics	Strengthening Research Integrity with Trust Markers	
	review required?	Dr Leslie McIntosh, Digital Science	
	Ms Isobel Cairns, Victoria University of Wellington		
12:05 – 12:30	Integrating data stewards into HREC	Information Forms - Box Ticking Vs Practical Engaging	
	Dr Laura Hurley & Dr Jennifer Rowland, Macquarie	Mr Mark Davies, University of Western Australia	
	University		
12:30 – 13:30	LUNCH		
13:30 - 14:30	Invited Speaker:		
	Dr Mishel McMahon		
	Aboriginal Rural Health Coordinator, Office of Lo	n Trobe Rural Health, La Trobe University	
	First Nations Research Circle		
		ples and processes to be addressed, understanding this	
		ith First Nations people or First Nations people are the e introduced through this presentation, and then applied	
	through application of the First Nations Research Circ		
	5 11		
	Session Chair: Prof Richard Chenhall		
14:30 - 14:50	AFTERNOON TEA		
14:50 – 15:50	Panel Session - Incidental disclosures and mane	latory reporting	
	Incidental disclosures occur particularly in qualitative	e research, when in the course of an interview, a participant	
		has not directly asked about and was not intending to find	
		troubling and may take the researchers into the realm of	
	mandatory reporting. Other types of disclosures (eg, about criminal or unprofessional activity, untreated		
	physical and mental health problems, or intimate partner violence) do not invoke mandatory requirements and		
	may be even more difficult for researchers and HRECs to manage. This panel will discuss what HRECs should be		
	vigilant for in reviewing applications, how prescriptive they should be in how any disclosures should be managed, and what researchers' responsibilities are in this area.		
	Panellist:		
	Phillip Johnstone, Barrister at the Victorian Bar		
	Prof Maurice Eisenbruch, Monash University Dr. Patricia McNamara, The University of Malbourne		
	Dr Patricia McNamara, The University of Melbourne Bronwyn Tarrant, The University of Melbourne		
	bionwyn rununt, me oniversity of vielbourne		
	Session Chair: Prof Lynn Gillam & Kandy White		
15:50 - 16:00	Conference Close		

*Preliminary program is subject to change at discretion of the conference organisers.