

November 15, 2010

12:00 – 2:00 p.m.

Plaza 600F

BROCK UNIVERSITY RESEARCH ETHICS BOARD

Minutes of the November 15, 2010 Meeting

Attendees:

Book, Angela
Bordonaro, Karen
Chalmers, Heather
Ditor, Dave
Down, Susan
Falk, Bareket
Frijters, Jan
Hodson, Gordon
Lovering, Mary
McGinn, Michelle
Rose-Krasnor, Linda
Shores, Bevin
Tardif-Williams, Christine
Torti, Jacqueline
Walker, Lori
Williams, Kate
Woloshyn, Vera

Regrets:

Conteh, Charles
DiBiase, Ann-Marie
Mair, Bruce
Malleck, Dan
Rawlings, Kevin
Thomson, Ron

MINUTES		
ITEM	DISCUSSION	ACTION
1	<p>Welcome:</p> <p>Motion to approve October Agenda (BF, JF)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">· All in favour <p>Motion to approve September and October decision reports (HC, AB)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">· All in favour <p>Motion to approve September minutes (GH, CTW)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">· Approved 14, Opposed 0, Abstentions 1 <p>Motion to approve October minutes (BF, JF)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">· Approved 11, Opposed 0, Abstentions 4	
2	<p>Business arising from Previous Minutes</p> <p>Update on REB2 Proposal for Senate Committee on Research and Scholarship</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">· The proposal has gone to the VP-Research with a request to present it to the Senate Committee on Research and Scholarship· The VP-Research has indicated support <p>Annual Report 2009-2010</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">· The final report was emailed to current REB members and sent to last year's REB members, the Aboriginal Research Advisory Circle (ARAC) and the REB Appeals Committee· REB members were thanked for their feedback· The report was also sent to the VP-Research	
3	<p>New Business</p> <p>Survey Policy</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">· Discussed how this policy will connect with REB issues and concerns· Discussed how to ensure that this policy does not confuse researchers in terms of REB requirements· Noted potential edits to the draft for clarity including a title change. It was thought that the current title is too vague and	

		<p>may cause confusion. Adding the word “administration” to the title was suggested</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> · Noted this policy needs to be clearly separated from the REB’s mandate and role · Discussed that the REB should advocate for wording that instructs researchers to submit an application to the REB if a survey involves research as defined by the TCPS · REB members were asked to think of other issues that may contribute to the feedback LW and MM provide the Senate Committee on Research and Scholarship. · Some clarity in terms of examples of surveys that would fall under this policy is needed · Noted it might be helpful for the REB to articulate different examples and ask for clarity · Concerns were raised about the lack of clarity with regards to faculty member and graduate student research · Concerns were raised about data storage and the institutional parameters around anonymity and confidentiality (#9 on application) 	
4	Educational Component	<p>Mandatory Reporting Laws</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> · The main points of this law were discussed · Noted that it applies to researchers doing research with children under the age of 16 years. It also applies to children subject to a child protection order who are 16 and 17 years old. · Any limits to confidentiality due to mandatory reporting law should be stated on studies involving children and youth (that fit the above parameters) when there are open ended questions about their home life, family, sports teams, care settings, etc. · The REB does not require a statement describing limits to confidentiality due to mandatory reporting law for every study with children and youth · Discussed that the research may not include questions directly pertaining to child abuse but certain open ended questions could generate unanticipated responses · Confidentiality cannot be guaranteed in research where this law could apply. Children and parents should be informed in research consent materials about this limitation · In Canada, mandatory reporting law applies to everyone · It is not sufficient for researchers to just tell their supervisor or any “authority” other than CAS if suspicions of child abuse arise during the research · Noted that harm to self or others is not part of mandatory reporting in Canada however there are special additional reporting duties for clinical psychologists and health professionals. Any duties to report that researchers have as part of a profession should be clearly articulated in consent forms. · Researchers who are not duty bound to report criminal activities or other sensitive issues may choose, through personal moral stance, to limit participant confidentiality in certain circumstances. In such cases, they need to make their stance known prior to beginning research and clearly explain this in consent/assent materials · Suggested the REB create guidelines, or co-host a forum to educate researchers and their research assistants · Suggested the REB work with researchers to develop policy/guidelines for working with children · Noted that Research Assistants have a lot of responsibility when it comes to mandatory reporting law 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> · Create guidelines for researchers working with children/youth · Once these are together the REB will revisit this issue and work on how to extend the educational piece and promote Brock’s need to support researchers that would be doing research with children/youth

		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> · Noted that the REB does not want to promote over zealous reporting by researchers · Debated the limits to confidentiality statement on all research consent forms involving youth under the age of 16 · Noted that this may dilute the effectiveness of the phrase · Noted that in the notes section of the decision letter it could be strongly advised to ensure researchers are aware of this law · Debated that it is not the REB's responsibility to ensure the law is enacted · Suggested it should be on all consent forms because it is not for the researcher, but for the protection of the participant so they know exactly what will happen if they share information on abuse · Suggested adding a statement to the standard application for ethics review once guidelines have been developed to alert researchers to their responsibility in terms of mandatory reporting laws. 	
5	Full Board Review	(Moved in-Camera)	
6	Other Business		
7	Adjourn	2:05pm	