January 18, 2011 12:00 – 2:00 p.m. Plaza 600F

BROCK UNIVERSITY RESEARCH ETHICS BOARD Minutes of the January 18, 2011 Meeting

Attendees:	Regrets:		
Chalmers, Heather	Book, Angela		
Down, Susan	Bordonaro, Karen		
Falk, Bareket	Conteh, Charles		
Hodson, Gordon	DiBiase, Ann-Marie		
Mair, Bruce	Ditor, Dave		
McGinn, Michelle	Frijters, Jan		
Tardif-Williams, Christine	Lovering, Mary		
Thomson, Ron	Malleck, Dan		
Torti lacqueline	Dawlings Kovin		

Tardif-Williams, Christine
Thomson, Ron
Torti, Jacqueline
Walker, Lori
Williams, Kate

Lovering, Mary
Malleck, Dan
Rawlings, Kevin
Rose-Krasnor, Linda
Shores, Bevin

ITE	EM	DISCUSSION	ACTION
1	Welcome: Motion to approve Janu Motion to approve Deco Motion to approve Deco	Did not have quorum; voting deferred to next meeting	
2	Business arising	Update on REB2 proposal for Senate Committee LW and MM re-wrote the draft proposal to highlight the importance of compliance with the MOU and to articulate that the two REBs will be leaner, more focused boards LW and MM to meet with VP-Research to discuss the revised draft document The revised document will be discussed at the Senate Research and Scholarship Policy Committee meeting this month	Updates will be brought to the next REB meeting
		Revisit Guidelines for Students Conducting Research for Course Credit Substantive changes were requested at the last REB meeting Worked with LRK who was most vocal with recommendations to prepare revised draft The main concerns were with the previous title and lack of examples of things that do not fit the definition of research in the TCPS A request was also made last meeting to include the definition of research in the document REB members had more revisions and suggestions: Suggested the need to flesh out what is "public domain" # 3 – too vague Questions were raised about teaching objectives/pedagogical teaching goals vs. research and where to draw the line	KW to follow up on revisions to course-based application from last year to see if there any guidance LW to create decision tree, send to GH, LRK and MM for review and bring back to REB

		Suggested we make a continuum to clarify what research is, what it is not and what is in between Noted that there are many grey areas in the guidelines as they are currently written Question raised about exemption for researchers using standardized instruments or protocols Questions raised about deciding on the appropriate protections and proper support for instructors, students, and ourselves to work through different scenarios It was suggested that the REB work toward isolating key factors such as the purpose of the research, who the participants are, who has access to the data etc., and derive scenarios from this A decision tree was suggested as another possible solution Challenges – some changes required to our current practice Revisit Guidelines for Minimal Risk Research Involving Alcohol Consumption	 Motion to approve (BF, GH)
		Reviewed revisions discussed from previous meeting REB members were satisfied with the changes	 All in favour To be reaffirmed at the next REB meeting
3	Educational Component	Some Changes Based Upon TCPS2 LW presented on major changes clarifications of anonymous, anonymized, and other data types exemption for anonymous secondary data were discussed sexemption for some naturalistic observations were discussed These changes were discussed along with how they differ from our current policy/practice REB working beyond TCPS – some REBs take a stand on particular issues in order to provide what they perceive to be "greater protection" than the TCPS. Such decisions should not be entered into lightly and would require strong guidance to support such a stance secondary use of anonymous data is exempt from REB review in TCPS2 provided the process of data linkage, recording, or dissemination does not generate identifiable information Consistent with TCPS1, non-research activities do not need to be reviewed by the REB – quality assurance, program evaluation, performance reviews, testing within normal educational requirements or creative practice All of these things are exempt when used for assessment, management or improvement purposes Risk and proportionate review were discussed REB must consider magnitude or seriousness of harm and probability that the harm will occur in order to effectively assess risk (and must ensure reviews take a proportionate approach) Noted that a lower level of scrutiny does not mean a lower level of adherence to core principles	
4	New Business	Planning Our TCPS2 Education Strategy Asked for advice or suggestions in moving forward Aboriginal issues and research was suggested as a topic for an educational session Autoethnography, where it fits into the REB's review and where it does not	

		Online/Internet research studies HC and KW to search TCPS2 for guidance in this regard A session on comparing TCPS2 to TCPS1 was suggested so we can see the distinctions and come up with some guidance A discussion about attendance at REB meetings and file overdue reviews ensued REB members who were present were upset that we do not always have quorum Update on REB Survey GH gave breakdown of survey questions and format One addition suggested for demographic information section: add "To what extent has your experience on the REB been educational?"	Revise, circulate to MM and LW for feedback and bring draft document to the next REB meeting for approval
5	Other Business		
6	Adjourn	2pm	