

**March 22, 2011**  
**12:00 – 2:00 p.m.**  
**Plaza 600F**

**BROCK UNIVERSITY RESEARCH ETHICS BOARD**  
**Minutes of the March 22, 2011 Meeting**

**Attendees:**

Bordonaro, Karen  
 Chalmers, Heather  
 Ditor, Dave  
 Down, Susan  
 Falk, Bareket  
 Frijters, Jan  
 Hodson, Gordon  
 McGinn, Michelle  
 Tardif-Williams, Christine  
 Thomson, Ron  
 Torti, Jacqueline  
 Walker, Lori  
 Williams, Kate

**Regrets:**

DiBiase, Ann-Marie  
 Liu, Jason  
 Lovering, Mary  
 Mair, Bruce  
 Malleck, Dan  
 Rawlings, Kevin  
 Rose-Krasnor, Linda  
 Shores, Bevin

<b>MINUTES</b>		
<b>ITEM</b>	<b>DISCUSSION</b>	<b>ACTION</b>
1	<p><b>Welcome:</b></p> <p><b>Motion to approve March Agenda</b></p> <p><b>Motion to approve February decision reports</b></p> <p><b>Motion to approve February minutes</b></p>	<p>No quorum                      All votes deferred to next meeting</p>
2	<p><b>Business Arising from Previous Minutes</b></p> <p><b>Follow up on Compliance Case</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>· Level 3 - turned over to the VP-Research</li> <li>· No response was received from researchers since sending the letter</li> <li>· The ethics file has been closed. A final report is pending</li> </ul>	
3	<p><b>Business deferred from Previous Minutes</b></p> <p><b>Update on BREB proposal to Senate</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>· The proposal was accepted by Senate and the Faculty Handbook has been updated accordingly</li> <li>· We will have two boards: Bioscience Research Ethics Board (BREB) and Social Science Research Ethics Board (SREB)</li> <li>· An individual was identified to serve as Chair on BREB</li> <li>· REB executive retreat planned for next week</li> <li>· Intention to implement BREB for July, so fully functioning by September 2011</li> <li>· Continuing members will be consulted regarding preference regarding which Board to join</li> <li>· Broad-based expertise needed for each board</li> <li>· REB members were encouraged to share their comments</li> </ul>	

		<p>or suggestions before the retreat via email</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>· Next Wednesday and Thursday the Interagency Advisory Panel on Research Ethics (PRE) is offering training sessions in Toronto on TCPS2</li> <li>· The Office will bring back information from PRE and other attendees to assist with aligning our policies and practices with the new TCPS2</li> </ul> <p><b>Affirm Motion to Approve Guidelines for Minimal Risk Research Involving Alcohol Consumption</b></p> <p><b>REB Survey</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>· Anticipated distribution - second week of April</li> <li>· VP-Research is happy to encourage faculty to participate</li> <li>· Concerns were raised about anonymity when participants sign in with their portal password</li> <li>· REB members want an anonymous survey</li> <li>· To keep data anonymous email addresses need to be entered on a separate survey link if we include an incentive draw</li> <li>· Compensation/incentive for participation was discussed</li> <li>· Some REB members felt incentive may be particularly applicable to graduate students but less so for faculty</li> <li>· Some people had concerns about using incentives for an REB survey</li> <li>· Discussion ensued around types of incentive. A gift certificate from the bookstore was suggested.</li> <li>· Study duration - month of April</li> <li>· Some REB members suggested a deadline is important for the draw</li> <li>· Timeline of April 1-30 was suggested</li> </ul> <p><b>Potential strike protocol</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>· In the event of a strike, all REB materials will be sent electronically</li> <li>· Question posed: Does it work for REB members if the REB communicates via email during a strike?</li> <li>· Most agreed. Some would feel uncomfortable indirectly crossing the picket line to do work off campus</li> <li>· While this might create more work for the Office, it would keep things moving</li> <li>· The case of full board reviews were discussed</li> <li>· Some researchers may not feel comfortable attending meetings off campus during a strike</li> <li>· Noted that negotiation would have to happen with care and delicacy</li> <li>· The decision should be left with the researcher as to whether or not to put it off or meet at an alternative location</li> <li>· A written SOP was suggested</li> </ul> <p><b>Research Ethics administrative support</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>· Since 2005 the office has had a dedicated Research Ethics Assistant (REA)</li> <li>· In 2008, the REA job description was broadened for ORS more generally since we were anticipating Process Pathways (online database system)</li> <li>· The Office never received Process Pathways, there were several VP switches, and now ethics does not have specific support</li> <li>· More administrative support for the office has allowed research ethics to spend time on educational outreach</li> </ul>	<p>Deferred to next REB meeting</p> <p>Survey scheduled for implementation in April</p> <p>LW to follow up with York University's REB to see how they dealt with strike procedures in the past</p> <p>Draft and circulate letter electronically for REB members' input</p>
--	--	---	--

		<p>(presentations, forums), guidelines, training, etc.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>· The reduction in administrative support has increased the clerical work allocated to LW and KW (compiling, sending decision letters, managing database and file systems, preparing monthly reports, assigning reviewers, tracking emails, answering phones, etc.)</li> <li>· The REB receives an average of 400 new applications per year. Each application requires at least three points of contact (receipt, decision, final report); many involve an additional point of contact involving clarifications. This results in an annual average of 1650 formal points of contact regarding applications. This number does not include modifications or annual renewals for new or continuing files.</li> <li>· Concerns expressed about what this reduction in administrative support means for the future of the REB (e.g., turnaround times, establishing the new Bioscience Board, developing policy and procedures associated with TCPS2)</li> <li>· REB members tried to work through some potential solutions</li> <li>· REB members were concerned that the withdrawal of support will affect research</li> <li>· Time management issues were discussed</li> <li>· Discussed how to get a visible message to VP-Research that system has been disrupted</li> <li>· REB members expressed concern and were willing to write a letter to the VP-Research</li> <li>· LW thinks a letter to the VP-Research would suffice with a focus on service and how reduced administrative support diminishes service</li> <li>· Circulate the draft letter and call for a vote</li> </ul>	
4	<b>New Business</b>	<p><b>ARAC</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>· Aboriginal Research Advisory Circle reformed and is a strong group</li> <li>· The first meeting was held today</li> <li>· Administrative support needed for this group</li> <li>· ARAC conducts a cultural review for files involving Aboriginal Peoples</li> </ul>	
5	<b>Other Business</b>	<p><b>Interesting self-study/creative practice case</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>· A researcher wants to collect personal biological data to be used as the foundation for creative practice</li> <li>· A question was received about whether REB clearance would be needed</li> <li>· Discussion ensued regarding possible exemptions for creative practice or self-study research</li> <li>· TCPS2 provides some guidance for creative practice, but not self-study (which had been proposed for exemption in an earlier draft of TCPS2)</li> </ul>	Consider a future educational session related to self-study research
6	<b>Adjourned</b>		