

**June 20, 2011**  
**12:00 – 2:00 p.m.**  
**PL600F**

**BROCK UNIVERSITY RESEARCH ETHICS BOARD**  
**Minutes of the June 20 2011 Meeting**

**Attendees:**

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

**Regrets:**

Bordonaro, Karen  
Liu, Jason  
Lovering, Mary  
McGinn, Michelle  
Shores, Bevin  
Rawlings, Kevin  
Rose-Krasnor, Linda

<b>MINUTES</b>		
<b>ITEM</b>	<b>DISCUSSION</b>	<b>ACTION</b>
1	<p><b>Welcome:</b></p> <p><b>Motion to approve June Agenda (BF, GH)</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>· Addition under "Other Business": CGSB</li> <li>· Approved 9, Opposed 0, Abstentions 0</li> </ul> <p><b>Motion to approve May decision reports (CTW, BF)</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>· Approved 9, Opposed 0, Abstentions 0</li> </ul> <p><b>Motion to approve May minutes (HC, JT)</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>· Approved 7, opposed 0, Abstentions 2</li> </ul>	
2	<p><b>Updates from Previous Minutes</b></p> <p><b>REB Survey</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>· KW pulled together qualitative portion of the survey, JF did qualitative portion</li> <li>· The data is ready for analysis</li> <li>· There were notable differences between faculty and graduate student responses</li> <li>· Both quantitative and qualitative feedback were positive for the most part</li> <li>· The complaints will be used as educational opportunities</li> <li>· Full update will be given once the annual report is written</li> </ul>	
3	<p><b>New Business</b></p> <p><b>Compliance Case (in-camera)</b></p> <p><b>Strike Protocol</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>· Rather than approach York University directly, LW asked a question on the CAREB list serve about strike protocols</li> <li>· Feedback was received on protocols if the administration were to go on strike, but not faculty</li> <li>· Other REB's suggested they would reduce the workload in the event of a strike (i.e., only review full board files)</li> <li>· Discussed that research would be severely affected if faculty strike as they make up a significant portion of the REB</li> <li>· Discussion arose about whether or not faculty members</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>· LW to contact Tri-Council</li> </ul>

		<p>would cross picket lines to continue research</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>· IRB services (independent review board) operate at arms length from the institution. UBC had an agreement with IRB services to conduct ethics reviews in case of a strike.</li> <li>· REB members seemed in agreement to set up a service with IRB in case it is needed in future</li> <li>· They could become the Board of record at that time.</li> <li>· Work could also be delegated to the office staff</li> <li>· SOP needed</li> </ul>	
4	<b>Pre-Discussion – Full Board Review (in-camera)</b>		
5	<b>First Full Board Review (in-camera)</b>		
6	<b>Second Full Board Review (in-camera)</b>		
7	<b>Other Business</b>	<p><b>SREB/BREB</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>· Discussion about preparation for new BREB, meeting scheduling and membership arose</li> <li>· Returning REB members were welcomed at orientation and lunch</li> <li>· Student representation and this years applicants were discussed</li> </ul> <p><b>CGSB</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>· Update on Canadian General Standards Board draft document for clinical trials. The CGSB is taking an ISO approach to development</li> <li>· CAREB voted “no” to the adoption of the document but was in the minority</li> <li>· Discussed that the checklist mentality is problematic and could eventually impact social sciences</li> </ul>	