

**MINUTES OF MEETING #2 (2011 - 2012) OF THE
SENATE RESEARCH AND SCHOLARSHIP POLICY COMMITTEE
HELD ON TUESDAY, OCTOBER 18th, 2011 AT 9:00AM - 10:30AM
IN MC D350-L**

PRESENT: Professor Steven Renzetti (Chair), Professor Francine McCarthy (Vice-Chair), Professor Kimberly Cote, Professor David Gabriel, Dr. Murray Knuttila, Dr. Gary Libben, Professor James Mandigo, Professor Diane Miller, Dean Michael Plyley, Professor Lynn Rempel, Professor Jennifer Rowsell, Professor Dragos Simandan, Professor Elizabeth Vlossak, Mr. Daniel Anti-Amoa, Ms. Judith Maiden (Recorder)

ALSO PRESENT: Professor Gail Cook, Professor Jan Frijters (SREB Chair), Professor Michelle McGinn (BREB & SREB Vice-Chair, Professor Brian Roy (BREB Chair), Professor Barbara Sainty, Ms. Lori Walker (Manager, Research Ethics)

REGRETS: Ms. Margaret Grove, Dean Philip Kitchen, Mr. Chris Ventura

1. Introductions / Welcome

Since this was Professor Renzetti's first in-person meeting, members were asked to state their name and their department association.

2. Approval of Agenda

MOVED (Simandan /Rowsell)

THAT the agenda be accepted as circulated.

CARRIED

3. Approval of Minutes of Previous Meeting

MOVED (Plyley/Rowsell)

THAT the minutes of the #1 (2011 - 2012) Senate Research & Scholarship Policy Committee held on September 20th, 2011 be approved as circulated.

CARRIED

Professor Renzetti requested updates for action items recorded in the September 20th minutes.

Dr. Knuttila addressed the status of the Travel & Field Safety Policy. He mentioned that since the collective bargaining had been completed, he will have a report on the status of the policy from Greg Finn for the next meeting.

Professor Mandigo followed up with Mike Farrell regarding the issue of the Vice-President Research reporting on the Senate agenda. In January of last year, Governance passed a motion to have the Terms of Reference of the Research and Scholarship Policy Committee amended to state that a report from the Vice-President, Research be added as a standing item on each Committee agenda. At the time, the Governance Committee had concurred that it was more appropriate for the Report of the Vice-President, Research to come to Senate through a Committee then to have a place on the Senate agenda.

The committee discussed and concurred unanimously that Faculty Handbook II:7.1.5: Order of Business be amended to include a report of the Vice-President Research on the Senate agenda.

MOVED (Knuttila/Plyley)

THAT a report of the Vice-President Research be added as a standing item on the Senate agenda.

CARRIED

(14 in favour - unanimous)

Dr. Knuttila agreed to attend the next Senate meeting to address this item.

After the committee had voted, Dr. Libben addressed the fact that he wants to have research visible everywhere and that one manifestation of this would be to have a place for him to report on the Senate agenda. Professor Renzetti concurred that by reporting to Senate, the VPR would also be at the meeting to answer the report.

Professor McCarthy contacted Nota Klentrou, Chair of the Graduate Studies committee to encourage that committee to pursue the establishment of a Graduate Faculty. Professor Klentrou was happy to hear that the Research & Scholarship Policy Committee supports the Graduate Studies committee's reintroduction of this motion to Senate. The Graduate Studies Committee intends to put through a report noting the encouragement and acknowledging the support from other committees.

CARRIED

4. Update/Information

It was agreed to reverse the order of the first two items in the agenda so that the REB 2010-2011 Annual Report is addressed prior to the Proposed Changes to the Research Ethics section of the Faculty Handbook.

a. Research Ethics Board (REB) 2010-2011 Annual Report

Ms. Walker and Professor McGinn indicated the report contained activities from the previous year and spoke briefly on the role of Research Ethics Boards (REBs) and the Research Ethics Office (REO). Professor McGinn mentioned that on January 26th, 2011, this Committee passed a motion to recommend that Senate approve the differentiation into two distinct Research Ethics Boards—a Bioscience Research Ethics Board (BREB) and a Social Science Research Ethics Board (SREB)—and the corresponding modifications to the Faculty Handbook. At the February 9th meeting, Senate approved the modifications to the Faculty Handbook III: 8.3.1 to 8.3.4 and the composition and structure of the Research Ethics Boards allowing for the creation of a Bioscience Research Ethics Board (BREB).

Discussion ensued regarding the changes made to the REO and the impact on the application turnaround time due to the reduction of dedicated administrative support. This lack of support has resulted in the Research Ethics Manager taking on more clerical duties. These issues are of great concern to both REB's. The results of the 2011 REB Survey indicated that turnaround time is a strong predictor of researcher satisfaction with the REB process and the long-term effect of this problem is yet to be seen.

Professor McGinn stated that additional challenges faced by the REB's are in regard to which REB to send the applications to for review. Some people still use old forms that need modification. Ms. Walker stated that it has to be communicated to people to use the new forms, not the old ones. The information has been posted in the Brock News, but old forms are still

being received.

After the Committee discussed the Research Ethics 2010-2011 Annual Report, it was accepted as presented through the Research Ethics Boards.

MOVED (Simandan /Miller)

THAT the committee accept the REB 2010-2011 Annual Report as presented.

CARRIED

b. Proposed changes to the Research Ethics section of the Faculty Handbook

Professor McGinn stated *that as a requirement under the Memorandum of Understanding (MOU) on the Roles and Responsibilities in the Management of Federal Grants and Awards, all institutional human research ethics policies, procedures, guidelines, and practices at Brock must meet the requirements laid out in the Tri-Council Policy Statement (TCPS2) with regard to the Ethical Conduct for Research involving Humans. The report was released in December 2010. For this reason the REB's worked collaboratively to identify and approve the recommended changes to the Faculty Handbook requiring the removal of articles FHB:III:8.3.13 (Clinical Trials), III:8.3.14 (Human Genetic Research), and III:8.3.15 (Human Gametes, Embryos, or Fetuses).* These articles were identified as being restrictive and an immediate priority.

Professor Renzetti suggested the Committee deal separately with the three numbered items listed in the REB Proposal cover letter for the Proposed Changes to the Brock Faculty Handbook.

1 - *Remove articles FHB:III:8.3.13 (Clinical Trials), III:8.3.14 (Human Genetic Research), and III:8.3.15 (Human Gametes, Embryos, or Fetuses).*

2 - *Update the Faculty Handbook section on research ethics (III:8.2–III:8.3) to remove redundancies and inconsistencies with TCPS2, and to emphasize policy rather than procedure.*

3 - *Remove article III:8.1.9.*

MOVED (Mandigo/Plyley)

THAT the three numbered items in the REB document 'Proposed Changes to the Brock Faculty Handbook' be dealt with separately.

CARRIED

The Committee received and discussed at length revisions to the Faculty Handbook III: 8 and recommends to Senate that the revisions be approved as outlined by the Brock University Research Ethics Board covering letter, 'Proposed Changes to the Brock Faculty Handbook'.

MOVED (Vlossak /McCarthy)

THAT Senate approve the modifications to the Faculty Handbook: remove articles FHB:III:8.3.13 (Clinical Trials), III:8.3.14 (Human Genetic Research), and III:8.3.15 (Human Gametes, Embryos, or Fetuses)

CARRIED

Rationale (provided by the REB): Removal of these restrictive articles is an immediate priority. These articles were written with a view to revision when Brock's research direction showed evidence of change, and that time is now. With the new infrastructure targeted toward the biosciences, new faculty, and a vision toward a more intensely comprehensive University, Brock will increasingly be host to research in these areas. Researchers are already prepared to conduct research in these areas hence the restrictions provided in these three articles constitute an infringement upon academic freedom for Brock researchers (thereby contravening Article 11 in the Collective Agreement Between Brock University and the Brock University Faculty Association). Importantly, the definition of clinical trials provided in TCPS2 includes "any investigation involving participants that evaluates the effects of one or more health-related interventions on health outcomes" (p. 147). Following this broad definition, article III:8.3.13 would require the Bioscience Research Ethics Board to reject or shut down numerous research projects.

Tri-Council Policy Statement II (TCPS2) provides substantive guidelines to support researchers and the Bioscience Research Ethics Board in the ethical conduct of research in these areas (Chapters 11, 13, and 12, respectively). Given the substantive support in TCPS2, there is no need for further guidance to be incorporated directly into the Faculty Handbook.

It was agreed that the Faculty Handbook section on Research Ethics (III:8.2–III:8.3) needs updating to remove redundancies and inconsistencies with TCPS2, and to emphasize policy rather than procedure.

MOVED (Simandan/Libben)

THAT the Faculty Handbook articles on Research Ethics (III:8.2–III:8.3) be changed to remove redundancies and inconsistencies with Tri-Council Policy Statement II (TCPS2).

CARRIED

Rationale (provided by the REB): Brock's current policy was written to be compliant with the original Tri-Council Policy Statement: Ethical Conduct for Research Involving Humans (1998), which was extensively revised to produce TCPS2 (released in December 2010). Consistent with

the requirements of the MOU, Brock's policy must now be updated to reflect these changes. The TCPS2 states that "the highest body within an institution shall: establish the REB [Research Ethics Board] or REBs, define an appropriate reporting relationship with the REBs, and ensure the REBs are provided with necessary and sufficient ongoing financial and administrative resources to fulfil their duties" (TCPS2, 6.2). Within Brock's bicameral system, Senate is the relevant highest body. None of these requirements have changed since the original TCPS, so the

proposed text reaffirms the existing policy by clearly outlining responsibilities and reporting relationships for the Vice-President Research, the Research Ethics Boards, and the Research Ethics Office.

Beyond the requirements noted above, much of the other content in the current Faculty Handbook section on research ethics includes procedural details that would be best handled in a separate procedures and practices manual that could be updated on an ongoing basis by the Research Ethics Boards to reflect the dynamic context for research, developments in the field, and future TCPS revisions or interpretations. This streamlined focus for the Faculty Handbook will furthermore reduce the burden on Senate to oversee every minor procedural change while ensuring the REBs have the necessary mandate and expertise to fulfill this responsibility on behalf of the institution. The manual will be readily available from the Research Ethics Office.

After reviewing the proposed policy changes, it was agreed by the committee as outlined in FHB III:8.2.1: Human Research at Brock (b), that Senate will need to clarify what is meant by 'under the auspices or within the jurisdiction of Brock University'. Conversation ensued regarding this issue and it was mentioned DeGroot Medical School will be located in the CFHBRC and that they do not fall under our REB's, so this issue needs to be resolved before their arrival.

It was felt it could be argued for people to do controversial research and that we allow this since we are a university. Conversation continued around what are the academic risks, what is fiduciary; we need to protect people's right to take risks. Professor McCarthy stated that faculty members have the right to do research. Professor Mandigo remarked when people outside the university do research here, how are we to determine their rights. Professor Renzetti felt we should ensure there is consistency with all of our guidelines and procedures.

Professor McGinn felt the bigger challenge is when there is research conducted on our people and questioned whether this is under the auspices or jurisdiction of Brock University. Senate will need to communicate what these risks are. Professor McCarthy felt for her there were two issues; as an individual she should be allowed to answer, but as the chair of her department who is acting on behalf of Brock University she may have to give a different answer and that an institutional response should be looked at closer.

If other universities are conducting surveys and are asking more personal questions, than we have a concern and responsibility to view the survey implement. Institution based should seek institutions approval. Quality assurance surveys are different than research project surveys. How do we determine when to do these surveys?

There may be issues of intuitional protection, endorsement and approval. We need interpretation on these. Complaints have been received from people at Brock doing research without ethics approval. There can be a lack of clarity around what this means. Professor Renzetti wants the committee to address these terms.

MOVED (Miller/Rowell)

THAT Faculty Handbook III. 8.1. 9 - Compliance with the Policy be removed

CARRIED

Rationale (provided by REB): This information is more appropriately placed in the Human Research at Brock section of the proposed updated policy as article 8.2.1(c).

c. Response to the Chair of the Senate Governance Committee

i. FHB III:25.2

On October 5th, 2011, Professor Renzetti received an email from Carol Merriam, Chair, Senate Governance Committee in regard to FHB III:25 passing on a communication it had received questioning that the previous requirement in Section 25.2, namely: “To provide a policy framework that emphasizes and encourages academic freedom, innovative scholarly research and creative activity, and accountability to the university community; and To provide a transparent and efficient procedure for the creation...” does not appear in Section 25, as currently posted on the Senate website. The communication went on to inquire whether the values of accountability, transparency and openness had been included in another section of the FHB. It was thought the whole point of the last revision was to enhance openness.

The Committee discussed this issue and agreed to the following wording for the Chair’s response to the Chair of the Senate Governance Committee:

“At its May 11, 2011 meeting, Senate, at the recommendation of the Senate Research and Scholarship Policy Committee, approved changes to FHB III:25. To the best of my knowledge the cited deletions have not been added to another section of the FHB. I would point out that, as part of those changes, a procedure was introduced in FHB III:25.4.1.1 to have any application for a research centre/institute be posted on the Senate website for a period of 21 days for comment to the relevant Dean/Vice President prior to it being considered by the Research and Scholarship Policy committee.”

Professor Renzetti will reply to the Chair of Governance and send this information in a report to Senate as an information item.

d. Process of obtaining Senate approval for Centres

Professor Barbara Sainty and Professor Gail Cook stated that for five years over \$300,000 in funding was received for research through two funding bodies for the CMA Brock Accounting Research & Education Centre (CMA BAREC). BAREC has existed since 1992 and Gail Cook is its Director. The CMA portion was added in 2007 when the Faculty of Business received funding from CMA Ontario. The funding was rolled into what already existed in accounting. It was received to support faculty research and the Institute of Chartered Accountants of Ontario have asked that they go through accreditation in order to understand how the funds are managed. The

CA/Brock Centre for International Institute for Issues in Accounting (IIIA) is a standing entity and reports to the dean, so this entity can be called a centre instead of an institute. They have clear guidelines within their faculty and bodies for governing themselves. Professor Sainty wished to have the two entities grandfathered under their current structure. With the recent changes to Faculty Handbook 25: Policy on the Establishment and Review of Research Centres and Institutes, guidance is requested as to the proper procedure regarding these entities and numerous questions were raised.

Professor Renzetti suggested they change the name to something that is neither a centre nor an institute or that they do nothing or apply to be a centre as currently defined in the Faculty Handbook by submitting a proposal to the committee for review.

Much discussion ensued, and Professor Mandigo provided information from the May 11th meeting of Senate and it was agreed that the proposed amendments to the Faculty Handbook with respect to the Policy on the Establishment and Review of Research Centres and Institutes that the proposed nomenclature would apply to new Research Centres and Institutes, not existing ones.

Professor McCarthy asked that discussion of a new research centre be added to the next agenda since BESRU has a proposal on the website for public review and now wants to be considered a centre.

5. Report from Vice-President Research

Dr. Libben gave an update on his recent activities. These activities included; meeting with Dean Plyley to look at ways to make both Research and Graduate Studies more visible across campus; conducting joint monthly meetings with Dean Plyley and the Associate Deans Research to discuss issues relevant to Research and Graduate Studies; a meeting with Human Resources and Facilities Management to develop key support positions for the Cairns Health and Bioscience Research Complex; review of the new ORS Research Officer Position; attended the Niagara Venture Forum; reviewed CFI applications; attended the first meeting of the Task Force to create Institutional Analysis capacity; discussed research mentorship program and the new Seed grant program funding.

He mentioned that Senior Administrators will be meeting in Caledon for a retreat at the end of November and have been asked to bring their Strategic Plans to the meeting and that these plans need to speak to the seven university directions.

Dr. Libben has a goal of turning 1 application into 4 projects and does not want to depend entirely on Tri-Council funding since it is harder to obtain, but does not want to abandon it altogether either. He hopes to add to it by discovering other funding opportunities.

Dr. Libben questioned the role of the committee in the development of research at Brock and asked if there was interest in developing a framework of key performance indicators for research. He asked the committee to consider the following questions.

- Could the Committee also have “research development” in its mandate?
- How can this Committee play a role in the development of the Strategic Plan?
- Do we have an appetite for measurement?
- Could the committee play a key role in developing a framework?
- What else could we do?

It was agreed that a report from the Vice-President Research will be circulated to the Committee prior to meetings and that a discussion of the report is to occur at the beginning of subsequent meetings.

ACTION Professor Renzetti requested that Ms. Maiden add to the next agenda a discussion of the report from the Vice-President Research and the VPR’s above questions.

6. Other Business

None

Date of Next Meeting:

Tuesday, January 17th, 2012

The above meetings will be held in the Research/Graduate Studies Boardroom (MC D350-L)

7. Adjournment

MOVED (Mandigo /Plyley)

THAT the meeting be adjourned

CARRIED

The meeting adjourned at 10:35am