

October 27, 2011
12:00 – 2:00 p.m.
MCD350-L

BROCK UNIVERSITY SOCIAL SCIENCE RESEARCH ETHICS BOARD
Minutes of the October, 2011 Meeting

Attendees:

Bay, Darlene
 Frijters, Jan
 Hodson, Gordon
 Jaipal-Jamani, Kamini
 Lorusso, Jenna
 MacInnis, Cara
 Mair, Brue
 Servos, Jennifer
 Tardif-Williams, Christine
 Walker, Lori
 Williams, Kate

Regrets:

Chalmers, Heather
 McGinn, Michelle
 Rawlings, Kevin
 Thomson, Ron

MINUTES		
ITEM	DISCUSSION	ACTION
1	<p>Welcome:</p> <p>October Agenda</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> · items added under "Other Business": Draft Guidelines for Online/Internet Research and Policy · dropped Scholarship of Teaching and Learning from the agenda as this was covered during the May REB meeting · Approved <p>September decision reports</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> · Approved <p>September minutes</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> · no corrections were raised, and the minutes were approved 	
2	<p>Business Deferred from Previous Meeting</p> <p>Feedback on REB Survey</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> · Feedback was promised to participants · A summary should be ready by January 2012 and will be posted on the human research ethics website · Preliminary results were shared with the Board: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> · 69% of Brock researchers overall predicted some degree of satisfaction with the form and ethics process. · Graduate students were less satisfied than professors overall · The top predictor of satisfaction was the feedback participants got from the REB (quality of feedback) · 2nd predictor of satisfaction was turnaround time · 3rd predictor of satisfaction was the application form itself · 4th predictor of satisfaction was discrepancy between what researchers thought the turnaround time was and what their turn around time was · Noted dissatisfaction rates were quite low · Qualitative feedback will also be analyzed and included in 	

		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> the final report SREB members were encouraged to share anything they would want to see or have looked at more closely Differences between professor and graduate students were discussed as interesting topics to improve the process for each group LW interested in perceptions (what do researchers think we do) 	
3	New Business	<p>Participants: Inclusion/Exclusion</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Some members of the Psychology department are interested in creating a database that would match appropriate participants to particular studies shyness was given as an example It would be a type of pre-screening software that asked participants basic demographic questions (sex, handedness, mother tongue etc). This information would be stored and kept to match and recruit participants for potential future studies Non-demographic questions were also discussed (e.g. degree of shyness) Noted that type of questions may expand in future Explained that this database would not be used often and likely only by a few researchers Question posed: Would the Board agree with something like this or would a broader conversation be necessary? Questions arose about pre-screening on recruitment materials in the beginning of the study vs. having a database. Data security was discussed. There was concern about who would have access to the database Process and procedures were debated Ethical issues were raised about participants being able to participate in a study without having private information remain in the database Filtering was discussed Pros and cons were weighed Benefits to justify cost were discussed Risk to privacy and confidentiality was a main concern Noted this could be a slippery slope in targeting Noted the spirit of the database is not known Noted that Waterloo has something similar Concluded this issue is complex and the Board cannot make any decisions without more details To be discussed again at the next available meeting 	<p>GH to report back to Psychology researchers and ask for a concrete proposal explaining who has access to the data, how long it will be around, etc.</p> <p>LW will contact Waterloo</p>
4	Educational Component	<p>Emergent Designs</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Noted that REB's must recognize emergent designs LW explained emergent designs cannot always explain each step of the research up front In some cases researchers may only be able to lay out the parameters of their research and focus at first Some researchers submit to our Board in stages All of the details are not always present at the start of research using emergent designs Specified that researchers need room to have their work develop This is particularly true in Aboriginal research Discussed reviewers notes to chair and helpfulness of having this section for reviewers on the standard application outline 	

		Scholarship of Teaching and Learning (SOTL) <ul style="list-style-type: none"> · Noted that guidelines need to be created · There are some SOTL activities where ethics clearance is not needed · LW has some background documents · MM suggested to help write guidelines 	LW will look into creating guidelines and talk to MM
5	Other Business	Draft Guidelines for Online/Internet Research <ul style="list-style-type: none"> · Some members did not seem to receive this at the September 2011 meeting · Requested to send around to SREB members again for comments/feedback · bring back to November meeting · Some ethical issues involving Facebook were discussed Policy <ul style="list-style-type: none"> · Jan reported on the Research and Scholarship Policy Committee (RSPC) meeting · In general the committee accepted our rationale · Committee was unsure of how to define “under Borck’s auspices” or “jurisdiction” · Discussed the three prohibitions currently in the faculty handbook that need to be lifted (genetic research, clinical trials & fetuses embryos and gametes) · This received immediate and widespread agreement from committee as a whole · RSPC will ask that the 3 prohibitions are immediately struck from the handbook 	KW to re-circulate guidelines and request feedback
6	Meeting Adjourned		