

November 9, 2011

12:00 – 2:00 p.m.

MCD350-L

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

Attendees:

Chalmers, Heather
Frijters, Jan
Hodson, Gordon
Jaipal-Jamani, Kamini
Lorusso, Jenna
MacInnis, Cara
Mair, Brue
McGinn, Michelle
Servos, Jennifer
Walker, Lori
Williams, Kate

Regrets:

Bay, Darlene
Rawlings, Kevin
Tardif-Williams, Christine
Thomson, Ron

MINUTES		
ITEM	DISCUSSION	ACTION
1	<p>Welcome:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">· The potential of having two new community members was discussed. <p>November Agenda</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">· Additions/changes· Approved <p>October decision reports</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">· Discussed the unequal distribution of files to SREB· Discussed possibility of using SSHRC and NSERC criteria to distribute files more evenly· LW suggested another executive meeting for Chairs to discuss this· The ethics office will run the numbers in December and see how the files have been distributed thus far· Approved <p>October minutes</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">· no corrections were raised, and the minutes were approved	
2	<p>Welcome</p> <p>Gary Libben – VP Research</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">· Introductions were made· VP-Research expressed his recognition for the hard work the SREB does and thanked all members for their contributions· The benefit of the SREB to colleagues was also stressed· Noted the experience of being a REB member can make volunteers better researchers· VP-Research discussed his role as the interface between Brock and government and noted the zero tolerance for research that violates ethical standards· Noted that as stewards of public funding, REBs are stewards of trust· VP-Research encouraged the SREB to provide best practice models· VP-Researcher concluded that he seeks to ensure that the work of the SREB is appreciated and better understood across campus· VP-Research suggested meeting with SREB Chair once per term to check in	

3	Business Arising from Previous Minutes	Guidelines for Online/Internet Research <ul style="list-style-type: none"> · BREB members felt overall that the document is ready to send to researchers with knowledge about or experience with online/internet research · Researchers names suggested: John Rodue, Camille Rutherford, Darlene Bay, Tony Boaegart 	KW and HC to follow up and send an email to all researchers knowledgeable about or involved in online/internet research
4	New Business	REB Member workload recognition/expectation <ul style="list-style-type: none"> · SREB Chair went over what REB members do to get feedback on how to clean up the letter of recognition and letter of appointment · Discussed content of the letter of appointment: duration of appointment, role on the Board, timing of meetings, statements of competency, liability, compensation and confidentiality · Noted that yearly or at the end of each members' term there is a letter of recognition · Discussed the current letter of recognition (handout) · Explained both templates are being revisited because of CVs and purposes useful to members careers (to attempt to better recognize service) · Some debate emerged about whether the letter of appointment and letter of recognition should be distributed annually or per term · Discussed several possibilities to alert a member who is not fulfilling the requirements · Debated whether the letter for those not fulfilling requirements should only go to individual members who are struggling to meet their requirements and/or cc'd to Deans/Chairs. · Noted that it is first the Chair's responsibility to address these issues with members not fulfilling their requirements · HC and MM both came forward as having experience working on workload issues for their departments Revisions to Modification Form <ul style="list-style-type: none"> · KW discussed proposed changes to the form (a handout was distributed with the meeting package) · Discussed how to revise modification form to balance office workload and facilitate research · Noted that the form must be more explicit about what is added and what is subtracted from the original study. · Suggested more questions/examples for what constitutes a "change in risk" and what constitutes a "new modification" · Discussed how long a modification can stay open · How to navigate which board to apply to with a modification was addressed (SREB or BREB) · Suggested to look into procedures for modifications at other institutions (e.g. McMaster, Toronto) 	LW and KW to look into procedures at other universities
5	Educational Component	Alternatives to formal written consent <ul style="list-style-type: none"> · The new document (TCPS2) recognizes verbal consent · Discussed consent as a process, not just a form (can be written, verbal or implied) · Re-consent after deception was also discussed · Continuing consent was discussed · Cognitive and diminished capacity of research participants was discussed · Discussed consent procedure when there is an elite participant 	

6	Other Business	1:55pm	
---	-----------------------	--------	--