

**November 16, 2011**

**12:00 – 2:00 p.m.**

**MCD350-L**

**BROCK UNIVERSITY BIOSCIENCE RESEARCH ETHICS BOARD**

**Minutes of the November, 2011 Meeting**

**Attendees:**

Cratt, Charlene  
Ditor, Dave  
Jehu, Deborah (student)  
Marquardt, Drew (student)  
McGinn, Michelle (Vice-Chair)  
Peters, Sandra  
Roy, Brian (Chair)  
Shores, Bevin  
Stansfield, Melanie  
Williams, Kate

**Regrets:**

Good, Dawn  
Liu, Jason  
Walker, Lori  
Weaver, Tyler (student)

<b>MINUTES</b>		
<b>ITEM</b>	<b>DISCUSSION</b>	<b>ACTION</b>
1	<p><b>Welcome:</b></p> <p><b>Gary Libben – VP Research</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>· Introductions were made</li><li>· VP-Research suggested meeting with BREB Chair once per term to check in</li><li>· VP-Research expressed his recognition for the hard work the BREB does and thanked all members for their contributions</li><li>· The benefit of the BREB to colleagues was also stressed</li><li>· Noted the experience of being a REB member can make volunteers better researchers</li><li>· VP-Research discussed his role as the interface between Brock and government and noted the zero tolerance for research that violates ethical standards</li><li>· Noted that as stewards of public funding, REBs are stewards of trust</li><li>· VP-Research encouraged the BREB to provide best practice models</li><li>· Question posed about future plans for BREB with the new Bioscience Research Complex</li><li>· Noted more funds are needed as there will be more files to review with more complex issues to consider</li><li>· Explained part of the research mandate of the new Bioscience building is to create partnerships with the community</li><li>· Noted the REB requirement that we review anything under the auspices or jurisdiction of Brock</li><li>· A discussion arose about what constitutes Brock’s “auspices” and “jurisdiction”</li><li>· Question posed to VP-Research: Does Brock have any plans to make formal partnerships with the new hospital in St.Catharines (for researchers to collaborate with physicians/clinicians)</li><li>· Noted that some facilitation would be needed to connect researchers to physicians</li><li>· Discussed that future conversations are needed around this issue</li><li>· VP-Researcher concluded that he seeks to ensure the work of the BREB is appreciated and better understood across campus</li></ul> <p><b>November Agenda</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>· Motion (DJ, SP)</li><li>· Approved</li></ul> <p><b>October decision reports</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>· Motion (MM, DJ)</li><li>· Approved</li></ul>	

	<p><b>October minutes</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>· Motion (DD, DM)</li> <li>· no corrections were raised, and the minutes were approved</li> </ul>		
2	<p><b>Updates from Previous Minutes</b></p>	<p><b>Full Board Reviews (in-camera)</b></p>	
3	<p><b>New Business</b></p>	<p><b>Feedback on REB survey</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>· The BREB was formed after the REB approved and distributed the REB Survey</li> <li>· As such, the BREB found it difficult to comment on something they have not yet seen</li> <li>· Noted this survey may be repeated after the two Boards (BREB &amp; SREB) have been up for a year or so</li> <li>· Preliminary results were shared with the Board: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>· 69% of Brock researchers overall predicted some degree of satisfaction with the form and ethics process.</li> <li>· Graduate students were less satisfied than professors overall</li> <li>· The top predictor of satisfaction was the feedback participants got from the REB (quality of feedback)</li> <li>· 2<sup>nd</sup> predictor of satisfaction was turnaround time</li> <li>· 3<sup>rd</sup> predictor of satisfaction was the application form itself</li> <li>· 4<sup>th</sup> predictor of satisfaction was discrepancy between what researchers thought the turnaround time was and what their turn around time was</li> </ul> </li> <li>· Noted that overall dissatisfaction was quite low</li> <li>· Discussed that turnaround time is always going to be an issue for researchers</li> <li>· Discussed REB's progression from ethics creep to more meaningful, relevant comments</li> <li>· Noted that this survey collected more information about the Research Ethics Office staff than the REB members</li> <li>· A draft report will be circulated to this Board once complete (estimated Jan 2012)</li> </ul> <p><b>Guidelines for Online/Internet Research</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>· BREB members felt overall that the document is ready to send to researchers with knowledge about or experience with online/internet research</li> <li>· Researcher names suggested: Diane Mack, Jamie Mandigo, Philip Wilson, Cathy Van Ingen, Kim Gammage, Joyce Ingles</li> </ul> <p><b>REB Member workload recognition/expectation</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>· KW explained that SREB Chair wanted to go over what we do and get feedback on how to clean up the letter of recognition and letter of appointment</li> <li>· Discussed content of the letter of appointment: duration of appointment, role on the Board, timing of meetings, statements of competency, liability, compensation and confidentiality</li> <li>· Noted that yearly or at the end of each members term there is a letter of recognition</li> <li>· Discussed the current letter of recognition</li> </ul>	<p>KW and HC to follow up and send an email to all researchers knowledgeable about or involved in online/internet research</p> <p>SREB Chair is going to start this process of revising the templates</p>

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>· Explained these templates are being revisited because of CVs and purposes useful to members careers (to attempt to better recognize service)</li> <li>· Some debate emerged about whether the letter of appointment and letter of recognition should be distributed annually</li> <li>· Challenge noted – office workload would increase</li> <li>· Suggested recognition letter for community members be sent to the member, but addressed to “whom it may concern”</li> <li>· Letter to those not fulfilling requirements – discussed being wary of leaving paper trail that may be limiting someone to tenure or promotion of some kind. This may be negative. Noted we should be hesitant to put anything in writing but instead follow up with an email or meeting</li> <li>· 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. Suggested wording, “we would take this to understand that this is a role you can no longer fulfill...”</li> <li>· BREB member knowledgeable in the law was concerned a paper trail could be damaging (simply because it exists somewhere)</li> <li>· If something could be perceived negatively against a Board member it was advisable to take caution or be discrete</li> <li>· Noted that it is first the Chair's responsibility to address these issues with members not fulfilling their requirements</li> <li>· Noted it is not fair to the members that do pull their weight</li> <li>· If a member received a 2 year appointment but something comes up we will still have a recognition letter to thank them for the commitment they did make</li> <li>· Discussed finding a way to acknowledge that the REB is more labour intensive than other committees</li> <li>· Noted that in general, tenure and promotion committees are aware of the importance and onerous nature of the REB</li> <li>· Noted that the recognition letter should better acknowledge the workload</li> <li>· Noted the VP-Research recognizes this work has a lot of value</li> <li>· No BREB members were engaged in workload projects from their department</li> </ul> <p><b>Revisions to Modification Form</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>· KW discussed proposed changes</li> <li>· Chair suggested word change to question #7 – change “increase” to “alter”</li> <li>· Discussed how to revise modification form to balance office workload and facilitate research</li> <li>· Suggested more questions/examples for what constitutes a “change in risk” and what constitutes a “new modification”</li> <li>· Suggested to look into procedures for modifications at other institutions (e.g. McMaster, Toronto)</li> <li>· Discussed how long a modification can stay open</li> <li>· Noted that SREB discussed 5 year maximum</li> <li>· Suggested to add section to modification to ask researchers to give a summary of where their current file is at and explain what they are adding or subtracting</li> <li>· How to navigate which board to apply to with a modification was addressed</li> <li>· Debated whether or not researchers should identify who</li> </ul>	<p>BREB chair to talk to departments that submit programs of study</p> <p>LW and KW to look into procedures at other universities</p>
--	--	---

		reviews the research study (BREB or SREB) regarding the modification (or change) or have researchers indicate which REB panel reviewed their original ethics application	
4	<b>Educational Component</b>	<b>Alternatives to formal written consent</b>	Deferred to next meeting
5	<b>Other Business</b>		
6	<b>Adjourned</b>		