

January 26, 2012
12:00 – 2:00 p.m.
MCD350-L

BROCK UNIVERSITY BIOSCIENCE RESEARCH ETHICS BOARD
Minutes of the January, 2012 Meeting

Attendees:

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

Regrets:

Liu, Jason
Stansfield, Melanie
Good, Dawn

Guest:

Jan Frijters (SREB Chair)

MINUTES		
ITEM	DISCUSSION	ACTION
1	<p>Welcome:</p> <p>January Agenda</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> · Suggested to move “PHIPPA and FIPPA presentation” up on the agenda · Additions/changes were welcomed · Approved <p>November decision reports</p> <p>December decision reports</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> · Combined motion to approve both (SP,CC) · All in favour <p>November minutes</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> · Motion to approve (DD, CC) · Questions, concerns, comments were welcomed · All in favour <p>December minutes</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> · Motion to approve (MM, DJ) · All in favour 	
2	<p>Business Arising</p> <p>PRE Interpretations</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> · The Panel on Research Ethics (PRE) has agreed to create an interpretation for what defines a “clinical trial” · Noted there will likely be reference to small scale studies for non-medical institutions specifically · Noted it would be helpful if we articulated some examples for PRE · Potential implications for NSERC funded research that appears to meet the criteria of a clinical trial as per the TCPS were noted · Potential case examples to put forth to PRE were discussed <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Dietary interventions 2. Behavioural interventions with autistic children 3. Exercise interventions 	

		<p>4. fall prevention program – balance and gait studies</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> · Noted that BREB Chair is currently working on writing a policy for this · However, noted it is difficult to write a policy until we have a definition we can fully understand · Noted that PRE's intention may not have been to include all health related interventions related to health outcomes · Questions posed about the effect on turnaround time when registering a study as a clinical trial <p>Brock's Jurisdiction and Auspices</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> · LW attended the Research and Scholarship Policy Committee (RSPC) meeting with Maureen Murphy (Legal Advisor for the Office of Research Services) · The RSPC and Maureen were called upon to help define Brock's "auspices" and "jurisdiction" · Maureen explained there was no legal definition for the terms · Maureen suggested Brock should take initiative and work to create definitions · RSPC asked the REB to draft definitions and bring them forward · Defining Brock's auspices and jurisdiction is important for research ethics as McMaster will have a school of medicine in the Bioscience Research Complex. We need to know if our REB's need to review their research since McMaster will be renting space on Brock's property · Noted that at the December 2011 meeting there was discussion around company/corporate review · Noted this is largely the same issue 	<p>Maureen and LW will work on definitions of "auspices" and "jurisdiction" and bring them back to the Boards, then to the RSPC</p>
3	Updates from previous minutes	<p>Guidelines for Online/Internet Research</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> · Noted that the guidelines were approved by the SREB with a few minor revisions · KW explained revisions made since last discussed with BREB · Noted that guidelines are meant for researchers but must be approved by both REB's before they can be distributed and used as a resource tool · All guidelines, once approved, are posted on the research ethics website as a resource · Motion to approve the Guidelines for Online/Internet Research (BS, SP) <ul style="list-style-type: none"> · all in favour 	<p>Post guidelines on Research Ethics website</p>
4	Potential Full Board Reviews (in –camera)		
5	New Business	<p>PHIPA and FIPPA presentations</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> · Both acts were brought to the Board to create a discussion around how they could impact the REB and to discuss potential issues · The SREB Chair gave an overview of FIPPA · Noted that last year someone came to speak to the Board about FIPPA but we were not prepared with the proper questions. Thus, the presentation was not as helpful as the Board had hoped 	<p>KW to look for FIPPA request incident at UBC</p> <p>KW to compile all questions and send to SREB Chair</p>

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> · Purpose of this discussion was to generate questions · The SREB Chair discussed key parts of PHIPA and FIPPA to share with BREB · The Freedom of Information and Protection of Privacy Act (FIPPA) discusses when research projects are exempt from requests by the public · Noted that emails are considered “institutional records” so they should be exempt from FIPPA · Question raised on whether or not all emails would be excluded More detail was requested on how this would be managed · Noted the subject matter of individual research and funding can be shared, however, we discussed that REB applications would be exempt from a request by the public as they are considered research records · Question posed: should in-camera minutes from meetings be recorded (as they currently are)? · Noted that the REBs need to provide their justification for what is considered a “research record” and what is not · Potential implications for Board members and researchers if a FIPPA request was made were discussed · MM noted a UBC instance when a FIPPA request was made · Noted that UBC has steps to secure information (to articulate what would happen) · Discussed whether or not any correspondence with the REB, REB reviewer comments, etc would be considered a “record of the research” · Member knowledgeable in the law suggested the REBs uphold what our obligations are to the subjects of the research. Since the REB’s ultimate goal is policy based, it was suggested to take an approach to each FIPPA request that reflects our goals (through the TCPS) · Suggested that each FIPPA request should be dealt with on a case by case basis as it all depends on the context in which one is asking for certain information · LW discussed a case we had where we were asked to provide an ethics file. We provided proof that it received clearance and handed over a membership list of the Board but did not reveal specific reviewers or any other information · Brock’s procedures for handling personal information were discussed: http://www.brocku.ca/webfm_send/7936 · SREB Chair discussed PHIPA · Noted PHIPA is more complex than FIPPA from the research perspective · Noted it is Ontario legislation to regulate personal health information (relates to physical or mental health of individual) · Discussed how PHIPA defines health information · Noted that everything in PHIPA revolves around the health information custodian · The custodian may or may not be a researcher · Researchers who are not health information custodians may request information · While there is not explicit requirement to seek consent, consent is subject to guidance by the REB · LW explained a file that BREB is currently dealing with · Question raised on how to protect the confidentiality of individuals while facilitating research · How to define a “medical record” was discussed · Discussed some potential examples of what may count as being health information and what may not 	
--	---	--

		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> · Question was raised about who PHIPA pertains to. Noted that it may only apply to clinicians or trained professionals (healthcare) · BREB members were encouraged to contact the office with any additional questions · Questions for future consideration: What constitutes “health information”? Does PHIPA pertain to a registered health practitioner or researchers in general? Exactly who can be a health information custodian? Does a researcher become a health information custodian when they collect personal health information? <p>Future guideline on mandatory reporting laws</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> · Noted that researchers need a guiding document on this topic · One mandatory reporting law pertains to suspected child abuse (includes mandatory reporting for child pornography) · Welcomed volunteers from BREB to help with creation of these guidelines · Clinical instruments in non-clinical research was suggested as a future guideline · Discussed McMaster’s policy for reporting harm to self or others. While this is McMaster’s policy it was noted this is not law (unless you work in certain health professions) · We want researchers to be thinking about what the mandatory reporting laws are beforehand and develop ways in which they can deal with them · Noted that people who are members of associations may have additional requirements (e.g. Canadian Psychological Association) · BREB members were encouraged to contact the Research Ethics Office to share responsibilities of other professions in terms of mandatory reporting <p>Screening database proposal</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> · Some faculty from Brock’s Psychology department are considering ways to facilitate the recruitment process from the student participant pool · The pre-screen proposal (previously circulated with the meeting package) was discussed · A debate ensued about whether or not this would be considered a research project · There was debate around the appropriateness of a pre-screen database · Soliciting participants was discussed and debated · Some BREB members expressed concern and were uncomfortable with this proposal · Questions about the Psychology subject pool were raised · Noted that Linda Rose-Krasnor (previous Vice-Chair of the REB and Psychology professor) may be able to speak to the ethical issues raised when forming the Psychology subject pool at Brock 	<p>LW offered to help start off this document</p> <p>Circulate the subject pool guidelines and discuss these at the next BREB meeting</p>
6	Educational Components	Data retention in TCPS2	Deferred to next meeting
7	Other business		
8	Adjourned		

