

February 29, 2012

12:00 – 2:00 p.m.

MCD350-L

BROCK UNIVERSITY BIOSCIENCE RESEARCH ETHICS BOARD

Minutes of the February, 2012 Meeting

Attendees:

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

Regrets:

Good, Dawn
Liu, Jason
Marquardt, Drew (student)

MINUTES		
ITEM	DISCUSSION	ACTION
1	<p>Welcome:</p> <p>February Agenda</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">· Additions/changes were welcomed· All in favour (SP, BS) <p>January Decision Reports</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">· Motion to approve (TW, CC)· All in favour <p>January minutes</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">· Motion to approve (BS, SP)· Questions, concerns, comments were welcomed· All in favour	
2	<p>Business Arising</p> <p>Student Subject Pool</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">· Guidelines for Student Research Participation for Course Credit were circulated prior to the meeting· Overall, BREB members felt they were well written· Noted that guidelines are not being followed by current users of the Psychology and Business subject pools specifically· Ways to approach this were discussed· Benefits of having students take part in research were discussed· Discussed PSYC 1F90 research participation options (Options A and B on Psychology course outline)· The educational value of both options were debated· History of the subject pool in Psychology at Brock was discussed· Equivalence was discussed (between research component [Option A] and written component [Option B])· Noted that some literature on subject pools states that students learn from simply taking part in research· In terms of educational value, educational debriefing was discussed	<p>KW to follow up with Psychology and Business subject pool organizers to see what they are doing and sort through the issues discussed</p> <p>KW to forward the most recent version of the PSYC 1F90 research participation assignment outline to BREB members prior to the next meeting</p>

		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> · Noted that participants should be referred to further reading in the subject area after participating in research · Request was made to find out the last correspondence with the subject pool organizers in Psychology at Brock · Changes were suggested to guidelines: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> · # 4 “when possible” was questioned. Is it a “should” or a “must” do? · REB members appreciated participation in research as a pedagogical tool · LW shared some research findings on subject pools with the Board · BREB members were encouraged to forward any suggested edits on guidelines on student research participation for course credit to the office 	
3	Updates from previous minutes	Request for PRE interpretations <ul style="list-style-type: none"> · LW was asked to summarize the following interpretations received from PRE: <p><u>Subject pools (new):</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> · Noted that the award of bonus credits is consistent with the REB guidelines as long as the research is voluntary · To minimize coercion students should be given an alternative · Noted that students should not be penalized if they fail to complete the study (they should still receive compensation) <p><u>Scope: What is considered under Brock’s “Auspices” and “Jurisdiction”</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> · Several examples of research studies that would and would not be considered under Brock’s auspices and jurisdiction were shared · Noted that the REB executive needs to look into more examples and give this information to the Research and Scholarship Policy Committee (RSPC) <p><u>Deception & debriefing</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> · Our current guidelines on debriefing need to be revised and circulated to the Board · Noted there are contrary parts in the current TCPS about deception and debriefing · Noted that reconsent does not always need to take place · Discussed conditions under which researchers may not ask for reconsent · PRE’s interpretations were in line with how Brocks REBs and the REO currently interpret this section of the TCPS · Noted that debriefing itself does not necessarily <i>need</i> to take place, especially if it may affect the data or if the debriefing itself may be more detrimental to participants <p><u>Governance:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> · The TCPS stresses that REBs need to be at arms length from the institution · Noted that REBs should not be influenced by senior administration (or anyone responsible for the financial aspects of the institution due to conflict of interest) · The PRE interpretation suggests that the REB should not be appointed by the VP-Research (as is the current process) · Noted that the responsibility should fall on someone who is not responsible for accruing funds for the institution 	LW to revise and summarize PRE’s interpretations and send to the BREB

		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> · Current REB processes for recruitment were discussed · Meeting moved in-camera 	
4	New Business	<p>TCPS 2 tutorial</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> · LW registered Brock as an institution on the Panel on Research Ethics (PRE) website · Noted TCPS tutorial may become a requirement for all researchers who submit an REB application for research involving humans at Brock · Board members were encouraged to try the tutorial so a broader discussion can be had about its effectiveness in the future · Noted problems/concerns with old TCPS tutorial · Discussed that the new tutorial is more interactive and contains case studies · Noted time commitment can be a detour (it can take 4 hours minimum) · Noted that this requirement is slowing coming · Noted that at some point this may be compulsory · Noted the usefulness of completing such a tutorial · Benefits to overall flow of ethics applications were noted (in terms of Board members and PI's being educated) · The REB was not certain on what to recommend at this point as most members had not completed the tutorial · Noted that researchers who have been doing research for 20 years may be reluctant to complete the tutorial 	KW to send TCPS2 tutorial link to all BREB members with a request for feedback
5	Educational components	<p>Data retention and TCPS2</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> · Many researchers have asked how long they need to keep their data · Noted that the TCPS does not set a particular time · Noted that certain journals or professions have such requirements · Noted that consistency is important as well as ensuring participants are aware of how long the data will be kept <p>Compensation and coercion</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> · Explained this was discussed at SREB · Roughly \$10 per hour is considered average · Noted this depends on the risk of the study · What constitutes "undue influence" was discussed and debated · Reasons for compensation were discussed · Examples were given 	
7	Other business		
8	Adjourned	1:43 pm	