

**December 8, 2009**

**12:00 – 2:00 p.m.**

**Plaza 600F**

**BROCK UNIVERISTY RESEARCH ETHICS BOARD**

**Minutes of the December 8, Meeting, 2009**

**Attendees:**

Bordonaro, Karen  
DiBiase, Ann-Marie  
Falk, Bareket  
Gallagher, Tiffany  
Liu, Jason  
Longboat, Catherine  
Mair, Bruce  
Malleck, Dan  
Mallen, Cheryl  
McGinn, Michelle  
Nash, Catherine  
Raddon, Mary-Beth  
Rose-Krasnor, Linda  
Shores, Bevin  
Walker, Lori  
Williams, Kate

**Regrets:**

Blayer, Irene  
Galston, David  
Gregson, Paige  
Muir, Cameron  
Rawlings, Kevin  
Stevens, Julie  
Welland, Richard

<b>MINUTES</b>		
<b>ITEM</b>	<b>DISCUSSION</b>	<b>ACTION</b>
1	<p><b>Motion to approve December Agenda</b> (AMD, BS)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>- all in favour</li></ul> <p><b>Motion to approve November decision reports</b> (AMD,CL)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>- all in favour</li></ul> <p><b>Approval of November minutes</b> (TG,AMD)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>- Approved 11, opposed 0, abstentions 3</li></ul>	
2	<p><b>Business Arising from Previous Minutes</b></p> <p><b>Update on Annual Report</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>· The REB 2008-2009 Annual Report was given to the VP Research to be discussed at Senate</li><li>· The Board voted that the Research Ethics Office should post this report on the website for educational purposes.</li><li>· It was discussed that the Research Ethics Officers should make an addendum to the REB 2008-2009 Annual Report which would include revisions or suggestions for changes to our current policy.</li></ul> <p><b>Subject Pools</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>· The draft response letter to Prof. John Mitterer was discussed.</li><li>· Various suggestions were provided about ways to reduce differences in (real or perceived) effort and grading practices for the course options. Many of these suggestions had been provided to the course instructor in person at the November meeting.</li><li>· There was some concern that the REB was in danger of overstepping its role by specifying a particular solution for the instructor.</li><li>· Edits were made to the draft letter to identify the issues rather than solutions (e.g., examples were deleted).</li></ul>	<p>Motion to make it a policy to post 2008-2009 Annual Report and all other reports (DM, CN)</p> <p>– all in favour</p> <p>These issues should be discussed with the Board again in the New Year.</p> <p>Once revisions are made the Board agreed to have the office send Prof. Mitterer the letter.</p> <p>LRK and AMD agreed to draft guidelines for student subject pools.</p>

		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>· It was discussed that it would be useful to find ways to verify students' perceptions of inequity and this suggestion can be provided to the instructor.</li> <li>· It was noted that this is not the only course where students participate in research for course credit. We need to better educate professors who include research as part of the course(s) they teach.</li> <li>· Guidelines should be created.</li> <li>· The Board also needs a mechanism to track any changes in courses involving research options for course credit.</li> </ul>	
3	<b>Deferred Items</b>	<p><b>Discussion with VP Research</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>· The REB reports administratively to the VP-Research.</li> <li>· It was discussed that the Board would like a copy of any reports the VP-Research may have for our review.</li> </ul> <p><b>Update from Aboriginal Forum</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>· The Chair gave a brief overview of the sessions at the forum. The Research Ethics Office was the first to invite Six Nations Ethics Committee to its university and the delegation expressed their excitement about establishing a relationship with us. The goal of this forum was to try and move towards an MOU between Six Nations and Brock University. We want to continue to strive to meet the needs of the Aboriginal community and better understand how to support Aboriginal research participants and researchers wishing to do research in this context.</li> </ul> <p><b>Aboriginal Research Ethics Guidelines</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>· The Research Ethics Officers, REB Chair and Ad-hoc committee members met with ARAC to discuss this document and we envision changes based upon the draft TCPS Chapter 9.</li> <li>· The original guidelines and proposed changes were discussed.</li> <li>· REB members did not express any concerns about this document. REB members were encouraged to email any other comments to the office.</li> </ul> <p><b>Scholarship of Teaching</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>· It has been mentioned before that faculty need some guidance when carrying out research with their students. Many faculty members find this kind of research challenging and struggle with it. Guidelines would be useful.</li> <li>· It was suggested that this might be a good topic for a forum. CTLET could help facilitate such an event.</li> </ul> <p><b>Risks arising in protocols involving staged activities</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>· It was discussed that researchers only need to take responsibility for the risk they are imposing from the research, not the risks that are a result of activities already taking place.</li> <li>· Several examples outlining the risks from the research versus the risks from the activity itself were discussed.</li> </ul> <p><b>REB Survey</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>· In 2005-2006 the ORS conducted a researcher satisfaction survey that included an REB component. We will revisit this data and revise and expand on the REB component to administer the survey again.</li> </ul>	<p>The REB Chair will request this from the VP-Research</p> <p>The Board will continue to be updated on any progress made in this area.</p> <p>We will return to this once the ad-hoc committee and ARAC have a revised set of guidelines to bring the Board.</p> <p>Set a meeting between ARAC, the Research Ethics Officers, and ad-hoc committee members in the New Year.</p> <p>The Chair will ask faculty members what would be useful for them.</p> <p>KW and LW will start making a list of issues/questions that often come up in this type of research.</p> <p>LRK – Contact CTLET about a forum on this topic.</p>

		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>· The purpose of distributing such a survey would be to see how researchers feel about the REB process. We generally would like to know how we are doing and how we can improve.</li> <li>· There was some discussion that feedback has not yet been provided from the Biomedical Forum discussing the possibility of a second REB. It was agreed that this feedback should be delivered before a new survey is conducted.</li> </ul>	Feedback will be distributed to those who attended.
4	<b>New Business</b>	<p><b>Honduran Visit</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>· Two professors from Honduras will be visiting Brock's REB in the New Year.</li> </ul> <p><b>Update on REB Files</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>· REB Members were updated on the acceptance of the last two files that went to Full Board Review</li> </ul>	Deferred to next meeting
5	<b>Educational Component</b>	<b>CAREB-Ontario update (K W)</b>	Deferred to next meeting
6	<b>Adjourned</b>		