## April 7, 2010 12:00 – 2:00 p.m. Plaza 600F

## BROCK UNIVERISTY RESEARCH ETHICS BOARD Minutes of the April 7, 2010 Meeting

## Attendees: Regrets:

Bordonaro, Karen
DiBiase, Ann-Marie
Falk, Bareket
Gallagher, Tiffany
Gregson, Paige
Longboat, Catherine
Mair, Bruce
Malleck, Dan
McGinn, Michelle
Rose-Krasnor, Linda
Shores, Bevin

Walker, Lori Williams, Kate Blayer, Irene Galston, David Liu, Jason Nash, Catherine Raddon, Mary-Beth Rawlings, Kevin Stevens, Julie

M	MINUTES							
IT	EM	DISCUSSION	ACTION					
1	Melcome:  Motion to approve April Age  All in favour  Motion to approve March de  All in favour							
	Approval of March minutes  It was noted that the with business facult from the March mini All in favour of appre							
2	Business Arising from Previous Minutes	Update on one upcoming research study  The first of two upcoming studies was sent for expedited review and has been accepted.  The second study has been circulated to the full board and will be discussed at the May REB meeting.  External advice will be sought.  REB members were encouraged to send in their responses.  Update on Full Board Review (moved in-camera)  Subject Pool Guidelines  While they currently serve as guidelines if we want to have some ability to enforce this or bring awareness at a wider	LW to consult with VP-Research to seek Senate approval of the guidelines					
		Business Cases as Research  KW has been in touch with various people in the Faculty of Business to seek clarity about the difference between developing business cases for research or teaching	Subcommittee formed: LRK, AMD, KW					

		purposes.	
		The REB has yet to figure out what should be reviewed,	
		how it should be reviewed and how we should proceed in	
		terms of business cases.	
		Questions arose about what constitutes student learning	
		versus what constitutes research.	
		Different business cases were discussed.	
		Requirements for human research ethics review regarding business cases were discussed.	
		It was noted that this process is not easy to articulate as it is	
		multidimensional. The REB needs to decide what is and is	
		not considered research according to the TCPS and provide	
		examples for faculty members to refer to.	
		It was suggested that a subcommittee be established to try	
		to articulate this process. It was also suggested that an	
		open forum with the Faculty of Business could follow.	
3	New Business	Senate Committee on Research and Scholarship	
			V to attend Senate meeting
		, , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , ,	ond to any questions.
			•
		1. Bioscience REB	
		The proposal for the REB2 was not accepted in January	
		2009 by the then VP-Research. It was brought to the	
		attention of the Committee that this proposal should be	
		revisited.	
		The Committee made a motion to approve it in principle and take it to Senate.	
		The Chair, Vice-Chair and Senior Research Ethics Officer	
		will meet with the VP-Research and work out budget,	
		volume and other issues related to moving forward with	
		REB2.	
		Efficiency and quality of reviews should be improved with a	
		Bioscience Board as we will have the level of expertise	
		needed for bioscience studies (as stated in the TCPS)	
		There has been interest in the past of colleagues who would	
		be willing to serve this Board.	
		There would need to be overlap between the two Boards.	
		It is anticipated that the office will be able to support the two	
		Boards if the staffing in the office remains the same as it is currently.	
		Currontly.	
		2. Policy Changes	
		Our Research Ethics Policy needs to be revised and	
		approved by the VP-Research and then proposed to the	
		Senate Committee on Research and Scholarship. The REB	
		is an institutional liaison to the Committee.	
		REB members were told their expertise will be required in	
		this regard.	
		In addition to changes to be introduced by the new TCPS,	
		we also need to attend to other changes to update our policy to reflect the ways that we currently proceed.	
		policy to rolloct the ways that we sufferfully proceed.	
		3. Online system	
		The REB was encouraged to think about what we would	
		need a new online system to do. We will need to brainstorm	
		what we want to keep track of and what things we would	
		like a new database to help us do:	
		o continuing review/final report reminders	
		o improve quality of turnaround statistics and other statistics	
		The VP-Research has been looking into different systems	
		The VI Research has been looking into different systems	

			<u> </u>
		All of these issues will be brought forth in the Senate meeting on April 21st 2010. REB members were encouraged to speak to their representatives to encourage them to support these items.	
4	Educational Component	Update on Compliance cases	
5	Other Business	Public comments to revised TCPS  The Panel on Research Ethics website shows all public comments about the TCPS. REB members were encouraged to take a look online.  The Research Ethics Office will let REB members know when the official new TCPS is released. Upon its release, training will be provided.	
		NCEHR  Was a Federally funded body that was responsible for educating and making site visits to see if different human protection programs were ideal according to the TCPS.  This council lost funding as of March 31st 2010 and they no longer exist.  They were one of the driving forces at one point behind accreditation and they provided a lot of human research ethics training.  They host one conference each year in February.	
6	ADJOURNED	Motion to adjourn (PG) 1:47pm	