May 19, 2010
12:00 – 2:00 p.m.
Plaza 600F

BROCK UNIVERISTY RESEARCH ETHICS BOARD
Minutes of the May 19 2010 Meeting

Attendees:	**Regrets:**
DiBiase, Ann-Marie	Blayer, Irene
Gallagher, Tiffany	Bordonaro, Karen
Gregson, Paige	Falk, Bareket
Mair, Bruce	Galston, David
Malleck, Dan	Liu, Jason
McGinn, Michelle	Longboat, Catherine
Raddon, Mary-Beth	Nash, Catherine
Rose-Krasnor, Linda	Rawlings, Kevin
Shores, Bevin	Stevens, Julie
Walker, Lori	
Williams, Kate	

MINUTES		
ITEM	**DISCUSSION**	**ACTION**
1	**Welcome:** **Motion to approve May Agenda (DM, LRK)** · All in favour **Motion to approve April decision reports (DM, MBR)** · Before voting, a discussion ensued around referring researchers to other policies in our clearance letters. · In a recent decision letter for a protocol involving research taking place in a foreign country, a note on the university's travel policy was included. · Referring researchers to other policies when applicable has been our standard practice. · Board members raised concerns regarding these kinds of notes, which seem to go beyond what is in the faculty handbook by drawing attention to travel advisories. Some REB members felt these notes would imply we are in support of such policies and their enforcement by the administration. Some reviewers felt it is not our job to draw attention to other university policies. · Concerns were raised about overstepping the REBs role and blurring the line between addressing university policy and ensuring the research is conducted in an ethical way. REB ethics clearance should not be dependent on other University policies. · It was asked if such a note would be more appropriate if it was sent in a standard letter to inform researchers that clearance beyond the REB may be necessary. It was discussed that this would be beneficial because people tend to assume that REB clearance is all that is needed before proceeding with research. · Some debate arose regarding this proposal. Some REB members felt these notes do not address ethical concerns and therefore do not need to be written on REB clearance letters. It was suggested that education around other policies can be done through workshops as part of our educational mandate. · There seems to be some misunderstanding by faculty about what REB clearance means. Some clarity on clearance letters for researchers would be beneficial as this can be a risk to participants. · It was suggested that the VP-Research be apart of this process. The REB's concerns on this issue should be shared with him. Other resources also may be needed. · A suggestion was made to incorporate this issue into our educational initiative. We could add a sentence to our clearance letters, giving information about other relevant policies. · It was suggested that ORS should take on this educational role rather than the REB and that we revisit this as a Board and get more resources. Decision: All in favour	Review conversation regarding REB's educational role and develop strategy to ensure researchers are given advance notice about when information in their protocols will be shared.

	Approval of April minutes		Deferred to next meeting
2	**Business Arising from Previous Minutes**	**Update on Subject Pool Guideline** **Update on Business cases as Research** **Update from Senate Meeting** **Update on Compliance cases**	Deferred to next meeting Deferred to next meeting Deferred to next meeting Deferred to next meeting
3	**New Business (In-Camera)**	**Full Board Review**	
4	**Educational Component**	**CAREB/ACCER 2010 International Conference Update (LW)**	Deferred to next meeting
5	**Other Business**	**Human Genetic Research** **REB Membership for 2010-2011**	Deferred to next meeting Deferred to next meeting
6	**ADJOURNED**	2:00pm	