

June 16, 2010
12:00 – 2:00 p.m.
Plaza 600F

BROCK UNIVERISTY RESEARCH ETHICS BOARD
Minutes of the June 16 2010 Meeting

Attendees:

Bordonaro, Karen
 Falk, Bareket
 Gallagher, Tiffany
 Gregson, Paige
 Liu, Jason
 Longboat, Catherine
 Mair, Bruce
 Malleck, Dan
 McGinn, Michelle
 Raddon, Mary-Beth
 Rawlings, Kevin
 Rose-Krasnor, Linda (Meeting Chair)
 Shores, Bevin
 Walker, Lori
 Williams, Kate

Regrets:

Blayer, Irene
 DiBiase, Ann-Marie
 Galston, David
 Nash, Catherine

MINUTES		
ITEM	DISCUSSION	ACTION
1	<p>Welcome</p> <p>Motion to approve June Agenda (BS, DM) - All in favour</p> <p>Motion to approve May decision reports and April and May minutes (MM, BS) - no additions or corrections - Approved 9, opposed 0, abstentions 4</p>	
2	<p>Business Arising from Previous Minutes</p> <p>Other policy references and REB clearance letters</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> · It was discussed that in the past, studies involving alcohol, illegal activity, studies focused on suicide or self harm, international studies, studies involving issues that might garner attention in the press and studies that the REB might deny clearance for have been brought by the senior research ethics officer to the attention of the A/VP-Research for his/her information as such studies might give rise to institutional issues beyond the mandate of the REB. · It was questioned whether this should remain a courtesy or if this should be automatic. · It was concluded that guidelines should be created to specify clearly the route that should be taken in these cases. · Some members felt we need to be explicit and up front about what types of things will be communicated to the VP-Research to ensure that researchers know in advance what information will be communicated. Other members felt that we should not be sharing this type of information with Senior Administration as doing so it is beyond the mandate of the REB which is focussed on participant protection, not institutional liability. · It was agreed that the university needs to provide guidance and policy for researchers as to what types of research may require institutional review (or notification) and what 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • LW will raise the issue with the current VP Research for advice and the sub-committee will work on a motion to bring to the Senate Committee on Research and Scholarships. The sub-committee will report back at the August meeting

		<p>processes can be put in place to accomplish this.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The REB should prepare something for the Senate Committee on Research and Scholarship to consider. A sub-committee was formed to further discuss these issues (LW, DM and MBR). <p>Full Board Review updates (moved in-camera)</p>	
3	Deferred items	<p>Update on Subject pool guidelines</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The REB already voted to accept these guidelines as and directed LW to take them to the VP-Research for presentation to the Senate Committee on Research and Scholarship. In these guidelines, the REB asked that faculty who organize and use student subject pools create a brief document outlining general ethical principles and procedural details for using the pool, including guidelines for instructors who include research participation as part of their courses, either as a required component or for extra-credit. These procedures are supposed to be submitted by July 1. It was suggested we give faculty who organize and use student subject pools an extension until September. It was suggested that we move ahead with these guidelines and post them on our website. The next steps will be to educate the community about the existence and rationale for the guidelines. It was suggested this be included in an REB newsletter. <p>Update on Business cases as research</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> KW, LRK and AMD have been exploring this area and have learned more about what is typical in the field McMaster has some useful documents regarding research cases and skill development activities. They clearly differentiate between what is research and what is skill development. We will rely on these to develop a set of guidelines Once the REB approves these we will have an open forum with business faculty to discuss this. Some suggestions for future guidelines were made. Some REB members suggested guidelines be created for service learning (course-based internships) and talking to experts. <p>Update from Senate Meeting</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Previously, LW attended the Senate Committee on Research and Scholarship meeting where the group responded positively to the idea of a bioscience board and indicated an intention to take this proposal forward to Senate (as reported at the April REB meeting). LW and MM were invited to attend the Senate meeting where the report was to be presented. Upon the advice of the VP-Research, LW and MM first attended a Senior Administrators Council meeting, where no concerns were raised regarding the proposal Senate has received the REB's 2008-2009 Annual Report which includes the report recommending REB2. The REB needs to prepare a formal proposal (including budget details and Faculty Handbook changes) that the Senate Committee can present to Senate for voting. The first possible meeting when Senate could discuss this issue is October 2010, but that depends upon whether the Senate Committee meets before that time. <p>Update on Compliance cases</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Post the guidelines online Work out a strategy to educate the Brock community about the existence and rationale for the student research participation guidelines. Distribute to those individuals responsible for subject pools as a first step in that education strategy <ul style="list-style-type: none"> MM to check with the Chair of the Senate Committee to see what information is needed It was recommended that LW talk to the VP-Research Prepare proposal for Senate

		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> · These 3 cases were discussed at the April REB meeting · All 3 studies were halted until issues could be solved, all have been resolved and research has resumed. <p>CAREB/ACCER 2010 International Conference Update (LW)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> · OCUR – VP’s of Research have been discussing the harmonization of reviews for multiple site studies. · They have proposed several possible models · LW and MM will be going to a meeting in Toronto about this next week · The new TCPS should be out this summer · The Board should be thinking about our education strategy after this comes out · In the meantime, we can revise our policy and keep moving forward <p>Human Genetic Research</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> · We have not acknowledged this type of research before as our current policy states human genetic research is not permitted · A few applications were recently submitted that involved human genetic research · Rather than writing a new policy it was suggested that the REB needs to revise the old policy to allow this type of research · The VP-Research was alerted to these studies being reviewed and receiving ethics clearance · Both studies were minimal risk so we were able to handle this · When Senate meets again in the fall we will need to present a proposal (through the Senate Committee on Research and Scholarship) to implement changes to our policy · <p>REB Membership for 2010-2011</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> · This year the VP-Research has asked for CVs and training records for all REB members in keeping with the Revised Draft 2nd Edition of the TCPS 	
4	ADJOURNED	Voting to adjourn (BF, DM) 2:02pm	