

BROCK UNIVERSITY RESEARCH ETHICS BOARD

Friday, January 12, 2018

12:00 – 2:00 p.m.

Cairns 207

Minutes of the BREB Meeting

Attendance

Jean Armitage
Kirsten Bott
Stephen Cheung
Stephen Emrich
Kimberley Gammage
Lara Green
Grant Hayward

Carly MaGee (non-voting)
Jennifer Matunin-Brown
Maureen Shantz
Ayda Tekok-Kilic
Craig Tokuno
Danielle Williams

Regrets

Gail Frost
Matthew Mallette
Lori Walker (non-voting)

MINUTES		
ITEM	DISCUSSION	ACTION
1	<p>Motion to approve Agenda</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Approved <p>Motion to approve December Decision Reports</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Approved <p>Motion to approve December Minutes</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Approved 	<p>Motion to approve: KB Seconded: JA All in favour</p> <p>Motion to approve: KG Seconded: KB All in favour</p> <p>Motion to approve: KG Seconded: LG MS abstained given absence at the December meeting All in favour</p>
2	<p>New Business</p> <p>Full board review (in camera)</p> <p><u>Discussion re: Ethics Annual Report</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The Chair explained that both he and the SREB Chair and the Manager, Research Ethics are meeting with the new Vice-President Research (VPR) so if the Board has any comments or concerns they would like taken to him, they can let us know. The Research Ethics Office (REO) explained to the Board that when the report went to Senate last year, there was a question as to why the REO is compiling the report instead of the Chairs. CM clarified that this is an administrative report and a lot of information in it pertains to tasks that the Chairs are not responsible for (e.g., member workload, community engagement, training, professional development and contributions to the field, etc.). CM also indicated that a lot of the background information in the report is carried over from year to 	<p>Motion to move in camera: LG Seconded: JA All in favour</p> <p>Motion to move out of camera: KB Seconded: LG All in favour</p>

		<p>year, to ensure all new members of Senate understand the context and background.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • CM identified that the REO's priorities are the same as the last 14 years. We are still hoping to get an online application and clerical staff. • The new VPR (Tim Kenyon), was concerned that we have not met those priorities yet. Although the Office of Research Services (ORS) has had various near launches of an enterprise system, none of them have taken off. • Ideally, we are looking for a system that the Principal Investigator (PI) would input their name into the form and it would self-populate with their personal information such as: Faculty, department, contact information etc. Right now, this is all being done by hand in the office. • Also, the online system would allow for revisions to be made in the online document, allowing us to track in one place how the project has changed and been modified over time. As of now, with all different copies and versions of the application, it is sometimes difficult to assess the project in its current state. • CM brought to the Board's attention the slight increase in workload this past year. • We try to stress that the REO sees upwards of 1000 submissions a year (versus just 300 or so new applications). Each of these submissions includes a point of contact and action required by the REO. For example: processing the new application; reviewing; sending out a clarification and revision request; reviewing the clarification responses; sending out annual renewal/final report requests; processing annual renewal/final report requests; modifications etc.). • CM explained that the ethics year runs from July 1-June 30. So, although the Board will not see details regarding the external review in this report (it was not done until the 2017-2018 ethics year), this occurred in November 2017 for all of ORS and ethics. 	
3	Adjourn	Meeting adjourned at 1:45 p.m.	<p>Motion to adjourn: SE Seconded: CT All in favour</p>