

BROCK UNIVERSITY RESEARCH ETHICS BOARD
Tuesday, July 10, 2018
12:00 – 2:00 p.m.
MC D350-L

Minutes of the BREB Meeting

Attendance

Kirsten Bott
 Gail Frost
 Kimberley Gammage
 Carly MaGee (non-voting)
 Matthew Mallette

Maureen Shantz
 Ayda Tekok-Kilic
 Lori Walker (non-voting)
 Danielle Williams

Regrets

Jean Armitage
 Stephen Emrich
 Grant Hayward
 Jennifer Matunin-Brown
 Craig Tokuno

MINUTES		
ITEM	DISCUSSION	ACTION
1	<p>Motion to approve Agenda</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Approved <p>Motion to approve June Decision Reports</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Approved <p>Motion to approve June Minutes</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Approved 	<p>Motion to approve: MM Seconded: KG All in favour</p> <p>Motion to approve: MM Seconded: DW All in favour</p> <p>Motion to approve: MS Seconded: DW All in favour</p>
2	<p>Business Item</p> <p><u>Introduction of new Chair</u></p> <p><u>Discuss and compiled feedback on draft Tri-Agency Research Data Management Policy</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Discuss and compiled feedback on draft Tri-Agency Research Data Management Policy • The three federal research funding agencies - CIHR, NSERC, and SSHRC - have developed a draft Tri-Agency Research Data Management Policy, which aims to support Canadian research excellence by fostering sound digital data management and data stewardship practices. The policy includes suggested requirements related to institutional data management strategies, researcher data management plans and data deposit. • LAW clarified that as a Board, we need to decide if we want to submit a group response to the consultation or respond individually, or through academic departments. • She gave Board members the option of sending in their comments to the Research Ethics Office (REO) and we can compile them to submit on behalf of both Boards and the Office. • LAW summarized that the Tri-Council is moving towards requiring that all Tri-Agency funded projects follow this data management policy. But it will also suggest that all research – even non-Tri-Agency funded - abide by the 	

		<p>policy as well (but this will be left to each institution to decide).</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • From an ethics perspective, it means we will ask more questions about long-term data management practices and move away from the assumption that data needs to be destroyed. The policy will outline the options such as retention, archiving, and ask who the custodian of the data during that time will be. • When the new set of revisions to the TCPS2 are released, there will be a big focus on the dissemination of the data. Most of the drive around this has come from clinical trials (where negative results have not been reported). • In terms of process, researchers will be asked to attach their data management plans with their grant application, and their data management plan will be assessed as part of the grant review. This review will assess: is this a robust data management plan? Can your institution handle your proposed plan? Does it have the adequate resources to carry it out? • One of the challenges at this point is that different sectors seem to be speaking different languages. Because of this, Boards can ask to see contracts to ensure they are in line with the TCPS2. For example, a recent contract indicated that the researchers would anonymize the data. The REO encouraged the researchers to familiarize themselves with the definition of anonymize in the TCPS2 (irrevocably stripped of identifiers) versus de-identified (identifiers can still exist but not with the dataset that is passed on). It was believed that the researchers meant to agree to de-identify data, without understanding the definitions used in ethics. • Board members were encouraged to read through the policy as it covers much more than just “open access.” • A detail that will need to be cleared up with the new TCPS pertains to the “public” nature of the data in databases such as open access. Currently, any data that are publicly available do not require REB approval to use. However, when the TCPS2 was written, they were referring to a different kind of “public” data (e.g., Statistics Canada). Will data in databanks require a secondary use of data application to access and use for future studies? This is unclear at this point. • It was pointed out that we will need to modify our Brock consent form templates accordingly to ensure they meet the requirements of archiving data. • LAW indicated that some of the Portage committee groups are looking at boiler plate language to give to other REBs to help out with this. This should ease the transition period for both REB administrators and researchers. • The new TCPS will also indicate that researchers should not be agreeing to anything that limits how they use data. For example, Ministry of Education contracts all 	
--	--	---	--

		<p>currently say that the Ministry has control of the data and the researcher can only publish what the Ministry agrees can be published. It is going to be very clear that REBs should not be approving projects if the researcher has signed such an agreement. In that regard, REBs will also need to look at these agreements as part of the review process. This will be enforced much more with the new data management policy. LAW clarified that if we decide the project represents fee for service or program evaluation then it can be exempt from REB review. But those projects that fall under the mandate of the REB will need to be carefully evaluated to ensure these restrictions are not in place.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • This will be more complicated when working with industry partners – something that is currently being pushed by the Ontario Conservative Government to engage in more. • Some key points we will have to be aware of were reviewed: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Who is the data custodian? ○ What is the researcher’s plan for the data if someone dies or leaves the University? Data cannot be left with no one to act as the custodian. ○ If researchers are keeping data indefinitely, how will it be stored during this time? ○ If a student leaves, what does it mean for the data? • A member pointed out that the 3rd paragraph of the draft indicates that “all digital or non-digital” have the option of becoming research data. What does non-digital data refer to? LAW clarified this might be things like artifacts. • A member asked if we are concerned about where the data is stored (in terms of Canada or outside)? LAW clarified that this concern is slowly lessening given the lack of control we have with all data being in the cloud etc. At one-point, Canadian university ethics boards were asking that the researchers inform participants if data would be subject to American Homeland Security laws such as the Patriot Act (if data were located on an American server). Now, we are only requiring this for sensitive data. • LAW confirmed that although the move is to make data more accessible to others through these different platforms, we are still responsible for looking at the security of raw data. • As a REB, we will also need to help researchers avoid writing themselves into a corner regarding secondary use of data. This will involve educating the researchers on their options, and eliminating any assumptions that data need to be destroyed. 	
3	Education Item	<p><u>Discuss suggested changes to the ethics application</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The Board went through the proposed changes to the ethics application and revised/commented accordingly. 	

		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • LAW explained we are unsure of timelines for implementation given we do not yet know the specific system we are using (e.g., smart form, Enterprise system). Once those details are finalized, we can start to draft rough timelines. • The plan after the REBs comments on the application is to pilot it with researchers and work out any kinks before it goes live. • The Office of Research Services has hired a new Director and their number one priority when they arrive is to determine what online application system we will be getting. The new intake office for the REO (once hired) will also be a main contact for the system (e.g., running, administrating, troubleshooting). 	
4	Adjourn	Meeting adjourned at 2:00 p.m.	Motion to adjourn: KB Seconded: MM All in favour