

BROCK UNIVERSITY RESEARCH ETHICS BOARD
Tuesday, July 4, 2017
12:00 – 2:00 p.m.
MC D350-L

Minutes of the BREB Meeting

Attendance

Jean Armitage
 Kirsten Bott
 Stephen Cheung
 Gail Frost
 Kimberley Gammage
 Lara Green

Matthew Mallette
 Jennifer Matunin-Brown
 Greg McGarr
 Sandra Peters
 Ayda Tekok-Kilic
 Craig Tokuno

Regrets

Jason Liu

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: KB Seconded: MM All in favour</p> <p>Motion to approve: SC Seconded: JA All in favour</p> <p>Motion to approve: GM Seconded: LG All in favour</p>
2	<p>New Business</p> <p>Full board review (in-camera)</p> <p>The REB Sub-Committee on Guidelines, Practice, and Procedure (GPP)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The new documents to be approved by BREB today were reviewed: <p>1. REB Guideline – Meetings, Quorum, and Attendance:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • This document went back to the sub-committee to incorporate the REB's preference: that any meeting where decisions will take place, quorum is required. • A motion was put forward by GF to approve the guideline. Seconded by KG. All members voted in favour. <p>2. REB Standard - Confidentiality:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • This standard was last reviewed in March 2017 however, a recent compliance case involving two institutions brought about a few necessary edits. During the compliance case, the REB had to consider whether they were permitted to share information on the file with the other institution. It was the intention when the 	<p>Motion to move in camera: KB Seconded: KG All in favour</p> <p>Motion to move out of camera: KG Seconded: JMB All in favour</p>

		<p>standard was introduced in May 2005 that institutions would be permitted to work together and share information to effectively resolve the issue.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • When the compliance case came up, the lawyer for Brock indicated that the REB's confidentiality agreement, as currently written, would not allow us to share anything outside the REB. The lawyer clarified that there was nothing institutionally that opposed the sharing of documents however, our own REB document had put us in a bind. This brought about the edits that were made to the standard to ensure pertinent information on files can be shared across institutions moving forward: e. In the case of multi-jurisdictional research, protocols and review materials will be shared with the relevant REBs; f. Protocols and review materials may be shared with other institutional bodies (e.g., the Academic Safety committee, investigative committees established under the Responsible Conduct of Research policy) within or beyond Brock to facilitate review of the research. • A motion was put forward by MM to approve the edits made to the standard. Seconded by JA. All members voted in favour. <p>3. SOP 05 Polysomnography:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The Chair informed the Board that this SOP should be coming to the REB for their approval at the next meeting. She has been working with Kimberly Cote, a researcher in this field, on the final edits. <p>4. SOP 04 VO₂ Max testing:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The Chair explained that this SOP was drawn up because we see many applications using the exact same VO₂ Max protocol. This will simplify and streamline the ethics submission process for researchers and the Board in the future. • This SOP applies to tests conducted on healthy adult populations (i.e., no concerns from a PAR-Q or medical clearance from a physician). Should a researcher wish to submit a protocol where they are testing a different population of interest, they are asked to specify how they plan to modify the framework/standard procedures. • This means the REB will not have to review the entire VO₂ Max protocol with each new application. Instead, researchers will state that they plan to follow SOP04 with the following modifications (if any). • Researchers that frequently use VO₂ Max protocols were asked whether separate SOPs would need to be made for other populations (e.g., children, older adults, sedentary individuals, spinal cord injury and multiple sclerosis patients). The researchers agreed separate SOPs would not be necessary and that the researchers applying to the REB would simply refer to SOP04 and additionally submit the testing values they intend to use, a screening form for maximal effort exercise and any 	
--	--	--	--

		<p>additional risks associated with that population.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The Chair confirmed that the SOP also covers equipment (maintenance, calibration and cleaning), training required for researchers and test administrators (e.g., First Aid and CPR with AED training; a minimum of 2 researchers present at all times), risks, and safeguards and safety procedures. • The Chair informed the Board that the document will also go to Biosafety after it is approved by the BREB, given the risk of vomiting. Any of our SOPs that have Biosafety implications are being sent to the Biological & Laboratory Safety Officer for approval. • A Board member who frequently uses VO₂ Max protocols felt that from a user standpoint, the document was very clear and well done. It will be easy for the researchers to use. • A few minor typographical errors were pointed out and the range for wattage was extended to 15-30W. This is the typical range used for healthy, fit individuals. • The Board discussed whether the risk of falling needed to be addressed for other exercise modalities – it is currently only listed for running. Members felt the risk only exists for running. • It was clarified that even though the risks are listed in the SOP, they still need be detailed in the consent form for participants. • The Board discussed whether the ethics application itself should include a section where researchers can sign off, indicating they have read and understood the SOP. The Board felt this may be cumbersome and agreed a note with the clearance certificate would suffice. • It was agreed that it is be the Principal Investigator's (PI) responsibility to ensure they are, and their students are, familiar with the document if they intend to use it in their work. • A Board member pointed out that SOPs change over time – how will we ensure the researchers have read the most recent version? The Chair confirmed that any changes made will be made known to the researchers and that all subsequent versions would still fall under SOP04 (simply labelled as version 1, 2 etc.). • The Chair indicated that once all the SOPs have been approved, we will set up a re-review protocol (i.e., after how many years will they need to be re-reviewed). • A motion was put forward by GM to approve the SOP with the minor edits discussed above. Seconded by KB. All members voted in favour. <p>5. SOP 06 Colour Vision and Hearing Testing:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The Chair indicated that the SOP was modified to clarify the focus on colour vision specifically. • There was a question whether depth perception needed to be incorporated into this SOP however, the Chair confirmed this is not a concern for the sleep lab as far 	
--	--	---	--

		<p>as she knows.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A Board member asked whether another reference could be used for the Ishihara colour blindness test if possible (instead of Wikipedia). This was agreed on. • A few typographical errors were pointed out. • A motion was put forward by GF to approve the SOP with the minor edits discussed above. Seconded by CT. All members voted in favour. <p>6. SOP 07 Surface EMG:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • This SOP has had input from several researchers. • It was clarified that the SOP only covers the preparation, application, use, and removal of non-conducting surface EMG electrodes (not indwelling EMG). It also does not include Functional Electrical Stimulation (FES) which is stimulation based as well. • The Chair highlighted that there was some discrepancy among the researchers who reviewed the protocol regarding disposable razors. Some labs use a medical grade, single blade razor. Other labs seemed to be using the same disposable razor for the same individual across many experiments. Therefore, the SOP specifies that researchers should use a new, disposable razor to shave the area of the skin where the electrodes will be placed, and that disposable razors are single use only. Any other type or use of razors must be cleared by the REB on a case-by-case basis. • A few typographical errors were pointed out. • Due to some confusion by the Board, it was specified that this SOP applies to non-conducting electrodes only – even if they are active recording electrodes. • A motion was put forward by JMB to approve the SOP with the minor edits discussed above. Seconded by KB. All members voted in favour. <p>August Meeting</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The Chair indicated that if there is a full board file to review, GF will act as the Interim Chair on her behalf. However, if there are no full board files to review, the meeting will be cancelled. 	
3	Adjourn	Meeting adjourned at 1:14 p.m.	Motion to adjourn: GM Seconded: MM All in favour