BROCK UNIVERSITY RESEARCH ETHICS BOARD
Monday, June 5, 2017
12:00 – 2:00 p.m.
MC D350-L

Minutes of the BREB Meeting

Attendance

Jean Armitage
Kirsten Bott
Gail Frost
Kimberley Gammage
Lara Green
Jason Liu
Matthew Mallette
Jennifer Maturin-Brown
Greg McGarr
Sandra Peters
Ayda Tekok-Kilic
Craig Tokuno

Regrets

Stephen Cheung

MINUTES			
ITEM		**DISCUSSION**	**ACTION**
1	**Motion to approve Agenda** • Approved **Motion to approve May Decision Reports** • Approved **Motion to approve May Minutes** • Approved		Motion to approve: KB Seconded: JA All in favour Motion to approve: LG Seconded: MM All in favour Motion to approve: GM Seconded: JMB All in favour
2	**New Business**	**Full board review (in camera)** **The REB Sub-Committee on Guidelines, Practice, and Procedure (GPP)** **Update on Changes to REB Guideline – Conducting Research as a Course Assignment:** • The Chair updated the board with changes made to this guideline based on suggestions from the SREB. The BREB approved this guideline at the last meeting however, when it went to SREB, there was concern from some members that it was not clear whether cop-op, practicum projects etc. would need REB review and approval. The document was taken back to GPP who clarified that these examples would not be considered research – instead, projects used to practice the skills required for their profession. Therefore, the following changes were made to the guideline: "Course assignments that do not meet the definition of research with human participants [e.g., assignments that are limited to data that are in the public domain, consultations with individuals for assistance in accessing information that is in the public domain,	Motion to move in camera: KB Seconded: KG All in favour Motion to move out of camera: MM Seconded: KB All in favour

		observations of facets of an organization or institution without collecting data about individuals within the organization, practice using standardized instruments or protocols where no data or analyses will be reported, *practicums where the primary purpose is to develop professional skills, or co-op placements*] are not subject to REB review." GPP also added however that if data collected are later proposed for research, it would be considered secondary use of information not originally intended for research and would require REB review. This would apply to cases where data was originally collected for assignment purposes but then later proposed for research. • A motion was put forward by KG to accept the changes made to the guideline. Seconded by GF. All members voted in favour. • The new documents to be approved by BREB today were reviewed: 1) Venipuncture Information Sheet • The Chair explained that this sheet was created as there is currently no way to track and ensure quality control with respect to blood draws. GPP developed this sheet so researchers have a way to track venipuncture data (e.g., phlebotomist name, number of attempts, written consent from participants for a second attempt, reporting serious adverse events etc.). • For example, if a participant experienced severe bruising, this would be documented on this sheet. It would be reported after the fact to the REB (on the annual report), however, the sheet ensures records are kept on this information. • LW clarified that adverse events refer to something that goes wrong in research that was unanticipated. If researchers have already listed something as a risk and the participant consented to proceed with this risk in mind, the event would need to be recorded on this venipuncture information sheet and reported to the REB on the annual report (still reported but not within 24 hours or as an emergency) If, however, an anticipated event occurs, meaning a risk that was not outlined in the application or the consent form, this needs to be reported to the REB immediately. • For example, if someone falls in the lab and this was an unanticipated event (researchers did not include falling as a potential risk in the application or on the consent form that the participant signed), this would need to be reported to the REB immediately. Changes would then be made to the protocol to prevent any future events (e.g., introducing a spotter in the protocol for future participants). • It would be helpful if we had a written definition of adverse events to avoid confusion. This will be taken back to the GPP. • This venipuncture sheet will raise awareness of what	

		events need to be reported. A link for this sheet will also be provided in the venipuncture SOP so researchers are aware of both documents. • A board member suggested adding a separate column to record the date blood was drawn, should researchers use the same form on multiple draw days. • It was also agreed to change the last column to ask for the date a serious adverse event was reported to the REB (instead of whether it was reported at all). • A motion was put forward by MM to approve the Venipuncture Information Sheet. Seconded by GM. All members voted in favour. 2) REB Standard – Responsibilities of Faculty Supervisors and Student Researchers • The SREB discussed including details on this standard regarding who constitutes a student researcher (i.e., would this include post-doctoral fellows?). As a result, the standard was taken back to GPP who made the following changes: "Each student researcher (undergraduate, master's, or doctoral) or post-doctoral fellow…" which clarifies who the standard would apply to. • Per wording in the Faculty Handbook (FHB), the word "proposal" was changed to "research design," given that the definition of a proposal is very different across departments (i.e., "The supervisory committee must approve the *research design* prior to…"). • A board member asked why the ethics application asks researchers to define the level of research (e.g., Faculty research, Masters thesis/project, PhD, undergraduate etc.), if the standards are the same for all types of research. LW confirmed that this is simply used for metrics in the office. • Board members asked why the following question is being recommended as an addition to the application form: Has the research design been approved by a supervisory committee in accordance with the relevant graduate program's procedures? If a Faculty member is qualified enough to submit their own application for their own Faculty work, why does the office need to confirm that the entire committee has approved a student's project? It would seem the supervisor would be capable enough to approve the project on their own. • The office confirmed that this is not the REB's policy - the requirement for supervisory committee approval of graduate student research designs prior to applying to the REB has been in place at least since 2003. The online Senate records confirm these requirements were introduced at some point prior to Senate 555 (January 23, 2008). • Some universities ask on the REB application whether a scientific review been done – perhaps this might be a more appropriate question to ask? • From a graduate program perspective (not the REB's), it	

		is a requirement to have the design approved by the committee. • A board member asked about whether this applies to side project where a student is completing work for their own personal purposes, and not for academic work. • LW clarified that students can only do research for an academic project. E.g., student work for a directed reading, Master thesis or Major Research Project (MRP). A board member suggested that this be clarified on the application – it was agreed to change Masters thesis/project to Masters thesis/MRP, given the word project may give the impression that a student can complete research on their own, without needing an academic tie/purpose. • LW clarified that this protects the participants right to sue because if the student is just completing the research without any connection to Brock, there have no affiliation or tie to Brock. • The board discussed if the question about whether the committee has approved the research design fits in the application – do board members see any issue in asking this question? It helps ensure that before projects come to ethics, they have been reviewed by the appropriate and qualified individuals. This avoids numerous changes being made to the ethics application, after it has received clearance. Having the question on the application might also act as a check-point or a reminder for supervisors that this is a requirement according to the FHB. • A motion was put forward by LG to approve the standard in principle (and that the question regarding whether the research design has been approved by the supervisor committee will be asked). Seconded by MM. all members voted in favour. • The following documents were tabled for approval at the next board meeting: REB Guideline – Meetings, Quorum, and Attendance; SOP 04 VO2 Max; SOP 06 Colour Vision and Hearing (Sleep Lab).	
3	**Adjourn**	**Meeting adjourned at 1:56 p.m.**	Motion to adjourn: KG Seconded: JL All in favour