

BROCK UNIVERSITY RESEARCH ETHICS BOARD
Monday, March 6, 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
 Jason Liu

Matthew Mallette
 Jennifer Maturin-Brown
 Greg McGarr
 Sandra Peters
 Ayda Tekok-Kilic

Regrets

Lara Green
 Craig Tokuno

MINUTES		
ITEM	DISCUSSION	ACTION
1	<p>Motion to approve Agenda</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Approved <p>Motion to approve January & February Decision Reports</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Approved <p>Motion to approve January Minutes</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Approved 	<p>Motion to approve: KB Seconded: JA All in favour</p> <p>Motion to approve: KB Seconded: MM All in favour</p> <p>Motion to approve: SC Seconded: KG All in favour</p>
2	<p>New Business</p> <p>Full board review (in camera)</p> <p>Office Updates</p> <p>Annual Report (2013-2016)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The Office explained that the Annual Report has been delayed for the past several years as we were waiting to confirm process regarding governance (i.e., who the reports go to). • Now that these questions have been cleared up, the report will be made public on our website. • The board was invited to ask any questions or propose any revisions to the report. • A current board member indicated their name was missing from the list of members in 2013. This will be added before the report goes to Senate. • LW explained that the first part of the report contains a great deal of background information that was included to ensure Senate could fully understand our board, structure and reporting, workload etc. • However, information pertaining to how the Office participates in community engagement may be new to the board. 	<p>Motion to move in camera: KB Seconded: JA All in favour</p> <p>Motion to move out of camera: JL Seconded: KG All in favour</p>

- The Office explained that when our REB split into two boards, Senate was concerned that BREB was not seeing equitable workload to the SREB (BREB only reviewed 48 applications, as opposed to SREB who reviewed 262 applications that year). This year, those numbers increased to 57 and 282 respectively. However, when the boards split, we maintained two reviewers on each BREB file and reduced to one reviewer on SREB files. This meant overall workload for each REB member was quite similar: 31 applications a year for SREB members and 22 applications a year for BREB members. These numbers also reflect the type of research that goes on a Brock (i.e., majority being social science).
- It was also explained that the Chair of the BREB processes all clarification responses and modification requests whereas these are handled in the Office for SREB files. This helps to even out the time commitment for each Chair.
- The BREB Chair also indicated she felt the workload was fairly equitable when she acted as the SREB Interim Chair for a short period.
- It was also discussed that a great deal of BREB applications come to full board given the measures used and complexity of the protocol. Although SREB sees a larger number of applications, they are perhaps lower in risk and complexity.
- SREB also sees a larger number of undergraduate applications, which are only reviewed in the Office. Some of the numbers reported above would be undergraduate projects so they would not contribute to the board reviewer's workload numbers. This further closes the gap between the boards in terms of workload.
- LW indicated that the report first went to the Research and Scholarship Policy Committee who accepted it with two questions: who constitutes the Aboriginal Research Advisory Circle (ARAC) and how do they judge research. It was clarified for committee members that ARAC performs a cultural review of the project.
- ARAC was explained to BREB board members who were not familiar: ARAC was established in 2009 through partnership with the Tecumseh Centre for Aboriginal Research and Education at Brock. ARAC is an advisory committee, normally comprised of 5 people. Members come from inside and outside the Brock community however, must self-identify as Aboriginal. ARAC completes a culturally informed review of all research applications that fall under the guidance and definition of TCPS2 Chapter 9: Research Involving the First Nations, Inuit and Métis Peoples of Canada, with consideration for cultural protocols, histories, and traditions.
- LW also explained to board members that Aboriginal research is not exclusive to research involving Aboriginal participants. For example, if a researcher

wanted to specifically report on demographics (i.e., Aboriginal participants yielded these results), this would have to come to ARAC for review. They would examine the information and determine whether it may single out or stigmatize a group unfairly.

- The Research and Scholarship Policy Committee also inquired about the possibility of having separate reports for SREB and BREB, and whether it would be possible to have the Chairs write the reports.
- LW and the BREB Chair both attended the meeting to field these questions. The BREB Chair was also invited to speak about the venipuncture guidelines. She informed the committee about how the board arrived at the guidelines, the type of opposition we received since then and our responses to these researchers. At this point, quorum at the Research and Scholarship Policy Committee meeting was lost and this discussion was tabled.
- The R&SP committee was concerned about whether rules around blood draws were actually policy. Senate believed that although we labelled them guidelines, we were implementing them as policy. And as such, they would have to go through Senate for approval (the process for getting policies approved). The BREB Chair helped Senate understand that we still look at blood draws on a case by case basis. It was explained that each project/research design is very unique and we intend to continue to examine blood draws in the context of each protocol.
- We also informed Senate that the board will use those guidelines as a minimum. However, if we believe a circumstance requires greater qualifications, we could certainly request that.
- The REB is independent in our decision making which makes this case-by-case basis an option for us.
- The Dean of Applied Health Sciences has communicated with the Office that he is working towards implementation of the guidelines to ensure his researchers can continue to do the work they need to do, while also working with the REB guidelines.
- Senate also felt that we should not apply this guideline retroactively (to protocols already in place). It was explained that for the safety of the participants, this guideline must be adhered to in both new and existing protocols. This would also ensure consistency and reduce any frustration on behalf of the researchers (i.e., requiring this of all researchers and not just some).

The REB Sub-Committee on Guidelines, Practice, and Procedure (GPP)

- It was explained to the board that GPP is made up of SREB (although no SREB members are currently sitting on this sub-committee) and BREB members.
- GPP has met three times so far, and are in the process of reviewing and revising all of the REB's existing

		<p>documents. This will ensure all guidelines, practice and procedures are up to date and reflective of the current TCPS2, Brock policy etc.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • BREB members were informed that document revisions are being made not only by GPP members but also relevant researchers in the field. For example, guidelines regarding research involving deception were vetted through researchers in psychology that often use deception in their work. This will ensure their accuracy. • The Chair reviewed the final edits that were made to the blood draw guidelines, in accordance with suggestions and conversations with Senate. They were revised to better reflect “guidelines” versus “policy.” If the BREB approves of these edits at today’s meeting, they will be posted on the website and circulated to researchers for their knowledge. • The three new documents to be approved by BREB today were reviewed: • 1) Proposed Revision to the Requirement for Graduate Student Researchers to Complete the CORE Tutorial (proposed change to the Faculty Handbook): This document initially indicated that if graduate students were conducting human participant studies strictly based on secondary analysis of a) human tissue or bodily fluids or b) data from non-public sources (provided there was no involvement or interaction with human participants), they were only required to complete Modules 1 (core principles), 2 (defining research) and 5 (privacy and confidentiality) as a minimum (but were encouraged to complete the tutorial in its entirety). • The revised requirement now applies to all graduate students preparing a thesis, exit project, or course-based research as part of their degree requirements and to students working as research/laboratory staff, project managers or research assistant where they will be responsible for recruiting or interacting with human participants or have access to data in an identifiable form. • 2) Proposed Requirement for Undergraduate Student Researchers to Complete the CORE Tutorial (proposed requirement to be passed by the Undergraduate Student Affairs Committee): It is being proposed that as part of any application for human ethics clearance, all undergraduate students must complete the CORE tutorial in its entirety as well, prior to their involvement with human participants in research. The same parameters would apply as outlined above for graduate students. • Both these documents need to first be approved by the REBs before taken to Senate and the Undergraduate Student Affairs Committee for approval, respectively. • LW informed the board that 1842 Brock affiliates have completed the CORE tutorial since it was made mandatory for graduate students in 2014. When you 	
--	--	--	--

		<p>examine the breakdown of demographics, it appears that 70% of these completions were by undergraduate students. Therefore, in practice it would seem that faculty supervisors are having their undergraduate students complete the tutorial anyways. Making it a requirement should not be onerous on researchers or students. In fact, when speaking with professors of methods courses, several of them have used the CORE tutorial as a 10% assignment for their students.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • It was also clarified that the REB's original intention when putting the CORE tutorial requirements forward was to implement the undergraduate student requirements a year after the graduate student requirements were released. However, this did not come to fruition. The Chair asked if there were any objections to the undergraduate requirements moving forward as intended. No objections were brought forward. • A motion was put forward by KG to approve the changes made to the graduate student requirements. Seconded by MM. All members voted in favour. • A motion was put forward by GF to approve the changes made to the blood draw guidelines. Seconded by KG. All members voted in favour. • 3) REB Standard: Ethics Education for Student Researchers: This document provides a synopsis of the CORE tutorial and the requirement of student completion, should they be conducting research with human participants. This document will be circulated to researchers and put on the website for informative and educative purposes. • A motion was put forward by JF to approve REB Standard: Ethics Education for Student Researchers. Seconded by JMB. All members voted in favour. • LW informed the board that the Health and Safety Committee has been looking at phlebotomy recently as well in terms of Brock's stance on Controlled Acts (from a biosafety perspective). This committee was encouraged to speak with the BREB about our previous conversations and deliberations on these. For example, BREB concluded that we cannot choose to follow some Controlled Acts and not others. From a consistency and liability standpoint, this would not be the best option for Brock. We can communicate this information to the committee. • The Office also updated the board on some small revisions that were made to the Standard for Maximum Number of Annual Renewals. This already approved by the REBs in December 2016 however, GPP made some minor revisions to allow leeway in applying this standard in extenuating circumstances. For example, if a project was only collecting data for a few more months, we may not require a full resubmission. • A small typo was noted by the board and a motion was put forward by KG to approve this Standard as revised. Seconded by MM. All members voted in favour. 	
--	--	---	--

		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> LW indicated that if any BREB members are interested in sitting on the Health and Safety Committee who is looking at Controlled Acts, please let us know. Our researchers can offer insight on what is happening with these protocols in practice (perspective of those who draw blood frequently or engage in these Acts on a regular basis as part of their research, for example). 	
3	Adjourn	Meeting adjourned at 1:31 p.m.	Motion to adjourn: JL Seconded: KB All in favour