

## Attendance

## Regrets

Sandra Bosacki  
Lynn Dempsey  
Linda Morrice  
Miya Narushima  
Catherine Nash  
Esther Santos  
Robert Steinbauer  
Kendra Thomson

[illegible]

	<b>Motion to approve October Minutes</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Tabled for January meeting</li> </ul>	Motion to approve: Meeting did not have quorum (tabled until January)
2	<b>New Business</b> <p>The REB Sub-Committee on Guidelines, Practice, and Procedure (GPP)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The new documents to be approved by SREB today were reviewed:</li> </ul> <p>REB Guideline – Definition of a Research Team:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• A member asked how researchers will be informed of these changes – will a hyperlink to this document be embedded in the application? Or will definitions be provided in the application?</li> <li>• The office explained we are still determining the best strategy for dissemination but most likely, definitions on the application will be provided for the first few months until researchers are aware of the change.</li> <li>• A member asked: what about a student who is in between degrees? For example, the student has finished their undergraduate degree and will be starting their graduate degree in September, but they want to get a head start on research in the summer. Technically, they would not be a registered student. Could they instead submit an application disguised as faculty research and list themselves as a research personnel? GPP might want to think about this.</li> <li>• It was explained to Board members that this has happened once in the past where a student contacted the office, hoping to conduct a small study before his graduate degree started up in September. He did not have any faculty affiliation with Brock and wanted to serve as the Principal Investigator (PI) on his project. When informed that was not eligible to serve as a PI, he approached a Faculty member at Brock to fulfill this role. The office still had to deny his application at this point because the Faculty member would not be involved in the project and therefore, would not be able to oversee the work appropriately. The office explained to the Board that at this point, the office determined that Brock would have no authority over this student who could conduct the project inappropriately or unethically, and we would have no oversight to stop the project or see to any disciplinary action.</li> <li>• The Board asked GPP to consider how onerous it may be to name every research personnel. These names change a lot as students filter in and out of projects. Is this reasonable or necessary? For example, does the REB want to know the name of a third-party transcriptionist who has been hired and signed a confidentiality agreement?</li> <li>• The office explained that research personnel only need to be named if they will be recruiting, interacting with participants, or have access to data in an identifiable form.</li> </ul>	

		<p>REB Standard – Eligibility to Serve as a Principal Investigator:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Board members asked whether PhD students who are teaching a course under a contract are eligible to serve as a PI. It was discussed that all sessional instructors (even if they are PhD students) may serve as PIs for research projects associated with the courses they teach for the duration of their appointments if granted permission from the Chair or Centre Director.</li> <li>• A member pointed out that there is different language across departments for sessional instructors (e.g., part-time instructor, sessional, contract). Are these all the same things? Should all terms be included in this standard to ensure understanding and applicability to all departments/faculties?</li> <li>• A member mentioned that CUPE uses the term “instructors.” Perhaps this language should go back to GPP for a final read to ensure it is consistent with the job titles listed under CUPE.</li> <li>• Members confirmed that although sessional instructors may serve as PIs for research projects associated with the courses they teach for the duration of their appointments if granted permission from the Chair or Centre Director, they cannot supervise a student in their studies (per policy).</li> </ul> <p><b>Discussion</b>  Review <i>Guidelines for Protocols Involving Deception/General Education</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The Board discussed the difference between deception and partial disclosure, and whether researchers need to include a full debrief in studies using partial disclosure. It was explained that deception occurs when an investigator gives false information to participants or intentionally misleads participants about one or more aspects of the research study. Deception can range from mild deception such as a slight misrepresentation of the study purpose or incorrect duration of the study session to a more severe deception such as giving false feedback to participants about themselves or their spouse/partner. In comparison, partial disclosure involves an investigator withholding or omitting information about the specific purpose or objectives of the research study or other aspects of the research. Examples include: participants are informed about the purpose of the study in general terms, which are true, but are not given the specific focus of the study which would lead to the investigator’s objectives.</li> <li>• Members suggested replacing the term “re-consent” in the current guideline to read “informed consent.” This would be consistent with terms used in the TCPS2.</li> </ul>	
3	Adjourn	Meeting adjourned at 1:23 p.m.	Motion to adjourn: Meeting did not have quorum