

BROCK UNIVERSITY RESEARCH ETHICS BOARD

Monday April 20, 2021

12:00 – 2:00 p.m.

Teams

Minutes of the SREB Meeting

Attendance

Alyssa Bax (non-voting)
Angela Book
Christine Tardif-Williams
Dipanjan Chatterjee
Elizabeth Shulman
Heather Chalmers
Lori Walker (non-voting)
Linda Morice

Michele Donnelly
Nicole Luke
Robert Steinbauer
Sandra Bosacki
Tom O'Neill
Veronica Panchyshyn
Xiaoyang Xia

Regrets

Jo-Ann Boyle-Jackson
Sandra Kroeker

| MINUTES | | |
|---------|---|--|
| ITEM | DISCUSSION | ACTION |
| 1 | <p>Motion to approve Agenda</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Approved <p>Motion to approve March Minutes</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Approved <p>Motion to approve March Decision Report</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Approved (amended version): REB file 20-254 should not have been included in the approval list. It has been removed. See "Other Business" for further discussion. Q: Approved items include Indigenous research – what is the review process for these files? A: The Aboriginal Research Advisory Circle (ARAC) reviews all files including Indigenous research. ARAC is currently only composed of two members however we will be working on recruiting new members in the coming months. | <p>Motion to approve: LM Seconded: RS All in favour</p> <p>Motion to approve: RS Seconded: LM All in favour</p> <p>Motion to approve: MD Seconded: SB Amendment - Motion for 20-254 removal: AB Seconded: LM March report revised motion to approve: AB Seconded: LM All in favour</p> |
| 2 | <p>Discussion Items</p> <p>Multijurisdictional guidelines presentation</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Definition: research involving humans that may require the involvement of multiple institutions and/or multiple REBs (Chapter 8, TCPS2) Brock guideline: "any research that will be conducted by or associated with a member of the Brock University community... that will in any way make reference to their affiliation with Brock University or use the resources (financial, physical, or human) of Brock University, will require clearance from the Brock University REB, regardless of the members' contribution or the location of the research site." Q: Where an individual working under the auspices of an institution is involved in research solely as a service provider to researchers in other institutions, should the REB of that institution review the research? The individual in question would not be required to submit the research for research ethics board (REB) review within his/her institution so long as | |

- the individual is not a member of the research team,
- he/she does not benefit from authorship on publications, and
- his/her contribution is limited in nature to a service that does not in and of itself constitute research involving humans as defined in TCPS 2 (see application of [Article 2.1](#)).
- If the service provider meets the above criteria, or falls within an exception set out in his/her institution's policy, it would be sufficient for the individual to get confirmation from the principal investigator (PI) that this research has been reviewed by the PI's institutional REB so long as it is compliant with TCPS 2.
- Institutions can have exceptions (e.g., authorship criteria).
- Our main concern is that it's paramount to protect participants.

Discussion/Questions

- Q1. A Brock researcher informally brainstorms potential project ideas with an external PI. Due to their intellectual contribution to the conceptualization and design of the study, the Brock researcher is asked whether they wish to be recognized as a co-author on the manuscript. The project has received ethics clearance from the external PI's REB.
 - A1: Multi-jurisdictional but no REB review required since there is no access to data other than what is written in the manuscript.
 - A2: If no anonymous data analyses, then review should not be required since there is no risk to participants. However, if the data are just de-identified then it depends.
 - A3: Review could be required in the situation due to the Brock researcher having a role in shaping the project.
 - A4: If you are an author on a manuscript and it gets retracted you are assumed to be fully involved and should have the appropriate clearances to be involved. Review could sometimes be required to protect the researcher as well as the participants.
 - A5: If receiving data (anonymous or not) the project should likely be reviewed but this is likely not for the protection of the participants so maybe it shouldn't be required.
 - A6: Many researchers are unaware that they require clearance for these types of situations. Departmental education is required to resolve this (many members agree). Perhaps a shorter acknowledgment form could be used in these situations to ensure that the researchers are asking the right questions and have the proper clearances, rather than requiring a full review.
 - A7: Agreed with A6 - a shorter form is a good idea as the level of risk is minimal to participants but should still be monitored.
 - Members indicated that a form should be drafted in the future and brought back to the boards for review.
 - Q: What happens in cases where the study has already occurred?
 - A: We can't grant clearance for past unethical projects or the use of data from those projects. However, we can educate the researchers that are attempting to receive clearance. We can also report cases to other boards if necessary.
- Q2. An external PI e-mails a Brock researcher for help with the analysis of recently collected data. The Brock researcher would be sent a set of de-identified data so that they can perform statistical analyses and contribute to the writing of the manuscript. The Brock

| | | | |
|--|--|--|--|
| | | <p>researcher would be recognized as a co-author on the manuscript. The project has received ethics clearance from the external PI's REB.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ A1: Being on the research team and involved in data analysis should mean that REB review is required. ○ A2: Since this project is listed as "recent" it is likely still open and should require review. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Q3. A Brock researcher visits a collaborator's lab at another institution to carry out a new research project. The Brock researcher is involved in data collection (while at the collaborator's lab), data analysis and manuscript writing. The project has received ethics clearance from the collaborator's REB. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ A1: Requires REB review. • Q4. An external PI e-mails a Brock researcher to ask for help with participant recruitment. The Brock researcher is asked to post a recruitment poster to students in their class; interested students would then contact the external PI for further details about the study. No data collection would occur at Brock University. The project has received ethics clearance from the external PI's REB. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ A1: Brock researcher is required to check that the PI from the external institution has come through the Brock REB and received clearance for the project. Perhaps this could be done through a short form as well rather than a full review (currently it goes through a "previously-approved" file review process that is expedited). ○ A2: The TCPS states that this falls under Multi-Jurisdictional but it really doesn't since the Brock researcher isn't involved in the project other than for recruitment (i.e., use of Brock's auspices and resources). ○ A3: The Brock researcher has no responsibility except to know if the Brock REB has reviewed and cleared the project. ○ A4: Requiring review in this case seems to be treating the students in a condescending way. The students are able to see the consent form and determine for themselves that the study isn't from Brock. Posters are up in the school with other opportunities that are external from the University. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ There is a legal requirement for the Brock REB to see that the project has been approved elsewhere and to review the research. ▪ Posters and the Brock press articles are required to be approved prior to placement and publication. ▪ In the past the Brock Press had posted studies that had not received clearance yet which resulted in RCR cases so now they are required to check on REB clearance prior to publication. ▪ Students may know that the research is not from Brock but they could still feel pressured to participate so we should review it anyways. • Discussed that it should be considered how communities are represented in the write-ups. In the case of intellectual resources we should have an idea what the projects are about. E.g., working with the data vs. how it is represented in writing. | |
|--|--|--|--|

| | | | |
|---|---------|---|---|
| | | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • In summary, the board feels that all of the multi-jurisdictional scenarios should require ethics review but in the form of a shorter/simpler application and review process • Regardless of study location, Brock REB oversight is required when the Brock researcher: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ is part of a research project that has not been approved by another REB ○ has direct involvement in the project (i.e., recruitment, data collection, analysis/storage of identifiable info) ○ holds the research grant or sub grant ○ has a conflict of interest (e.g., financial gain, commercialization); ○ is conducting the project as part of their academic degree, or supervising the project being conducted as part of an academic degree • Brock REB oversight is generally not required when the Brock researcher: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ is only involved in conceptual development ○ working with manuscript review (e.g., only access to data that would be reported in the public/final form; after data collection and analysis has been finalized) and aggregate (de-identified) data ○ recruiting without consent for a project that has received clearance from the Brock REB • Next step: create a form for multi-jurisdictional research and run the idea past other institutions. No final decisions can be made at this time. <p>COVID-19 Update</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • No changes to research at Brock since last month's meeting despite the increased province-wide restrictions. • Exceptions from the government including leaving houses for volunteering duties (likely not originally meant for research purposes). • Thus, the HREB still has in-person research that is on-going for projects that were able to be adequately adapted to meet the required health and safety measures. <p>Other Business</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • REB full board file 20-254 • After reviewing the SREB voting results (50/50 split) the chairs decided to deny clearance for this file. • The researchers can appeal this decision if they believe that the decision is not in line with the TCPS2. • Q: How much can we work with the researchers now that we have denied clearance? • A: We cannot shape research so we cannot tell the researchers how to change the project in order to receive clearance. We have had multiple discussions about different focuses for the project with the researchers or they would need to adequately justify the original methods in order to receive clearance. | |
| 3 | Adjourn | Meeting adjourned at 1:30 p.m. | Motion to adjourn: CTW Seconded: RS All in favour |

