

BROCK UNIVERSITY RESEARCH ETHICS BOARD

Wednesday June 23, 2021

12:00 – 2:00 p.m.

Teams

Minutes of the SREB Meeting

Attendance

Alyssa Bax (non-voting)
Angela Book
Dipanjana Chatterjee
Jo-Ann Boyle-Jackson
Lori Walker (non-voting)
Linda Morice
Michele Donnelly

Nicole Luke
Robert Steinbauer
Sandra Bosacki
Sandra Kroeker
Tom O'Neill
Veronica Panchyshyn

Regrets

Christine Tardif-Williams
Elizabeth Shulman
Heather Chalmers
Xiaoyang Xia

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 	<p>Motion to approve: LM Seconded: DC All in favour</p> <p>Motion to approve: LM Seconded: RS All in favour</p> <p>Motion to approve: LM Seconded: TO All in favour</p>
2	<p>Discussion Items</p> <p>TCPS2 Public Consultation 2021</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Multi-Jurisdictional Revisions <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Review only to be conducted at the Principal Investigator's (PIs) Institution with the option for review at the other REBs connected (e.g., by the office or a reviewer dedicated to these types of files). These files will still be kept in the REB records as normal with the intention for the researchers to send us any updates, modifications, and renewals the project receives from the home institution's REB. This method will improve the timeline for review; however, it also puts the onus on the researcher to send the REB the appropriate clearance and study materials. Thoughts: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Q1: What is the timeline for the implementation of these changes? A: Since this is only a public consultation, the changes may never be implemented. Since the deadline for any comments on the revisions is October 4, 2021 – any changes that are made will likely not come into effect until 2022. Q2: Will this potential change impact the REB's control over procedures and methodology choices that the researchers make? A: No, the REB will still not be in the position to shape research and this change will not influence the REB review. The positive side of this change is that there 	

		<p>will be a quicker turn-around time for multi-jurisdictional projects. The researchers must be made aware of the proper submission procedures for these types of files.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ SREB members asked to have their comments/concerns back to the board by the 1st week of September 2021 if they would like their comments to be submitted through the REB. If not, members can submit their own comments separately. • Broad Consent Revisions (e.g., journal data repository requirements) <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ When data is placed in a repository for future use that extends beyond the original research purpose, researchers are required to inform participants of: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Withdrawal options or explain why withdrawal is not possible ▪ An estimate of what data will be collected and why ▪ Emphasize that their participation is voluntary, and their consent is ongoing ▪ Any foreseeable potential risks and benefits ▪ Information about the repository (e.g., a link) ○ Thoughts: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Q1: Is broad consent indefinite? ▪ A: Yes, if the data is anonymous and there is no way of contacting the participants. ▪ Q2: Can repository submissions that are anonymized still have keys linking the data to the contact information in order to provide ongoing consent options? ▪ A: Yes, a 'Master List' could be used to retain the contact information, but it also provides a method of potential participant identification, which may not be preferred for projects that collect greater than minimal risk data. ▪ Discussion: Data repositories appear to put into question the idea of "Informed Consent". ▪ Response 1: Yes, broad consent has been used for a while now in America and they have found problems with its use. Now Canada is considering broad consent use under the TCPS, so it is necessary to bring up any concerns that we have. ▪ Response 2: Participants should be informed of the possibility of their data being placed in a repository. ▪ Discussion: The use of data repositories can result in data misuse (e.g., Indigenous blood samples repurposed for genetics research that went against the original purpose of the research). It is hard to anticipate the types of risks that could arise from further use of data. The researchers should be able to define boundaries around how the data will be used before placing it in a repository. ▪ Response: Agreed with previous comment. Deidentified data as well as aggregate data can still be used to identify participants, especially if the sample size is small (could be the case for the Indigenous example above). While some participants may not care about what happens to their data after 	
--	--	---	--

		<p>their initial participation, others do and could be negatively impacted by being identified.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Q3: What is the purpose of a data repository? ▪ A1: Meta-analysis and secondary-use of data ▪ A2: Data repositories should have enough info on them that they are the only gate-keeper of the data (e.g., don't need to contact researcher for more information). A reminder that the TCPS2 describes the minimal standard for participant protection, we can ask for more. Note that the proposed multi-jurisdictional changes are only based on the other institutions being in Canada (i.e., following the TCPS2), so the changes are not applicable to other countries. ▪ Discussion: At other institutions consent can be withdrawn at any time. Pools of qualitative data are often small and there is always a risk of participant identification. ▪ Q4: Yes/No options for data repository available in the consent forms? ▪ A: Yes/No options are required, but not sufficient. More of an explanation is needed for consent to be "informed". <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Other changes: cell line repositories - to be discussed at the HREB July 2021 meeting. • A formal request was submitted by the ORE manager to the secretariat to interpret Article 6.4, in relation to sex and gender considerations. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ◦ The secretariat responded that they will initiate an analysis of TCPS 2 with regards to EDI (Equity, Diversity and Inclusion) and GBA+ (Gender-Based Analysis Plus). ◦ Since this change won't require the public consultation process, any changes will hopefully be included in the next version of the TCPS. • All members reminded to submit their questions/concerns on their own or through the REB by the 1st week of September 2021. <p>Recruitment of Community Members</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Community members are an essential for REB quorum, so it is important that we always have multiple community members on the board so that one member does not feel pressured to attend every meeting. • In the past, recruitment of community members has come through local businesses, healthcare centres, the Canadian Federation of University Women and many other sources. • Q1: Does REB quorum require the inclusion of an Indigenous member? • A1: No, only the requirements listed in the TCPS2 Chapter 6: Article 6.4. • If Brock University was involved in more Indigenous research projects we would require a member to be on the REB. • For now, all Indigenous research goes through Brock's Aboriginal Research Advisory Circle (ARAC) for a cultural review in addition to the REB (TCPS based) review process. • Currently in the process of providing ARAC with additional support. 	
--	--	--	--

		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • SREB members asked to let the office know if they have any suggestions for community members or where to recruit from. • The community members must not be affiliated with Brock (some exceptions apply). • We could also put out a newspaper ad for community members and conduct interviews. • Also noted that at other institutions participants who had previously expressed concerns about studies are potentially contacted to see if they would like to be a community member. <p>COVID-19 Update</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Brock University is planning to be mostly in-person starting in the Fall term and will pull back if necessary. • The ORE is currently determining a plan for a (likely) hybrid approach in the fall, meaning that some days we will be in our offices in person and other days we will work from home. There will likely be someone available in person every day due to alternating days in/out of office. • Face-to-face REB meetings are recommended by the TCPS. Thoughts on on-campus meetings September 2021 – December 2021: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Since all members will likely not want to meet in-person yet, we could potentially stay online until 2022. ○ Meeting virtually will protect everyone until we've all had our second vaccine (if we want it). ○ Some staff might want to have the in-person social aspect of the meetings. ○ With Brock University moving forward with in-person course delivery, members may be trying to manage the amount of time they are required to be on campus so online until December might be best for scheduling. • Members asked to let the office know their thoughts. Otherwise we will plan to continue online until December. <p>Other Business</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • N/A 	
3	Adjourn	Meeting adjourned at 1:14 p.m.	Motion to adjourn: n/a Seconded: n/a All in favour