BROCK UNIVERSITY RESEARCH ETHICS BOARD
Thursday October 20, 2022
12:00 – 2:00 p.m.
Teams

Minutes of the SREB Meeting

Attendance			**Regrets**
Alyssa Bax (non-voting)	Lori Walker (non-voting)	Matt Kwan	Dan Cui
Danny Tarulli	Michael Owen	Nicole Luke	Harriet Yeboah
Ege Kamber	Michele Donnelly	Robert Steinbauer	Miya Narushima
Esther Stanley	Sadia Jahanzeb		
Linda Morrice	Sarah Ciotti		

MINUTES			
ITEM		DISCUSSION	ACTION
1	**Motion to approve Agenda** • Approved		Motion to approve: LM Seconded: RS All in favour
	Motion to approve September Minutes • Approved		Motion to approve: RS Seconded: MO All in favour
	Motion to approve September Decision Report • Approved		Motion to approve: MO Seconded: RS All in favour
2	Discussion Items	**Guideline review and discussion: Online research and fraudulent responses** • We circulated a guideline recently for discussion that has been controversial due to its purpose. • In this past year we've seen an increase in the number of cases where there are RCR issues surrounding online research that has been shared on social media. In some cases, thousands of fraudulent responses were generated, and researchers are required to pay all of them the compensation amount that is outlined in their application and consent form. • We worked with researchers to try to help them determine if any responses could be flagged as ineligible (i.e., confirmed bots) but often no safeguards were in place to determine response validity or limit mass-responses. • The Board's stance is always to err on the side of the participant so unless researchers could prove responses were not genuine, they were required to pay. • Following some of these cases where payment was not made and compensation adjustments were made, RCR investigations proceeded and concluded with education-based sanctions. • During these investigations researchers have brought up that the REB could've cautioned or warned them about the possibility of fraudulent responses in internet research. However, we question if this is truly under our mandate. • We've generated a document that includes suggestions for researchers who are conducting online research and using social media recruitment	

strategies based on Queens' existing guidelines. We would like your opinions on the document itself and its necessity coming from the REB.

- o HREB agreed with the document as is and included a link for Captcha implementation to limit bot responses. HREB also indicated that they think this document should be posted and guidance delivered by ORS.
- o Discussed that a collaboration-based workshop with ORS may also be useful.
- o Currently, no department within the university offers training on this topic.
- o SREB members agree that this training/guidance does not fall within the purview of the REB. Since this document would be to protect the researchers and not the participants themselves this training should be implemented by ORS.
- o Members agreed that at most we should include a note to warn researchers about recruitment online. However, we do not include warnings about other topics so it's unclear if we should take that approach in this case.
- o Q1: What is required of the researchers in these cases? Are they required to pay and how do we enforce this requirement?
- o A1: We do not determine the requirements. We provide the researchers with our opinion (i.e., that according to the TCPS the participants all need to be paid) and the case is then forwarded to the AVPR for an RCR investigation. As a result of these investigations researchers can be asked to pay the participants or use alternative payment options such as making donations to relevant charities and posting the information online. However, in some cases the project funding is not enough to provide compensation to thousands of participants.
- o Discussed that the cautionary note to researchers about online recruitment could be used to protect real participants from not receiving compensation in these cases.
- Overall the SREB members agree that this training should be forwarded to ORS and it could be included in their "Building Better Research" training series.

REB 22-020 SAINI – Full board file update
- Following the full board meeting the researchers provided the research coordinator email not the CAMH REB contact info. The coordinators indicated that the things we were asking for would be included in the application to CAMH. We've told them that the applications must be the same for both locations and we've asked that they answer our concerns in the new CAMH doc and reapply with us afterward.
- We will touch base with them again to confirm that we have deferred the first review to them and then we will conduct a previously approved review afterward with access to the CAMH review as well.
- CMAH review will take up to 4 months so there may be some delay before we hear back.

Synto training
- We have pushed back the soft launch of Synto until early November.
- Everything is working except for one IT issue of where researchers will access the portal (e.g., from my.brocku portal?).
- We will send out a doodle poll with training times following this meeting.

If you cannot make any of the dates, please let us know and we will set up a separate time.

- The training will include creating accounts so you can log into the system and create a profile.
- In the email with the poll, we will ask for 3-5 areas of reviews that you're comfortable with so we can send incoming applications to those who have the most expertise to review them.
- Please note that we would still like volunteers to add new applications to the online system. Please let us know if you would be interested.

The REB's role in supporting anti-Black racism and Black thriving

- This connects to our last discussion of having members bring their expertise to their reviews.
- The Scarborough Charter is a document that universities have signed onto to support anti-Black racism and promote equality and inclusivity in high education. **Note:** Scarborough Charter link will also be sent in the email with the training date poll.
- CAREB took up this topic two years ago and resources are now available and accessible to non-members in terms of anti-Black racism and research.
- The ORE has started weekly training and will start training with the boards afterwards. We can learn a lot from a personal perspective, but it is also difficult to determine where this fits within our mandate. Our mandate is to educate our board to support their reviews but likely not the university community.
- The Black community and Indigenous community have a long history of mistrust with children's aid and family services. This is something we should be considering when specific populations are being studied. There are any cases of where we should be more aware, and the office is interested in improving our reviews. We will collaborate with many departments and individuals throughout the university to ensure our training is meaningful. Our priority is training for the board on what to look for when conducting reviews.
- We are in the process of developing a demographics guidance document for race, ethnicity, sex, gender. etc. (e.g., no use of "other", "marital status", "annual income"). This document will require consultation from the boards and other groups in the university, so it is a meaningful and valuable piece.
- Q1: Do we require additional reviews from external experts for international projects or additional reviewer expertise?
- A1: We do try to choose reviewers purposefully and see what the researchers experience is in the area/topic of the project. We ask for a local review or leadership body/cultural guide.
- Q2: If this research is online does it not still require a cultural review?
- A2: Yes, it might. It depends on the questions that are being asked.
- Q3: Is the responsibility of the Office to provide training linked to conscious and unconscious biases?
- A3: Conscious vs unconscious bias training has been provided in the past and we will resume this training in the future.
- Q4: How do we increase representation on the boards to support the projects that we receive?
- A4: This is difficult since the board is volunteer based. We need to be recruiting in the right places and not overburden people who are in underrepresented and marginalized groups.

| | | Discussed that these individuals could be adjunct/associate members where their role on the boards is different. This could be in the form of a broader committee for general cultural reviews (i.e., less specific than ARAC). Q5: What is the responsibility on the researcher to not misjudge what constitutes risk in terms of child welfare reporting? There is a lot of discretion here. A5: There is a lot of discretion here. Previously researchers were asked to include this information in the consent form to protect the parents. Most boards have pulled back and mandatory reporting laws are now only brought up when we feel the topic could warrant it. **Other Business** n/a | |
| 3 | **Adjourn** | **Meeting adjourned at 1:24 p.m.** | Motion to approve: MK
Seconded: MD
All in favour |