

BROCK UNIVERSITY RESEARCH ETHICS BOARD

Tuesday April 12, 2022

12:00 – 2:00 p.m.

Microsoft Teams

Minutes of the HREB Meeting

Attendance:

Stephen Cheung

Kimberly Gammage

Connie Schumacher

Jenilyn Yumol

Megan Magier

Nicole Chimera

Shawn Beaudette

Terrance Wade

Jennifer Matunin-Brown

Michelle Vine

Lori Walker (non-voting)

Melissa Rattle (minutes)

Regrets: Maureen Shantz

MINUTES		
ITEM	DISCUSSION	ACTION
1	<p>Motion to approve Agenda</p> <p>Motion to approve March Minutes</p> <p>Motion to approve February and March Decision Reports</p>	<p>Motion to approve: TW Seconded: SB All in favour</p> <p>Motion to approve: TW Seconded: MV All in favour NC abstained from the vote</p> <p><u>February Decision Reports</u> Motion to approve: JY Seconded: NC All in favour MV abstained from the vote</p> <p><u>March Decision Reports</u> Motion to approve: JY Seconded: NC All in favour</p>
2	<p>New Business</p> <p>1. Article Discussion-Teitcher et al., 2015</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The Chair provided background information on two queries that have come in from researchers recently regarding compensating research participants when it is not clear if the respondents are bots or people or if multiple submissions have been made by the same person. 	

- In the past, options have been to try and identify illegitimate responses by determining if the reply email was different from the participant email. If there was any doubt, participants were to be paid
- In the past, researchers have gone so far to identify fraudulent entries that they violate participant confidentiality.

Case 1

- In response to the recent queries, the researchers were told they could send one email asking participants to confirm receipt. Researchers chose to look at IP addresses to determine if participants were from the Niagara region. Researchers were not supposed to collect IP addresses or geolocators.
- One of the arguments from the researchers was that it was not fair to the legitimate participants to keep illegitimate responses in the data. However, the data set would need to be discarded anyway.
- Researchers were told they had to pay participants if they met the criteria. The researchers asked participants to provide the last three digits of their postal code. All participants responded. Researchers argued that anyone could look up a postal code.
- The mandate of HREB is to protect the participants not the researchers.
- The REB has asked Michelle McGinn to ask ORS to reconsider creating a help document to aid researchers in identifying risks associated with IT and methods that can be used to avoid this in the future.

Case 2

- In another recent case, a student circulated a survey without REB approval. The researcher has been contacted. Also, the link they circulated was the administrative link, so participant names, answers and contact information were all accessible through the link. This case has been sent to the RCR. The instructor will have to speak with the undergraduate students involved.

Case 3

- Last example, an attention check was linked to participant compensation. A student declined to reimburse a participant the \$1 compensation on MTURK because the algorithm suggested the

respondent was not a person. The participant contacted the REB with a complaint. The student continued to refuse payment. The PI jumped in and the participant has been paid. This incident had the potential to impact the participants rating on MTURK which could directly affect his income. In this case, the researcher collected additional information that should not have been collected based on the ethics submission.

Summary and Next Steps

- Three violations have occurred in the last few weeks. The office has written to Michelle McGinn asking to have ORS consider their stance to prevent these events from occurring in the future.
- The REB should petition ORS to point out that Brock, in conjunction with ORS needs to develop systems or IT specific training for individual researchers to avoid these cases from happening in the future.
- Other Canadian REBs have responded similarly in the past. REBs are not supposed to shape methodology. If REBs offer advice and something is missed, researchers may come back to the REB when funding is lost. A lot of REBs have IT and privacy members on the Board who would go back to their own department flagging any possible issues.
- There is no requirement per the TCPS-2 to have an IT representative on the Board.
- Moving forward, the Office is asked to add comments to the notes section if there are flags advising researchers to seek advice from IT if the researcher is not familiar with the security settings for the platform (ex. Qualtrics, MTURK).
- With the new Enterprise system, there will be a question to determine if the researcher has experience with the participant pool.
- **Action Item:** LW will draft a statement about inherent risks for online surveys and advise researchers to seek advice if needed.

2. **REB Guideline for Conducting Research Involving Students as Participants**

- Document to be reviewed by the Board. Comments to be made in tracked changes and sent to the

		<p>Office. The target is to have this document in place by September.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Request is to have REB members to submit their responses the first week in May. • The guideline will be submitted with the HREB final report which is due in July. • In terms of publication considerations, the REB is strongly encouraged to put documents before Senate for advice before guidelines are published. This is a collegial process and is not formally required. • Key points of the guideline were summarized including the Brock stance on bonus points and advertising the research of a faculty members own Masters or Undergraduate students. <p>3. TCPS2 CORE 2022 - deadline for completion</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The revised module is live and available on the TCPS Core website. • All members of the Board are asked to complete the new TCPS-2 by the following dates: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Soft Deadline August 31, 2022 ○ Hard deadline is January 1, 2023 • <u>Action Items:</u> Board to send certificates to Melissa 	
3	Other Business	<p>1. ADR Authorization of Research</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The process may be dropped on May 1 for human participant research. • LW and AB are condensing the forms to facilitate the process for submission through HREB from May 1 onward. • The Board was reminded to submit their availability for future meetings from May to August 2022 to the Office. Please indicate if you prefer virtual HREB meetings, in-person meetings or hybrid meetings 	
4	Adjourn	Meeting adjourned at 1:07 p.m.	<p>Motion to adjourn: MV Seconded: JY All in favour</p>