

# **BROCK UNIVERSITY RESEARCH ETHICS BOARD**

**Tuesday June 21, 2022**

**12:00 – 2:00 p.m.**

**Microsoft Teams**

## **Minutes of the HREB Meeting**

### **Attendance:**

Stephen Cheung

Kimberly Gammage

Jennifer Matunin-Brown

Michelle Vine

Connie Schumacher

Angela Book

Shawn Beaudette

Terrance Wade

Maureen Shantz

Michelle McGinn

Jenalyn Yumol

Lori Walker (non-voting)

Alyssa Bax (non-voting)

Chae Lynn Bush (non-voting)

### **Regrets:**

Megan Magier

Nicole Chimera

<b>MINUTES</b>		
<b>ITEM</b>	<b>DISCUSSION</b>	<b>ACTION</b>
1	<b>Motion to approve Agenda, May minutes and Decision Report</b>	Motion to approve amended version: TW Seconded: SB All in favour
2	<p><b>Discussion Items</b></p> <p><b>Land Acknowledgement for National Indigenous Peoples Day</b></p> <p><b>Welcoming New Research Ethics Officer – Chae Bush</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Chae is replacing Melissa and Shirin as a full time Research Ethics Officer for HREB until Carly returns in March/April 2023.</li> </ul> <p><b>Brock COVID-19 Mandate Changes</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Overarching question: how will changing measures impact the projects that currently have safety measures in place and new projects moving forward?</li> <li>The Chair outlined that his research has many restrictions currently in place for distancing etc. Speaking as a researcher he indicated that there will be no issue maintaining the current COVID protocols. Even if Brock says masks are not required – their lab will continue to follow their previously approved mitigation strategies.</li> <li>Member comment: Research that involves patients will require the maintenance of masking protocols regardless of what the ministry requires. However, if a researcher submits an application now what information do we expect them to provide regarding masking and any options they may have? With many possible variations it becomes difficult to provide guidance if it's not clearly outlined.</li> <li>Chair agrees that this information needs to be broken down for currently approved protocols and new applications.</li> <li>July 4, potential date to lift the requirements.</li> </ul>	

		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Member comment: In some labs the current mandates have limited student training opportunities (i.e., only one person allowed in the lab) so this change could allow for more research training opportunities moving forward. Researchers may need to consider if changing the protocol mid-study could impact their results (i.e., additional variable: mask vs. no mask; restricted vs. unrestricted breathing). Perhaps we could leave it up to the researchers to choose how their studies implement the changes to prevent biases in the research?</li> <li>• Michelle McGinn (AVPR) joined the meeting to communicate the decisions that will be taking place in the coming days/weeks.</li> <li>• Member comment: For in person research where COVID measures would not impact the outcomes there should be freedom for researchers to make these decisions. It may be helpful for there to be a statement from the REB reminding participants that we will be moving in the direction of lifting restrictions, and they are allowed to withdraw at any point if they are not comfortable.</li> <li>• Member comment: The issue is the participants for research that has been approved and currently has the mitigations in place. These participants have consented to the higher restrictions that are currently in place, and we need to confirm that they are still okay with the lower restrictions. In this case it should likely be the participants' choice to maintain the measures or not. We should focus on how participants feel and what they want and are comfortable with. This could be conveyed with example text from the REB to tell the participants it is their choice.</li> <li>• AVPR: Niagara public health has made it clear that they have their own opinion, but the institution can make its own decision. Ideally want to let students know about any changes before registration (i.e., July 4). Are we ready to make that change this week? It may happen soon but could be in the future (e.g., September). We need to think about how this will impact researchers and participants. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ What about unvaccinated students who now want to join a lab? How does the lab feel about it – how do you decide yes or no?</li> <li>○ There are predictions of another wave in the fall. We may need to reinstate measures. However, we don't want to have to stop research again and make researchers put additional measures in place.</li> <li>○ Risk acknowledgement and restrictions: should we maintain for continuing studies until all participants are through? How do we communicate this information in the midst of a study?</li> </ul> </li> <li>• Chair: will maintain restrictions in his lab for continuity into the fall. Physiology related participants seem happy with the restrictions that are in place currently so there is no need to change.</li> <li>• Manager: For messaging we could tell researchers that they need to have a plan in place for if/when another wave comes. We should also emphasize that whatever can be</li> </ul>	
--	--	--	--

		<p>done online should be done online (e.g., info sessions and consenting).</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Manager: Does the REB need to know what each individual lab is doing? If the university lifts the restrictions but a lab keeps them, do we need to know?</li> <li>• AVPR: If participant risk is not increased, we likely don't need to know. The approach we take should be participant centered and should be discussed within each lab. We should draft a statement to send to all researchers with in-person research to initiate discussions surrounding this topic with their labs and participants – but to be aware the situation can change.</li> <li>• Manager: What will we need to be informed of when researchers decrease their measures?</li> <li>• AVPR: The REB might not need to see modifications if it is assumed that everyone is dropping the mandates.</li> <li>• Manager: Will check with REBs at external institutions that have already made this change to see what level of detail is being required.</li> </ul> <p><b>New HREB Members</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Discussed the need for new community members and students to join the HREB for the 2022-2023/24 year(s).</li> <li>• All of our student members are stepping down as they've completed the maximum term.</li> <li>• Looking for new community members to support our current community members as they should be able to miss meetings occasionally without worrying about impacting quorum.</li> </ul> <p><b>Update on New Enterprise System (Synto)</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Provided a preview of the online enterprise system that will be up and running for the fall/winter term.</li> <li>• Answered questions surrounding profile completion, the application process and the review process.</li> </ul>	
3	<b>Adjourn</b>	<b>Meeting adjourned at 1:57 p.m.</b>	<p>Motion to approve version: MV          Seconded: JY          All in favour</p>