

BROCK UNIVERSITY RESEARCH ETHICS BOARD

Friday, March 12, 2021

12:00 – 2:00 p.m.

Teams

Minutes of the HREB Meeting

Attendance

Shawn Beaudette
Stephen Cheung
Nicole Chimera
Kimberley Gammage
Carly MaGee (non-voting)
Megan Magier

Jennifer Matunin-Brown
Maureen Shantz
Craig Tokuno
Terrance Wade
Lori Walker (non-voting)
Danielle Williams
Jenilyn Yumol

Regrets

Gail Frost
Robert Kumar

MINUTES		
ITEM	DISCUSSION	ACTION
1	<p>Motion to approve Agenda</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Approved <p>Motion to approve January, February Decision Reports & January Minutes</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Approved 	<p>Motion to approve: TW Seconded: SC All in favour</p> <p>Motion to approve: KG Seconded: SC All in favour</p>
2	<p>Discussion Item</p> <p>REB Guideline: Recruitment of REB Members and Chairs</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> LW explained to the board that Senate would like us to craft a guideline on our process for recruitment of Research Ethics Board (REB) members and Chairs. We have a current draft, but the office would like input from board members on any changes they recommend. Currently, the guideline does not address removal of a board member or Chair. The office would prefer more direction on this before anything is written in. The board agreed the Chair should be a tenured faculty member, but that board members can be at any stage in their career. Board members are currently recruited through an open call where closer to the recruitment cut off date, the office looks at the representation we have from each Faculty/department and then does a more targeted recruitment to those areas with lacking representation (by approaching the Associate Deans Research to ask if they can send out a more urgent request for volunteers). The guideline still needs some work around how Chairs should be selected (e.g., from the current board or from outside the board?). A board member suggested that the office put out a call from within the current board for a volunteer Chair and that all candidates have at least 1-year experience as a board member. However, board members also agreed that should this technique not yield any interest, we 	

		<p>could put out a wider call to past members. In this case, should there be any time limits to ensure the individual is up to date on the TCPS2? (e.g., was a member in the past 5 years).</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • LW explained that the Social Science Research Ethics Board (SREB) strongly supports the model of co-Chairs where the terms are staggered so there would always be a more experienced Chair, and a training/incoming Chair. Co-Chairs have a half course reduction each instead of a full course (per the Vice-President Research [VPR]). • The guideline also needs to include the length of Chair terms and how many times Chairs can be renewed. • The board agreed to remove the statement “No appointment shall be made solely on the basis of sex” from the guideline as a requirement of the TCPS2 is that the REB shall consist of at least five members, including both men and women (Article 6.4). • The board also agreed to add the word “gender” where there is discussion of sex as well. • The board revisited the discussion about whether Chairs should be recruited from within the board or outside. Members agreed the wording “preference will be given to current members” should be added to the guideline to allow for recruitment beyond current membership, but with preference to those who are currently serving. • In terms of the co-Chair model, it was considered whether one Chair could be from the more typical bioscience field and the other from a more “social science” health science background to provide a good balance/perspective from both. • The current Chair clarified the workload is manageable for one Chair of the Health Science Research Ethics Board (HREB). But other Chair candidates may prefer to split the role. • The advantage of the co-Chair model is that it allows for a continuous succession plan. The board wondered if we could just have a member shadow the Chair in a more informal way to “train” them for the following year. • The board agreed we should build both options in the guideline: one Chair (with a full course release) or two co-Chairs (with a half course release each). Particularly given the HREB division is new and the board has not experienced a proper year of workload due to COVID (meaning it is difficult to say what the workload will look like typically for the HREB Chair). • LW noted that SREB has found attending/Chairing meetings much more manageable with the co-Chair model as well. • A board member felt concerned that the co-Chair model might result in more work with the need to discuss files or coordinate which would not otherwise be needed in a single Chair model. • LW explained that currently the Chair role is a 2-year term with the option to renew. She asked the board to 	
--	--	--	--

		<p>consider how many times a Chair should be able to renew their term.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Board member terms are currently 2-years. In the event a member is not reviewing files well/appropriately, after training, what should be our next step? A member suggested that in this case, we may want to keep the terms shorter (e.g., 1 year) and then simply not invite that member back after their year is up. • LW asked whether removal of a Chair should be voted on by the members? Board members pointed out that they would not be the best judge of how well a Chair is fulfilling their role as they really only see them conduct monthly meetings (and don't see any of their reviews or work with the office). • A member suggested having a probationary year for new members: their first term could be 1 year, then if they meet their requirements as a member, their term can be renewed. This would be very helpful from LW's perspective to have built in and may even work for the Chairs as well. • LW plans to consult the VPR about this plan and can hopefully write in that he or the Associate VPR could attend probationary meetings with members and Chairs to add this support from the VPR office. • LW will work on this document and circulate to the board and the VPR. Then it will go to the Research and Scholarship Policy Committee who takes the document to Senate for final approval. • Given the removal of a member is more complicated, the board and office will finalize this process in the future and instead, include the probationary period (after which there will be a review with each member) for now. • LW will also include a description of the jobs of a Chair and a member in this guideline so it is clear what our expectations are up front. 	
3	Adjourn	Meeting adjourned at 1:00 p.m.	<p>Motion to adjourn: SC Seconded: NC All in favour</p>