

BROCK UNIVERSITY RESEARCH ETHICS BOARD
Monday, November 23, 2020
12:00 – 2:00 p.m.
Teams

Minutes of the HREB Meeting

Attendance

Jean Armitage
 Shawn Beaudette
 Angela Book (SREB)
 Stephen Cheung
 Nicole Chimera
 Gail Frost
 Kimberley Gammage
 Robert Kumar

Carly MaGee (non-voting)
 Jennifer Matunin-Brown
 Maureen Shantz
 Craig Tokuno
 Terrance Wade
 Danielle Williams
 Jenalyn Yumol

Regrets

Megan Magier
 Lori Walker (non-voting)

MINUTES		
ITEM	DISCUSSION	ACTION
1	<p>Motion to approve Agenda</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Approved <p>Motion to approve October Decision Reports & Minutes</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Approved 	<p>Motion to approve: JA Seconded: GF All in favour</p> <p>Motion to approve: SC Seconded: JMB All in favour</p>
2	<p>Education Items</p> <p>Deception in Research Presentation</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Angela Book (co-Chair of the SREB and seasoned researcher using deception methods) provided a presentation to the HREB board regarding types of deception, ethical issues, options regarding consent and debrief, and withdrawal. 	
3	<p>Discussion Item</p> <p>Equitable compensation across research platforms</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The HREB Chair asked board members to consider their view on researchers using different compensation forms/rates across research platforms. For example, when people sign up to participate in research via the Qualtrics research panel, they can decide how they wish to be compensated ranging from airline points to cash to gift cards (list not exhaustive). Qualtrics does not tell the researchers conducting the study how much they are compensating each participant because the amount depends on the type of compensation a worker has signed up for. This is being brought to the REB's attention when researchers use a service such as Qualtrics research panel, <i>and</i> recruit in the general public where a specific compensation rate and type is given. To participants, there seems to be a discrepancy between participation avenues. For example, if they participate via Qualtrics, they may get less than if they were recruited and participate through other means. 	

		<p>This becomes even more problematic when researchers recruit Qualtrics panel participants <i>and</i> participants from other means but give the latter participants a chance to win a prize. Meaning some participants receive compensation and some do not.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • KG provided her insight based on experience using Qualtrics panels. Based on her understanding, Qualtrics does not recruit people for their panels. They approach other marketing companies who have existing panels of potential participants and Qualtrics accesses participants through this third-party. So, it is possible Qualtrics may not even know how much people get paid and in what format (if we were to ask). It was clarified that researchers pay Qualtrics directly (and not these third parties) for their recruitment services. • Board members wondered, could we tell participants the options for participation and let them decide knowing there are different compensation options? For example, “we are offering participation through these various means: Qualtrics, Kijiji, etc.” and let the participant decide what type of compensation is most suitable/valuable to them? • Members are not sure this would work in practice given the Qualtrics members have a profile set up and subscribe to these services. In other words, it wouldn’t be as easy as giving participants a Qualtrics link. It would also be a “work around” the Qualtrics panel service and interject with their business model making it less feasible. • Some members felt that using a draw instead of compensating each participant was not a huge issue because if the researchers took the total value of the draw prize and divided it by the number of participants, it would be so trivial it may even be offensive. Where the issue lies is when a draw is used in conjunction with a separate group of participants in the same study that all receive individual compensation. • With respect to a draw alone, members agreed researchers should be providing a few options for different types of gift cards so they might be more relevant to each participant’s everyday life. • Members noted this issue also comes up when recruiting participants internationally. In what currency should researchers pay? Do they have the ability to pay in different currencies? • The Chair asked for clarification on how researchers pay for the panel service – what does this look like? The researcher pays Qualtrics per number of participants (who provide usable data) the researcher requires. So, if a researcher needs 150 responses, they pay for 150, but it may take Qualtrics 300 surveys to gather this because they will only pass on the usable data. • The cost per participant is also dependent on how specific the participant pool is (general versus split by age groups, split by genders etc.). 	
--	--	---	--

		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • For example, KG did a study where she only recruited women who were pregnant. That was much more expensive, but participants did not receive any more compensation. That extra cost goes to Qualtrics as it is more work from their perspective to find the participants. • Because of this, it would be difficult for us to estimate what an average compensation rate is. In other words, it is not as simple as taking what the researchers pay Qualtrics and dividing it by the number of participants (that cost includes overhead which seems case dependent and difficult to estimate). • Compensation levels in general were discussed. Where studies require a lot of time and there is no compensation, are we obligated to comment on this? The board clarified compensation is context specific and we leave it to investigators to propose and justify rates. • It was decided to discuss this more with SREB members at the next meeting to gain their insight as well. 	
4	Adjourn	Meeting adjourned at 1:24 p.m.	Motion to adjourn: SC Seconded: KG All in favour