

**BROCK UNIVERSITY RESEARCH ETHICS BOARD**  
**Tuesday October 18, 2022**  
**12:00 – 2:00 p.m.**  
**Microsoft Teams**

**Minutes of the HREB Meeting**

**Attendance:**

Lori Walker (non-voting)	Terrance Wade	Connie Schumacher
Chae Lynn Bush (non-voting)	Maureen Shantz	Michelle Vine
Stephen Cheung	Shawn Beaudette	Kirina Angrish
Kimberly Gammage	Matthieu Dagenais	Manal Alzghoul
Chris Cochran		Sara Madanat
		Taranjot Dhillon

**Regrets:**

Nicole Chimera

MINUTES		
ITEM	DISCUSSION	ACTION
1	<p><b>Motion to approve Agenda</b></p> <p><b>Motion to approve September Minutes</b></p> <p><b>Motion to approve September Decision Report</b></p>	<p>Motion to approve: MV            Seconded: SB            All in favour</p> <p>Motion to approve: SB            Seconded: SC            All in favour</p> <p>Motion to approve: SB            Seconded: SC            All in favour</p>
2	<p><b>New Business</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• An effort will be made to decrease the length of minutes and make them brief.</li> </ul>	
3	<p><b>Discussion Items</b></p> <p><b>Faculty concern regarding REB</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Researchers in faculty meeting were concerned that REB seems to cross over into biosafety issues.</li> <li>○ The REB ensures that all risks are acknowledged. The biosafety committee is legislative and more specific than the REB. Biosafety looks for the safety of the researcher whereas the REB protects the participant and the participant's data.</li> <li>○ Our turnaround time is much faster than other schools, we may go back to saying 20 days instead of 15.</li> <li>○ Sometimes we take longer on files depending on what's going on in the office and whether there are other files that need to be expedited.</li> </ul> <p><b>SOP – Microneurography (Clarification Response)</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ A reminder that SOPs are not specific to an individual and that any researcher can use an SOP.</li> <li>○ We asked the researcher about the procedure of autoclaving and the re-use of ground electrodes. They responded that autoclaving and re-using electrodes are common practices for this type of research.</li> <li>○ Members suggested that the researcher should explicitly say in participant-facing materials that these practices are industry standard.               <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Motion to approve the SOP: KG</li> </ul> </li> </ul>	

- Seconded: MS
- All in favour
- Stephen will work with the researcher to make this final revision and the office can give a number to identify the SOP.

**New guideline for researchers**

- Guidelines do not guarantee research ethics compliance nor clearance, there are many other factors. They are advice for researchers.
- Although social media seems like a great way to recruit participants, there is little control over the speed and breadth of the message. It is also difficult to assess eligibility criteria and prevent participants from repeating the survey many times.
- Unless researchers are certain the participation is fraudulent, ethics will remain on the side of the participant and ask researchers to compensate. Otherwise, it would be an RCR case and potentially impact government funding.
- The office has generated a document that includes suggestions for researchers who are conducting online research and using social media recruitment. The office is seeking the opinions of REB members on the document.
  - Comment: We can encourage researchers in the guideline to use a Captcha to help filter out bots.
  - Members agreed overall that it may not be the REB's role to provide this guideline to researchers.
  - It is the REB's role to protect the participants, not the researchers. If we distribute this information, it may be assumed it is our responsibility.
  - The REB should communicate this important information to the Office of Research Services so they can distribute it themselves.
  - ORS does a workshop series called "building better research", we may suggest contributing to the topics but not running the workshop. We can also suggest that this guideline be posted on their website.
  - Q1: How do we communicate as a board to the Office of Research Services?
  - A1: ORS and ORE are parallel on an organization chart and we both report to the VPR. The administrative function is within the VPR. There is a head of units meeting once a month and we communicate to each other at this meeting.

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

- Brock has signed the Scarborough Charter in agreement to move toward action to address anti-Black racism.
- Members were asked to become familiar with the charter.
- The office is currently going through anti-Black racism training provided by the Canadian Association of Research Ethics Boards.
- A lot of trainings great education on culture, but they do not give much guidance on how to apply that information to the REB.
- The Office will look at other training materials and communicate them back to the board. If members are interested in contributing or accessing the CAREB training modules, they can let the office know.
- A link to the Scarborough Charter and CAREB training modules will be sent following the meeting.

**Synto Training**

- We have pushed back the soft launch of Synto until early November. Everything is working except for one IT issue regarding where researchers will access the portal.
- The office will send out a doodle poll with potential training times following this meeting.
- The training will include creating personal accounts and learning how to use the reviewer side of Synto.
- Members will let the office know if they are submitting an application soon so that it can be piloted in Synto.

		<p><b>Other Business</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ A reminder for members to send their TCPS-2 2022 certificate to the office by January 1<sup>st</sup>.</li> <li>○ The office will send out a request for members to write 3-5 areas that they are comfortable reviewing. These preferences could be related to cultural, academic, or personal experiences. This will help us triage files to reviewers with relevant expertise.</li> </ul>
4	<b>Adjourn</b>	<p><b>Meeting adjourned at 1:23 p.m.</b></p> <p>Motion to Approve: SC  Seconded: CC  All in favour</p>