

BROCK UNIVERSITY RESEARCH ETHICS BOARD
Wednesday, July 5, 2017
12:00 – 2:00 p.m.
MC D350-L

Minutes of the SREB Meeting

Attendance

Sandra Bosacki
 Ann-Marie DiBiase
 Mahfuz Hassan

Linda Morrice
 Miya Narushima
 Ayda Tekok-Kilic

Regrets

Lynn Dempsey
 Christina Garchinski
 Karen Julien
 Christine Tardif-Williams

MINUTES		
ITEM	DISCUSSION	ACTION
1	<p>Motion to approve Agenda</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Approved <p>Motion to approve June Decision Reports</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Approved <p>Motion to approve May 2 Minutes</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Approved <p>Motion to approve May 23 Minutes</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Approved 	<p>Motion to approve: SB Seconded: LM All in favour</p> <p>Motion to approve: LM Seconded: MN All in favour</p> <p>Motion to approve: LM Seconded: SB All in favour</p> <p>Motion to approve: MH Seconded: LM All in favour</p>
2	<p>New Business</p> <p>Full board review (in-camera)</p> <p>The REB Sub-Committee on Guidelines, Practice, and Procedure (GPP)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The new documents to be approved by SREB today were reviewed: <p>1. REB Guideline – Meetings, Quorum, and Attendance:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A Board member asked why there is a requirement for both male and female REB members. LW indicated that this is based on TCPS2 requirements for REB composition. • A motion was put forward by LM to approve the guideline. Seconded by MN. All members voted in favour. <p>2. REB Guideline – Conducting Research as a Course Assignment:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The Office reviewed the additions made to the guideline: 	<p>Motion to move in camera: AMD Seconded: LM All in favour</p> <p>Motion to move out of camera: AMD Seconded: SB All in favour</p>

there was some confusion about whether practicum type activities would need to come to the REB for review. For example, some students in Applied Disability Studies participate in a practicum component for clinical work, however the clinical work is “research based” in nature. The data collection involves participants outside of the student body (i.e., clients in various settings) and there is a day where final projects are presented in front of classes, as well as other invited speakers (leaders in the field) and clinical supervisors (that supervised practicum experiences). Given the diversity of the work, some of these practicums may not be minimal risk (e.g., treating extreme aggression, self-injurious behaviors, pica etc.). The current guideline was edited to clarify that this type of work would not constitute research per the definition in the TCPS2. Practicums where the primary purpose is to develop professional skills, or co-op placements are not subject to REB review. However, if data collected are later proposed for research, it would be considered secondary use of information not originally intended for research and would require REB review (TCPS2, article 2.5). This information was added to the guideline.

- A motion was put forward to approve the guideline. All members voted in favour.

3. REB Standard – Responsibility of Faculty Supervisors and Student Researchers:

- The Board discussed that there are some post-doc fellows that are hired specifically to do research. In these unique cases, we allow them to act as the Principal Investigator (PI) given they are contracted specifically for research. Otherwise, post-docs require Faculty supervisor. They are expected to publish under their supervisor unless a separate agreement is made with the Office of Research Services.
- In fact, the Faculty Handbook (FHB) states that post-docs must have a Faculty supervisor and that the supervisor’s name should be present on all publishing etc.
- A motion was put forward to approve the standard. All members voted in favour.

4. REB Standard - Confidentiality:

- This standard was last reviewed in March 2017 however, a recent compliance case involving two institutions brought about a few necessary edits. During the compliance case, the REB had to consider whether they were permitted to share information on the file with the other institution. It was the intention when the standard was introduced in May 2005 that institutions would be permitted to work together and share information to effectively resolve the issue.
- When the compliance case came up, the lawyer for Brock indicated that the REB’s confidentiality agreement, as currently written, would not allow us to

		<p>share anything outside the REB. The lawyer clarified that there was nothing institutionally that opposed the sharing of documents however, our own REB document had put us in a bind. This brought about the edits that were made to the standard to ensure pertinent information on files can be shared across institutions moving forward: e. In the case of multi-jurisdictional research, protocols and review materials will be shared with the relevant REBs; f. Protocols and review materials may be shared with other institutional bodies (e.g., the Academic Safety committee, investigative committees established under the Responsible Conduct of Research policy) within or beyond Brock to facilitate review of the research.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A motion was put forward to approve the edits made to the standard. All members voted in favour. <p>Update on Compliance Case (in camera)</p>	
3	Adjourn	Meeting adjourned at 2:03 p.m.	Motion to adjourn: AMD Seconded: LD All in favour