

**BROCK UNIVERSITY RESEARCH ETHICS BOARD**  
**Wednesday, September 12, 2018**  
**12:00 – 2:00 p.m.**  
**PL 501C**

**Minutes of the SREB Meeting**

**Attendance**

Michael Ashton  
David Brown  
Lynn Dempsey  
Caitlin Kelley  
Carly MaGee (non-voting)  
Mike McAlpine  
Linda Morrice  
Miya Narushima

Trent Newmeyer  
Thomas O'Neill  
Robert Steinbauer  
Christine Tardif-Williams  
Kendra Thomson  
Amber-Lee Varadi  
Lori Walker (non-voting)  
Xiaoyang Xia

**Regrets**

Sandra Bosacki  
Kirsten Haylow  
Linda Morrice  
Catherine Nash

<b>MINUTES</b>		
<b>ITEM</b>	<b>DISCUSSION</b>	<b>ACTION</b>
1	<p><b>Motion to approve Agenda</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Approved</li> </ul> <p><b>Motion to approve July &amp; August Decision Reports</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Approved</li> </ul> <p><b>Motion to approve July Minutes</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Approved</li> </ul>	<p>Motion to approve: MN  Seconded: KT  All in favour</p> <p>Motion to approve: MA  Seconded: CTW  All in favour</p> <p>Motion to approve: KT  Seconded: RS  4 abstentions given lack of presence at meeting.</p>
2	<p><b>Business Item</b></p> <p><b><u>Introduction of new members</u></b></p> <p><b><u>Review Annual Report</u></b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• LW explained that the Research Ethics Boards (REBs) put in an Annual Report to Senate (through the Research Scholarship Policy Committee) and the Research Ethics Office (REO) reports to the Vice-President of Research (VPR) on an annual basis.</li> <li>• The report is written by LW and passed through the Chairs for editing. After that, it goes to Senate.</li> <li>• If everyone at the Board level is happy with the content, it will go to the October Senate meeting.</li> <li>• CM agreed to send out the report to all Board members by email, requesting any feedback.</li> <li>• LW clarified that although membership of the Boards is posted publicly, membership of the Appeals Board is not. Although the Appeals Board slate gets approved through Senate, it does not get posted publicly to lower the risk of researchers trying to coerce or pressure members of the appeals committee.</li> </ul>	

- Last year we had the Appeals Board for 2018-2020 approved through Senate. The REB sub-committee (GPPC) is currently working on guidelines for the appeals process to post on the website for researchers. Although there is a general process laid out in the TCPS2, it is very basic.
- LW clarified that the ethics year runs from July 1 to June 30.
- In 2017-2018, the REBs reviewed 232 new project submissions. The breakdown for each Board was 42 delegated reviews for the Bioscience Research Ethics Board (BREB; approximately 7 delegated files per reviewer for the year) and 197 for the Social Science Research Ethics Board (SREB; approximately 15 delegated files per reviewer for the year). SREB reviews considerably more applications which is one of the reasons we moved to a Co-Chair model this year.
- LW clarified that the disparity is generally felt at the level of the reviewers, not at the level of the Chair, because the REO handles the modification requests and clarification responses for SREB, whereas these responsibilities are part of the BREB Chair's role (to help equate workload between the Boards).
- LW explained to the Board that both the SREB and BREB Chairs are independently responsible for reviewing relevant previously approved applications (meaning the board of record has already given ethics clearance to the project and approval from Brock is now required (if the project is under Brock's auspices and jurisdiction), and applications for secondary use of data. This past year, the turnaround time for previously approved applications was between 2 and 3 business days. This is something we need to promote in education around campus, so researchers are familiar with the expedited process and understand it is not a barrier to their work progressing.
- The REO processed 1186 submissions this past year, an increase of 16% from the previous year.
- The turnaround time (number of business days between when the application goes out for review and when we have a first response back to the researchers) has decreased by 59% over the years, from 22 business days to 9 business days.
- In 2017/2018, the REO delivered 8 classroom presentations/trainings to both graduate and undergraduate classes.
- It was highlighted that a lot of students have completed the CORE tutorial however, interestingly, they are mostly undergraduate students (who the training is not actually mandatory for). We highly encourage more Faculty to complete the tutorial because the numbers are quite low (1%). However, this cannot be required of them.

- |  |  |  |  |
|--|--|--|--|
|  |  | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Two compliance cases were reported in 2017/2018 however, neither needed to be reported to the Tri-Council since neither involved government money.</li> <li>• A member asked how compliance cases are reported to the REB. LW clarified that most often, researchers actually bring the case to the REO's attention and admit fault.</li> <li>• LW summarized the community engagement that the REO was involved in this year. She encouraged anyone on the REB to let us know of any engagement pertaining to the field of ethics that they contributed to in the last year and we will add it to the report.</li> <li>• LW reviewed that adequate staff support remains the main issue for the REO and REBs. The REO is currently comprised of two FTE staff. The volume of reviews conducted by the REO coupled with the associated administrative and processing tasks; the front-line support provided to researchers; and the coordination of REBs and sub-committees leaves little time for higher order tasks. These higher order tasks include keeping abreast of policy and changing regulations, oversight and compliance, and providing REB and researcher training and education. As a result, staff work overtime and find it difficult to take vacation days and time off when they are ill. This issue was particularly evident in 2012, 2016 and 2017 when staff turnover and illness led to upheavals in service, resulting in an inordinate amount of staff overtime.</li> <li>• At minimum, the REO would greatly benefit from a 0.5 FTE Administrative Coordinator or Intake Officer to manage the processing and triage of submissions. In June 2013, the VPR approved a plan to recruit a Data Assistant to provide administrative support to the REO but the position never materialized. In discussions between the new VPR, Tim Kenyon and the REO, solutions to staffing issues have been prioritized for the coming year.</li> <li>• In terms of REB succession, it has become challenging to recruit volunteers for the REBs and recruiting Chairs can be particularly difficult. This may be in part due to the size of Brock and the fact that we have not had a large influx of new faculty in some time resulting in a small pool from which to draw new members. Ideally, in terms of faculty members, REB composition should be one of proportionate representation and reflect the number and type of research ethics applications received. Chairs should be elected from experienced members within the Board. In the coming year, the REO/REBs hope to work with the VPR and Senate to try to improve processes for recruitment and succession. In the meantime, we have implemented a new co- Chair model for the SREB 2018-2020 term. It is hoped that this collegial model will allow for better distribution of the SREB workload and free the Chairs up to exercise more</li> </ul> |  |
|--|--|--|--|

stewardship in both the development of policies and procedures and in researcher support.

- In September 2016, the REO established the REB Sub-Committee on Guidelines, Practice, and Procedure (GPPC). This group is tasked with reviewing REB practice and procedure; developing guidelines for research ethics at Brock; and revising these documents regularly in response to changes in the field, including evolving provincial, federal, and professional requirements. Recommendations from the GPPC are presented to the REBs for approval and, as appropriate, Senate—through the R&SPC. These documents are posted on the Research Ethics website for easy access by researchers.
- Systems management improvement: In 2017-2018, the REO and GPPC prioritized the development of new “smart” application forms with built in educational features and supports. In addition, the current VPR has committed support to procuring a comprehensive electronic platform for research administration that will be able to support research ethics application and review functions. We hope to pilot and launch new forms by September 2019; however, this plan is contingent on resources.
- A Board member asked whether it would be helpful to put in writing how an enterprise system would help us (to make the case stronger). LW clarified that given the current VPR has committed support for this, we are hopeful it will move forward. LW stressed that we need a long-term solution, not an interim short-term solution (which IT has proposed in the past).
- In terms of data management, over the past year, the Tri-Agencies (CIHR, NSERC and SSHRC) have been engaging in consultations regarding a draft Research Data Management Policy. This draft policy proposes requirements to Tri-Agency funded research in three primary areas: 1. Institutional data management strategies, 2. Researcher data management plans, 3. Data deposit.
- The REO has been actively involved in consultations at both the local (Brock) and Federal levels (Tri-Agency and the Canadian Association of Research Libraries, Portage Network) and is being proactive in revising sections of the current research ethics application regarding the management, access and storage of research data.
- One of the major issues that has been identified so far is a lack of conversation between policy makers and those who are collecting the data (or experts in data management).
- It will be important when a new system arrives to determine how we should incorporate these policy changes into our guidelines and application.
- It was noted that Brock’s Aboriginal Research Advisory Circle (ARAC; an advisory committee comprised of

		<p>members from the Brock community who self-identify as Aboriginal. ARAC completes a culturally informed review of all research applications that fall under the guidance and definition of TCPS2 Chapter 9, with consideration for cultural protocols, histories, and traditions) reviews &lt;2% of our applications.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• LW summarized the ethics training/presentations that the REO was involved in this year. She encouraged anyone on the REB to let us know of any presentations pertaining to the field of ethics that they have contributed to in the last year and we will add it to the report.</li> <li>• Board members had some suggestions for next year in terms of presenting the report to new members. It could be done in PowerPoint format with a “take home” message for the Board to understand what to do with these numbers.</li> <li>• The REO agreed to take this under advisement and encouraged board members to see the report as a glimpse into what is happening at the office and Board level overall. We report to Senate on an administrative process only (so there is no influence on ethical decisions), meaning the VPR cannot change our processes. We do not need formal Senate or VPR approval because it would be prescribing the decision making of the Board. Senate could however, advocate on our behalf to help us move our priorities forward.</li> <li>• LW informed the Board that the Appointment of the Chairs happened at the Research Scholarship Policy Committee yesterday (September 11) and appointments of Board members will go forward to this same committee in October for them to approve and send forward to Senate proper.</li> </ul>	
3	<b>Education Items</b>	<p><b><u>How to review a protocol presentation</u></b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• LW delivered a presentation to the Board, for both new members and as a refresher for returning members, regarding how to review a protocol.</li> <li>• A member asked for clarification on employers acting as gatekeepers (i.e., passing information on to employees about the study). Is it ok to ask whether the employees gave permission for their contact information to be used in this way? It was agreed this would be an appropriate question.</li> </ul>	
4	<b>Adjourn</b>	<b>Meeting adjourned at 2:04 p.m.</b>	Motion to adjourn: Lost quorum