1.0 Introduction

The Brandon University Research Ethics Committee (BUREC) Policies and Procedures were created under the guidance of the Tri-Council Policy Statement 2: Ethical Conduct for Research Involving Humans (TCPS2) and the Brandon University Policy on Research Involving Humans. Faculty, staff, and students who intend on using human participants in their research should read all policies and procedures before proceeding with an ethics submission. All documents and forms required in the ethics review process are available from the Research Office website at: http://www2.brendonu.ca/administration/vpacademic/research/committees/ethics.asp.

Ethics applications and other required documents and forms are to be submitted electronically to the Research Office at burec@brandonu.ca.

2.0 Human Participatory Research and the Need for Ethics Review

The purpose of ethics review for research involving human participants is to foster and ensure research practices that respect and protect the rights and dignity of participants, promote the integrity of researchers, and uphold the principle of academic freedom.

The TCPS2 definitions:

- Research - an undertaking intended to extend knowledge through a disciplined inquiry or systematic investigation.
- Participant - an individual whose data or responses to interventions, stimuli, or questions by a researcher are relevant to answering a research question.

Human participatory research conducted under the auspices of Brandon University or within our jurisdiction requires review and approval by BUREC prior to the start of the research. This includes research that:

- is undertaken by faculty, staff, or students; including adjunct professors, visiting professors, visiting professional associates, research associates, and postdoctoral fellows;
- is conducted on or off campus;
- is funded or unfunded;
- is conducted inside or outside of Canada;
- is conducted in the classroom or a course requirement;
- is a pilot or feasibility study;
- involves the secondary use of data gathered in earlier projects; or
- is conducted on University premises using any university resources, equipment or facilities.

2.1 Research Requiring BUREC Review

The following research requires ethics review and approval by BUREC prior to the start of research:

- research involving living human participants; and
- research that involves human biological materials, as well as human embryos, fetuses, fetal tissue, reproductive materials and stem cells. This applies to materials derived from living and deceased individuals.
All undertakings that involve the collection of information from human participants, including but not limited to tests, questionnaires, interviews, written communications, and/or representations (such as photographs, audiotapes, videotapes, etc.) of living human participants, normally require approval. This includes the use of secondary information that includes participants’ identifiable information.

**Undergraduate and Graduate Student Research:** student theses, senior student research projects, and other undertakings where the student takes a significant role in the research development, require BUREC review. A student researcher must list their research supervisor on the application and the supervisor should be a resource for the student when completing the ethics application, providing guidance and reviewing the application prior to submission.

**Course Project Research:** Course labs, demonstrations, assignments, papers, independent studies courses, and projects, undertaken in a course require BUREC approval. Course project research is limited to participants, topics, and methods that pose minimal risk. Ethics can be applied for collectively by the course instructor, if all students will be utilizing the same ethics submission, or individually by the student with the course instructor as their research supervisor. Instructors should make students aware of ethics requirements and timelines at the beginning of the course, to allow sufficient time for completion and review.

Given the breadth of possible research topics and methods to be reviewed, the *BUREC Policies and Procedures* cannot exhaustively cover all possible circumstances or ethical issues that may arise. Circumstances may occur in which a principle or standard of conduct implied in these materials is inappropriate, or should be applied differently from what is implied or stated. The policies and procedures reflected in this document have been selected to apply to frequently encountered research situations. **It is the responsibility of the researcher to verify with BUREC whether ethics certification is required, prior to commencement of a research project. Failure to obtain the necessary ethics certification for a research project involving human participatory research is a violation of academic integrity and responsible conduct of research.**

### 2.2 Research Exempt from BUREC Review

Research does not require ethics review and approval by BUREC prior to the start of research when:

a. the information is legally accessible to the public and appropriately protected by law;

b. the information is publically accessible and there is no reasonable expectation of privacy;

c. the research involves the observation of people in public places where interaction or intervention is not staged by the researcher, individuals have no reasonable expectation of privacy, and any dissemination of results does not identify specific individuals;

d. the research relies exclusively on secondary use of anonymous information, or anonymous human biological materials, that does not generate identifiable information;

e. the data collected is for quality assurance and quality improvement studies, program evaluation activities, performance reviews, or testing within the normal educational requirements when used exclusively for assessment, management or improvement purpose, unless the data is used for other research or scholarly purposes; or

f. it is a creative practice activity where an artist makes or interprets a work of art or studies how a work of art is generated, unless the research employs creative practice to obtain responses from participants that will be analyzed to answer a research question.

### 3.0 Matters of Particular Concern in Ethics Review

The TCPS2 is based on three core principles (*TCPS2, B., Article 1.1*):

1. **Respect for Persons** – *Respect for Persons recognizes the intrinsic value of human beings and the respect and consideration that they are due.*

2. **Concern for Welfare** – *The welfare of a person is the quality of that person’s experience of life in all its aspects.*

3. **Justice** – *Justice refers to the obligation to treat people fairly and equitably.*
Notwithstanding the necessity to address all ethical issues fully, the following key elements of the TCPS2 fall within the core principles and should receive careful attention when preparing an ethics submission:

3.1 Free and Informed Consent

Consent encompasses a process that begins with the initial contact (e.g., recruitment) and carries through to the end of participants’ involvements in the project, (TCPS2, Article 3.3). Free and informed consent must be given by each participant and must be maintained throughout the research study. Evidence of consent shall be contained either in a signed consent form or in documentation by the researcher of another appropriate means of consent (TCPS2, Article 3.12). Written consent in a signed statement from the participant is a common means of demonstrating consent; however, there are other means of providing consent that are equally ethically acceptable. Where a signed consent form is not used, the procedures used to seek and confirm consent must be documented. Whether or not a consent form is signed, it may be advisable to leave a written statement of the information conveyed in the consent process with the participant. The requirement to leave said written statement with the participant is a matter of judgment by BUREC and is dependent on the degree of risk and the general nature of the research participation.

Researchers shall provide to prospective participants, or authorized third parties, full disclosure of all information necessary for making an informed decision to participate in a research project (TCPS2, Article 3.2). At the commencement of any process of consent, researchers (or their qualified representatives) shall provide prospective participants with the information set out in the following list, as appropriate to the particular research project. Not all the listed elements are required for all research. However, additional information may be required in particular types of research or under particular circumstances. If a researcher does not include some of the listed disclosure requirements, they should explain to BUREC why these requirements do not apply to that particular project. It is the responsibility of BUREC to consider whether all elements listed, or additional elements, are necessary to the consent process of the research project.

a. Participants are Invited to participate and that participation is voluntary;

b. Participants are free to refuse to answer any question or withdraw at any time;

c. Ensure the protection of the participants’ privacy and the confidentiality of any information they provide;

d. Participation should be free of undue influence and coercion;

e. The information provided to participants about the study prior to obtaining consent must be comprehensible to them, specifically, written or spoken in plain language/layperson, and translated fully if necessary;

f. Full disclosure of all information required to make an informed decision to participate including: research purpose, duration and nature of participation, description of procedures, explanation of the participant’s responsibilities, risks and benefits to the participant and that may arise from the research (the risks should outweigh benefits), plans for dissemination;

g. The researcher must outline any incentives offered, and keep in mind that they are a strong consideration in assessing voluntariness. The onus is on the researcher to justify to BUREC the use of a particular model and level of incentives. Any incentives offered to participants must be honored, should they choose to withdraw from the study;

h. The presence of any conflicts of interest, real, potential or perceived, must be disclosed;

i. Address how data will be collected and recorded, how it will be used (and any future uses), who will have access, how it will be stored, how long will it be retained, and how will it be disposed of;

ii. If participants will be audiotaped, videotaped, photographed, and/or recorded in any other way, include a “Do you agree to be (insert type of recording)?” question for each type of recording for participants to consent to, by selecting either “yes or “no”.

iii. Data retention may be discipline specific.

j. Include a statement that Participants have not waived any rights to legal recourse in the event of research-related harm;

k. Contact information must be provided for the researcher should the participant have any research concerns and for BUREC for ethical concerns; student researchers must also include their supervisor's
Information;

1. Participants should receive a copy of signed consent on University letterhead or an alternative document that contains the above information; and
2. Parental consent must be included for participants under the age of 18.

Additional notes on informed consent:

- In situations where a parent or legal guardian has provided consent, the participant must also agree to participate via an assent process.
- Where recruitment is separate from the consent process, researchers are expected to provide a description of the initial contact process and supporting scripts.
- See TCPs2, Chapter 3, for complete details on the consent process.

3.2 Temporary Concealment and/or Incomplete Disclosure

If there is a plan to temporarily conceal the purpose of a research project or any other aspects of the research from the participants, or if the research involves partial disclosure, this must be discussed fully in the application. In some types of studies, the purposes initially are only partially disclosed to avoid over-sensitizing participants to particular issues, but the undisclosed information would not be likely to affect informed consent. If this is the case, describe the way in which disclosure is incomplete, provide a rationale, and provide assurance that the information left undisclosed would not reasonably be expected to influence informed consent. If there is concealment or partial disclosure about matters that reasonably might be expected to influence informed consent, the proposal will be a higher level of risk. In such cases, potential risks must be discussed and how they will be minimized; describing how the reasons for the concealment or incomplete disclosure will be explained, and how any negative feelings or loss of trust/respect that has been created will be dispelled. In addition, where feasible, the researcher must offer an opportunity to withdraw consent for the use of the data after debriefing. In all cases, an explanation of how participants will be debriefed must be included. Where there is a moderate or greater risk of harm to participants, or where participants cannot later be debriefed, BUREC may not approve the research.

3.3 Privacy and Confidentiality

Participants have the right to expect that their identities will be kept private and their personal information kept confidential. Even when the researcher has reason to believe that participants will agree to being identified publicly, the researcher must ask whether participants consent to this. The application must specify whether the researcher will protect privacy, anonymity, and/or confidentiality, and if so, how it will be done. This should also be referred to in the informed consent material. If there are risks attached to the accidental revelation of participants’ identities or private information, describe these, explain how they will be minimized, and take them into account in assessing the risk level of the research. Should the risk of revelation of information present a greater risk than participants encounter in their everyday lives, the proposal will be considered under the Full Review process.

3.4 Vulnerable Persons

Ethical conduct precludes the exploitation of persons who are legally or otherwise not competent to provide informed consent. However, research involving such people may provide benefits to them or to the group that they represent. Thus, researchers should not automatically exclude vulnerable persons from research participation. However, if research conceivably could be conducted effectively using a legally-competent population, that alternative should be given careful consideration. If vulnerable persons are the participants in human participatory research, the consent procedures must comply with all legal requirements that might apply. Consent must be obtained from an authorized representative who is able to advocate independently for the vulnerable person. The researcher must demonstrate that the study will not pose more than minimal risks to participants without the potential for direct benefits to them. Special care must be taken to ensure that there is no coercion, constraint or undue influence to participate. It must be clearly indicated in the proposal how these higher risk category, regardless of the degree of actual risk to participants. Thus, Full Review will be
required, and additional review time may be required to address any ethical issues raised.

3.5 Children

The use of children, persons under 18 years of age, as participants does not, in and of itself, place the study in a higher risk category. However, the informed consent of parents or authorized representatives must be obtained, and the child also must be given an independent opportunity to consent/decline to participate in the study, if he/she is old enough to do so. Information provided to children must be comprehensible for their age or developmental level. Particular care must be taken to prevent real or apparent coercion, constraint or undue inducement to participate. These matters must be discussed fully in the submission. Schools, day care centres, etc. often have review procedures that must be followed in addition to those of BUREC, and additional time should be allowed for this. If applicable, note that the law may require the reporting of any disclosures of abuse made by persons under the age of 18. If this is a potential issue, it must be fully discussed in the ethics submission.

3.6 Captive or Dependent Populations

If the participants are drawn from captive or dependent populations (e.g., in prisons, schools, hospitals, psychiatric facilities, treatment programs, etc.) special care must be taken to ensure that consent is given freely, and that no actual or perceived coercion, constraint, or undue influence or inducement to participate is present. Often, because the researcher has good intentions, he/she may fail to note some way in which potential participants might feel subtle pressure to participate. For example, a token payment of five or ten dollars for research participation might represent a large inducement to someone who has no other means of obtaining extra money. Even if a study is being conducted by a researcher who has no connection to a participant’s doctor or therapist, the participant might nonetheless feel that refusal to participate might compromise his/her treatment or therapy. The onus is on the researcher to identify potential problems of free and informed consent and/or actual or perceived coercion, to devise safeguards to prevent or minimize such problems, and to explain these matters fully in the proposal.

3.7 Research Involving First Nations, Inuit, and Métis Peoples

Where the research is likely to affect the welfare of an Aboriginal community to which the participants belong, the researcher shall seek engagement with the relevant community. The conditions under which community engagement is required include, but are not limited to:

a. Research conducted on First Nations, Inuit or Métis lands;
b. Recruitment criteria that include Aboriginal identity as a factor for the entire study or for a subgroup in the study;
c. Research that seeks input from participants regarding a community’s cultural heritage, artifacts, traditional knowledge or unique characteristics;
d. Research in which Aboriginal identity or membership in an Aboriginal community is used as a variable for the purposes of analysis of the research data; and
e. Interpretation of research results that will refer to Aboriginal communities, peoples, language, history or culture.

The researcher should read Section 6 in-full of the TCPS2 and any discipline-specific ethics guidelines that may apply to the study.

3.8 Fairness and Equity in Research Participation

Researchers should be inclusive when selecting participants for their research studies. Participants shall not be excluded based on attributes such as culture, language, religion, race, sexual orientation, ethnicity, linguistic proficiency, gender or age. Where such exclusion occurs the researcher must demonstrate a valid reason to BUREC.
3.9 Conflict of Interest

A conflict of interest may arise when activities or situations place an individual or institution in a real, potential or perceived conflict between the duties or responsibilities related to research, and personal, institutional or other interest (Tri-Council MOU, Schedule 14). These interests include, but are not limited to, business, commercial or financial interests pertaining to an institution and/or the individual, their family members, friends, or their former, current or prospective professional associates. A conflict of interest may involve the institution, researcher, or BUREC member. Any real, potential or perceived conflict of interest must be disclosed. (For more information, please refer to the Brandon University Conflict of Interest Policy).

4.0 Types of Review

The type of review and the ongoing review procedures must be proportionate to the level of risk posed by the proposed undertaking. The researcher has a responsibility to minimize any possible risks and to ensure that these risks do not outweigh the benefits expected from research. The researcher should select the appropriate review upon careful consideration of level of risk and the potential benefits of the proposed project. Proposals will be subject to one or more of the types of review described below:

4.1 Full Review:

Full review is the default review process. All proposals will be reviewed by BUREC at the monthly scheduled, face-to-face meetings of the full ethics committee.

A Full Review is required if the research involves a level of risk higher than the standard of everyday life, and/or is moderately invasive. Higher risk is also present if the research involves temporary concealment of information or incomplete disclosure to participants in advance of participation (unless this would be unlikely to influence the decision to participate), if informed consent cannot be obtained, if a breach of confidentiality or publication of the results might place the participants or their membership group at risk, if the participants are legally incompetent or institutionalized, or if large inducements to participate are present. Please note that this is not an exhaustive list and that other circumstances and situations may also elevate risk. For higher risk research, it must be demonstrated that all possible steps have been taken to minimize harm, and that the potential benefits of the research outweigh the potential harms.

4.2 Delegated Review:

Projects involving minimal risk may be eligible for Delegated Review, provided that the researcher requests such review and the BUREC Chair concurs. The TCPS2 defines minimal risk as research in which the probability and magnitude of possible harms implied by participation in the research is no greater than those encountered by participants in those aspects of their everyday life that relate to the research (TCPS2, p23).

If the Chair concurs, the submission will be reviewed by the Chair and two BUREC members. Should any of the reviewers decide that Full Review is necessary, they can provide reasons to the Chair for reconsideration. The Chair, in consultations with the delegates shall come to a final decision.

Should a Delegated Review result in an approval, this will be reported at the next BUREC meeting.

Please note that Delegated Review is available for minimal risk proposals and is not available to accommodate a researcher’s time constraints.

4.3 Multi-Site Research Review

When a minimal risk ethics submission has been reviewed and approved by an institution working under the
TCPS2, other than Brandon University, it can be submitted to BUREC for review under the Multi-Site Research Review process. In this process, the BUREC Chair is given the discretion to decide whether the ethics submission can be approved or requires further BUREC review. In the case where the Chair believes all BUREC requirements have been met, he/she has the authority to accept the approval from the other institution without further review. In the case where further expertise is needed to determine whether BUREC is likely to approve the submission, the Chair may consult experts and/or may initiate normal BUREC review procedures. Higher risk ethics submissions must undergo Full Review by BUREC.

5.0 Timeframe and Review Procedures

It is the responsibility of the researcher to allow sufficient time for review in advance of the anticipated project start date in consideration of BUREC meeting dates and turnaround. Time frame considerations include the following:

5.1 Submission Completeness

A submission that lacks required items or does not provide sufficient detail for review will be returned to the researcher for completion and resubmission.

5.2 Ethical Complexities

A submission involving ethical issues that necessitates further consideration by BUREC may require time for consultation, revision, and/or committee discussion at more than one scheduled meeting.

5.3 Type of Review Required

The level of review (Full or Delegated) will affect the review time frame. Provided that no additional time is needed because of submission incompleteness or ethical complexities, the guidelines for review timing are as follows:

5.3.1 Full Review

The researcher must submit electronically to the Research Office by the posted deadline, for review at the next scheduled BUREC meeting. BUREC requires sufficient time to read submissions prior to the meeting, therefore, proposals received between the submission deadline and the meeting date will not be reviewed until the subsequent scheduled BUREC meeting. The researcher will normally be notified of the outcome of the BUREC review within two (2) working days. In cases of Full Review, the review process will produce one of the following three outcomes:

a. ethically acceptable as is;
b. return to researcher for further information and/or revision; or
c. unacceptable, researcher to revise and resubmit.

5.3.2 Delegated Review

The researcher submits electronically to the Research Office anytime for review by the BUREC Chair and two BUREC members. The researcher will normally be notified within ten (10) working days from the date of submission. If the reviewers decide that Full Review is required, the procedure reverts to Full Review, as described above, and the submission will be considered at the next scheduled BUREC meeting for which the deadline has not passed. In cases of Delegated Review, the review process will produce one of the following four outcomes:

a. ethically acceptable as is;
b. return to researcher for further information and/or revision; or
c. recommended for Full Review; or
d. unacceptable, researcher to revise and resubmit.
5.3.3 Ethics Submission Changes

Where ethics submission changes are required by BUREC, the researcher and the BUREC Chair, acting on behalf of BUREC, will work together to finalize the submission requirements. Once an agreement has been reached, the Chair shall issue a certificate indicating ethics approval for the research. Any changes to a submission will be documented and kept on file.

5.4 Pending Approval

A submission must be either approved or withdrawn within six (6) months of the initial BUREC review date, after which time a new ethics submission is required.

5.5 Ethics Certification

Once BUREC has approved the ethics submission, a BUREC ethics certificate will be released to the researcher. No human participatory research shall begin until the researcher has received a signed ethics certificate from BUREC.

6.0 Continuing Research Ethics Review

Continuing research ethics review is a requirement of the TCPS2 and an approved ethics submission is subject to ongoing monitoring throughout the life of the project. At minimum, continuing ethics research review shall consist of an Annual Report for multi-year projects and a Final Report at the end of all projects. At the time of review, BUREC will determine if more frequent continual research ethics review is required in accordance with a proportionate approach to review and level of risk. Failure to fulfill the continuing research ethics review requirements is considered an act of non-compliance and may result in the suspension of active ethics certifications; refusal to review and approve any new research ethics submissions; and/or others as outlined in section 10.0. Types of continuing research ethics review include, but are not limited to:

6.1 Annual Reports

Annual Reports are to be submitted to BUREC within one month of the anniversary of the approval date. The faculty supervisor is responsible for ensuring that student Principal Investigators submit Annual Progress Reports as outlined above. The Annual Progress Report form is available from the Research Office website;

6.2 Final Reports

Final Reports are to be submitted to BUREC upon completion or termination of an approved ethics submission and when ethics approval is no longer required. Reports are to be submitted within one month of completion/termination. Students must remember to submit their reports prior to leaving the University. The faculty supervisor is responsible for ensuring that student Principal Investigators submit a Final Report as outlined above. The Final Report Form is available from the Research Office website;

6.3 Adverse Event Reports:

Adverse Event Reports are to be submitted WITHOUT DELAY to BUREC. An adverse event is one that exceeds the level of response anticipated and provided for in the approved proposal that increase the level of risk. Adverse Event Report form is available from the Research Office website; and

6.4 Amendment to a Previously Approved Ethics Submission

Amendments to an Approved Ethics Submission are submitted to BUREC for review and approval, prior to implementation. The BUREC Chair will determine whether additional review is required, and if so, what type. Amendment to an Approved Ethics Submission form is available from the Research Office website; The
BUREC Chair reviews and approves all amendments to an approved research submission unless there are substantive changes that warrant a new review or there is an increase in the level of risk, which would result in the initiation of a Full Review.

7.0 Researcher

7.1 Researcher Responsibilities

All members of the University community (faculty, staff and students) and those within our jurisdiction who conduct research or teaching activities involving human participants have the responsibility to:

a. familiarize themselves with the TCPS2 and the BUREC Policies and Procedures, as well as any relevant disciplinary ethics guidelines, and to abide by these;
b. not undertake any project involving human participants that requires review without obtaining the necessary approval;
c. ensure that proposals submitted for review are complete, and describe all aspects of the project relevant to ethics review;
d. disclose in their proposals any real, potential or perceived conflicts of interest regarding their relationship with potential participants or regarding the potential uses of the research findings;
e. conduct their research in accordance with the contents of their approved proposals;
f. submit Amendment to Approved Ethics Submissions to BUREC for review and approval, prior to implementation;
g. comply with all undertakings, reporting procedures, and monitoring procedures that form the conditions of project approval;
h. obtain signed Oaths of Confidentiality from all individuals involved with collecting and/or with access to the data, where applicable. This should be addressed in the application. An Oath of Confidentiality template is available from the Research Office website;
i. submit Adverse Event Reports WITHOUT DELAY to BUREC via the Research Office;
j. submit Annual Progress Reports to BUREC via the Research Office for all approved ethics submissions, and certain projects may require more frequent progress reports and/or ongoing monitoring;
k. submit Final Reports to BUREC via the Research Office in a timely manner upon completion or termination for all approved ethics submissions and when ethics approval is no longer required and;
l. submit a new ethics application for any approved ethics submission lasting longer than five (5) years from the date of approval.

7.2 Proposal Preparation

Before preparing a proposal, researchers should thoroughly read the BUREC Policies and Procedures and familiarize themselves with the TCPS2 which can be found on the Research Office website. Additionally, all required forms and templates can be downloaded for completion for electronic submission. The following items are to assist researchers in preparing and submitting their ethics applications:

a. All applicable sections of the BUREC Application must be completed or labeled “n/a”; b. The researcher must identify the level of risk posed to participants and propose the type of review the project should receive;
c. All information must be provided that are pertinent to the assessment of the level of risk, harms/benefits of participating in the research, and the possible need for ongoing review;
d. Researcher must disclose in the submission any potential conflicts of interest that may arise in their relationships with participants and/or in the potential uses of the findings;
e. Copies of all research instruments should be attached, for example, questionnaires, surveys, and interviews. Where the research is qualitative and involves emergent design, the researcher must provide BUREC with all available information to allow for a proportionate approach to ethics review, for example, a draft set of sample questions, thematic categories, or other guides and outlines. Please note that final versions should be submitted to BUREC as soon as they become available;
f. If participants are to be photographed, audio taped, videotaped, or otherwise recorded, a detailed
description of the parameters within which recording will occur must be provided;
g. The proposal must include a participant written consent form, or an explicit method of otherwise obtaining and documenting informed consent. Where a researcher considers a consent form impossible, inadvisable, or unnecessary, he/she must demonstrate to BUREC how this will be done. See TCPS2, Chapter 3, for complete details on the consent process;
h. For human participatory research conducted within or in association with other institutions, a letter of permission or appropriate approval from a person with institutional authority must be provided to BUREC, either with the proposal or before the project begins;
i. An incomplete proposal received by BUREC will be returned for resubmission when complete;
j. Researcher may consult with the Research Office and/or the BUREC Chair, if they are uncertain what information is required or how the proposal preparation guidelines apply to their project.
k. The proposal must specify a mechanism for providing a summary of the study’s results to interested participants where practical and appropriate.
l. If sensitive information is to be recorded in a manner that might identify individual participants, the proposal must describe the provisions that will be made for storing such information securely.

8.0 Brandon University Research Ethics Committee (BUREC)

8.1 BUREC Responsibilities

It is the responsibility of BUREC to:

a. establish and maintain policies and procedures for the ethical conduct of human participatory research. These must include the TCPS2, the BUREC Policies and Procedures, and should also include accepted disciplinary guidelines relevant to the nature of the project.
b. nominate a Chair who has the necessary knowledge of and experience with TCPS2, all applicable University policies and procedures, and the administrative responsibilities of BUREC;
c. to approve, propose modifications, or terminate any proposed or ongoing ethics research conducted by members of, or within, Brandon University under the guidance of the TCPS2 and BUREC’s policies and procedures;
d. ensure that appropriate mechanisms exist to inform researchers of these Policies and Procedures;
e. provide consultation to researchers on human ethics matters;
f. provide periodic opportunities for education on human participants’ ethics to its own members and to members of the University’s research and scholarly community;
g. disclose any real, potential or perceived conflicts of interest regarding any relationship to researchers (and team members) who have submitted ethics applications;
h. review these Policies and Procedures annually, and recommend any necessary policy changes for Senate approval;
i. in the event of an ethics appeal at The University of Winnipeg, will serve as an appeal body, under the terms of a joint appeal agreement between Brandon University and The University of Winnipeg; and
j. in situations of non-compliance, issue the appropriate penalty.

8.2 BUREC Chair Responsibilities

In addition to such other responsibilities as may be delegated to the BUREC Chair, he/she is responsible for:

a. having sound knowledge of and experience with the TCPS2, all applicable University policies and procedures, and any other relevant human ethics information;
b. reviewing all proposals received by the BUREC, whether for Full or Delegated Review;
c. signing ethics certificates, once the application is approved;
d. appointing an Acting Chair from the BUREC membership, when away from the university;
e. making initial decisions regarding an application’s eligibility for Delegated Review;
f. reviewing and approving minimal risk amendments to previously approved ethics submissions on behalf of BUREC;
g. conducting any aspects of ongoing review delegated to the Chair by BUREC;
h. communicating with researchers as required concerning their ethics applications and consulting with BUREC when required;
i. ensuring that BUREC meets at reasonable, scheduled, publicized times;
j. appointing ad hoc BUREC members as required;
k. participating in BUREC and University ethics-educational undertakings; and
l. ensuring that any concerns arising with BUREC policies and procedures are noted and brought forward for discussion at the BUREC annual policy review meeting.

8.3 BUREC Composition

All BUREC members are to be appointed by the Senate Research Committee. BUREC membership shall include:

- Chair, to be nominated by and from members of BUREC for a one-year renewable term;
- One assistant professor, associate professor, full professor or P.A. (II, III, or IV) from the Faculty of Education;
- One assistant professor, associate professor, full professor or P.A. (II, III, or IV) representative from the School of Health Studies;
- One assistant professor, associate professor, full professor or P.A. (II, III, or IV) representative from the Social Sciences (Arts, Music, Science or Student Services);
- One assistant professor, associate professor, full professor or P.A. (II, III, or IV) representative from the Social Sciences (Arts, Music, Science or Student Services), normally from the Department of Psychology;
- One assistant professor, associate professor, full professor or P.A. (II, III, or IV) representative from the Humanities (Arts) or Library;
- One Brandon University representative, normally a faculty member, experienced in Aboriginal and/or indigenous research; and
- One community representative who has no affiliation with Brandon University.

Additionally, the following requirements shall be satisfied among the above named members:

- at least one member is knowledgeable in ethics;
- at least two members having broad expertise in research methods;
- at least one member knowledgeable in legal principles, but who shall not be the University's legal counsel;
- to be composed of both men and women; and
- to hold and maintain membership on BUREC, all members must be in good research ethics standing.

8.4 BUREC Administrative Matters

a. Meeting quorum shall be 50% plus one.
b. BUREC members shall come to meetings prepared with comments, having thoroughly read the agenda package.
c. BUREC members who have three or more meeting absences in a year, for which regrets and the reasons therefore are not conveyed, will automatically be considered to have resigned from the committee.
d. BUREC members who are unable to attend a meeting are encouraged to submit written comments concerning proposals to be reviewed at that meeting.
e. Minutes of BUREC deliberations shall be kept. For proposal reviews, the minutes shall document clearly the decisions, any dissents and the reasons for them. Although proposal deliberation minutes are generally confidential, such minutes (or relevant portions of them) shall be accessible to all BUREC members, authorized administrative assistants, and the Vice-President (Academic & Provost).
f. It is expected that the University continue to provide BUREC with sufficient administrative assistance to ensure that adequate record-keeping is maintained, and that proposals are processed
administratively in a fashion adequate to the needs of BUREC’s work.

9.0 BUREC Appeals

A researcher may request that BUREC reconsider a decision made regarding their ethics submission. They must do so in writing to the Chair of BUREC, detailing the reasons for their request. Reconsiderations will normally occur at the next regularly scheduled BUREC meeting. Reasons for the reconsideration should be provided and the specific applicable sections of the TCPS2 and BUREC Policy and Procedures should be referenced. A request for appeal should be submitted within 30 days of BUREC’s decision.

Decisions of BUREC may be appealed and such requests will be heard at The University of Winnipeg by the Senate Committee on Ethics in Human Research and Scholarship, under the conditions of a joint appeal agreement between Brandon University and The University of Winnipeg. Appeal decisions of The University of Winnipeg Senate Committee on Ethics in Human Research and Scholarship are final. A request for appeal should be submitted to the Research Office within 30 days of BUREC’s reconsideration decision.

10.0 Compliance

Brandon University requires that all faculty members, staff, and students adhere to the BUREC Policies and Procedures. The University considers non-compliance and the inappropriate treatment of human participants to be a serious offence, subject to penalties, including, but not limited to, formal written documentation included permanently in one’s personnel file, suspension of ethics certifications, withdrawal of privileges to conduct research involving humans, and/or disciplinary action. All acts of non-compliance will be reviewed on a case by case basis by BUREC, and may involve the Vice-President (Academic & Provost). Any actions taken will take into account the severity of non-compliance.

11.0 Publicly Declared Emergency

BUREC Review during Publicly Declared Emergencies

A publicly declared emergency is defined by the TCPS2 as:

*an emergency situation that, due to the extraordinary risks it presents, has been proclaimed as such by an authorized public official (in accordance with legislation and/or public policy). (TCSP2, p. 85, D.)*

Publicly declared emergencies are unique and rare situations and BUREC will exercise due diligence in respecting ethical principles, procedures and the law in effect in order to preserve the core principles of the TCPS2. During publicly declared emergencies only “essential” research will be considered. This includes:

- the initial review process of new research projects arising from the emergency (e.g., research involving interviews with first responders and victims to understand human response during a disaster, such as a tornado, flood, communicable disease outbreak, environmental disaster, catastrophic civil disorder, bio-hazardous release, and humanitarian emergency);
- the continuing ethics review of research undertaken prior to the occurrence of the emergency;
- and
- the ethics review process for changes to approved research because new information has become available and requires immediate action during the emergency.

BUREC recognizes two categories of emergency:

1. A Publicly Declared Emergency that has not affected Brandon University and its normal function; and
2. A Publicly Declared Emergency that has affected Brandon University and its normal function.
Procedures:

Publicly Declared Emergency that has not Affected Brandon University

Research to be conducted at a time when an emergency has been publicly declared and that emergency has not affected Brandon University, will be initiated through the Office of Research Services during regular business hours. The Chair of BUREC may consult with the Vice-President (Academic & Provost) to determine the type of review and quorum necessary to review and approve the application, e.g. face-to-face meeting or electronic review of the application with the full board or a delegated committee.

Publicly Declared Emergency that has Affected Brandon University

Research to be conducted at a time when an emergency has been publicly declared and that emergency has had a direct impact on Brandon University (e.g. destruction of campus buildings due to a tornado), will be initiated via contact to the Vice-President (Academic & Provost) as per the Brandon University Emergency Procedures Manual (http://www.brandonu.ca/-available under “Emergency Info”). The Vice-President (Academic & Provost) will make contact with the Chair of BUREC or designate, to determine the procedures for the review and approval of the ethics application.

BUREC will ensure the adherence to a rule of reasonable, fair and principled design. For both categories of emergency, review will be dealt with on an emergency-by-emergency basis with full understanding that procedures may be modified to include attention to such things as timing, locale, expertise, form and scope of review, quorum, availability of BUREC members, appointment of substitute BUREC members, ad hoc committees, and communications.

Emergency procedures will end as soon as possible after public officials have declared the emergency over. Once regular BUREC policies and procedures are reinstated, a post-response evaluation will be conducted by the BUREC in order to review the emergency process and improve or revise it, if necessary.

Approved by Senate Executive acting as Senate July 10, 2012