Title	Research Ethics Board Policy
Policy Area	Education/Academic/Research
Policy Number *(to be assigned by Information Services)*	D.3.6
See also *(related policies)*	Conflict of Interest in Research

Effective Date of Policy:	March 30, 2011
Approval Date:	March 29, 2011
Applies to:	Employees, Students
Approving Body:	Okanagan College Board of Governors
Supersedes:	Okanagan College Research Ethics Board Policy of June 16, 2010 and the Research Ethics Board for Research Involving Human Subjects, Guidelines and Terms of Reference, approved Okanagan College Board June 28, 2005
Authority	*College and Institute Act*

The following are responsible for the administration of this policy,

Primary Office	**Contact**
Office of the Vice President Education	Vice President Education

Policy Statement

1 Purpose

This document contains Okanagan College's policy and procedures for review of ethical considerations arising from research involving human participants. Okanagan College recognizes that the use of human participants is necessary for progress in many areas of research. However, all research involving human participants should be conducted ethically in ways that protect individual participants and recognize their dignity and rights.

2 Rationale

Okanagan College is committed to ensuring the highest level of ethical conduct for research involving human participants and to following the guidelines outlined in the Tri-Council Policy Statement "Ethical Conduct for Research Involving Humans". It is the professional responsibility of all researchers to conduct their research according to the highest scholarly standards, and to adhere to the ethical norms and codes of conduct appropriate to their respective disciplines.

Furthermore, most funding agencies require an ethics review of research proposals that involve the use of human participants. For these reasons, policy and procedures are required to ensure that appropriate safeguards are provided.

3 Ethical Policy Considerations

This policy is intended to create a research environment in which human participants are protected and to ensure that responsibilities are discharged according to the relevant ethical standards: by promoting awareness of research ethics among faculty, staff and students, by establishing an independent research ethics review process, and by putting in place mechanisms for the protection of human participants through initial review and monitoring of ongoing research.

The primary principle underlying contemporary considerations of the ethics of research involving human participants is respect for their dignity and rights. As described in the Tri-Council Policy Statement: Ethical Conduct for Research Involving Humans (2005)[1], this principle encompasses the following ethical obligations:

- respect for free and informed consent;
- respect for the dignity of research participants;
- respect for vulnerable persons and their protection against abuse, exploitation and discrimination;
- respect for privacy and confidentiality concerning the access, control and dissemination of personal information, in accordance with the law (for example, the Freedom of Information and Protection of Privacy Act in BC);
- respect for justice and inclusiveness;
- balancing of harms and benefits to study participants to ensure that the foreseeable harms do not outweigh any anticipated benefits;
- minimizing risks;
- maximizing benefits;
- fair selection of study participants;
- ensuring that research participants shall not be subjected to unnecessary risks and harms and their participation in research must be essential to achieving scientifically and socially important aims that cannot be realized without the participation of human participants;
- ensuring that actual and potential conflicts of interest of researchers and individuals in the review process are made known and are dealt with appropriately;
- ensuring that the ethics review process is fair and independent of Okanagan College's other academic and administrative decision-making processes.

The purpose of an ethics review of research is to consider the possible impact of proposed research on the dignity of the human participants who participate in and/or are the participants of research. This review considers the need for research, the moral imperative of respect for human dignity, academic freedoms and responsibilities, and, as well, the relationship between ethics and the law. A research proposal must demonstrate that appropriate methods will be used to protect the rights and interests of the participants in the conduct of research. The ethics review process shall be completed in a timely manner.

[1] The Tri-Council Policy Statement: Ethical Conduct for Research Involving Humans (2005) defines the standards adopted by the three major federal research granting agencies (Natural Sciences and Engineering Research Council of Canada, Social Sciences and Humanities Research Council of Canada, Canadian Institutes of Health Research).

4 Research Regulations Involving Human Participants

4.1 Definitions

4.1.1 Research is defined as any systematic investigation to establish facts, principles or generalized knowledge.

4.1.2 "Human participants" refers to living individuals, groups of living individuals (for example, social ethnic, religious or economic groups) and to human remains, cadavers, tissues, biological fluids, and embryos or foetuses. It should be noted, however, that research involving human remains, cadavers, tissues, biological fluids, embryos and foetuses is also controlled under various Provincial Acts (e.g., Medical Act, Anatomy Act, Human Tissue Gift Act).

4.1.3 All research involving human participants, as defined above, requires review and approval by the Okanagan College REB before commencing the research, except in the cases described below (see 4.1.4). It should be noted that, as described in the Tri-Council Policy Statement (2005), the need for ethical review is independent of:

- the funding status of the project;
- where the research is to be conducted (e.g., inside vs. outside the institution);
- whether the study is being conducted for teaching/training purposes;
- whether the research is to be conducted by faculty, staff, or students;
- the specific method of research (e.g., observational, experimental, co-relational or descriptive);
- whether a similar protocol has been approved and conducted elsewhere;
- whether the research is a preliminary, exploratory study, a pilot study or a fully developed protocol;
- whether researchers intend to publish the results or not.

4.1.4 Research about a living individual involved in the public arena, or about an artist, based exclusively on publicly available information, documents, records, works, performances, archival materials or third party interviews are not considered to be within the context of this regulation. Such research only requires an ethics review if the subject is approached directly for interviews or for access to private papers. Also excluded are quality assurance studies, performance reviews (including evaluation of instructor's teaching performance or course content), or testing that occurs within normal educational requirements.

4.2 It is the intent of Okanagan College, where research or other activities involving human participants are carried out, to ensure that:

4.2.1 The safety, welfare and rights of participants are adequately protected;

4.2.2 A research project that poses more than minimal risk is capable of addressing the questions being asked in the research[2];

4.2.3 Before beginning a research project or study, the amount and the kind of information communicated to participants (or authorized third party) is appropriate to ensure that obtained consent is (a) informed, (b) given freely, and (c) maintained for the duration of the study; and

[2] In order for research to be ethically acceptable, it must be scientifically sound. If research does not have the appropriate research protocol and research design, valid results cannot be anticipated and the reason for undertaking the research vanishes.

4.2.4 Participants (or authorized third parties) are made aware that their participation is voluntary and that they have the right to withdraw from the research or study, at any time, without prejudice.

4.3 Requirement for Free and Informed Consent

4.3.1.1 Research governed by this Policy may begin only if (1) prospective participants, or authorized third parties, have been given the opportunity to give free and informed consent about participation, and (2) their free and informed consent has been given and is maintained throughout their participation in the research. Articles 4.3.1.3, 4.5 and 4.8 provide exceptions to Article 4.3.1.1.

4.3.1.2 Evidence of free and informed consent by the subject or authorized third party should ordinarily be obtained in writing. Where written consent is culturally unacceptable, or where there are good reasons for not recording consent in writing, the procedures used to seek free and informed consent shall be documented.

4.3.1.3 The REB may approve a consent procedure that does not include, or that alters, some of the elements of informed consent set forth above, or waive the requirement to obtain informed consent, provided that the REB finds and documents that:

i. The research involves no more than minimal risk to the participants;
ii. The waiver or alteration is unlikely to adversely affect the rights and welfare of the participants;
iii. The research could not practicably be carried out without the waiver or alteration;
iv. Whenever possible and appropriate, the participants shall be provided with additional pertinent information after participation; and
v. The waived or altered consent does not involve a therapeutic intervention.

4.3.1.4 In studies including randomization and blinding in clinical trials, neither the research participants nor those responsible for their care know which treatment the participants are receiving before the project commences. Such research is not regarded as a waiver or alteration of the requirements for consent if participants are informed of the probability of being randomly assigned to one arm of the study or another.

4.4 Voluntariness

4.4.1 Free and informed consent must be voluntarily given, without manipulation, undue influence or coercion.

4.5 Naturalistic Observation

4.5.1 REB review is normally required for research involving naturalistic observation. Naturalistic observation that does not allow for the identification of the human participants, and that is not staged, should normally be regarded as of minimal risk.

4.5.2 Research involving observation of participants in, for example, political rallies, demonstrations or public meetings shall not require REB review since it can be expected that the participants are seeking public visibility.

4.6 Informing Potential Participants

4.6.1 General Conditions

4.6.1.1 Researchers shall provide, to prospective participants or authorized third parties, full and frank disclosure of all information relevant to free and informed consent. Throughout the process of free and informed consent, the researcher must ensure that prospective participants are given adequate opportunities to discuss and contemplate their participation. Subject to the exception in 4.3.1.3, at the commencement of the process of free and informed consent, researchers or their qualified designated representatives shall provide prospective participants with the following:

i. Information that the individual is being invited to participate in a research project;
ii. A comprehensive statement of the research purpose, the identity of the researcher, the expected duration and nature of participation, and a description of research procedures;
iii. A comprehensible description of reasonably foreseeable harms and benefits that may arise from research participation, as well as the likely consequences of non-action, particularly in research related to treatment, or where invasive methodologies are involved, or where there is a potential for physical or psychological harm;
iv. An assurance that prospective participants are free not to participate, have the right to withdraw at any time without prejudice to pre-existing entitlements, and shall be given continuing and meaningful opportunities for deciding whether or not to continue to participate; and
v. The possibility of commercialization of research findings, and the presence of any apparent or actual or potential conflict of interest on the part of researchers, their institutions or sponsors.

4.7 Competencies

4.7.1 Subject to all applicable legal requirements, individuals who are not legally competent shall only be asked to become research participants when:

4.7.1.1 The research question can only be addressed using individuals within the identified group(s); and

4.7.1.2 Free and informed consent shall be obtained from their authorized representative(s); and

4.7.1.3 The research does not expose them to more than minimal risk without the potential for direct benefits for them.

4.7.2 For research involving incompetent individuals, the REB shall ensure that, as a minimum, the following conditions are met:

4.7.2.1 The researcher shall show how the free and informed consent shall be sought from the authorized third party, and how the participants' best interests shall be protected.

4.7.2.2 The authorized third party shall not be the researcher or any other member of the research team.

4.7.2.3 The continued free and informed consent of an appropriately authorized third party is required so as to continue the participation of a legally incompetent subject in research, so long as the subject remains incompetent.

4.7.2.4 When a subject who was entered into a research project through third-party authorization becomes competent during the project, his or her informed consent shall be obtained as a condition of continuing participation.

4.7.3 Where free and informed consent has been obtained from an authorized third party, and in those circumstances where the legally incompetent individual understands the nature and consequences of the research, the researcher shall seek to ascertain the wishes of the individual concerning participation. The potential subject's dissent shall preclude his or her participation.

4.8 Research in Emergency Health Situations

4.8.1 Subject to all applicable legislative and regulatory requirements, research involving emergency health situations shall be conducted only if it addresses the emergency needs of individuals involved, and then only in accordance with criteria established in advance of such research by the REB. The REB may allow research that involves health emergencies to be carried out without the free and informed consent of the subject or of his or her authorized third party if all of the following apply:

4.8.1.1 A serious threat to the prospective subject requires immediate intervention; and

4.8.1.2 Either no standard efficacious care exists or the research offers a real possibility of direct benefit to the subject in comparison with standard care; and

4.8.1.3 Either the risk of harm is not greater than that involved in standard efficacious care, or it is clearly justified by the direct benefits to the subject; and

4.8.1.4 The prospective subject is unconscious or lacks capacity to understand risks, methods and purposes of the research; and

4.8.1.5 Third-party authorization cannot be secured in sufficient time, despite diligent and documented efforts to do so; and

4.8.1.6 No relevant prior directive by the subject is known to exist.

4.8.2 When a previously incapacitated subject regains capacity, or when an authorized third party is found, free and informed consent shall be obtained promptly for continuation in the project and for subsequent examinations or tests related to the study.

4.9 Review of Multi-Centred Research

The REB shall review all research proposals that are presented by the investigator as Okanagan College research, regardless of the location where the research is conducted. In multi-centered research involving more than one institution, the researcher may wish to distinguish between core elements of the research (which

cannot be altered without invalidating the pooling of data from the participating institutions) and those elements that can be altered to comply with local requirements without invalidating the research project.

4.10 Review of Research in Other Jurisdictions or Countries

4.10.1 Research to be performed outside of the Okanagan College region or outside of Canada shall undergo ethics review both by the OC REB and the REB, where such exists, with the legal responsibility and equivalent ethical and procedural safeguards in the country or region where the research is to be done.

This Policy shall apply to all faculty, staff and students of Okanagan College who are conducting research under the auspices and administration of Okanagan College (where Okanagan College property and/or resources are being used or where the name of Okanagan College is being used in any way), regardless of whether that research is (or is not) supported by any special funds or grants or whether it is (or is not) conducted on Okanagan College premises. This policy also applies to research that identifies Okanagan College faculty, staff and/or students as a target group of the research. No research to which this policy applies may be undertaken unless it has received formal ethical approval by the REB and has been granted a Certificate of Approval before the proposed research begins.

Academic units in which research involving human participants is conducted are to ensure that those who conduct, and those who are being trained to conduct, such research understand their responsibilities for the ethical conduct of such research and receive appropriate training in the skills necessary for the ethical conduct of such research. This includes awareness of policies and other relevant standards (e.g. legal, professional, institutional) pertinent to the particular area of research. Academic units should be able to demonstrate how they have addressed the ethical training of researchers in their units, in the curriculum for students, and in other forms appropriate for faculty and staff.

5 Biohazards, Dangerous Substances and Activities as Applied to Human Participants
When the research involves the use of potentially hazardous materials, such as recombinant DNA molecules, radioactive substances, and animal viruses and cells, it is the primary concern of the College that procedures designed to prevent any hazards to humans from such use shall be followed. The College shall establish procedures for the review of protocols involving potentially hazardous biological materials. Accordingly, any project involving the use of potentially hazardous biological materials shall also require the approval established by the review procedures.

The Principal Investigator of each research project shall be responsible for establishing and maintaining appropriate safety procedures in accordance with the guidelines established by the College Safety Committee, Biohazards Officer, Radiation Safety Officer and the Workers' Compensation Board of British Columbia.

Structure and Composition

6 There is one Research Ethics Board (REB) at Okanagan College that addresses the ethical review of all research involving humans within the institution; it shall have both male and female members and shall include at least the following:

- four members of faculty who together have broad expertise in the methods or the areas of research reviewed by the REB (henceforth, referred to as members at large);

- one member who is knowledgeable in ethics law;

- one member who has no affiliation with Okanagan College, but is recruited from the community served by the institution;

- in addition and for biomedical research, at least one member who is knowledgeable in the relevant law;

The REB shall have sufficient members to ensure that the ethical review process has input from a multi-disciplinary membership with relevant expertise and experience. All members of the Okanagan College community (including students) are eligible to serve.

7 The Okanagan College Vice President Education shall appoint the Chair of the REB, normally from amongst its membership and based on recommendations by the REB voting members. The appointment shall be for a two year term, with the possibility of additional terms, commencing August 1st.

8 The term of office for all faculty positions shall usually be two years with the possibility of additional terms. To facilitate the continuity of the REB, and enhance its ability to implement the ethical guidelines in a consistent manner over time, the start dates of the member-at-large positions shall be staggered such that new members will start every year as previous members retire. The Chair of the REB shall seek applications for all REB faculty positions. All applications shall be reviewed and considered by the REB for recommendation to the Okanagan College Vice President Education. In order to ensure that the REB is duly constituted with respect to breadth of expertise, the recommendations shall, in part, reflect the perceived strengths and weaknesses of the incumbent REB members. Appointments shall be made by the Vice President Education and shall commence August 1st of the first year.

9 The term of office for any community representative(s) shall be two years with the possibility of additional terms. Applications for this position shall be sought from the Okanagan community using a variety of announcements, advertisements, referrals, etc. All applications shall be reviewed and considered by the REB for recommendation to the Okanagan College Vice President Education who shall make any final appointment.

10 In the event that a REB member cannot complete his/her term, a letter of resignation should be submitted to the Chair, giving as much notice as possible (preferably three months) so that a replacement may be found. In the event that a REB member does not adequately fulfill his/her duties (performing reviews, attending meetings) and it is the opinion of the REB that the member should be replaced, the REB shall recommend to the Vice President Education that said member’s appointment be terminated early and a replacement found.

11 Additional members may be invited on an ad hoc (non-voting) basis to provide advice and assistance on particular projects, if required by the REB.

12 All members of the REB shall be expected to lodge with the Chair of the REB a statement of any potential conflict of interest relevant to REB matters.

Procedures

13 The REB shall be guided by the following procedural guidelines:

13.1 Authority

13.1.1 In its assessment of research proposals, the REB shall be guided by the most current version of the Tri-Council Policy Statement: Ethical Conduct for Research Involving Humans and, where applicable, any discipline-specific standards or other relevant national and international standards. The REB may refer proposals to other individuals or agencies for advice.

13.1.2 The REB shall have jurisdiction over all research involving human participants. All OC research involving human participants may proceed only after ethical approval has been granted by the REB or by a Departmental Level Ethics Committee in the case of course-based research or assignments that require students to collect information from human participants except practica already covered by professional codes of ethics (see section 16).

13.2 Submission

13.2.1 Submissions for review should be submitted to the OC REB using the appropriate form.

13.2.2 While it is not necessary for the REB to review a proposal before it is submitted to a funding agency, REB approval must be obtained before the research begins.

13.2.3 Visiting researchers shall contact the OC REB well in advance of the anticipated start date of the research for an OC REB review of that research project.

13.3 Breadth of Scope

13.3.1 The REB shall review all research proposals involving human participants to be conducted by College faculty, staff or students and/or visiting researchers at Okanagan College (this includes any amendments that may occur during the course of an on-going study).

13.3.2 The REB shall monitor the progress of all research involving human participants being conducted by faculty, staff or students and/or visiting researchers at Okanagan College.

13.3.3 Both initial and on-going ethics review are based on a proportionate approach to risk assessment; that is, the higher the risk, the greater the scrutiny of the continuing review process. At a minimum (in the case of minimal risk[3] projects), on-going review shall involve the submission of an Annual Status Report by the Principal Investigator. For projects above the minimum risk threshold, the initial proposal review shall undergo close scrutiny by all REB members, and the REB shall decide on a process for on-going review after consultation with the Principal Investigator.

13.3.4 The REB shall terminate any project that does not conform to ethical standards.

[3] According to the Tri-Council Policy Statement (C.1) Minimal Risk is when "potential subjects can reasonably be expected to regard the probability and magnitude of possible harms implied by participation in the research to be no greater than those encountered by the subject in those aspects of his or her everyday life that relate to the research."

13.3.5 Projects will be terminated only after discussion with the researchers involved and after a reasonable effort has been made to resolve issues and ethical problems.

13.3.6 The REB shall review policies and procedures. Recommendations for revisions shall be referred to the College Vice President Education.

13.3.7 The REB shall be responsible for developing educational resources and/or services pertaining to the ethics of research involving human participants and make these available to the Okanagan College community.

13.3.8 The REB shall be available to members of the Okanagan College community for consultation on matters pertaining to ethics of research involving human participants.

13.4 Scholarly Review

13.4.1 In the case of research proposals that present more than minimal risk, the design of the project must be peer reviewed to assure that it is capable of addressing the question(s) being asked in the research. Sufficient peer review may be considered to be any one of the following:

13.4.1.1 Successful approval by the REB (if research is in the REB's field of expertise).

13.4.1.2 Successful funding of a grant proposal by a funding agency.

13.4.1.3 Ad hoc independent external peer review reporting directly to the REB, using the External Scholarly Review form – Appendix A.

13.4.2 The extent of the review for scholarly standards that is required for biomedical research that does not involve more than minimal risk will vary according to the research being carried out.

13.4.3 Research in the humanities and the social sciences which poses, at most, minimal risk shall not normally be required by the REB to be peer reviewed.

14 Normal Review Process

14.1 The REB shall meet regularly to discharge its responsibilities (usually once per month except July and August). Additional meetings may be called by the Chair, if required. Quorum is defined as attendance by five voting members (one of whom must be a community representative and one of whom must be knowledgeable in ethics), including the Chair of the REB or, if appropriate or necessary, the Chair's designate.

14.2 The REB shall meet face-to-face to review all proposed research. Faculty members submitting applications for review may attend the meeting to participate in discussions about their proposal but may not be present when the REB is making its decision.

14.3 After review, the REB may make one of the following decisions regarding a proposal:

14.3.1 Approve it unconditionally;

14.3.2 Grant provisional approval pending minor modifications (provisos) outlined to the researcher in a written Notice of Ethical Review;

14.3.3 Defer a decision until further information is supplied and/or pending major modifications outlined to the researcher in a written Notice of Ethical Review; or

14.3.4 Reject a proposal.

14.4 All REB decisions shall be conveyed to the Principal Investigator in writing along with the reason(s) for the decisions. Decisions of the REB shall be made by consensus. Where consensus is not achieved, the decision shall be made by majority vote. Minutes shall document any dissents in REB decisions and the reasons for them.

15 Expedited Review

15.1 All applications will go to full REB for review unless they qualify for an expedited review. Expedited Review does not require face-to-face meetings of the REB members. Expedited review is the review by the Chair of the REB and two members rather than the full REB.

15.2 To be considered for expedited review, the researcher must indicate a preference for expedited over full review. The REB Chair may reject any application for expedited review and refer it to the REB for full review if needed.

15.3 Urgency alone is not a sufficient criterion for expedited review.

15.4 An expedited review is available only in cases which fulfill one of the following criteria:

15.4.1 Research which obviously involves no more than minimal risk (as defined in the Tri-Council Policy Statement C.1: ". . . if potential participants can reasonably be expected to regard the probability and magnitude of possible harms implied by participation in the research to be no greater than those encountered by the subject in those aspects of his or her everyday life that relate to the research, then the research can be regarded as within the range of minimal risk."

15.4.2 Research projects which have already received approval by the OC REB, have complied fully with any requirements, have an up-to-date file, and the applicant is simply renewing the ethical approval certificate without significant changes to the ongoing research process.

15.5 An expedited review is usually completed within two weeks of submission of a completed application form. The Chair must report requests for expedited review and the results of such reviews to other members of the REB at an appropriate time.

16 Departmental Level Review

16.1 A department of Okanagan College may seek approval of the REB to form a Departmental Level Ethics Committee. Where so established, this committee may engage in ethical review of department based research in accordance with these provisions.

16.2 If human participants are involved in a teaching exercise (for example, part of an undergraduate or secondary level course), and entail no more than minimal risk, the research proposal may be reviewed by a departmental level ethics committee on

behalf of the REB and in compliance with the Tri-Council Policy Statement and this OC REB Policy guidelines.

16.3 The Departmental Level Ethics Committee must report results of such reviews to the REB at the end of the academic year.

16.4 Where there is no Department Ethics Committee, such activities shall be reviewed by the OC REB .

16.5 Research deemed to be beyond minimal risk must be reviewed by the OC REB.

17 The REB has the authority to prohibit any research which is in violation of its requirements (subject to 17.1 below).

17.1 If the REB rejects a proposal, it must state its reasons for rejection in writing. A Principal Investigator has the right to request, and the REB has an obligation to provide, reconsideration of a negative decision. If the REB and the Principal Investigator cannot reach an agreement through discussion, the Principal Investigator may appeal the REB's decision to the REB at the University of British Columbia Okanagan, whose decision shall be final. The decision of the Okanagan College REB cannot be overridden except by formal appeal to the UBC Okanagan REB.

18 As per the recommendations of the Tri-Council Policy Statement, Certificates of Approval will be granted for one year only. In order to extend approval, Principal Investigators must submit an Annual Status Report and request continuing approval for a further year. A project can only be approved through this mechanism for a maximum period of three years, after which a new ethics application must be submitted.

19 The REB shall maintain a record of all research activities involving human participants carried out by Okanagan College employees or students, including copies of all proposals, amendments reports, decisions made on these documents and any correspondence. Such records shall be kept for a minimum of five years after completion of any research project.

20 For the purpose of continuing review of approved research, the REB shall request annual status reports for all on-going projects. Upon receipt and satisfactory review of this report, an Approval Certificate will be issued for a further one-year period. In special circumstances (for example, projects that are considered high risk for study participants), the REB may request the Principal Investigator to supply interim progress reports more frequently than once a year.

21 The REB has the right to temporarily suspend or terminate a proposal if the research study is not conducted according to appropriate ethical standards or if research participants are exposed to new, previously undisclosed risks.

22 The REB will be notified promptly when research projects conclude (or are terminated) through the submission of a Final Report.

23 The REB shall maintain accurate minutes of all meetings (including clear documentation of decisions made) and shall forward copies to the Office of the Vice President Education. These minutes may be made available to researchers, funding agencies and other relevant authorities involved in the research (as judged appropriate by the Vice President Education of Okanagan College).

24 The REB shall report to the Vice President Education of Okanagan College. The REB should provide annual reports to the Vice President Education on its activities and any other matters requested by the Vice President Education.

Additional Information

The attached application form is required for research proposals. See sections 4.2.2 and 13.4 of the Policy for criteria outlining when such a review is necessary.

Submit by Email | Print Form

Research Ethics Board Application Form
Appendix A: External Scholarly Review

Version: December 2010

Note:

For research proposals that present more than minimal risk, a scholarly peer review must be undertaken prior to submitting an application for ethics review and approval to the Okanagan College Research Ethics Board (REB). See Sections 4.2.2 and 13.4 of the Okanagan College Research Ethics Board Policy for criteria outlining when such a review is necessary.

This form is for the use of an independent external peer review. The completed form must be attached to the Principal Investigator's application and submitted to the Chair of the Okanagan College's Research Ethics Board.

Conflict of Interest (External Reviewer)

This is to confirm that I have no conflict of interest and that I am also free of any biases that would prevent me from giving my best independent scientific opinion on this participant.

Reviewer's Name

Title

Address

Phone Number

Fax Number

Email

Signed By

Date

okanagan college

Research Ethics Board Application Form
Appendix A: External Scholarly Review - *page 2*

PART A: GENERAL

Name of Applicant	
Department/Area	
Project Title	
Funding Agency (if applicable)	

1. Brief Description of Project (to be completed by reviewer)	
2. Budget (if applicable)	
a) Approximate Budget - Year 1	
b) Is it justified in the application?	
c) Are the sums requested adequate?	
d) Is there a project contract?	

PART B: REVIEW

1. Is there a reasonable hypothesis?	
2. Is there an appropriate literature review?	
3. Is the research protocol clearly described?	
4. Is the significance of the study explained?	

PART B: REVIEW *con't*

5. Is this study feasible? If not, why?	
6. Is the study likely to yield publishable results?	
7. What is your overall assessment of the application?	
8. Please list any specific recommendations (attach an additional page if necessary)	

PART C: HUMAN PARTICIPANTS

1. Are participant inclusion and exclusion criteria carefully delineated?	
2. Is the study comparative to representative research in this area?	
3. Are the study numbers (sample size and selection of participants) discussed and justified? If yes, are the study numbers sufficient to provide likelihood of an interpretable result?	
4. Is the study descriptive? If yes, is the information to be derived likely to be unique?	
5. Does the study involve disruption of schedules (including school or work) for participants/parents? If yes, is the disruption justified?	

PART C: HUMAN PARTICIPANTS *con't*

6. Is statistical analysis required? If yes, is there a discussion of statistical methods and are they appropriate?

7. Is the harm vs potential benefits appropriate?

8. Is this a clinical trial comparing two or more treatment regimens, are the risk - benefit ratios of each regimen well balanced so that the average expert would not favour one regimen over the other (that is, does equipoise exist)?

☐ Yes ☐ No ☐ Don't Know

9. Are there any major changes that need to be made before this proposal should be reviewed by the Research Ethics Board?

10. Is scientific merit including significance of study adequate to justify its ethics consideration?

PART D: RANKING

Two ratings are to be determined; the proposal as is, and the proposal if the proposed revisions are made.

Please use the rating system from 0 to 4:

0 Reject 1 Fair 2 Good 3 Very Good 4 Outstanding

	0	1	2	3	4
1. Proposal As Is:	○	○	○	○	○
2. Proposal if Revisions are Made:	○	○	○	○	○

Signed By

Date

All research involving humans at Okanagan College must be reviewed and approved by the Research Ethics Board. Approval must be obtained in writing before the research begins.

This form should accompany the Principal Investigator's application as well as all supportive documents and submit these to:

Chair, Research Ethics Board
Okanagan College
1000 KLO Road
Kelowna, B.C. V1Y 4X8
email: REB-CHAIR@okanagan.bc.ca

The Research Ethics Board (REB) adheres to the principles and practices stated in the Canadian *Tri-Council Policy Statement* (1998 and subsequent published editions).