



SENATE REGULAR MEETING

Tuesday, October 5, 2021 4:00 – 6:00 pm
VIA ZOOM

AGENDA

Acknowledgement

We respectfully acknowledge the unceded lands of Lil'wat, Musqueam, Squamish, Sechelt and Tsleil-Waututh people on whose territories our campuses are located.

1. **Welcome**
2. **Approval of the Agenda - Decision** Senate Members
3. **Approval of the September 7, 2021 Minutes – Decision** Senate Members
Schedule 3
4. **Correspondence Received**
5. **Business Arising**
 - 5.1 Volunteers for Senate Subcommittees – *Information* Stephen Williams
6. **New Business**
 - 6.1 Annual Academic Schedule – *Information* Kyle Vuorinen
Schedule 6.1
 - 6.2 Extension of Temporary Acceptance of Duolingo - *Decision* Kyle Vuorinen
Schedule 6.2
7. **Committee Reports**
 - 7.1 Academic Planning and Program Review Committee – *Information* Stephen Williams
 - 7.2 Bylaw, Policy and Procedure Committee – *Decision*
 - 7.2.1 S2021-02 Research Ethics Policy: Research with Human Participants – *Motion to Approve* Corey Muench
Schedule 7.2.1
 - 7.2.2 S2021-02-01 Research Ethics Procedure: Research with Human Participants - Research Ethics Board - *Motion to Approve* Schedule 7.2.2
 - 7.2.3 S2002-01 Research Ethics Policy: Research With Human Subjects *Motion to Rescind* Schedule 7.2.3



SENATE REGULAR MEETING

Tuesday, October 5, 2021 4:00 – 6:00 pm

VIA ZOOM

AGENDA

- | | |
|---|-------------------------------|
| 7.2.4 Faculty of Global and Community Studies Bylaws
<i>Motion to Approve</i> | Schedule 7.2.4 |
| 7.3 Curriculum Committee – <i>Decision</i>
7.3.1 Resolution Memo
September 17 Agenda / September 17 Draft Minutes | Deb Jamison
Schedule 7.3.1 |
| 7.4 Teaching and Learning Committee – <i>Decision</i> | Diana Twiss
Schedule 7.4 |
| 7.5 Budget Advisory Committee – <i>Information</i> | Michael Thoma |
| 8. Other Reports | |
| 8.1 Chair of Senate | |
| 8.2 Vice Chair of Senate – <i>Information</i> | Stephen Williams |
| 8.3 VP Academic and Provost – <i>Information</i> | Laureen Styles |
| 8.4 Board Report – <i>Information</i> | Sonny Wong |
| 9. Discussion Items | |
| 10. Other Business | |
| 11. Information Items | |



SENATE MEETING

Tuesday, September 7, 2021 4:00 pm
VIA ZOOM

MINUTES

Present: Paul Dangerfield (Chair), Tania Alekson, Oscar Blue, John Brouwer, Sue Dritmanis, Iana Dokuchaeva, Lara Duke, Brian Ganter, Christy Goerzen, Kyle Guay, Maia Lomelino, Miranda Huron, Deb Jamison, Khwaish Kochhar, Essya Nabbali, Lesley Nelson, Pouyan Mahboubi, Anthea Mallinson, Brad Martin, Zabir Montazar, Jennifer Nesselroad, Corey Muench, Dennis Silvestrone, Anmol Singla, Laureen Styles, Michael Thoma, Robert Thomson, Diana Twiss, Kyle Vuorinen, Stephanie Wells, Stephen Williams, Sonny Wong, Recorder: Mary Jukich

Regrets: Joel Cardinal, Pardis Daneshyar

Acknowledgement

We respectfully acknowledge the unceded lands of Lil'wat, Musqueam, Squamish, Sechelt and Tsleil-Waututh people on whose territories our campuses are located.

1. Welcome

The Chair called the meeting to order at 4:00 pm.

Senators were invited to visit the Skw'chays Canoe in the Cedar courtyard as an opportunity to learn about the history of the Coast Salish People.

The following new members were introduced and welcomed to Senate:

- Essya Nabbali – Voting faculty representative from the Faculty of Arts and Sciences
- Oscar Blue – Voting student representative
- Maia Lomelino – Non-voting CSU representative

2. Approval of the Agenda

Paul Dangerfield moved and Dennis Silvestrone seconded:

To adopt the agenda.

CARRIED

3. Approval of the Minutes

Information was provided that a minor housekeeping revision was made to the previously approved June 1, 2021 minutes. The revision related to the proposed changes to the Academic Schedule Policy in terms of eliminating the comment in the minutes around the 15th week end of the term.



SENATE MEETING

Tuesday, September 7, 2021 4:00 pm
VIA ZOOM

MINUTES

Paul Dangerfield moved and Lesley Nelson
To adopt the August 17, 2021 minutes.

CARRIED

4. Orientation

Stephanie Wells presented the Senate orientation for both new and returning members. The orientation included a review of the Senate composition, bylaws, subcommittees, University Act and Robert's Rules.

The orientation document is posted on the [Senate website](#).

5. Correspondence Received

No correspondence was presented.

6. Business Arising

6.1 Senate Election Update

Presented by: Kyle Vuorinen

The Registrar reported that there was one remaining non-voting vacancy on Senate from the Faculty of Arts and Sciences.

6.2 Volunteers for Senate Subcommittees

Presented by: Paul Dangerfield

Members were encouraged to volunteer to serve on any of the remaining vacancies on the Senate subcommittees.

7. New Business

7.1 Graduates

Presented by: Kyle Vuorinen

The Registrar submitted a list of 623 graduates, verified by the Registrar's Office, to have met the graduation requirements of their program.

Kyle Vuorinen moved and Lara Duke seconded:

21/36 That Senate approve the list of candidates as graduates from their programs.

CARRIED



SENATE MEETING

Tuesday, September 7, 2021 4:00 pm
VIA ZOOM

MINUTES

7.2 Quality Assessment Process Audit (QAPA)

Aurelea Mahood reported that the QAPA advisory group was seeking input from Senate, the Academic Planning and Program Review Committee as well as the Curriculum Committee on the draft self-study findings, specifically on two sections of the institution report, i) Capilano University's Assessment of 4.1 Overall Process and ii) Capilano University's Assessment.

Also as part of the quality assessment process audit, an external expert panel will undertake a virtual site visit of the University on January 10 and 11, 2022.

Members were invited to provide feedback and comments to Aurelea Mahood.

7.3 Call for Honorary Degree and Faculty Emeritus Candidates

Presented by: Paul Dangerfield

As information, the Senate Tributes Committee will be calling for nominations for Honorary Degrees and Faculty Emeritus, on or about October 1 via Frontlines. Nominations must be submitted in writing no later than December 1 to the Office of the President, Attention: Honorary Degrees / Faculty Emeritus.

7. Committee Reports

7.1 Academic Planning and Program Review Committee

Presented by: Stephen Williams

Stephen Williams reported that at the August 17 Senate meeting, he inadvertently reported on the May 18 Committee meeting which had already been reported to Senate.

At the June 8 meeting, the Committee confirmed the completed review cycle for the Diploma in 2D Animation and Visual Development, the Diploma in 3D Animation for Film and Games, the Diploma in Digital Visual Effects, and the Animation Fundamentals programs. The Committee also received a one year progress report from Community Development.

At the August 24 meeting, the Committee confirmed the completed review cycle for the Associate of Biology and the Engineering Transfer Certificate and the



SENATE MEETING

Tuesday, September 7, 2021 4:00 pm
VIA ZOOM

MINUTES

Engineering Transition Diploma, and a one year progress report for the Education Assistant program.

The Committee is expected to elect a new chair at the next meeting on September 14.

7.2 Bylaw, Policy and Procedure Committee

Presented by: Corey Muench

The next scheduled meeting is on September 14 at which time the Committee will be completing their review on the Research Ethics Policy and Procedure and reviewing revisions to the Faculty of Global and Community Studies By-laws.

7.3 Curriculum Committee

Presented by: Deb Jamison

7.3.1 Resolution Memorandum

The resolutions brought forward from the August 20th Senate Curriculum Committee meeting were presented to Senate for approval.

Deb Jamison moved and Khwaish Kochhar seconded:

21/35 Senate approve SCC Resolutions 21/56 to 21/63.

CARRIED

7.4 Teaching and Learning Committee

Presented by: Diana Twiss

A report was not presented as the next Committee meeting is scheduled for September 21.

7.5 Budget Advisory Committee

Presented by: Michael Thoma

The next meeting of the Senate Budget Advisory Committee is scheduled for October 21 to review the Quarter 2 forecast and for an update on integrated planning.



SENATE MEETING

Tuesday, September 7, 2021 4:00 pm
VIA ZOOM

MINUTES

8. Other Reports

8.1 Senate Chair

Paul Dangerfield provided the Chair's report, including the following highlights:

- Focus of the work continues to be on returning to campus. The Chair acknowledged that the campus community are returning to a campus that was previously in a one delivery model, and now returning to a campus wherein program delivery is in multiple models and operating and working in a new flexible framework.
- It is anticipated that over the next couple of weeks and into October there could be some shifts, and the University will continue to work with the Ministry to look at ways to augment the safety measures and practices. This will ensure that the campus is as safe as possible and everyone feels comfortable, and practices and tools are in place in case of future pandemics.
- Enrollment for domestic students remains strong; however, there may be some challenges with international student enrollments over the next two or three months.
- The University has seen a high student graduation number in June, and also over the summer an increased number of students taking more courses and this may flow through in the future and cover some gaps on the international side. There is an approval from the Board and from the Ministry for a deficit budget which the University is anticipating may be the case.
- The Chair will be away for the October Senate meeting, and Stephen Williams, Vice Chair, will serve as chair.

8.2 Senate Vice-Chair

Stephen Williams, Vice-Chair, acknowledged and recognized the volunteers, and the amount of work completed at each of the Senate subcommittees.



SENATE MEETING

Tuesday, September 7, 2021 4:00 pm
VIA ZOOM

MINUTES

8.3 VP Academic and Provost

Lauren Styles provided the VP Academic and Provost report, including the following highlights:

- Work over the last several weeks has been focussed on approaches to explore how to strengthen and augment safety measures, as well as additional adaptations and flexibility, and explore further safety measures that the University could put in place.
- Currently there is approximately 37% of courses online, 15% mixed mode (some in-person and some online) and 47% in-person.
- In terms of returning to campus and the initial period of adaption from now until October, the University will be working closely with government counterparts to determine what additional steps may be put in place, and this may evolve over the next few weeks.
- In terms of options for students, approximately 62% of courses will have some level of in-person and this is a strong indication of faculty's engagement with students and the importance on the experience for students and interactions with faculty.

8.4 Board Report

Sonny Wong, Board representative, reported that the Board has not met since the last Senate meeting. In the interim, Nanci Lucas has been elected as a faculty representative and appointed to the Board until July 2024. The Board will also be seeking a new student representative and other appointments as necessary.

The next Board meeting is scheduled for September 28.

9. Discussion Items

No discussion items were presented.

10. Other Business

No other business was presented.



SENATE MEETING

Tuesday, September 7, 2021 4:00 pm
VIA ZOOM

MINUTES

11. Information Items

No information items were presented.

The meeting was adjourned at 5:30 pm.

Next Meeting: Tuesday, October 5, 2021

DRAFT

MEMO

To: Senate
From: Kyle Vuorinen, Registrar
Subject: Academic Schedule for 2022-23
Date: September 27, 2021
cc:

ACADEMIC SCHEDULE FOR 2022-23

Please see the following document outlining the various important dates and deadlines for the 2022 – 2023 academic year (September to August).

MOTION:

That Senate accept as information, the academic schedule for the 2022 – 2023 academic year.

CAPILANO UNIVERSITY ACADEMIC SCHEDULE & IMPORTANT DATES
FALL 2022 TO SUMMER 2023

September 2, 2022	Fall 2022 New International Student Orientation New International Student Orientation at the North Vancouver campus. The complete schedule can be found at capilano.ca/student-life/campus-community/new-student-orientation/new-international-student-orientation/
September 5, 2022	University Closed for Labour Day
September 6, 2022	Fall 2022 Term Commences / New Student Orientation Fall term commences with evening classes starting at 4:30 pm or later unless stated by a program representative. New Student Orientation at the North Vancouver campus. The complete Orientation schedule can be found at capilano.ca/orientation <i>Note: Courses/programs commence on various days. Consult your program for further information.</i>
September 6 – 19, 2022 *	Fall 2022 Add/Drop Period
September 20 – November 11, 2022 *	Fall 2022 Withdrawal Period <i>Note: During this period, withdrawals will be noted on the permanent student record as a “W”.</i>
September 30, 2022	University Closed for National Day for Truth and Reconciliation
October 10, 2022	University Closed for Thanksgiving Day
November 10, 2022	Reading Break Please check the Capilano University Library website for hours of operation.
November 11, 2022	University Closed for Remembrance Day
November 14 – 23, 2022	Spring 2023 Registration and Waitlisting
December 5, 2022	Last Day of Classes for Fall 2022 <i>Note: Some courses/programs continue until the last day of the examination period.</i> <i>Consult your program for further information.</i>
December 7 – 16, 2022	Fall 2022 Final Exam Period (Includes Saturday, December 10, 2022)
December 19, 2022 (4:00pm)	Fall 2022 Final Grade Submission Deadline for Faculty
December 19, 2022 (4:00pm)	Fee Payment Deadline – Spring 2023 Full payment must be received by the Cashier's Office to avoid deregistration. Registration System Closed. Students will not be able to add, drop, or waitlist for courses.
December 20 – 21, 2022	Fall 2022 End-of-Term Processing Registration System Closed for Fall 2022 End-of-Term Processing and Spring 2023 deregistration due to non-payment of fees. Students will not be able to add, drop, or waitlist for courses.
December 22, 2022	Registration System Re-opens

CAPILANO UNIVERSITY ACADEMIC SCHEDULE & IMPORTANT DATES FALL 2022 TO SUMMER 2023

	Students can add, drop, and waitlist for courses. <i>Note: In-person registration will be unavailable from December 24, 2022 to January 3, 2023 due to University closure.</i>
December 24, 2022 – January 2, 2023	University Closed <i>University closed December 25, 26, 27, 28, 30 and 31, 2022; and January 1, 2023. December 24 and 29, 2022 closed to the public. (departments may be open)</i>
January 4, 2023	Spring 2023 Term Commences <i>Note: Courses/programs commence on various days. Consult your program for further information.</i>
January 4 – 17, 2023*	Spring 2023 Add/Drop Period
January 18 – March 21, 2023*	Spring 2023 Withdrawal Period <i>Note: During this period, withdrawals will be noted on the permanent student record as a “W”.</i>
February 20, 2023	University Closed for Family Day
February 21 – 24, 2023	Reading Break <i>Note: Please check the Capilano University Library website for hours of operation.</i>
February 24-25, 2023	Winter 2023 Convocation
March 6 – 10, 2023	Summer 2023 Registration and Waitlisting
April 7 - 10, 2023	University Closed for Easter <i>Please check the Capilano University Library website for hours of operation.</i>
April 11, 2023	Last Day of Classes for Spring 2023 <i>Note: Some courses/programs continue until the last day of the examination period. Consult your program for further information.</i>
April 13 – 21, 2023	Spring 2023 Final Exam Period (includes Saturday, April 15, 2023)
April 24, 2023 (4:00pm)	Spring 2023 Final Grade Submission Deadline for Faculty
April 24, 2023 (4:00pm)	Fee Payment Deadline – Summer 2023 Registration System Closed. Students will not be able to add, drop, or waitlist for courses. Full payment must be received by the Cashier’s Office to avoid deregistration.
April 25-26, 2023	Spring 2023 Grades and End-of-Term Processing Registration System Closed for Spring 2023 End-of-Term processing and Summer 2023 deregistration due to non-payment of fees. Students will not be able to add, drop, or waitlist for courses.
April 27, 2023	Registration System Re-opens Students can add, drop, and waitlist for courses.
May 8, 2023	Summer 2023 – Full Term Commences Summer 2023 – Session I Commences
May 8 - 12, 2023 *	Summer 2023– Session I Add/Drop Period
May 8 – 19, 2023 *	Summer 2023– Full Term Add/Drop Period

CAPILANO UNIVERSITY ACADEMIC SCHEDULE & IMPORTANT DATES
FALL 2022 TO SUMMER 2023

May 13 – June 2, 2023 *	Summer 2023 – Session I Withdrawal Period <i>Note: During this period, withdrawals will be noted on the permanent student record as a “W”.</i>
May 20 – July 14, 2023 *	Summer 2023 – Full Term Withdrawal Period <i>Note: During this period, withdrawals will be noted on the permanent student record as a “W”.</i>
May 22, 2023	University Closed for Victoria Day
June 9 - 10, 2023	Spring 2023 Convocation
June 23, 2023	Last Day of Classes for Summer 2023 – Session I
June 26, 2023 (4:00pm)	Summer 2023 - Session I Final Grade Submission Deadline for Faculty
June 27, 2023	Summer 2023 – Session I Grades and End-of-Term Processing Registration System Closed for Summer 2023 - Session I grades processing. Students will not be able to add, drop, or waitlist for courses.
June 28, 2023	Registration System Re-opens Students can add, drop, and waitlist for courses.
July 3, 2023	University Closed for Canada Day (in lieu)
July 4, 2023	Summer 2023 – Session II Commences
July 4 – 10, 2023 *	Summer 2023 – Session II Add/Drop Period
July 4 – 14, 2023	Fall 2023 Registration and Waitlisting
July 11 – 28, 2023 *	Summer 2023 – Session II Withdrawal Period <i>Note: During this period, withdrawals will be noted on the permanent student record as a “W”.</i>
August 7, 2023	University Closed for BC Day
August 18, 2023	Last Day of Classes for Summer 2023 – Session II and Full Term
August 21, 2023 (4:00 p.m.)	Summer 2023 - Session II and Full Term Final Grade Submission Deadline for Faculty
August 21, 2023 (4:00 p.m.)	Fee Payment Deadline – Fall 2023 Full payment must be received by the Cashier's Office to avoid deregistration. Registration System Closed. Students will not be able to add, drop, or waitlist for courses.
August 22-23, 2023	Summer 2023 - Session II and Full Term End-of-Term Processing Registration System Closed for Summer End-of-Term processing and Fall 2023 deregistration due to non-payment of fees. Students will not be able to add, drop, or waitlist for courses.
August 24, 2023	Registration System Re-opens Students can add, drop, and waitlist for courses.
September 4, 2023	University Closed for Labour Day

* Please note: Add/drop and withdrawal dates vary for courses/programs that do not start in September and end in December (Fall term) or start in January and end in April (Spring term) or start in May and end in August (Summer term). Please check the University website or contact the Registrar's Office.

MEMO

To: Paul Dangerfield, President and Chair of Senate
Dr. Laureen Styles, Vice President, Academic & Provost
Toran Savjord, Vice President, Strategic Planning & Institutional Effectiveness

From: Kyle Vuorinen, Registrar

Subject: Extension of Acceptance of Duolingo English Test

Date: September 24, 2021

cc: Chris Bottrill, Director, Centre for International Experience
Brad Martin, Dean, Education, Health & Human Development
Corey Muench, Instructor and Workload Coordinator, EAP

DUOLINGO TEST OF ENGLISH

The University has been accepting the Duolingo Test of English on a temporary basis since the spring of 2020. The scores that we have been using are outlined in the chart below.

Given the on-going COVID-19 pandemic, and the challenges students face to access traditional in-person tests of English as a foreign language, the University needs to extend its temporary acceptance of the online Duolingo test.

A small sample of students who were admitted in Fall 2020 indicates that students admitted with Duolingo perform as well as students who have been admitted with traditional tests such as IELTS and TOEFL. In addition, the majority of post-secondary institutions in the province who have been accepting Duolingo on an emergency basis, have opted to extend recognition of the test for at least another year.

As per section 4.4 of the Admissions Policy, I move that Capilano University extend the acceptance of the Duolingo Test of English on a temporary, emergency basis, through to the end of the Fall 2022 semester with the following scores:

IELTS/TOEFL	Duolingo	Sample program areas
IELTS 6.5/iBT 83	110 or higher	Standard admissions (all degrees, diplomas – except those noted below), and certificates)
IELTS 6.0/iBT 75	100 or higher	Post-Baccalaureate Diploma in Global Tourism and Hospitality
IELTS 5.5/iBT 67	90 or higher	Tourism Management Diploma for International Students

SENATE REPORT

AGENDA ITEM:	S2021-02, <i>Research Ethics Policy</i> S2021-02-01, <i>Research Ethics Procedures</i> Rescind S2002-01 <i>Research Ethics Policy: Research With Human Subjects</i>
PURPOSE:	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Approval <input type="checkbox"/> Information <input type="checkbox"/> Discussion
MEETING DATES:	May 25 & June 8, 2021; September 14, 2021
PRESENTER:	Corey Muench; Chair, Senate Bylaw, Policy, and Procedure Committee

PURPOSE

Recommendation to approve S2021-02, *Research Ethics Policy*; S2021-02-01 *Research Ethics Procedures*; thereupon to rescind S2002-01, *Research Ethics Policy: Research With Human Subjects*

BACKGROUND AND CONSULTATION

Capilano University (CapU) is committed to maintaining the highest ethical standards in research involving human participants. The CapU Research Ethics Board (REB) supports this goal by educating the CapU community and by ensuring that research associated with CapU complies with *the Tri-Council Policy Statement: Ethical Conduct for Research Involving Humans (TCPS2, 2018)*. The current Capilano University *Research Ethics Policy* was issued in 2002 and revised in 2012. The new (proposed) *Research Ethics Policy and Procedures* have undergone significant updating in response to changes in the federal government TCPS (2018).

The new (proposed) *Research Ethics Policy and Procedures* have undergone considerable consultation over the past two years. Consultation has included in-person and virtual presentations to all 5 Faculties and sub-groups, the Academic Leadership Collective, The Senior Leadership Committee, The Capilano Faculty Association, The Office of Indigenous Affairs and Education, The SLC Policy and Procedures Committee and the Senate Bylaw, Policy and Procedure Committee (SBPP). In addition to these presentations, all employees of the university were invited to submit written feedback through Frontlines, and an emailed Constant Contact request. The *Research Ethics Policy and Procedures* first went to SBPP on May 25, 2021, and were discussed at that meeting as well as at two subsequent meetings on June 8, 2021 and September 14, 2021.

SUMMARY of REVISIONS

SBPP discussed the following topics with the policy proponents from the Research Ethics office:

Research Ethics Policy

- General wording revisions suggested to make language in the document more precise.

Research Ethics Procedures

- General wording revisions suggested to make language in the document more precise.
- Reorganization of section 4 on levels of review
- Removal of the optional member of the REB knowledgeable in relevant law (section 2.1)


- Removing language referring to “Senior University Administrators” to a more general reading: “University administrators” throughout the document where appropriate so as to better keep the REB at arm’s length from administrative decisions regarding research ethics
- Removing the involvement of administrators other than the President from appointing REB members and Chair.

DOCUMENTS FOR SENATE REVIEW

Two versions of the proposed revisions are provided for Senate: a version with “track changes” and with comments visible; and a clean, finalized version.

RECOMMENDATION

THAT Senate approve S2021-02, Research Ethics Policy; THAT Senate approve S2021-02-01, Research Ethics Procedures; and THAT Senate subsequently rescind S2002-01, Research Ethics Policy: Research With Human Subjects

 CAPILANO UNIVERSITY		POLICY	
Policy No.	Officer Responsible		
S2021-02	Vice President Academic & Provost		
Policy Name			
Research Ethics Policy: Research with Human Participants			
Approved by	Replaces	Category	Next Review
	S2002-01 Research Ethics Policy with Human Subjects	B	
Date Issued	Date Revised	Related Policies, Reference	
		B.506 Standards of Conduct	

1. PURPOSE

The purpose of this policy is to ensure that research at Capilano University involving human participants is conducted to the highest ethical standards within all disciplines, protects the interest of human participants, and describes the institutional standards and procedures governing research.

2. THE CAPILANO UNIVERSITY RESEARCH ETHICS BOARD (REB)

Capilano University is committed to maintaining the highest ethical standards in research involving human participants, and to ensuring that the safety, health, welfare, and rights of participants are adequately protected. Capilano University will maintain a Research Ethics Board (REB) that exercises the authority of the President in matters concerning research involving human participants and/or human biological materials associated with Capilano University.

3. COMMITMENT TO PROTECT HUMAN PARTICIPANTS

3.1 When engaging in research involving human participants and/or human biological materials, all those associated with Capilano University or conducting research on a Capilano University campus will:

- a) Have approval from the Capilano University Research Ethics Board (REB) prior to conducting research involving human participants and/or human biological materials that is not exempt from REB review (see Section 4). In instances where funding has been granted for the proposed research, Capilano University will release the funds to the researcher only after REB approval is granted or interim release of funds has been approved by the REB;
- b) maintain REB approval for the duration of the project, whether funded or unfunded;
- c) ensure that changes to the research are approved by the REB prior to implementation;
- d) be familiar with and adhere to REB Policy and Procedures, the *Tri-Council Policy Statement: Ethical Conduct for Research Involving Humans (TCPS)*, and relevant legislation, including statute law pertaining to intellectual property, copyright, and privacy; and
- e) satisfy the REB that the proposed research accords with standards of professional and scholarly review appropriate to the relevant field of study.

4. COMMITMENT TO INDIGENIZE AND DECOLONIZE

4.1 When engaging in research involving or impacting Indigenous communities or Indigenous peoples particularly, researchers associated with Capilano University will:

- a) seek to engage with Indigenous communities in the manner and to the extent desired by the Indigenous communities involved;
- b) strive to engage with the Indigenous governance structure(s) best suited to provide guidance on the proposed research, as determined by the Indigenous communities themselves; and,
- c) seek to apply principles that accommodate Indigenous Ownership, Control, Access, and Possession (OCAP) of data derived from research involving or impacting particular Indigenous communities;
 - i. When reviewing research involving or impacting an Indigenous community or Indigenous people particularly, the REB will:
- d) support researchers to understand and apply TCPS requirements regarding engagement with Indigenous communities in the manner and to the extent desired by the Indigenous communities involved;

- e) support researchers to understand and apply principles that accommodate Indigenous Ownership, Control, Access, and Possession (OCAP) of data derived from research involving or impacting particular Indigenous communities; and
- f) establish and maintain a permanent place for a minimum of one Indigenous person to serve as an appointed member of the REB.

5. ACTIVITIES EXEMPT FROM REB REVIEW

5.1 The requirement for REB review applies to all research involving human participants and/or human biological materials except as exempted by the TCPS. Accordingly, the following activities are exempt from REB review:

- a) Research that relies exclusively on publicly available information when:
 - i. the information is legally accessible to the public and appropriately protected by law; or
 - ii. the information is publicly accessible and there is no reasonable expectation of privacy.
- b) Research involving the observation of people in public places where:
 - i. the research does not involve an intervention staged by the researcher or direct researcher interaction with individuals or groups;
 - ii. individuals or groups targeted for observation have no reasonable expectation of privacy; and
 - iii. dissemination of research results does not allow for the identification of specific individuals.
- c) Research that relies exclusively on secondary use of anonymous information or anonymous human biological materials, so long as processes of data linkage or dissemination of results do not generate personally identifiable information.
- d) Quality assurance, quality improvement and program evaluation studies when used exclusively for assessment, management, or improvement purposes, where such studies are within the mandate of an organization and are normally administered in the ordinary course of the operation of the organization.
- e) Research conducted by Capilano University, or by others authorized by Capilano University, where such research is conducted to meet external reporting requirements or to facilitate the management of Capilano University.

- f) Student activities intended exclusively for teaching and learning, where the products of these activities are not distributed outside Capilano University (e.g., course assignments). For further clarity, course-based student activities not intended to result in the distribution of findings or data outside of Capilano University do not require REB review.
- g) Course-based student research projects that meet *all* the following criteria (see, also, REB Procedures):
 - i. are undertaken as part of course requirements;
 - ii. are 'minimal risk', as defined by the TCPS;
 - iii. do not involve deception; and
 - iv. have been approved by a Faculty or Department Ethics Review Committee approved by the REB.

5.2 If unsure whether a proposed project is subject to ethical review, researchers, course instructors, and Faculty/Department Ethics Review Committees will seek guidance from the REB on whether ethical review is required for specific projects. In the event of disagreement, the REB makes the final decision on whether proposed activities are exempt from REB review and/or Faculty/Department Ethics Review Committee review.

6. REB REVIEW BY SUBCOMMITTEE (DELEGATED REVIEW)

6.1 The following categories may be reviewed by a subcommittee of the REB on a delegated basis (see, also, REB Procedures):

- a) Research involving no more than 'minimal risk', as defined by the TCPS;
- b) Research not involving deception or withholding of information from participants;
- c) Continuing review of approved projects for which there has been little or no change;
- d) Research previously reviewed by the full board;
- e) Multi-jurisdictional research approved by another Canadian Research Ethics Board.

7. AUTHORITY AND DISCIPLINE

7.1 The REB has the authority to approve, reject, terminate, or require modifications to any proposed or ongoing research involving human participants and/or human biological materials not explicitly exempted from REB jurisdiction.

7.2 In matters related to potential breach of policy, the authority of the REB is limited to taking action to protect the safety and welfare of participants.

7.3 Discipline arising from a potential breach of the requirements established by the REB are addressed in Capilano University's Standards of Conduct Policy (Policy B.506).

8. SCHOLARLY REVIEW AS PART OF ETHICS REVIEW

8.1 The REB will review the ethical implications of proposed research methods and design. The primary criterion used by the REB in evaluating a research project will be compliance with the TCPS and, where appropriate, relevant professional and discipline-specific standards.


8.2 The REB will adhere to the following when conducting scholarly review as part of ethical review:

- a) The extent of review for scholarly standards will be proportional to the risks and vulnerabilities involved.
- b) Research involving human participants or human biological materials that poses, at most, minimal risk will not normally require scholarly review.
- c) Research involving human participants or human biological materials that poses risk of harm to public figures in politics, business, labour, or other walks of life, will not be blocked because of potentially negative findings. Safeguards for those in the public arena are through public debate and discourse and, in extreme circumstances, through court action.

9. RECONSIDERATION AND APPEAL OF REB DECISIONS

9.1 The REB is obligated to provide comprehensive documentation of the reasons for its decisions, and to reconsider its decisions when requested to do so by applicants.

9.2 Applicants have the right to appeal a REB decision in accordance with documented REB procedures.

 Policy			
Policy No.	Officer Responsible		
	Vice President Academic & Provost		
Policy Name			
Research Ethics Policy: Research with Human Participants			
Approved by	Replaces	Category	Next Review
	Policy S2002 01 (Jan 2002)		
Date Issued	Date Revised	Related Policies, Reference	
		B.506 Standards of Conduct	

1. The Capilano University Research Ethics Board (REB)

Capilano University is committed to maintaining the highest ethical standards in research involving human participants, and to ensuring that the safety, health, welfare, and rights of participants are adequately protected. Capilano University will maintain a Research Ethics Board (REB) that exercises the authority of the President in matters concerning research involving human participants or human biological remains materials associated with Capilano University.

2. Commitment to Protect Human Participants

Accordingly, when engaging in research involving human participants or human biological remains materials, all those associated with Capilano University or conducting research on a Capilano University campus, will:

- a. Have approval from the Capilano University Research Ethics Board (REB) prior to conducting research involving human participants or human biological materials that is not exempt from REB review (see Section 3). In instances where funding has been granted for the proposed research, Capilano University will release the funds to the researcher only after REB approval is granted or interim release of funds has been approved by the REB.
- b. Maintain REB approval for the duration of the project, whether funded or unfunded.
- c. Ensure changes to the research are approved by the REB prior to implementation.
- d. Be familiar with and adhere to REB Policy and Procedures, the *Tri-Council Policy Statement: Ethical Conduct for Research Involving Humans (TCPS)*, and relevant

Commented [DS1]: or just "research involving humans"

Commented [MV2]: "human participants, human biological remains, or identifiable human biological materials"

Commented [CT3R2]: 'Materials,' per TCPS. "Remains" has been replaced with 'materials' throughout the documents.

Commented [DS4R2]: ... or simply "research involving humans" as in the TCPS2

Commented [CM5]: remains or materials? (Both are used in the document)

Commented [CM6]: campus/-es ?

Commented [CM7R6]: maybe "on a Capilano University campus"

Commented [CM8]: Should be Section 4.

Commented [CM9]: Are there cases where outside funding has already been given to the researcher, and CapU has no control?

Commented [CT10R9]: Yes.

Commented [CM11]: "Ensure changes to the research which involve human participants or human remains"

Commented [CT12R11]: Points a-e refer only to research involving human participants or human biological materials, as is indicated in the sentence above (beginning with 'Accordingly ...')

legislation including statute law pertaining to intellectual property, copyright, and privacy.

- e. Satisfy the REB that the proposed research accords with standards of professional and scholarly review appropriate to the relevant field of study.

Commented [CM13]: is this in general or only regarding human participants/remains?

Commented [CT14R13]: See comment above

3. Commitment to Indigenize and Decolonize

Commented [CM15]: Stephen Williams: consider adding a section about marginalized populations (i.e. racialized groups, transgender people, etc.)

- a) When engaging in research involving or impacting Indigenous communities or Indigenous peoples particularly, researchers associated with Capilano University will:

- i. Seek to engage with Indigenous communities in the manner and to the extent desired by the Indigenous communities involved;
- ii. Strive to engage with the Indigenous governance structure/s best suited to provide guidance on the proposed research, as determined by the Indigenous communities themselves; and,
- iii. Seek to give effect to OCAP principles that acknowledge Indigenous community Ownership, Control, Access, and Possession (OCAP) of data derived from research involving or impacting particular Indigenous communities.

Commented [DS16]: apply?

Commented [DS17]: define fully in first instance, rather than below

- b) When reviewing research involving or impacting an Indigenous community or Indigenous people particularly, the REB will:

- i. Support researchers to understand and give effect to TCPS requirements regarding engagement with Indigenous communities in the manner and to the extent desired by the Indigenous communities involved;
- ii. Support researchers to understand and give effect to principles acknowledging Indigenous community Ownership, Control, Access, and Possession (OCAP) of data derived from research involving or impacting particular Indigenous communities; and

Commented [DS18]: What does this mean? Plain language preferred.

Commented [DS19]: See plain language note above

- iii. Establish and maintain a permanent place for a minimum of one Indigenous person to serve as an appointed member of the REB. Strive to have at least one Indigenous person appointed as a member of the REB.

Formatted: Highlight

4. Activities Exempt from REB Review

The requirement for REB review applies to all research involving human participants or human biological materials except as exempted by the **TCPS**. Accordingly, the following activities are exempt from REB review:

Commented [DS20]: Do we need to be specific about the TCSP2 rather than the previous TCPS?

- a. Research that relies exclusively on publicly available information when:
 - i. The information is legally accessible to the public and appropriately protected by law; or
 - ii. The information is publicly accessible and there is no reasonable expectation of privacy.
- b. Research involving the observation of people in public places where:
 - i. The research does not involve an intervention staged by the researcher or direct researcher interaction with individuals or groups;
 - ii. Individuals or groups targeted for observation have no reasonable expectation of privacy; and
 - iii. Dissemination of research results does not allow for the identification of specific individuals.
- c. Research that relies exclusively on secondary use of anonymous information or anonymous human biological materials, so long as processes of data linkage or dissemination of results do not generate personally identifiable information.
- d. Quality assurance, quality improvement and program evaluation studies when used exclusively for assessment, management, or improvement purposes, where such studies are within the mandate of an organization and are normally administered in the ordinary course of the operation of the organization.
- e. Research conducted by Capilano University, or by others authorized by Capilano the University, where such research is conducted to meet external reporting requirements or to facilitate the management of Capilano University the institution.
- f. Student activities intended *exclusively* for teaching and learning, where the products of these activities are not shared-distributed outside the Capilano University (e.g., course assignments), For further clarity, course-based student activities not intended to result in the distribution of findings or data outside of Capilano University do not require REB review.
- g. Course-based student research projects that meet *all* the following criteria (see, also, REB Procedures):
 - i. Are undertaken as part of course requirements;

Formatted: Font: Italic

Formatted: Not Highlight

Formatted: Not Highlight

- ii. Are 'minimal risk', as defined by the TCPS;
- iii. Do not involve deception; and
- iv. Have been approved by a Faculty or Department Ethics Review Committee approved by the REB.

Commented [DS21]: TCPS2?

If unsure whether a proposed project is subject to ethical review, researchers, course instructors, and Faculty/Department Ethics Review Committees will seek guidance from the REB on whether ethical review is required for specific projects. In the event of disagreement, the REB makes the final decision on whether proposed activities are exempt from REB review and/or Faculty/Department Ethics Review Committee review.

5. REB Review by Subcommittee (delegated review)

The following categories may be reviewed by a subcommittee of the REB on a delegated basis (see, also, REB Procedures):

- a. Research involving no more than 'minimal risk', as defined by the TCPS.
- b. Research not involving deception or withholding of information from participants.
- c. Continuing review of approved projects for which there has been little or no change.
- d. Research previously reviewed by the full board.
- e. Multi-jurisdictional research approved by another Canadian Research Ethics Board.

6. Authority and Discipline

The REB has the authority to approve, reject, terminate, or require modifications to any proposed or ongoing research involving human participants or human biological materials not explicitly exempted from REB jurisdiction. In matters related to potential breach of policy, the authority of the REB is limited to taking action to protect the safety and welfare of participants. Discipline arising from a potential breach of the requirements established by the REB are addressed in Capilano University's Standards of Conduct Policy (Policy B.506).

Commented [CM22]: human participants and human materials?

Commented [CT23R22]: 'materials,' per TCPS

Commented [DS24]: again, do we need more than "humans" ?

Commented [CM25]: Please explain what is meant by "disciplinary standards" in this context

Commented [CT26R25]: "Disciplinary standards" refers to generally accepted or required practice within a discipline. For example, the discipline of psychology requires data to be retained for seven years, whereas the disciplinary of human geography has no such requirement.

Commented [CM27R25]: Thank you...to the lay person, "disciplinary" here could seem like "punishment" Perhaps "professional and discipline-specific standards"? Change to discipline-specific in all areas of policy and procedure documents


7. Scholarly Review as Part of Ethics Review

The REB will review the ethical implications of proposed research methods and design. The primary criterion used by the REB in evaluating a research project will be compliance with the TCPS and, where appropriate, relevant professional and disciplinary standards. The REB will adhere to the following when conducting scholarly review as part of ethical review:

- a. The extent of review for scholarly standards will be proportional to the risks and vulnerabilities involved.
- b. Research involving human participants [or human biological materials](#) that poses, at most, minimal risk will not normally require scholarly review.
- c. Research involving human participants [or human biological materials](#) that poses risk of harm to public figures in politics, business, labour, or other walks of life, will not be blocked because of potentially negative findings. Safeguard for those in the public arena is through public debate and discourse and, in extremis, through court action.

8. Reconsideration and Appeal of REB Decisions

The REB is obligated to provide comprehensive documentation of the reasons for its decisions, and to reconsider its decisions when requested to do so by applicants. Applicants have the right to appeal a REB decision in accordance with documented REB procedures.

 CAPILANO UNIVERSITY		PROCEDURE	
Policy No.	Officer Responsible		
S2021-02-01	Vice President Academic & Provost		
Policy Name			
Research Ethics Procedure: Research with Human Participants - Research Ethics Board			
Approved by	Replaces	Category	Next Review
	S2002-01	B	
Date Issued	Date Revised	Related Policies, Reference	
		B.506 Standards of Conduct	

1. AUTHORITY AND RESPONSIBILITIES OF THE CAPILANO UNIVERSITY RESEARCH ETHICS BOARD (REB)

1.1 The REB exercises the authority of the President and is accountable to the President or their designate in all matters concerning research associated with Capilano University involving human participants or human biological materials.

1.2 The Capilano University REB has the following responsibilities:

- a) Ensures that research involving human participants and/or human biological materials associated with the University does not proceed without the prior approval by the REB or a Faculty or Departmental Ethics Review Committee approved by the REB, unless such research is exempt from REB review in accordance with REB Policy.
- b) Evaluates Applications for Ethical Review (Applications), ensuring proposed research adheres to the *Tri-Council Policy Statement: Ethical Conduct for Research Involving Human Participants (TCPS)*.
- c) Supports the University research community to become familiar with statutes, regulations, and Tri-Council guidelines pertaining to research involving human participants.
- d) Maintains a record of all active research projects approved by the REB and undertakes ongoing review of projects continuing after initial term of approval.

- e) Investigates reports of non-compliance with the Capilano University Research Ethics Policy, these Procedures, or complaints of improper research involving human participants associated with the University. The REB will only undertake these investigations in relation to the safety and welfare of the research participants.
- f) Maintains records for seven (7) years from the completion of the project, including meeting minutes, Applications submitted and approved, correspondence between the REB and researchers, written reasons pertaining to the acceptance or rejection of Applications, continuing review, amendments, appointment of members, procedures, and records of investigation of allegations of non-compliance with these Procedures and related Policy.

2 REB COMPOSITION, ADMINISTRATIVE SUPPORT, APPOINTMENT, AND ROLES OF MEMBERS

2.1 The REB will be comprised of no fewer than five (5) members and a Chair as follows:

- a) A minimum of two (2) regular members with broad knowledge in the methods or disciplines of research commonly reviewed by the REB;
- b) A minimum of one (1) member with broad expertise in research ethics;
- c) A minimum of one (1) community member who has no affiliation with the University;
- d) A minimum of one (1) REB Chair; and
- e) A minimum of one (1) Research Ethics Officer (ex-officio, non-voting member).

2.2 As the need arises, the REB may involve others on an ad hoc basis to aid in the review of Applications, including seeking expertise in disciplines not well-represented on the REB and/or regarding legal issues relevant to the research. Such individuals are not REB members and do not vote on REB decisions.

2.3 Capilano University will strive to have at least one Indigenous person appointed as a member of the REB.

2.4 Exclusions to REB Membership:

- a) The University's legal counsel will not be a member of the REB.
- b) University administrators may not be members of the REB, nor will they attend REB meetings when Applications are discussed.

2.5 Appointment and Reappointment of REB Members and Chair:

- a) REB Members and the Chair are appointed by the President for a two-year term and may be reappointed for a second two-year term.
- b) Upon resignation of the Chair, and/or at the end of the of Chair's term, the outgoing Chair and the Research Ethics Officer, in consultation with the REB, will recommend to the president appointment of a new Chair.
- c) On an annual basis, the REB Chair and Research Ethics Officer will assess the composition of the REB and recommend to the President appointment and reappointment of members. Recommendations on appointment and reappointment of REB members will be based upon:
 - i. The imperativeness of:
 - a. maintaining expertise in discipline-specific standards, fields and methods covered by the REB, and knowledge of research ethics;
 - b. maintaining an effective balance of new members and members serving a second term;
 - c. having at least one Indigenous member appointed to the REB;
 - ii. Adherence to documented *REB Standard Operating Procedure #001: REB Member Responsibilities and Conduct*; and
 - iii. Expressions of interest from University personnel who wish to be appointed and from members who wish to be reappointed.

2.6 Resignation and Removal of REB Members and Chair:

- a) The REB Chair or an REB Member may resign from the REB before the conclusion of their term upon provision of notice to the REB Chair or the Chair's designee.
- b) The REB Chair or an REB Member should resign immediately upon determination of research misconduct, mismanaged conflict of interest, or any other relevant behavior that could be perceived as compromising ethical judgment.
- c) The REB Chair may remove an REB member in accordance with REB Standard Operating Procedure #001: REB Member Responsibilities and Conduct, or upon determination of research misconduct, mismanaged conflict of interest, or any other relevant behavior that could be perceived as compromising their ethical judgment.

- d) The President may remove the Chair upon determination of research misconduct, mismanaged conflict of interest, or any other relevant behavior that could be perceived as compromising their ethical judgment

2.7 The University will provide the REB with the necessary, ongoing financial and administrative resources to fulfill its responsibilities.

3 MEETINGS OF THE REB, QUORUM, DECISION-MAKING AND MINUTES

3.1 The REB will meet formally in-person on a monthly basis, or as often as necessary to fulfill its responsibilities.

3.2 REB members will have at least five (5) business days' notice of any meeting, and copies of all documents to be considered at the meeting are to be provided with the notice.

3.3 Quorum of the REB will be at least five (5) members, including the Chair, and, at a minimum, will include:

- a) two (2) members with expertise in relevant research disciplines, fields and methods covered by the REB; and
- b) one member knowledgeable in ethics; and
- c) one community member not associated with Capilano University.

3.4 REB Decision-Making

- a) The REB will function impartially, provide fair hearing to those involved, and provide reasoned and appropriately documented decisions.
- b) When the REB issues a non-approval decision, it will provide the applicant the reasons for its decision and an opportunity to reply before making a final decision.
- c) The REB will strive to reach decisions by consensus. Only when necessary will decisions be made by a simple majority vote.

3.5 Meetings with the Applicant

- a) The REB will accommodate reasonable requests from applicants to discuss their applications with the REB.
- b) Applicants are not present at REB meetings when the REB is engaged in discussion leading to a decision.

3.6 Minutes

- a) Minutes of all REB meetings will be prepared and maintained by the REB with support of administrative support personnel. The minutes will clearly document REB decisions and the reasons for decisions when related to a non-approval decision.
- b) Meeting minutes will be accessible to representatives of the University, researchers, and funding agencies upon request.

4 APPLICATION FOR ETHICAL REVIEW

4.1 Applicants will submit their applications for Ethical Review by email to reb@capilanou.ca.

4.2 Timing of Submissions:

- a) To be considered at the next scheduled REB meeting, applications must be submitted to the REB at least two (2) weeks prior to the next meeting of the REB.
- b) The REB is under no obligation to review new applications during the faculty vacation period (June 15 to August 15).

4.3 Applications for Ethical Review submitted to the REB must conform to the format and content specified by the REB and presented in language that REB members can readily understand.

4.4 Applications for Ethical Review will be reviewed at a monthly meeting of the REB or by a subcommittee of the REB (Delegated Review).

4.5 Optionally, with approval of the Director, Creative Activity, Research and Scholarship, the REB may delegate its responsibility to review minimal risk course-based student research to a Faculty or Department Ethics Review Committee.

4.6 The REB Chair and/or their designate will determine the appropriate level of review in accordance with the criteria described in Section 5.

5 LEVELS OF REVIEW: FULL BOARD

5.1 Review of the Full Board (Full Board Review)

- a) Research not meeting the criteria for delegated review or Faculty or Department Ethics Review Committee Review will be reviewed at a meeting of the Full Board.
- b) Full Board meetings require, at a minimum, attendance of a quorum of members, as described in Section 3.3.
- c) The REB will strive to reach decisions by consensus. Where members disagree, areas of disagreement will be discussed with a view to reaching an outcome acceptable to all members. Only when necessary will decisions be made by a simple majority vote. The REB Chair decides whether a decision will be decided by majority vote.
- d) The REB will strive to provide its decisions, and reasons for its decisions, within one (1) week of the meeting at which an application is reviewed.

5.1 The following are the outcomes and applicable processes of a Full Board Review:

- a) If the REB approves an application as submitted, the REB Chair or Research Ethics Officer will provide a letter of approval to the applicant.
- b) If the REB does not approve an application, the REB Chair and/or Research Ethics Officer will summarize in writing the reasons for the REB's decision, describe the nature of the REB's concerns, and suggest modifications to the proposed research.
- c) Upon receipt of a revised Application, the REB Chair and/or the Research Ethics Officer will determine whether the application is to be approved as resubmitted, reviewed on a delegated basis, or reviewed at a meeting of the Full ~~REB~~ Board.
- d) The processes of review and resubmission will continue until the REB determines that the project may proceed, or the applicant declines to resubmit the application. At any point during this process, and if requested in writing by the applicant, the REB will reconsider its decision.
- e) If an application is not approved following every effort (as above) to address REB concerns, the researcher has the right to appeal the REB decision.

6 LEVELS OF REVIEW: DELEGATED REVIEW

6.1 Delegated reviews may be completed by a subcommittee of the REB comprised of the REB Chair and one regular REB Member, the Research Ethics Officer, and one regular REB member, or the REB Chair and the Research Ethics Officer.

6.2 The following types of research may be reviewed by a subcommittee of the REB (Delegated Review):

- a) Minimal risk research, defined 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;
- b) Research that does not involve persons or groups in vulnerable circumstances, invasive methods, sensitive subject matter, deception or withholding of information from participants;
- c) Continuing review of approved projects for which there has been little or no change from that originally approved;
- d) Resubmitted Applications for research previously reviewed at a meeting of the full REB; and
- e) Multi-jurisdictional research that has been approved by another Canadian Research Ethics Board.

6.3 The REB will strive to provide its decisions, and reasons for its decisions, within two (2) weeks of receipt of a complete application that satisfies the criteria for delegated review.

6.4 Delegated subcommittees will strive to reach decisions by consensus. Where reviewers disagree, areas of disagreement will be discussed with the goal of reaching an outcome acceptable to all reviewers. In instances when reviewers are unable to reach consensus, the REB Chair or the Research Ethics Officer may choose to promote an application to Full Board Review.

6.5 The following are the outcomes and applicable processes of a Delegated Review:

- a) If the REB approves an application as submitted, the REB Chair or Research Ethics Officer will provide a letter of approval to the applicant.
- b) If the REB subcommittee does not approve an application, the REB Chair or Research Ethics Officer will summarize in writing the reasons for the REB's decision, describe the nature of the REB's concerns, and suggest changes to the research and/or application.
- c) Upon receipt of a revised application, the REB Chair and/or the Research Ethics Officer will determine whether the application will be approved as resubmitted or will be reviewed on a delegated basis.
- d) The processes of review and resubmission will continue until the REB subcommittee determines that the project may proceed, or the applicant declines to resubmit the

application. At any point during this process, and if requested in writing by the applicant, the REB will reconsider its decision.

- e) If an application is not approved following every effort (as above) to address REB concerns, the researcher has the right to appeal the REB's decision.

6.6 At the regular monthly meeting of the REB, the Research Ethics Officer will provide, for REB information, a summary of applications approved since the last meeting.

7 LEVELS OF REVIEW: FACULTY OF DEPARTMENT ETHICS REVIEW COMMITTEE (COURSE-BASED STUDENT RESEARCH)

7.1 The REB and a Faculty or Department may enter into a *Faculty or Department Ethics Review Agreement* that sets out the conditions under which a Faculty or Department Ethics Review Committee may review minimal risk, course-based student research on behalf of the REB.

7.2 Research that meets all the following criteria may be reviewed by a Faculty or Department Ethics Review Committee approved by the REB:

- a) Course-based student research conducted by a student as part of a course under supervision of faculty;
- b) Minimal risk research, defined 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; and
- c) Research that does not involve persons or groups in vulnerable circumstances, invasive methods, sensitive subject matter, deception or withholding of information from participants.

7.3 The Faculty or Department Ethics Review Committee will be comprised of a Chair and at least one other identified Member associated with the relevant Faculty or Department, one of whom must be a current member of the REB.

7.4 Applications for course-based student research are to be submitted to the REB using the REB's Application Form. The REB Chair or Research Ethics Officer will review and determine the appropriate Level of Review and will identify applications appropriate for Faculty Department or Ethics Committee review.

7.5 Faculty or Department Ethics Review Committees will adhere to documented review procedures approved by the REB.

7.6 Twice annually, Faculty or Department Ethics Review Committees will provide to the REB PDF copies of all applications approved by the Faculty or Department Review Committee, including all approved recruitment, consent, and research instruments.

8 CONTINUING REVIEW

8.1 Applications for ethical review are approved for a maximum period of one (1) year. Research may be approved for a shorter time period when appropriate.

8.2 For research continuing after the approved period, prior to expiry, the applicant will submit to the REB an Application for Continuing Review that specifies:

- a) Progress made on the research project to date;
- b) Any changes to procedures or study population implemented or proposed;
- c) Changes to research personnel; and
- d) Any other changes that may affect risk or vulnerability of research participants.

8.3 The REB Chair and/or the Research Ethics Officer will review Applications for Continuing Review and determine if the application is approved, or if further review is required.

9 PROPORTIONATE APPROACH TO REVIEW

The REB will employ a proportionate approach to review. Where risk to participants is high, the REB will employ more rigorous review and oversight as required, such as by requiring more frequent reporting and review of records.

10 OBLIGATION TO REPORT UNANTICIPATED ISSUES

Researchers will report to the REB any unanticipated issues or events that may increase the level of risk to participants or have ethical implications that may affect the welfare of participants.

11 CONFLICT OF INTEREST


- 11.1 Members of the REB will disclose any real, potential or perceived personal interest in research reviewed by the REB and will be absent during REB discussion leading to decisions pertaining to such applications.
- 11.2 The REB will assess proposals for conflicts of interest and will ensure researchers informs participants during the consent process of any real, potential, or perceived conflicts.
- 11.3 The REB acts independently, at arm's-length from University administration, and will maintain its decision-making autonomy even when the University has a strong interest in an REB decision.

12 INVESTIGATION AND FINDINGS OF NON-COMPLIANCE

- 12.1 In the course of fulfilling its obligation to review research on an ongoing basis, if the REB discovers that a research project has not adhered to, or is not adhering to, a research protocol approved by the REB, the REB may take the following incremental steps to address the situation:
 - a) Notify the researcher of the non-compliance and request that action be taken to address it;
 - b) Notify the researcher that the research is to be halted until the non-compliance is addressed; or
 - c) Notify the Vice President Academic & Provost that a potential breach of Policy has occurred or is occurring.
- 12.2 The REB will investigate allegations of non-compliance with REB Policy and these Procedures, or complaints of improper research involving human participants, when requested by the Office Vice President Academic & Provost. The REB will ~~only~~ undertake these investigations only in relation to the safety and welfare of the research participants and may stop the research to safeguard the well-being of participants.
- 12.3 Disciplinary action is subject to the *Standards of Conduct Policy* of the University (Policy B.506), and thus falls outside the authority of the REB.

13 APPEAL

- 13.1 REB review will be guided by principles of natural and procedural justice in its decision-making. Such principles include providing reasonable opportunity to be heard, opportunity for rebuttal, and reasoned and written grounds for decisions. The researcher is responsible for providing in writing to the REB an explanation of why they believe the REB has misunderstood the Application or applied an inappropriate standard of review.
- 13.2 The REB will not issue a final decision until after all reasonable efforts to reach a mutually agreeable outcome have been exhausted. Because ethics review and the observance of research ethics at the University is based on the collegial relations between the REB and researchers, a request for a formal appeal should be a last resort.
- 13.3 If an applicant believes that the REB has, in its final decision, misunderstood the application or applied an inappropriate standard of review, the applicant has recourse to the appeal process described below.
- 13.4 The REB will establish and maintain an agreement with the Research Ethics Board of another University to serve as an Appeal Committee.
- 13.5 Applicants who wish to appeal a final REB decision will, within 30 days of the REB decision, send a notice of appeal to the Office Vice President Academic & Provost. The notice of appeal should specify the decision being appealed and the reasons for the appeal. The Vice President Academic & Provost will refer the research in question to the Appeal Committee within 10 business days of receipt of the Appeal. Copies of the application, REB decision(s), and all related correspondence will be made available to the Appeal Committee.
- 13.6 The Appeal Committee will consist of a quorum of the Research Ethics Board of the University with which the Capilano University has an Appeal Agreement.
- 13.7 The Appeal Committee will notify the applicant, the REB, and the Office of the Vice President Academic & Provost of its decision in writing. Unless otherwise stated in its decision, the decision of the Appeal Committee will be final.

 PROCEDURE	
Policy No.	Officer Responsible
	Vice President Academic & Provost
Policy Name	
Research Ethics Procedure: Research with Human Participants - Research Ethics Board	
Approved by	Replaces
	Category
	Next Review
Date Issued	Date Revised
	Related Policies, Reference
	May 26th, 2020
	B.506 Standards of Conduct

Commented [CT1]: Reviewers, thank you for your thoughtful comments on the draft. I look forward to more discussion.

1. Authority and Responsibilities of the Capilano University Research Ethics Board (REB)

1.1 The REB acts for the President

The REB exercises the authority of the President and is accountable to the President or their designate in all matters concerning research associated with Capilano University (CapU) involving human participants or human biological ~~remains~~ materials.

Commented [MV2]: human participants, human biological remains, or identifiable human biological materials.

1.2 Responsibilities of the REB

The Capilano University REB has the following responsibilities:

- Ensure that research involving human participants or human biological materials associated with the University does not proceed without the prior approval by the REB or a Faculty or Departmental Ethics Review Committee approved by the REB, unless such research is exempt from REB review in accordance with REB Policy.
- Evaluate Applications for Ethical Review (Applications), ensuring proposed research adheres to the *Tri-Council Policy Statement: Ethical Conduct for Research Involving Human Participants (TCPS)*.
- Support the University research community to become familiar with statutes, regulations, and Tri-Council guidelines pertaining to research involving human participants.
- Maintain a record of all active research projects approved by the REB and undertake ongoing review of projects continuing after initial term of approval.
- Investigate reports of non-compliance with CapU Research Ethics Policy, these Procedures, or complaints of improper research involving human participants associated

Commented [CT3R2]: Changed to 'materials' in accordance with TCPS language.

Commented [DS4R2]: Same comments from the policy: the TCPSs describes "research with humans" so do we need all of the additional language or can we follow the TCPS2?

Commented [CM5]: include reference to section 4 of the Policy

Commented [CM6]: in accordance WITH

with the University. The REB will only undertake these investigations in relation to the safety and welfare of the research participants.

- f. Maintain records for seven (7) years from the completion of the project including records including meeting minutes, Applications submitted and approved; correspondence between the REB and researchers, written reasons pertaining to the acceptance or rejection of Applications; continuing review, amendments, appointment of members, procedures, and records of investigation of allegations of non-compliance with these Procedures and related Policy.

Commented [MV7]: Some research projects have several phases and take longer than seven years to complete. How do we ensure ongoing record-keeping for some projects?

Commented [CT8R7]: Added "from the completion of the project"

2. REB Composition, Administrative Support, Appointment, and Roles of Members

2.1 Composition of the REB

- a. The REB shall be comprised of no fewer than five (5) members and a Chair as follows:
 - i. A minimum of two (2) regular members with broad knowledge in the methods or disciplines of research commonly reviewed by the REB.
 - ii. A minimum of one (1) member with broad expertise in research ethics.
 - iii. A minimum of one (1) community member who has no affiliation with the University.
 - iv. A minimum of one (1) REB Chair.
 - v. A minimum of one (1) Research Ethics Officer (ex-officio, non-voting member).
 - ~~vi. The REB may include one (1) member knowledgeable in relevant law but this is not mandatory.~~
- b. As need arises, the REB may involve others on an ad hoc basis to aid in the review of Applications. This includes seeking expertise in disciplines not well-represented on the REB and/or regarding legal issues relevant to the research. Such individuals are not REB members and do not vote on REB decisions.
- c. Capilano University will strive to have at least one Indigenous person appointed as a member of the REB.

Commented [CM9]: Is there an assumption that many of the members will be faculty? Would a staff member with expertise be able to serve? Should some positions specify "faculty"?

Commented [CM10]:

Commented [CM11]: Remove all instances of "shall" and replace with "will"

Commented [CM12R11]:

Commented [CM13]: Who vets this experience?

Commented [CT14R13]: Typically, REB Chairs and Research Ethics Officers strategically recruit new members to address gaps in disciplinary research knowledge on REBs. The current CapU REB is new. I am not aware of how inaugural members were selected.

Commented [MV15]: Necessary to include this given that it is not required?

Commented [CT16R15]: removed

2.2 Exclusions to REB Membership

- a. The University's legal counsel shall not be a member of the REB.
- b. Senior University administrators may not be members of the REB, nor will they attend REB meetings when Applications are discussed.

Commented [CM17]: does this need further definition?

Commented [CT18R17]: I suggest that we remove the word 'Senior.' In my experience, even someone at the rank of Associate Dean can be subject to real, potential or perceived conflict of interest.

Commented [DS19]: TCPS2 describes "senior administrators" i.e. VPs, executive as unable to participate

2.3 Appointment and Reappointment of REB Members and Chair

a. REB Members and the Chair are appointed by the President for a two-year term and may be reappointed for a second two-year term ~~with agreement of the member, the Chair, and senior administration.~~

b. ~~Upon resignation of the Chair, and/or at the end of the of Chair's term, the outgoing Chair and the Research Ethics Officer will recommend to the president appointment of a new Chair.~~

a.—

b-c. On an annual basis, the REB Chair and Research Ethics Officer shall assess the composition of the REB and recommend to the President appointment and reappointment of members ~~in consultation with senior administration.~~ Recommendations on appointment and reappointment of REB members shall be based upon:

- i. ~~Imperative to maintain expertise with in respect to disciplinary standards, broad expertise in research ethics, fields and methods covered by the REB, and knowledge of ethics and relevant law.~~
- ii. Imperative to maintain an effective balance of new members and members serving a second term.
- iii. Member adherence to documented "Role, Responsibilities, and Expected Conduct of REB Members;"
- iv. Expressions of interest from University personnel who wish to be appointed and from members who wish to be reappointed.

2.4 REB Support

The University will provide the REB with the necessary, ongoing financial and administrative resources to fulfill its responsibilities.

3. Meetings of the REB, Quorum, Decision-Making, and Minutes

3.1 Responsibility to Meet

The REB shall meet formally ~~in-person~~ on a monthly basis, or as often as necessary to fulfill its responsibilities.

3.2 Notice of Meetings

REB members shall have at least five (5) working days notice of any meeting, and copies of all documents to be considered at the meeting are to be provided with the notice.

3.3 Quorum

Commented [CM20]: insert "the" before Chair

Commented [MV21]: Wondering why the President selects the Chair. Members of the REB would likely have the required knowledge and expertise to select the best Chair. Having one individual appoint the Chair seems to be especially problematic in a committee focused on ethics.

Commented [CT22R21]: From TCPS Article 6.2: "The highest body within an institution shall: establish the REB ... The highest body of the institution that establishes the REB or REBs could be an individual, *such as the president*, rector or chief executive officer, or an equivalent body, such as a governing council, board of directors, or council of administration. Institutions determine the highest body ...

Commented [CM23R21]: Add "with advice from the Research Ethics Officer, and when possible, the outgoing ...

Commented [CM24]: Senior Admin cannot be members of the REB, but they appoint and approve the members. ...

Commented [CT25R24]: I suggest that references to (and role of) "senior administration" be removed to avoid ...

Commented [MV26]: No apparent role for faculty in providing input on REB membership

Commented [CT27R26]: Extant REB members are sometimes able to make thoughtful suggestions on other ...

Commented [MV28]: And the committee itself?

Commented [CT29R28]: See 2.3.c

Commented [CM30]: Sue Dritmanis: Add reference to inclusion of Indigenous member as per Policy section 3.b.iii

Commented [CM31]: maybe don't list disciplinary standards first since it makes it seem like we are really ...

Commented [CT32R31]: "Imperative to maintain *expertise* with respect to disciplinary standards" refers to ...

Commented [CT33]: Changed to more closely align with TCPS language.

Commented [DS34]: ... however the position knowledgeable in the law was removed above...

Commented [CM35R34]: remove reference to law

Commented [CM36]: Any section release or financial compensation for members or at least the Chair?

Commented [CT37R36]: The Chair receives section release. Members serve as institutional service.

Commented [CM38R36]: I'm wondering about the viability of mentioning the section release for the chair. T ...

Commented [SW39]: is this a limiting requirement that meetings be in-person?

Commented [CT40R39]: TCPS Article 6.10: "REBs shall have regular meetings to discharge their responsibilities, ...

A quorum of the REB shall be at least five (5) members including the Chair, and minimally include two (2) members with expertise in relevant research disciplines, fields and methods covered by the REB, broad knowledge of the methods or area of research reviewed, one member knowledgeable in ethics, and one community member not associated with the Capilano University.

Commented [MV41]: Is this possible in practice? "Broad knowledge" is vague.

Commented [CT42R41]: Agreed. Thank you. Section 3.3 is updated to more closely align with current TCPS language.

Commented [CM43]: omit "the" from "the Capilano University"

3.4 Decision-Making

The REB shall function impartially, provide fair hearing to those involved, and provide reasoned and appropriately documented decisions. When the REB issues a non-approval decision, it shall provide the applicant the reasons for its decision and an opportunity to reply before making a final decision. The REB shall strive to reach decisions by consensus. Only when necessary will decisions be made by a simple majority vote.

3.5 Meetings with the Applicant

The REB will accommodate reasonable requests from applicants to discuss their applications with the REB. Applicants are not present at REB meetings when the REB is engaged in discussion leading to a decision.

3.6 Minutes

Minutes of all REB meetings will be prepared and maintained by the REB with support of administrative support personnel. The minutes will clearly document REB decisions and the reasons for decisions when related to a non-approval decision. Meeting minutes are accessible to authorized representatives of the University, researchers, and funding agencies upon request.

Commented [CM44]: to a non-approval...

Commented [MV45]: Criteria for authorization?

Commented [CT46R45]: Good point. Clarified.

4. Process of Ethical Review

4.1 Application Submission

Applicants will submit their applications for Ethical Review by email to reb@capilano.ca.

4.2 Timing of Submissions

To be considered at the next scheduled REB meeting, applications must be submitted to the REB at least two (2) weeks prior to the next meeting of the REB. The REB is under no obligation to review new applications during the faculty vacation and PD period (June 15 to August 15).

Commented [MV47]: PD period is normally May 1 - June 15. Perhaps remove reference to PD period and retain reference to vacation period?

Commented [CT48R47]: Changed accordingly.

4.3 Applications for Ethical Review

Applications for Ethical Review submitted to the REB must conform to the format and content specified by the REB and presented in language that REB members can readily understand.

4.4 Level s of Review Assessment

Applications for Ethical Review will be reviewed at a monthly meeting of the REB ~~or~~ by a subcommittee of the REB (Delegated Review). Optionally, with approval of the Director, Creative Activity, Research and Scholarship, the REB may delegate its responsibility to review minimal risk course-based student research to ~~or~~ by a Faculty or Department Ethics Review Committee approved by the REB. The REB Chair and/or their designate will determine the appropriate level of review in accordance with the criteria described below.

4.5 Level of Review Assessment Levels of Review

4.5.1 Review of the Full-Board (Full-Board Review)

- a. Research not meeting the criteria for delegated review or Faculty or Department Ethics Review Committee Review will be reviewed at a ~~monthly~~ meeting of the Full-Board REB.
- b. Full-Board meetings minimally require attendance of a quorum of members, as described in section 2.1 a.
- c. The REB will strive to reach decisions by consensus. Where members disagree, areas of disagreement will be discussed with a view to reaching an outcome acceptable to all members. Only when necessary will decisions be made by a simple majority vote. The REB Chair decides whether a decision will be decided by majority vote.
- d. The REB will strive to provide its decisions, and reasons for its decisions, within one week of the meeting at which an application is reviewed.
- e. Outcome of a Full Board Review
 - i. If an application is approved as submitted, the REB Chair or Research Ethics Officer will provide a letter of approval to the applicant.
 - ii. If the REB does not approve an application, the REB Chair and/or Research Ethics Officer will summarize in writing the reasons for the REB's decision, describe the nature of the REB's concerns, and suggest modifications to the proposed research.
 - iii. Upon receipt of a revised Application, the REB Chair and/or the Research Ethics Officer will determine whether the application is to be approved as resubmitted, reviewed on a delegated basis, or reviewed at a meeting of the full REB.
 - iv. The processes of review and resubmission will continue until the REB determines that the project may proceed, or the applicant declines to resubmit the application. At any point during this process, and if requested in writing by the applicant, the REB will reconsider its decision.
 - v. If an application is not approved following every effort (as above) to address REB concerns, the researcher has the right to appeal the REB decision.

Commented [CM49]: add reference to section 3.3 also.

4.5.2 Review of a Subcommittee of the REB (Delegated Review) ~~The REB Chair and/or the Research Ethics Officer will complete a Level of Review Assessment on all Applications that are not exempt from REB review to determine whether an application will be reviewed at a meeting of the REB, by a REB subcommittee (Delegated Review), or by a Faculty or Department Ethics Review Committee approved by the REB. With approval of university administration, the REB may delegate its responsibility to complete a Level of Review Assessments on applications for ethical review of course-based student research to Faculty or Department Ethics Review Committees.~~

The following types of research may be reviewed by a subcommittee of the REB (Delegated Review):

- a. Minimal risk research, defined 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.
- b. Research that does not involve persons or groups in vulnerable circumstances, invasive methods, sensitive subject matter, deception or withholding of information from participants.
- c. Continuing review of approved projects for which there has been little or no change from that originally approved.
- d. Resubmitted Applications for research previously reviewed at a meeting of the full REB.
- e. Multi-jurisdictional research that has been approved by another Canadian Research Ethics Board.

4.8 Review by a Subcommittee of the REB (Delegated Review)

- a. Delegated reviews will be completed by a subcommittee of the REB comprised of the REB Chair and one regular REB Member, the Research Ethics Officer and one regular REB member, or the REB Chair and the Research Ethics Officer.
- b. The REB will strive to provide its decisions, and reasons for its decisions, within two weeks of receipt of a complete application that satisfies the criteria for delegated review.
- c. Delegated subcommittees will strive to reach decisions by consensus. Where reviewers disagree, areas of disagreement will be discussed with the goal of reaching an outcome acceptable to all reviewers. In instances when reviewers are unable to reach consensus, the REB Chair or the Research Ethics Officer may choose to promote an application to Full Board Review.
- d. Outcome of a Delegated Review:
 - i. If an application is approved as submitted, the REB Chair or Research Ethics Officer will provide a letter of approval to the applicant.

Commented [CM50]: Why is approval of university administration needed in the case of course-based student research?

Commented [CT51R50]: TCPS Article 6.12: "An institution may decide that ethics review of minimal risk course-based research activities with a primarily pedagogical purpose can be delegated to non-REB members at the institution's department, faculty or equivalent level" (emphasis added).

By means of this policy, then, the institution allows its REB to delegate review of course-based, minimal risk student research to a faculty or department committee. The REB may or may not choose to exercise this option. .

Commented [CM52]: make singular: "Assessment"

Commented [DS53]: The numbering goes out of whack here...

Commented [CM54]: section lettering here begins with a. I think a heading is missing.

- ii. If the REB subcommittee does not approve an application, the REB Chair or Research Ethics Officer will summarize in writing the reasons for the REB's decision, describe the nature of the REB's concerns, and suggest changes to the research and/or application.
- iii. Upon receipt of a revised application, the REB Chair and/or the Research Ethics Officer will determine whether the application shall be approved as resubmitted, or will be reviewed on a delegated basis.
- iv. The processes of review and resubmission will continue until the REB subcommittee determines that the project may proceed, or the applicant declines to resubmit the application. At any point during this process, and if requested in writing by the applicant, the REB will reconsider its decision.
- v. If an application is not approved following every effort (as above) to address REB concerns, the researcher has the right to appeal the REB's decision.
- e. At the regular monthly meeting of REB, the Research Ethics Officer will report for REB information a summary of applications approved since the last meeting.

~~Research not meeting the criteria for delegated review or Faculty or Department Ethics Review Committee Review will be reviewed at a monthly meeting of the REB.~~

4.7 Review at a Monthly Meeting of the REB (Full Board Review)

- a. ~~The REB will strive to provide its decisions, and reasons for its decisions, within one week of the meeting at which an application is reviewed.~~
- b. ~~The REB will strive to reach decisions by consensus. Where members disagree, areas of disagreement will be discussed with a view to reaching an outcome acceptable to all members. Only when necessary will decisions be made by a simple majority vote. The REB Chair decides whether a decision will be decided by majority vote. The REB Chair is ultimately responsible for all REB decisions.~~
- c. ~~Outcome of a Full Board Review~~
 - i. ~~If an application is approved as submitted, the REB Chair or Research Ethics Officer will provide a letter of approval to the applicant.~~
 - ii. ~~If the REB does not approve an application, the REB Chair and/or Research Ethics Officer will summarize in writing the reasons for the REB's decision, describe the nature of the REB's concerns, and suggest modifications to the proposed research.~~

Commented [MV55]: This relates to the concerns I raised above with the President appointing the REB Chair.

Commented [CT56R55]: Removed. This provision appears to be an artifact from previous versions of the TCPS. Interesting.

- iii. ~~Upon receipt of a revised Application, the REB Chair and/or the Research Ethics Officer will determine whether the application is to be approved as resubmitted, reviewed on a delegated basis, or reviewed at a meeting of the full REB.~~
- iv. ~~The processes of review and resubmission will continue until the REB determines that the project may proceed, or the applicant declines to resubmit the application. At any point during this process, and if requested in writing by the applicant, the REB will reconsider its decision.~~
- v. ~~If an application is not approved following every effort (as above) to address REB concerns, the researcher has the right to appeal the REB decision.~~

4.8 Review by a Subcommittee of the REB (Delegated Review)

- d. ~~Delegated reviews will be completed by a subcommittee of the REB comprised of the REB Chair and one regular REB Member, the Research Ethics Officer and one regular REB member, or the REB Chair and the Research Ethics Officer.~~
- e. ~~The REB will strive to provide its decisions, and reasons for its decisions, within two weeks of receipt of a complete application that satisfies the criteria for delegated review.~~
- f. ~~Delegated subcommittees will strive to reach decisions by consensus. Where reviewers disagree, areas of disagreement will be discussed with the goal of reaching an outcome acceptable to all reviewers. In instances when reviewers are unable to reach consensus, the REB Chair or the Research Ethics Officer may choose to promote an application to Full Board Review.~~
- g. ~~Outcome of a Delegated Review:~~
 - i. ~~If an application is approved as submitted, the REB Chair or Research Ethics Officer will provide a letter of approval to the applicant.~~
 - ii. ~~If the REB subcommittee does not approve an application, the REB Chair or Research Ethics Officer will summarize in writing the reasons for the REB's decision, describe the nature of the REB's concerns, and suggest changes to the research and/or application.~~
 - iii. ~~Upon receipt of a revised application, the REB Chair and/or the Research Ethics Officer will determine whether the application shall be approved as resubmitted, or will be reviewed on a delegated basis.~~
 - iv. ~~The processes of review and resubmission will continue until the REB subcommittee determines that the project may proceed, or the applicant declines to resubmit the application. At any point during this process, and if requested in writing by the applicant, the REB will reconsider its decision.~~
 - v. ~~If an application is not approved following every effort (as above) to address REB concerns, the researcher has the right to appeal the REB's decision.~~

~~h. At the regular monthly meeting of REB, the Research Ethics Officer will report for REB information a summary of applications approved since the last meeting.~~

4.9 Review by a Faculty or Department Ethics Review Committee

- a. The REB and a Faculty or Department may enter into a Faculty or Department Ethics Review Agreement that sets out the conditions under which a Faculty or Department Ethics Review Committee may review minimal risk, course-based student research on behalf of the REB.
- b. 4.6 Research that meets all the following criteria may be reviewed by a Faculty or Department Ethics Review Committee approved by the REB:
 - i. Course-based student research conducted by a student as part of a course under supervision of faculty.
 - ii. Minimal risk research, defined 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.
 - iii. Research that does not involve persons or groups in vulnerable circumstances, invasive methods, sensitive subject matter, deception or withholding of information from participants.
- c. The Faculty or Department Ethics Review Committee shall be comprised of a Chair and at least one other identified Member associated with the relevant faculty or department, one of whom must be a current member of the REB.
- d. Applications for course-based student research are to be submitted to the REB using the REB's Application Form. The REB Chair or Research Ethics Officer will review and determine the appropriate Level of Review and will identify applications appropriate for Faculty Department or Ethics Committee review.
- e. Faculty or Department Ethics Review Committees shall adhere to documented review procedures approved by the REB.
- f. Twice annually, Faculty or Department Ethics Review Committees will provide to the REB PDF copies of all applications approved by the Faculty or Department Review Committee, including all approved recruitment, consent, and research instruments.

5. Continuing Review

- a. Applications for ethical review are approved for a maximum period of one year. Research may be approved for a shorter time period when appropriate.
- b. For research continuing after the approved period, prior to expiry the applicant shall submit to the REB an Application for Continuing Review that specifies:
 - i. Progress made in the research project to date.

Commented [CM57]: Maybe section 4.9 becomes 4.5.3?

Commented [CM58]: Shouldn't this section be renamed "Course-based Student Research"? Isn't this already mentioned at the beginning of section 4.5? Should "approval of university administration" be included here since that was mentioned in 4.5? Another suggestion: re-organize section 4.5 to include three sub-sections: 1 REB Committee Review 2 Delegated Review 3 Faculty/Department Ethics Review Committee This would then match up with how 4.7 through 4.9 are organized.

Commented [CT59R58]: I substantively reorganized related sections, as suggested, although I am not sure if the document is clearer as a result. I am happy to let others judge. (gosh I loath formatting!)

Commented [CM60]: big F faculty? (i.e. Faculty)?

Commented [CT61R60]: I think the big 'F' is warranted in a committee name.

Commented [CM62R60]: by big "F" I meant Faculties as academic divisions of the University such as the Faculty of Arts and Sciences versus "faculty" as in faculty member (employee). Sorry I wasn't clear in my original comment

Commented [CM63]: Isn't this onerous? It is potentially causing REB members to have a lot of work--i.e. REB Committee responsibilities and in addition, responsibilities for different Faculties/departments

Commented [CT64R63]: Two related issues here:

1) **Workload.** Typically, roughly 90% of REB applications are reviewed on a delegated basis; that is, 90% of applications are not reviewed by the full board. Out of concern for workload, REB members who are also members of a Faculty or Department Ethics Review Committee (FDERC) would not be asked to complete delegated reviews (i.e., they would only be asked to review applications at the Faculty of Department level and applications reviewed by the full board).

2) **Consistency of decisions and knowledge sharing.** Because the REB is responsible for all decisions made on its behalf, and because all decisions are potentially subject to appeal, there must be a mechanism for the REB to track, monitor, and when required **assess** decisions of FDERCs. The Chair and/or their designate also has/have the responsibility to ensure that all decisions consistently apply the same standard of review (see, e.g., TCPS Article 6.8). A ...

Commented [MV65]: Necessary to specify format? Perhaps just electronic copies?

Commented [CT66R65]: Suffice it to say here that applications are almost always received as multiple documents, often in disparate formats. The REB would prefer to receive from FDERCs one PDF file for each application rather than many documents for each ...

- ii. Any changes to procedures or study population implemented or proposed.
 - iii. Changes to research personnel.
 - iv. Any other changes that may affect risk or vulnerability of research participants.
- c. The REB Chair and/or the Research Ethics Officer will review Applications for Continuing Review and determine if the application is approved, or if further review is required.

6. Proportionate Approach to Review

The REB will employ a proportionate approach to review. Where risk to participants is high, the REB shall employ more rigorous review and oversight as required, such as by requiring more frequent reporting and review of records.

7. Obligation to Report Unanticipated Issues

Researchers shall report to the REB any unanticipated issues or events that may increase level of risk to participants or have ethical implications that may affect welfare of participants.

8. Conflict of Interest

- a. Members of the REB will disclose any real, potential or perceived personal interest in research reviewed by the REB and shall be absent during REB discussion leading to decisions pertaining to such applications.
- b. The REB will assess proposals for conflict of interest and will ensure researchers inform participants during the consent process of any real, potential, or perceived conflicts.
- c. The REB acts independently, at arm's-length from University administration, and shall maintain its decision-making autonomy even when the University has a strong interest in a REB decision.

9. Investigation and Findings of Non-Compliance

- a. In the course of fulfilling its obligation to review research on an ongoing basis, if the REB discovers that a research project has not adhered to, or is not adhering to, a research protocol approved by the REB, the REB may take the following incremental steps to address the situation:
 - I. Notify the researcher of the non-compliance and request that action be taken to address it;
 - II. Notify the researcher that the research is to be halted until the non-compliance is addressed;
 - III. Notify the Vice President Academic & Provost that a potential breach of Policy has occurred or is occurring.

Commented [CM67]: Yet members are appointed by the administration, so it is hard to say that there is arm's length here

Commented [MV68R67]: Agree

Commented [CT69R67]: Other than reference to the President, references to the involvement of administration in the appointment of the Chair and REB members have been removed from this draft (May 31st). See, also, my comment on the highest body appropriate to this function, above.

I encourage reviewers to consider that the REB Chair and members are appointed for a two-year term. Potential for undue influence on the REB is minimized by the length of term and the requirement for the President to select appointees and re-appointees from those recommended by the Research Ethics Officer and the current REB Chair. The President can decline to appoint a recommended candidate but cannot unilaterally "hand pick" appointees to the REB.

In reality, REBs often struggle to recruit members with advanced disciplinary knowledge of research methods/ethics who are willing to devote considerable time to an REB year-after-year. When we can find such people, Presidential appointments are often perfunctory with much gratitude for a difficult and sometimes thankless job (Chairs, especially).

Although both concerns are largely unfounded in my view, potential for removal of an REB Chair and/or members has a much greater potential to unduly influence an REB than appointments, in my opinion. Responsibilities, expected conduct, and potential for removal of regular REB members are addressed in the REB document entitled "Role, Responsibilities, and Expected Conduct of REB Members." If reviewers are concerned about potential for university administration to unduly influence REB decisions through real or perceived potential for revocation of appointment, I can develop policy language that addresses removal of the REB Chair.

REBs are established by Policy and by appointment of a Chair and members by the highest body of the institution. The REB acts independently and at arms length from university administration, as is stated. If there is still a concern with the current draft with regard to potential for undue influence, I look forward to discussing any specific suggestion/s reviewers may have.

Commented [MV70]: The appointment process for Chair and members is at odds with this statement. Changing the membership of the REB could favour certain decision outcomes in which the University has a vested interest.

Commented [CT71R70]: Ibid.

- b. The REB will investigate allegations of non-compliance with REB Policy and these Procedures, or complaints of improper research involving human participants, when requested by the Office Vice President Academic & Provost. The REB will only undertake these investigations in relation to the safety and welfare of the research participants and may stop the research to safeguard the wellbeing of participants.
- c. Disciplinary action is subject to the *Standards of Conduct Policy* of the University (Policy B.506) and thus falls outside the authority of the REB.


10. Appeal

- a. REB review will be guided by principles of natural and procedural justice in its decision-making. Such principles include providing reasonable opportunity to be heard, opportunity for rebuttal, and reasoned and written grounds for decisions. The researcher is responsible for providing in writing to the REB an explanation of why they believe the REB has misunderstood the Application or applied an inappropriate standard of review.
- b. The REB will not issue a final decision until after all reasonable efforts to reach a mutually agreeable outcome have been exhausted. Because ethics review and the observance of research ethics at the University is based on the collegial relations between the REB and researchers, a request for formal appeal should be a last resort.
- c. If an applicant believes that the REB has, in its final decision, misunderstood the application or applied an inappropriate standard of review, the applicant has recourse to the appeal process described below.
- d. The REB will establish and maintain an agreement with the Research Ethics Board of another University to serve as an Appeal Committee.
- e. Applicants who wish to appeal a final REB decision will within 30 days of the REB decision send a notice of appeal to the Office Vice President Academic & Provost. The notice of appeal should specify the decision being appealed and the reasons for the appeal. The Vice President Academic & Provost will refer the research in question to the Appeal Committee within **10 business days** of receipt of the Appeal. Copies of the application, REB decision/s, and all related correspondence shall be made available to the Appeal Committee.
- f. The Appeal Committee will consist of a quorum of the Research Ethics Board of the University with which the **Capilano** University has an Appeal Agreement.
- g. The Appeal Committee will notify the applicant, the REB, and the Office of the Vice President Academic & Provost of its decision in writing. Unless otherwise stated in its decision, the decision of the Appeal Committee shall be **final**.

Commented [CM72]: 10 business days?

Commented [CT73R72]: Good catch. "business days" is better. I would anticipate that there would need to be sufficient time for the VP to gather all relevant information and inquire whether all other reasonable efforts have been exhausted.


Commented [CT74]: Reviewers, thank you very much for your thoughtful comments on the draft. I look forward to more discussion.

	Policy No.	Replaces	Policy
	S2002-01	EC2002-01	Senate
	Policy Name		
	Research Ethics Policy: Research With Human Subjects		
Approved by	Responsibility		Category
Senate	Senate		
Date Issued	Date Revised	Review Date	Related Policies, Reference
January 2002	February 2012	February 2017	

THIS POLICY IS CURRENTLY UNDER REVISION

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Section A: Purpose	2
Section B: Governing Principles	2
Section C: Definitions	3
Section D: Procedures And Guidelines	5
Section E: Free And Informed Consent	9
Section F: Privacy And Confidentiality	12
Section G: Fairness And Equity In Research Participation	15
Section H: Research Involving The First Nations, Inuit And Metis People Of Canada	16
Section I: Clinical Trials	21
Section J: Human Biological Materials Including Materials Related To Human Reproduction	23
Section K: Human Genetic Research	27
Section L: Governance Of Research Ethics Review	29

	Policy No.	Replaces	Policy
	S2002-01	EC2002-01	Senate
	Policy Name		
Research Ethics Policy: Research With Human Subjects			
Approved by	Responsibility		Category
Senate	Senate		
Date Issued	Date Revised	Review Date	Related Policies, Reference
January 2002	February 2012	February 2017	

SECTION A: PURPOSE

The purpose of this policy is to ensure that research at Capilano University involving human participants is conducted to the highest ethical standards within all disciplines, protects the interest of human participants, and describes the institutional standards and procedures governing research. Capilano University recognizes the importance of research while committed to upholding the values of respect, welfare, and dignity for humans. This policy is in compliance with the standards specified by the Tri-Council Policy Statement on Ethical Research Involving Humans which is comprised of the Canadian Institute Health Research (CIHR), Natural Sciences and Engineering Council of Canada (NSERC), and the Social Sciences and Humanities Research Council of Canada (SSHRC). All of the Articles in this document are in reference to the Tri-Council Policy Statement (TCPS, 2010).

SECTION B: GOVERNING PRINCIPLES


In carrying out its responsibilities, researchers and the Research Ethics Board (REB) will act at times guided by the Tri-Council Policy Statement on Ethical Conduct for Research Involving Humans, or future standards that may come to stand its place. As noted in the Tri-Council statement, **Respect for human dignity** is the underlying ethical principle in conducting research involving humans. Research must be “conducted in a manner that is sensitive to the inherent worth of all human beings and the respect and consideration that they are due” (p. 8). The Tri-Council Policy guidelines express respect for human dignity through three core principles: **Respect for Persons, Concern for Welfare, and Justice.**

1. Respect for Persons

In accordance with the Tri-Council Policy Statement (Article 1.1), the principle of Respect for Persons “recognizes the intrinsic value of human beings and the respect and consideration that they are due” (p. 8). Research with humans should not treat individuals as merely a means to accomplishing the research objectives. Research involving humans must give priority to the welfare and integrity of the participant(s). Participants include those who are directly involved, and those who are indirectly involved through use of their data or biological materials.

Respect for persons presumes that individuals have autonomy and can make voluntary and informed decisions to participate in research. Respecting the individual's ability and right to freely give or refuse their consent to participate involves providing complete information about the purpose of the research, what is involved in the research, and about its risks and possible benefits. In making their decisions, participants must not be coerced or influenced within an imbalance of power in the relationship between researcher and participant, and participants with developing, impaired or diminished autonomy must be protected.

2. Concern for Welfare

	Policy No.	Replaces	Policy
	S2002-01	EC2002-01	Senate
	Policy Name		
Research Ethics Policy: Research With Human Subjects			
Approved by	Responsibility		Category
Senate	Senate		
Date Issued	Date Revised	Review Date	Related Policies, Reference
January 2002	February 2012	February 2017	

As participation in research has the potential to affect the welfare of an individual or group, it is vital to ensure that participants are not exposed to unnecessary risks to their physical, mental, spiritual, social and economic welfare, and that their rights to privacy and confidentiality be ensured. Such risks must be eliminated or minimized, and the benefits of the research must be maximized balanced against these risks.

3. Justice

“Justice refers to the obligation to treat all people fairly and equitably” (p. 10). Thus, the risk of harm from research and the benefits of the knowledge obtained from research should not be unfairly allocated to specific individuals or groups while neglecting or discriminating against others. Criteria for including and excluding individuals or groups as participants should be justified by the research question; groups should not be excluded from participating in research “arbitrarily or for reasons unrelated to the research question” (p.11). An imbalance of power that may exist between researcher and participant can be a threat to this principle.

SECTION C: DEFINITIONS

Research


For the purpose of this policy, research is defined as an undertaking intended to extend knowledge through a discipline based inquiry or any systematic investigation that is quantitative or qualitative in nature to establish facts, principles, or generalizable knowledge which involves humans as research participants.

Researcher

A researcher is defined as any person who undertakes to conduct research as defined above. This includes employees and students as well as persons from the community seeking approval of Capilano University for research.

Principal Investigator

The principal investigator is the researcher who has primary responsibility for a given research project. In the case of course-based research involving human participants (which is described in Section D.8), the faculty member advising a student engaged in a research project (including a minor or major project) shall function as the principal investigator for the purposes of complying with REB requirements.

	Policy No.	Replaces	Policy
	S2002-01	EC2002-01	Senate
	Policy Name		
Research Ethics Policy: Research With Human Subjects			
Approved by	Responsibility		Category
Senate	Senate		
Date Issued	Date Revised	Review Date	Related Policies, Reference
January 2002	February 2012	February 2017	

Human Research Participants

A human participant is any person who is exclusively a source of primary data in regards to the research conducted. This term may refer to a living human participant or groups of individuals about whom a researcher obtains: (1) data through direct or indirect interaction with the individual or group, or (2) identifiable private information. In addition, this term refers to research involving human biological materials derived from living and deceased individuals.

Minimal Risk

The current Tri-Council Policy Statement defines minimal risk as follows: “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” (p.23).

Informed Consent


The ethical requirements for consent in research are twofold: (1) individuals who participate in research should do so voluntarily, understanding the purpose of the research, and its risks and potential benefits as fully and as reasonably as possible and (2) those individuals who lack capacity to decide for themselves should nevertheless have the opportunity to participate in research that may be of benefit to themselves or others but an authorized third party, acting on the behalf of the individuals, should decide on whether participation is appropriate. In both cases, the principal investigator is responsible for ensuring that the consent process is followed and is responsible for the actions of any member of the research team involved in the consent process.

Conflict of Interest

Tri-Council Policy Statement defines conflict of interest as “The incompatibility of two or more duties, responsibilities, or interests (personal or professional) of an individual or institution as they relate to the ethical conduct of research, such that one cannot be fulfilled without compromising another.” (p. 190).

Confidentiality

The Tri-Council Policy Statement defines confidentiality as “The ethical and/or legal responsibility of individuals or organizations to safeguard information entrusted to them, from unauthorized access, use, disclosure, modification, loss or theft.” (p. 190).

	Policy No.	Replaces	Policy
	S2002-01	EC2002-01	Senate
	Policy Name		
Research Ethics Policy: Research With Human Subjects			
Approved by	Responsibility		Category
Senate	Senate		
Date Issued	Date Revised	Review Date	Related Policies, Reference
January 2002	February 2012	February 2017	

SECTION D: PROCEDURES AND GUIDELINES

D.1 Research Requiring Review

The Tri-Council Policy states (see Article 2.1) that all research involving humans requires ethics review prior to commencement of the research, notwithstanding the exceptions noted below. In accordance, research conducted under the auspices of Capilano University is subject to REB review including, but not limited to research: (1) that is conducted at Capilano University; (2) research where the principle investigator’s affiliation is with Capilano; (3) research where the researchers’ affiliation with Capilano had been specified in reports, publications, or contracts; and (4) research undertaken with Capilano’s students, faculty, resources or facilities.

REB review is ongoing throughout the duration of the research. Post REB approval of the initial research, any changes to the research project requires notification and approval of the REB for the research to continue.


All research that involves human participants requires review and approval by the Research Ethics Board (REB) of Capilano University, before the research is started, except as stipulated. Researchers shall submit their research proposals, including proposals for pilot studies, for REB review and approval of its ethical acceptability prior to the start of recruitment of participants, access to data, or collection human biological materials.

D.2 Proportionate Approach to Ethical Review

The REB will take a proportionate approach to the research ethics review such that the level of risk (i.e., the magnitude and probability of harm) determines the level of review. A full board review is required when the level of risk is moderate to high, while minimal risk research is generally eligible for delegated review. “Minimal risk” research is 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” (p. 23). Whether the review is delegated or a full board review, a proportionate approach involves consideration of foreseeable risks, the potential benefits and the ethical implications of the research (Article 2.9).

D.3 Full Review

When the proposal poses more than minimal risk, the REB will assess the harms and benefits of the proposed research project, assess whether the research design is capable of answering the research questions, and ensure that the research procedures and materials conform to established ethical standards.

	Policy No.	Replaces	Policy
	S2002-01	EC2002-01	Senate
	Policy Name		
Research Ethics Policy: Research With Human Subjects			
Approved by	Responsibility		Category
Senate	Senate		
Date Issued	Date Revised	Review Date	Related Policies, Reference
January 2002	February 2012	February 2017	

D.4 Expedited/Delegated Review

Where a proposal poses only minimal risk, or has received ethics approval from another institutions REB, the Chair (or another designated member) of the REB will review the proposal and its conformity to established research ethics standards and practices (Article 6.12). Course-based/course-related research will be eligible for delegated review (see D.8)

D.5 Review Procedure for On-going Research


Ongoing research shall have a continuing ethics review. In the research proposal submitted for REB review, the researcher shall also describe the continuing review process planned for the project which would normally consist of an annual status report to the REB and prompt notification to the REB when the project concludes. For research that is above minimal risk, the REB should receive reports at intervals on the progress of the research project.

D.6 Application for Ethics Review

The researcher is responsible for submitting the research proposal to the REB for review prior to initiating the research. It is the responsibility of the researcher to ensure that the research is carried out professionally and ethically, including the need to consider the principles of free and informed consent (Article 3.1), privacy and confidentiality (Article 5.2), conflict of interest (consult Tri-Council Policy Statement Chapter 7), and the needs of specific populations of research participants (consult Tri-Council Policy Statement Section Chapter 8). This also entails following the approved protocol and abiding by the decision of the REB.

A faculty member enrolled in a graduate program in another institution or otherwise conducting research approved by an REB at another institution shall submit a copy of the approval form from that institution prior to engaging in the project or upon becoming affiliated with Capilano University if the research is to be conducted under the auspices of Capilano University. If so, then approval from Capilano University's REB is required.

A researcher presenting a proposal for multi-centered research, research which involves Capilano University, and sites overseen by other REBs, must identify the research as such and provide Capilano University's REB with contact information for all REBs with potential oversight. The researcher may consider providing the REBs with detailed information regarding the core elements of the research, which cannot be altered without invalidating the pooling of data from the participating institutions, and those elements which can be altered to comply with local requirements without invalidating the research project. Capilano University's REB may coordinate their review of such projects with other REBs, including sharing information and concerns with the other REBs during the review process.

	Policy No.	Replaces	Policy
	S2002-01	EC2002-01	Senate
	Policy Name		
Research Ethics Policy: Research With Human Subjects			
Approved by	Responsibility		Category
Senate	Senate		
Date Issued	Date Revised	Review Date	Related Policies, Reference
January 2002	February 2012	February 2017	

Research to be performed outside of Canada shall undergo prospective ethics review both by Capilano University’s REB and by the REB, where such exists, with the legal responsibility and equivalent ethical and procedural safeguards in the county or jurisdiction where the research is to be done.

In addition to REB review, researchers who work with Aboriginal peoples need to consult the Tri-Council Policy Statement for guidance on such research. As well, researchers working with Aboriginal peoples should consult the protocols established in the governing councils of the local Aboriginal community in which they plan to work.

To undergo REB review, researchers will:

- submit the full research proposal that describes in sufficient detail the purpose of the research, the overall methodology, informed consent, copies of questionnaires or other research instruments, and a statement regarding approval from other REBs
- complete the online “Application for Ethics Review” (*UNDER DEVELOPMENT*)
- any additional materials or information that may be requested by the REB


D.7 Research Exempt from Ethics Review

Research involving publically available data does not require REB review when that information is (1) legally accessible and protected by law and (2) publicly accessible with no reasonable expectation of privacy (Article 2.2.). Examples include film, digital or audio recordings; online archival materials or published third-party interviews to which the public is given uncontrolled access on the Internet; documents accessible to the public; artistic installations, exhibitions, or literary events freely open to the public; or publications accessible in public libraries.

Research involving observations of people in public places where there is no expectation of privacy; dissemination of results would not identify individuals, and does not involve any intervention staged by the research nor was there direct interaction between the researcher and participants (Article 2.3).

Research about a living individual involved in the public arena, based exclusively on publicly available information such as documents, records, works, or performances is not required to undergo ethics review. Such research only requires ethics review if the individual is approached directly for interviews or access to private documents.

Program evaluations, performance reviews, testing, and quality assurance studies are exempt. These activities constitute assessments within an organization and are not subject to REB review except in cases where research is proposed that differs from the original intent of the data collection. For example, student grades or employee reviews would not constitute research as outlined in this policy (Article 2.5).

	Policy No.	Replaces	Policy
	S2002-01	EC2002-01	Senate
	Policy Name		
Research Ethics Policy: Research With Human Subjects			
Approved by	Responsibility		Category
Senate	Senate		
Date Issued	Date Revised	Review Date	Related Policies, Reference
January 2002	February 2012	February 2017	

Any research not affiliated with or supported by Capilano University, conducted by University employees on their own time, outside of their role at the University, not using University students or resources.

When in doubt about the applicability of this section of the policy to their research, researchers should consult with the REB.

D.8 Ethical Review of Course-based Research

According to the Tri-Council Policy Statement, course-based and course-related research is defined as follows: “Activities assigned to students within the context of a course that meets the definition of research but are not conducted for a research purpose. The intent of these activities is usually to give the students experience in the conduct of research (e.g., surveying other students outside of class, observing people at a concert, etc) and to provide material for a course-based project” (p. 190).


Although the intent of the many course-based/course-related research projects is not for publication or public dissemination, there may nevertheless be potential risks to human participants that require ethical review. However, course-based research intended solely for pedagogical purposes can be delegated to non-REB members for review such as a designated faculty member in the Department under which the course falls.

In delegating research ethics review, the REB should be assured that all designated reviewers have the appropriate experience, expertise, training and resources required to review the ethical acceptability of all aspects of the proposed course-based/course-related research to be in accordance with the Tri-Council Policy Statement (Article 6.12). The designated faculty member is required to complete the TCPS online tutorial and provide evidence of the certificate of completion.

As an alternate, in very small Departments, or Departments in which research with human participants is rare, or in which a Department thinks there is not adequate expertise in the field of research ethics, there may be on a semi-permanent basis collaboration with another Department where there is expertise in research ethics. An additional alternative is that the Department could request review and approval for the course-based/course-related research from the REB.

Once approved, the course would then be designated as a “Research Ethics Approved Course” and this designation will remain with the course as long as the course description and the general method of teaching the course does not change significantly. Course-based/course-related research for designated review should:

- Provide a copy of the course outline
- Demonstrate that the research is confidently expected to involve minimal risk

	Policy No.	Replaces	Policy
	S2002-01	EC2002-01	Senate
	Policy Name		
Research Ethics Policy: Research With Human Subjects			
Approved by	Responsibility		Category
Senate	Senate		
Date Issued	Date Revised	Review Date	Related Policies, Reference
January 2002	February 2012	February 2017	

- Demonstrate that the instructor holds primary responsibility the research and for students' adherence to the ethical standards outlined by this policy and the TCPS.
- Provide a general description of the type(s) of research activities that are likely to be part of the course.
- Provide the means by which the students of the course are made familiar with appropriate ethical standards.
- Provide a general description of how the student research activity will be monitored.
- Provide evidence that informed consent from participants will be obtained.
- The decisions and actions of the delegated review will be summarized in a report to the REB Chair (Article 6.12)

SECTION E: FREE AND INFORMED CONSENT

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; (2) their free and informed consent has been given and is maintained throughout their participation in the research and; (3) the participants, or authorized third parties are informed that consent can be withdrawn at any time without consequences, if withdrawal of data is not possible, participants should be informed of this prior to data collection (Article 3.1).


E.1 Requirement for Free and Informed Consent

Voluntariness of consent must be demonstrated because it respects human dignity and means that individuals have chosen to participate in research according to their own values, preferences and wishes. In considering voluntariness of consent, researchers and the REB should be cognizant of situations where undue influence, coercion or the offer of incentives many undermine the voluntariness of a participant's consent to participate in research (Article 3.1).

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

E.2 Informed Consent

The key to informed consent is that the prospective participants understand the information being conveyed to them by the researchers. At the commencement of any process researchers shall provide 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 opportunity to discuss and contemplate their

	Policy No.	Replaces	Policy
	S2002-01	EC2002-01	Senate
	Policy Name		
Research Ethics Policy: Research With Human Subjects			
Approved by	Responsibility		Category
Senate	Senate		
Date Issued	Date Revised	Review Date	Related Policies, Reference
January 2002	February 2012	February 2017	


participation. With the exceptions noted above, the information provided to participants by the researcher, or their qualified designated representatives, shall generally include the following for informed consent and be in accordance with Article 3.2:

- Information that the individual is being invited to participate in a research project
- A statement of the research purpose in plain language, the identity of the researcher, the identity of the funder or sponsor, the expected duration and nature of participation, a description of the research procedures, information about any payments, including incentives for participation, reimbursement for participation-related expenses and
- Plain language of all reasonably foreseeable risks and potential benefits both to the participants and in general, that may arise from research participation, as well as the likely consequences of non-action, particularly research related to treatment, or when invasive methodologies are involved, or when there is a potential for physical or psychological harm.
- An assurance to prospective participants, or authorized third parties, that they are free not to participate, have the right to withdraw at any time without prejudice to pre-existing entitlements, will be given continuing and meaningful opportunities for deciding whether or not to continue to participate, and will be given information on the right to request withdrawal of data or human biological materials, including any limitations on the feasibility of that withdrawal.
- The possibility of commercialization of research findings, and the presence of any real, potential or perceived conflicts of interest on the part of the researchers, their institutions or research sponsors. Researchers should separate, to the greatest extent possible, their role as researcher from their roles as teachers, advisors, consultants, supervisors, employers or the like. If a researcher is acting in dual roles, this must always be disclosed to the participant.

E.3 Capacity

Research may involve individuals who lack the capacity, either permanently or temporarily, to decide for themselves whether to participate. Many participants who lack the legal capacity to make decisions may still be able to express their wishes in a meaningful way, even if such expression may not fulfill all of the requirements for consent. Prospective participants may be capable of verbally or physically assenting to, or dissenting from, participation in research. According to Article 3.10, those who may be capable of assent or dissent include:

- Those whose capacity is the process of development, such as children whose capacity for judgment and self-direction is maturing;
- Those who were once capable of making an autonomous decision regarding consent but whose capacity is diminishing or fluctuating; and
- Those whose capacity remains only partially developed, such as those living with permanent cognitive impairment.

	Policy No.	Replaces	Policy
	S2002-01	EC2002-01	Senate
	Policy Name		
Research Ethics Policy: Research With Human Subjects			
Approved by	Responsibility		Category
Senate	Senate		
Date Issued	Date Revised	Review Date	Related Policies, Reference
January 2002	February 2012	February 2017	


Research may involve individuals who lack the capacity, either permanently or temporarily, to decide for themselves whether to participate, the REB shall ensure that, as a minimum, the following conditions are met in accordance with Article 3.9:

- The researcher involves participants who lack the capacity to consent on their own behalf to the to the greatest extent possible in the decision-making process
- The researcher seeks and maintains consent from authorized third parties in accordance with the best interest of the persons concerned. When authorization for participation was granted by a third party and a participant acquires or regains capacity during the course of the research, the researcher shall promptly see the participant’s consent as a condition of continuing participation.
- The authorized third party is not the researcher or any member of the research team.
- The researcher demonstrates that the research is being carried out for the participant’s direct benefit, or for the benefit of other persons in the same category. If the research does not have direct benefit to the participant but only for the benefit of the other persons in the same category, the researcher shall demonstrate that the research will expose the participant to only a minimal risk and minimal burden, and demonstrate how the participant’s welfare will be protected throughout the research.

E.4 Alteration of Consent in Minimal Risk Research

In accordance with Article 3.7, the REB may approve a consent procedure that does not include, or alters, some or all of the elements of informed consent set forth above, or waive the requirement to obtain informed consent, provided the REB finds and documents that:

- The research involves no more than minimal risk to the participants
- The waiver or alteration is unlikely to adversely affect the rights and welfare of the participants
- It would be impossible or impractical to carry out the research and to answer the research question properly if the prior consent of the participant was obtained
- Whenever possible and appropriate, after participation, or at a later time during the study, participants will be debriefed and provided with additional pertinent information at which point they will have the opportunity to refuse consent in accordance with Article 3.1
- The waived or altered consent does not involve a therapeutic intervention

	Policy No.	Replaces	Policy
	S2002-01	EC2002-01	Senate
	Policy Name		
Research Ethics Policy: Research With Human Subjects			
Approved by	Responsibility		Category
Senate	Senate		
Date Issued	Date Revised	Review Date	Related Policies, Reference
January 2002	February 2012	February 2017	

E.5 Research Involving Partial Disclosure or Deception

Some types of research can be carried out only if the participants do not know the true purpose of the research in advance. In some research that uses partial disclosure or deception, participants may not know that they are part of a research project until it is over, or they may be asked to perform a task and told about only one of several elements the researchers are observing. Research employing deception can involve a number of techniques, such as giving the participants false information about themselves, events, social conditions and/or the purpose of the research. For such techniques to fall within the exception to the general requirement of full disclosure for consent the research must meet the requirements of **Alteration of Consent in Minimal Risk Research** noted above and be in accordance with Article 3.7 of the TCPS.


- At completion of research conducted with partial disclosure or deception the researchers:
- Debrief participants as soon as is feasible. Debriefing is an important mechanism in maintaining the participant’s trust in the research community. The debriefing should be proportionate to the sensitivity of the issue. In some cases, such as research with children, it may be more appropriate to debrief the parents, guardians or authorized third parties rather the participants themselves. In other cases, it may more appropriate to debrief the entire family or community.
- Debrief while alert and sensitive to participant’s needs, feelings, reactions and concerns
- Following the debriefing, participants must nevertheless be able to indicate their consent or refusal at the conclusion of the project. In cases where participants express concerns about their participation in a project, the researcher may give participants the option of removing their data from the project. Where the terms of the research proposal do not permit the participants to withdraw their data, in the absence of the consent of the participant, the identity of the participants shall be protected at all times during and following completion of the project. Participants who have concerns should be given the contact information for the REB.
- Report to the REB concerns about the project raised by participants at the time of the debriefing.

SECTION F: PRIVACY AND CONFIDENTIALITY

F.1 Privacy

Article 5.0

Privacy refers to an individual’s right to be free from intrusion or interference by others. Individuals have privacy interests in relation to their bodies, personal information, expressed thought and opinions, personal communications with others, and spaces they occupy. An important aspect of privacy is the right to control information about oneself. Privacy is respected and an individual has the opportunity to exercise control over personal information by consenting to, or withholding consent for, the collection, use and/or

	Policy No.	Replaces	Policy
	S2002-01	EC2002-01	Senate
	Policy Name		
Research Ethics Policy: Research With Human Subjects			
Approved by	Responsibility		Category
Senate	Senate		
Date Issued	Date Revised	Review Date	Related Policies, Reference
January 2002	February 2012	February 2017	

disclosure of information. Privacy may be violated if the information provided by a participant may reasonably be expected to identify an individual.

For the purposes of this Policy, researchers and the REB shall consider whether information proposed for use in research is identifiable. The following categories provide guidance for assessing the extent to which information could be used to identify the individual:

- Directly identifying information ~ the information identifies a specific individual through direct identifiers (e.g, name, social insurance number, student number)
- Indirectly identifying information ~ the information can reasonably be expected to identify an individual through a combination of identifiers (e.g., date of birth, place of residence or unique personal characteristic).
- Coded information – direct identifiers are removed from the information and replaced with a code. Depending on access to the code, it may be possible to re-identify specific individuals
- Anonymized information ~ the information is irrevocably stripped of direct identifiers, a code is not kept to allow future re-linkage and the risk of re-identification of the individuals is low or very low
- Anonymous information ~ the information never had identifiers associated with it and the risk of identification is low or very low

Ethical concerns regarding privacy decrease as it becomes more difficult to associate information with a particular individual. These concerns also vary with the sensitivity of the information and the extent to which access, use or disclosure may harm an individual or group.


F.2 Confidentiality

Article 5.0

The ethical duty of confidentiality refers to the obligation of an individual or organization to safeguard entrusted information. The ethical duty of confidentiality includes to protect information from unauthorized access, use or disclosure, modification, loss or theft. Fulfilling the ethical duty of confidentiality is essential to the trust relationship between researcher and participant, and to the integrity of the research project.

In accordance with Article 5.2, researchers shall describe measures for meeting confidentiality obligations and explain any foreseeable disclosure requirements:

- In application materials submitted to the REB; and
- During the consent process with prospective participants

	Policy No.	Replaces	Policy
	S2002-01	EC2002-01	Senate
	Policy Name		
Research Ethics Policy: Research With Human Subjects			
Approved by	Responsibility		Category
Senate	Senate		
Date Issued	Date Revised	Review Date	Related Policies, Reference
January 2002	February 2012	February 2017	

F.3 Safeguarding Information

Article 5.3

Researchers shall provide details to the REB regarding their proposed measures for safeguarding information for the full cycle of information: its collection, use, dissemination, retention and/or disposal. Factors relevant to the REB’s assessment of the adequacy of the researchers’ proposed measures for safeguarding information include:


- The type of information to be collected
- The purpose for which the information will be used, and the purpose of any secondary use of identifiable information
- Limits on the use, disclosure and retention of the information;
- Risks to participants should the security of the data be breached, including risks of re-identification of individuals
- Appropriate security safeguards for the full cycle of information
- Any recording of observations (e.g, photographs, videos, sound recordings) in the research that may allow identification of particular participants;
- Any anticipated uses of personal information from the research;
- Any anticipated linkage of data gathered in the research with other data about participants, whether those data are contained in public or personal records, and;
- Provisions for confidentiality of data resulting from the research.

F.4 Consent and Secondary Use of Identifiable Information for Research Purposes

Article 5.5

Secondary use refers to the use in research of information originally collected for a purpose other than the current research purpose. Researchers who have not obtained consent from participants for secondary use of identifiable information shall only use such information for these purposes if the REB is satisfied that:

- Identifiable information is essential to the research;
- The use of identifiable information without the participants’ consent is unlikely to adversely affect the welfare of individuals to whom the information relates;
- The researchers will take appropriate measures to protect the privacy of individuals, and to safeguard the identifiable information;
- The researchers comply with any known preferences previously expressed by individuals about any use of their information;
- It is impossible or impracticable to seek consent from individuals to whom the information relates; and

	Policy No.	Replaces	Policy
	S2002-01	EC2002-01	Senate
	Policy Name		
	Research Ethics Policy: Research With Human Subjects		
Approved by	Responsibility		Category
Senate	Senate		
Date Issued	Date Revised	Review Date	Related Policies, Reference
January 2002	February 2012	February 2017	

- The researchers have obtained any other necessary permission for secondary use of information for research purposes.
- If a researcher satisfies all the conditions in Article 5.5 (a) to (f), the REB may approve the research without requiring consent from the individuals to whom the information relates.

SECTION G: FAIRNESS AND EQUITY IN RESEARCH PARTICIPATION

The principle of Justice holds that particular individuals, groups or communities should neither bear an unfair share of the direct burdens of participating in research, nor should they be unfairly excluded from the potential benefits of research participation. Issues of fair and equitable treatment arise in deciding whether and how to include individuals, groups or communities in research, and the basis for the exclusion of some.

G.1 Appropriate Inclusion

Article 4.1

Taking into account the scope and objectives of their research, researchers should be inclusive in selecting participants. Researchers shall not exclude individuals from the opportunity to participate in research on the basis of attributes such as culture, language, religion, race, disability, sexual orientation, ethnicity, linguistic proficiency, gender or age, unless there is a valid reason for exclusion.

G.2 Inappropriate Exclusion

Article 4.2; 4.3

Women should not be inappropriately excluded from research solely on the basis of gender or sex; or their reproductive capacity, or because they are pregnant or breastfeeding.

Article 4.4


Children shall not be inappropriately excluded from research solely on the basis of their developmental stage. The inclusion of children in research is subject to Article 4.6.

Article 4.5

Elderly people should not be inappropriately excluded from research solely on the basis of their age.

Article 4.6

Subject to applicable legal requirements, individuals who lack the capacity to consent to participate in research shall not be inappropriately excluded from research. Where a researcher seeks to involve

	Policy No.	Replaces	Policy
	S2002-01	EC2002-01	Senate
	Policy Name		
Research Ethics Policy: Research With Human Subjects			
Approved by	Responsibility		Category
Senate	Senate		
Date Issued	Date Revised	Review Date	Related Policies, Reference
January 2002	February 2012	February 2017	

individuals in research who do not have capacity to consent for themselves, the researcher shall, in addition to fulfilling the conditions in Article 3.10, satisfy the REB that:

- The research question can be addressed only with the participants within the identified group; and
- The research does not expose the participants to more than minimal risk without the prospect of direct benefits for them; or
- Where the research entails only minimal risk, it should at least have the prospect of providing benefits to participants or to a group that is the focus of research and to which the participants belong.

SECTION H: RESEARCH INVOLVING THE FIRST NATIONS, INUIT AND METIS PEOPLE OF CANADA

As noted in the Tri-Council Policy Statement, “research involving Aboriginal peoples in Canada has been defined and carried out primarily by non-Aboriginal researchers. The approaches used have not generally reflected Aboriginal world views, and the research has not necessarily benefited Aboriginal peoples or communities. As a result, Aboriginal peoples continue to regards research, particularly research originating outside their communities, with a certain apprehension or mistrust” (p. 105).


The ethical guidelines presented in this section are intended to be a “framework for the ethical conduct of research.... It is not intended to override or replace ethical guidelines offered by Aboriginal peoples themselves. Its purpose is to ensure, to the extent possible, that research involving Aboriginal peoples is premised on respectful relationships. It also encourages collaboration and engagement between researchers and participants” (p. 105).

H.1 Requirement of Community Engagement in Aboriginal Research

Article 9.1

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

- Research conducted on First Nations, Inuit or Métis lands;
- Recruitment criteria that include Aboriginal identity as a factor for the entire study or for a subgroup in the study;
- Research that seeks input from participants regarding a community’s cultural heritage, artifacts, traditional knowledge, or unique characteristics
- Research in which Aboriginal identity or membership in an Aboriginal community is used as variable for the purpose of analysis of the research data; and

	Policy No.	Replaces	Policy
	S2002-01	EC2002-01	Senate
	Policy Name		
Research Ethics Policy: Research With Human Subjects			
Approved by	Responsibility		Category
Senate	Senate		
Date Issued	Date Revised	Review Date	Related Policies, Reference
January 2002	February 2012	February 2017	

- Interpretation of research results that will refer to Aboriginal communities, peoples, language, history or culture.

Article 9.2

The nature and extent of community engagement in a project shall be determined jointly by the researcher and the relevant community, and shall be appropriate to community characteristics and the nature of the research.

H.2 Respect for First Nations, Inuit and Métis Governing Authorities

Article 9.3

Where a proposed research project is to be conducted on lands under the jurisdiction of a First Nations, Inuit and Métis authority, researchers shall seek the engagement of formal leaders of the community. Research ethics review by Capilano University's REB and any responsible community body recognized by the First Nations, Inuit and Métis authority is required in advance of recruiting and securing consent of individuals.

H.3 Engagement with Organizations and Communities of Interest

Article 9.4

For the purpose of community engagement and collaboration in research undertakings, researchers and the REB shall recognize Aboriginal organizations, including First Nations, Inuit and Métis representative bodies, and service organizations and communities of interest, as communities. They shall also recognize these groups through representation of their members on ethical review and oversight of projects, where appropriate.

H.4 Complex Authority Structures


Article 9.5

Where alternatives to securing the agreement of formal leadership are proposed for research on First Nations, Inuit and Métis lands or organizational communities, researchers should engage community processes and document measures taken, to enable the REB to review the proposal with due consideration to complex community authority structures.

H.5 Recognizing Diverse Interest with Communities

Article 9.6

In engaging territorial or organizational communities, researchers should ensure, to the extent possible, that they take into consideration the views of all relevant sectors – including individuals and subgroups who

	Policy No.	Replaces	Policy
	S2002-01	EC2002-01	Senate
	Policy Name		
Research Ethics Policy: Research With Human Subjects			
Approved by	Responsibility		Category
Senate	Senate		
Date Issued	Date Revised	Review Date	Related Policies, Reference
January 2002	February 2012	February 2017	

may not have a voice in the formal leadership. Groups or individuals whose circumstances make them vulnerable may need or desire special measures to ensure their safety in the context of a specific project. Those who have been excluded in the past may need special measures to ensure their inclusion in research.

H.6 Critical Inquiry

Article 9.7

Research involving Aboriginal peoples that critically examines the conduct of public institutions, First Nations, Inuit and Métis governments, institutions or organizations or persons exercising authority over First Nations, Inuit and Métis individuals may be conducted ethically, notwithstanding the usual requirement of engaging community leaders.

H.7 Respect for Community Customs and Codes of Practice

Article 9.8

Researchers have an obligation to become informed about, and to respect, the relevant customs and codes of research practice that apply in the particular community or communities affected by their research. Inconsistencies between community custom and Capilano University's Ethics Policy should be identified and address in advance of initiating the research, or as they arise.

H.8 Institutional Research Ethics Review Required


Article 9.9

Research ethics review by community REB or other responsible bodies at the research site will not be a substitute for review by Capilano University's REB.

H.9 Requirement to Advise the REB on a Plan for Community Engagement

Article 9.10

When proposing research expected to involve First Nations, Inuit and Métis participants, researchers shall advise the REB at Capilano University as to how they have engaged, or intend to engage, the relevant community. Alternatively, researchers may seek REB approval for an exception to the requirement of community engagement, on the basis of an acceptable rationale.

	Policy No.	Replaces	Policy
	S2002-01	EC2002-01	Senate
	Policy Name		
Research Ethics Policy: Research With Human Subjects			
Approved by	Responsibility		Category
Senate	Senate		
Date Issued	Date Revised	Review Date	Related Policies, Reference
January 2002	February 2012	February 2017	

H.10 Research Agreements

Article 9.11

Where a community has formally engaged with a researcher or research team through a designated representative, the terms and undertakings of both the researcher and the community should be set out in a research agreement before participants are recruited.

H.11 Collaborative Research

Article 9.12

As part of the community engagement process, researchers and communities should consider applying a collaborative and participatory approach as appropriate to the nature of the research, and the level of ongoing engagement desired by the community.

H.12 Mutual Benefits in Research

Article 9.13

Where the form of community engagement and the nature of the research make it possible, research should be relevant to community needs and priorities. The research should benefit the participating community (e.g., training, local hiring, recognition of contributors, return of results), as well as extend the boundaries of knowledge.

H.13 Strengthening Research Capacity


Article 9.14

Research projects should support capacity building through enhancement of the skills of community personnel in research methods, project management, and ethical review and oversight.

H.14 Recognition of the Role of Elders and Other Knowledge Holders

Article 9.15

Researchers should engage the community in identifying Elders or other recognized knowledge holders to participate in the design and execution of the research, and the interpretation of findings in the context of cultural norms and traditional knowledge. Community advice should also be sought to determine appropriate recognition for the unique advisory role fulfilled by these persons.

	Policy No.	Replaces	Policy
	S2002-01	EC2002-01	Senate
	Policy Name		
Research Ethics Policy: Research With Human Subjects			
Approved by	Responsibility		Category
Senate	Senate		
Date Issued	Date Revised	Review Date	Related Policies, Reference
January 2002	February 2012	February 2017	

H.15 Privacy and Confidentiality

Article 9.16

Researchers and community partners shall address privacy and confidentiality for communities and individuals early on in the community engagement process. The extent to which limited or full disclosure of personal information related to the research is to be disclosed to community partners shall be addressed in research agreements where these exist. Researchers shall not disclose personal information to community partners without the participants consent.

H.16 Interpretation and Dissemination of Research Results

Article 9.17

Researchers should afford community representatives engaged in collaborative research an opportunity to participate in the interpretation of the data and the review of research findings before completion of the final report, and before finalizing all relevant publications resulting from the research.

H.17 Intellectual Property Related to Research

Article 9.18

In collaborative research, intellectual property rights should be discussed by researchers, communities and Capilano University. The assignment of rights, or grant of licenses and interests in material that may flow from the research, should be specified in a research agreement (as appropriate) before the research is conducted.

H.18 Collection of Human Biological Materials Involving Aboriginal Peoples


Article 9.19

As part of community engagement, researchers shall address and specify in the research agreement the rights and proprietary interests of individuals and communities, to the extent such exist, in human biological materials and associated data to be collected, stored and used in the course of the research.

H.19 Secondary Use of Information or Human Biological Materials Identifiable as Originating from Aboriginal Communities or Peoples

Article 9.20

Secondary use of data and human biological material identifiable as originating from an Aboriginal community or peoples is subject to REB review.

	Policy No.	Replaces	Policy
	S2002-01	EC2002-01	Senate
	Policy Name		
Research Ethics Policy: Research With Human Subjects			
Approved by	Responsibility		Category
Senate	Senate		
Date Issued	Date Revised	Review Date	Related Policies, Reference
January 2002	February 2012	February 2017	

Researchers shall engage the community from which that data or human biological materials and associated identifiable information originate, prior to initiating secondary use where:

- Secondary use has not been addressed in a research agreement and has been authorized by the participants in their original individual consent; or
- There is no research agreement; and
- The data are not publicly available or legally accessible

Article 9.21

Where research relies only on publicly available information, or on legally accessible information, community engagement is not required. Where the information can be identified as originating from a specific community or a segment of the Aboriginal community at large, seeking culturally informed advice may assist in identifying risks and potential benefits for the source community.

Article 9.22

REB review is required where the researcher seeks data linkage of two or more anonymous datasets or data associated with human biological materials and there is a reasonable prospect that this could generate information identifiable as originating from a specific Aboriginal community or a segment of the Aboriginal community at large.

SECTION I: CLINICAL TRIALS

According to the Tri-Council Policy statement, a clinical trial is any investigation involving participants that evaluates the effects of one or more health-related interventions on health outcomes.


I.1 Clinical Trials include, but are not restricted to, drugs, radiopharmaceuticals, cells and other biological products, surgical procedures, radiologic procedures, devices, genetic therapies, natural health products, process of care changes, preventive care, manual therapies and psychotherapies

Article 11.1

In the design and review of a such clinical trials noted above, researchers and the REB shall consider the type of trial (e.g., pharmaceutical, natural product, medical device, psychotherapy), its phase (if appropriate) and the corresponding particular ethical issues associated with it, in light of the core principles of the Tri-council Policy Statement and those outlined in this Capilano University's Ethics Policy.

In a proposal submission for research ethics review, the researcher shall:

- Clearly specify the type of trial proposed (and, where relevant, its phase)
- Identify foreseeable risks and potential benefits to participants

	Policy No.	Replaces	Policy
	S2002-01	EC2002-01	Senate
	Policy Name		
	Research Ethics Policy: Research With Human Subjects		
Approved by	Responsibility		Category
Senate	Senate		
Date Issued	Date Revised	Review Date	Related Policies, Reference
January 2002	February 2012	February 2017	

- Demonstrate how this information will be clearly communicated to participants in the informed consent process

The REB reviewing clinical trials need to be familiar with the ethical issues raised by the different types of clinical trials. If the REB does not have members with the appropriate expertise to review a particular trial, then it shall seek out someone with the necessary expertise to consult as an ad hoc advisor (see Section L.3).

I.2 Clinical Trials: Placebo-Controlled Trials

A clinical trial in which one or more interventions are compared with a placebo control group raises specific ethical issues. Where there is an established effective treatment, use of placebo may deprive participants of needed therapy. It is the responsibility of the researcher to provide justification to the REB for the choice of placebo control group, as opposed to the other possible choices of control group (e.g., active control or wait-list control). The following Articles set out the criteria for placebo control group.


Article 11.2

- A new therapy or intervention should generally be tested against an established effective therapy.
- As with all alternative choices of control, a placebo control is ethically acceptable in a randomized clinical trial only if:
 - Its use is scientifically and methodologically sound in establishing the efficacy or safety of the test therapy or intervention; and
 - It does not compromise the safety or health of participants; and
 - The researcher articulates to the REB compelling scientific justification for the use of the placebo control
- For clinical trials involving placebo control, the researcher and the REB shall ensure the general principals of consent are respected and that participants or their authorized third parties are specifically informed:
 - About any therapy that will be withdrawn or withheld for purposes of the research; and
 - Of the anticipated consequences of withdrawing or withholding the therapy.

I.3 Assessing Safety and Minimizing Risk

Articles 11.4, 11.5, 11.6, 11.7, 11.8 and 11.9

Participants enrolled in clinical trials are commonly exposed to investigational therapies, interventions, drugs or devices, each of which carries specific and possibly unknown risk. Because of the nature of clinical interventions, the potential harms can be physical, psychological or social and may cause lasting, irreparable damage.

	Policy No.	Replaces	Policy
	S2002-01	EC2002-01	Senate
	Policy Name		
Research Ethics Policy: Research With Human Subjects			
Approved by	Responsibility		Category
Senate	Senate		
Date Issued	Date Revised	Review Date	Related Policies, Reference
January 2002	February 2012	February 2017	

In accordance with the core principles of the Tri-Council Policy Statement and Capilano University’s Ethics Policy, it is the responsibility of the researchers and the REB to ensure that:

- Foreseeable risks to participants are minimized and appropriately evaluated alongside potential benefits
- Participants are clearly informed as the nature of foreseeable risks and potential benefits
- The plan for monitoring participant safety is clearly stated and accurately reported
- Any new information that may impact on the welfare of participants, or their decision to remain involved in a trial, be shared appropriately.

I.4 Financial Conflicts of Interest

Article 11.10

Researchers and the REB should be aware of and consider the possibility of financial conflicts of interest. Financial considerations shall not affect standards of participant’s safety or the scientific validity and transparency of trial procedures.

Related to this is that the REB shall ensure that clinical budgets are reviewed to ensure that conflicts of interest are identified and minimized, or otherwise managed (Article 11.11).

I.5 Analysis and Dissemination of Clinical Trial Outcomes

Article 11.12


With respect to research findings:

- Capilano University and the REB will take reasonable measures to ensure that sponsors, researchers publish or otherwise disseminate the analysis data and interpretation of clinical trial results in a timely manner without undue restriction; and
- Any prohibition or undue limitation on the publication of dissemination of scientific findings from clinical trials is ethically unacceptable.

SECTION J: HUMAN BIOLOGICAL MATERIALS INCLUDING MATERIALS RELATED TO HUMAN

REPRODUCTION

The Tri-Council Policy Statement notes that “the sources of these materials can be from patients following diagnostic or therapeutic procedures, autopsy specimens, donations of organs or tissue from living or dead humans, body wastes or abandoned tissue. Ethical considerations raised by research involving human biological materials centre on acceptable access to, and use of, the materials, potential privacy concerns

	Policy No.	Replaces	Policy
	S2002-01	EC2002-01	Senate
	Policy Name		
Research Ethics Policy: Research With Human Subjects			
Approved by	Responsibility		Category
Senate	Senate		
Date Issued	Date Revised	Review Date	Related Policies, Reference
January 2002	February 2012	February 2017	

arising from handling of information derived from such materials, and the special status some individuals and groups accord to the human body and its parts” (p. 169).

J.1 Human Biological Materials Including Materials Related to Human Reproduction

Article 12.1

Research involving collection and use of human biological materials requires REB review and:

- Consent of the participant who will donate biological materials; or
- Consent of an authorized third party on behalf of the participant who lacks capacity, taking into account any research directive that applies to the participant; or
- Consent of a deceased participant through a donation decision made prior to death , or by an authorized third party


Article 12.2

To seek consent for use of human biological materials in research, researchers shall provide of prospective participants or authorized third parties, issues regarding Section E, informed consent, as well as the following details:

- The type and amount of biological materials to be taken
- The manner in which biological materials will be taken, and the safety and invasiveness of the procedures for acquisition
- The intended use of the biological materials, including any commercial use
- The measures employed to protect the privacy of and minimize risks to participants
- The length of time the biological materials will be kept, who they will be preserved, location of storage (e.g., in Canada, outside of Canada), and process for disposal, if applicable
- Any anticipated linkage of biological materials with information about the participant; and
- The researchers’ plan for handling results and findings, including clinically relevant information and incidental findings.

J.2 Consent and Secondary use of Identifiable Human Biological Materials

Capilano University’s Ethics Policy does not require that researchers seek consent from individuals for the secondary use of non-identifiable human biological materials. In the case of the secondary use of identifiable human biological materials, researchers must obtain consent in accordance with applicable laws, unless the researcher satisfies all the requirements noted below.

	Policy No.	Replaces	Policy
	S2002-01	EC2002-01	Senate
	Policy Name		
Research Ethics Policy: Research With Human Subjects			
Approved by	Responsibility		Category
Senate	Senate		
Date Issued	Date Revised	Review Date	Related Policies, Reference
January 2002	February 2012	February 2017	

Article 12.3

Researchers who have not obtained consent from participants for the secondary use of identifiable human biological materials shall only use such material for these purposes if the REB is satisfied that:

- Identifiable human biological materials are essential to the research;
- The use of identifiable human biological materials without the participant’s consent is unlikely to adversely affect the welfare of individuals from whom the materials were collected;
- The researchers will take appropriate measures to protect the privacy of individuals and to safeguard any use of their biological materials
- It is impossible or impractical to seek consent from individuals from whom the materials were collected; and
- The researchers have obtained any other necessary permission for secondary use of human biological materials for research purposes.

J.3 Storage and Banking for Human Biological Materials

Article 12.5

Capilano University and researchers that maintain biobanks:

- Shall ensure that they have or use appropriate facilities, equipment, policies and procedures to store human biological materials safely, and in accordance with applicable standards
- Shall establish appropriate physical, administrative and technical safeguards to protect human biological materials and any information about participants from unauthorized handling.


J.4 Research Involving Materials Related to Human Reproduction

Employing the definitions from the Tri-Council Policy Statement, the following definitions apply:

“Embryo means a human organism during the first 56 days of its development following fertilization or creation, excluding any time during which its development has been suspended, and includes any cell derived from such an organism that is used for the purpose of creating a human being.

Fetus means a human organism during the period of its development beginning on the 57 day following fertilization or creation, excluding any time during which its development has been suspended, and ending with birth.

Fetal tissue includes membranes, placenta, umbilical cord, amniotic fluid and other tissue that contains genetic information about the fetus.

	Policy No.	Replaces	Policy
	S2002-01	EC2002-01	Senate
	Policy Name		
Research Ethics Policy: Research With Human Subjects			
Approved by	Responsibility		Category
Senate	Senate		
Date Issued	Date Revised	Review Date	Related Policies, Reference
January 2002	February 2012	February 2017	

Human reproductive materials means a sperm, ovum or other human cell, or human gene, and includes any part of them” (p.176 – 177).

Article 12.6

In addition to requirements that apply to all research involving human biological materials, the following guidelines apply to research involving materials related to reproduction:

- Research using materials related to human reproduction in the context of an anticipated or ongoing pregnancy shall not be undertaken if the knowledge sought can reasonably be obtained by alternative means
- Materials related to human reproduction for research shall not be obtained through commercial transaction, including exchange for services.

Article 12.7


Research on in vitro embryos already created and intended for implantation to achieve pregnancy is acceptable if:

- The research is intended to benefit the embryo;
- Research interventions will not compromise the care of the woman, or the subsequent fetus;
- Researchers closely monitor the safety and comfort of the woman and the safety of the embryo, and
- Consent was provided by the gamete donors.

Article 12.8

Research involving embryos that have been created for reproductive or other purposes permitted under the *Assisted Reproduction Act* , but are no longer required for these purposes, may be ethically acceptable if:

- The ova and sperm from which they are formed were obtained in accordance with Article 12.7;
- Consent was provided by the gamete donors;
- Embryos exposed to manipulations not directed specifically to their ongoing normal development will not be transferred for continuing pregnancy; and
- Research involving embryos will take place only during the first 14 days after their formation by combination of the gametes, excluding any time during which embryonic development has been suspended.

	Policy No.	Replaces	Policy
	S2002-01	EC2002-01	Senate
	Policy Name		
Research Ethics Policy: Research With Human Subjects			
Approved by	Responsibility		Category
Senate	Senate		
Date Issued	Date Revised	Review Date	Related Policies, Reference
January 2002	February 2012	February 2017	

Article 12.9

Research involving a fetus or fetal tissue:

- Requires the consent of the woman; and
- Should not compromise the woman's ability to decide to continue with her pregnancy

Article 12.10

Researchers who intend to conduct research to derive or use pluripotent stem cells shall follow the *Guidelines for Human Pluripotent Stem Cell Research*, as amended time to time and published by the Canadian Institutes of Health Research.

SECTION K: HUMAN GENETIC RESEARCH

As outlined in the Tri-Council Policy Statement, "Genetic information has implications beyond the individual because it may reveal information about biological relatives and others with whom the individual shares genetic ancestry. The participation of an individual in genetic research may therefore have ramifications for these other persons, communities or groups. In some cases, researchers specifically seek to conduct genetic research with members of families, communities or groups that requires particular attention to the social and cultural contexts in which participants live. Research with families, communities or groups may raise special considerations regarding recruitment of participants, consent processes, privacy and confidentiality.

K.1 Human Genetic Research

Article 13.1


Guidance regarding a proportionate approach to research ethics review, consent, privacy, confidentiality, research with human biological materials and other ethical guidance described in earlier sections of this Policy apply equally to human genetic research .

K.2 Plans for Managing Information Revealed Through Genetic Research

Article 13.2

Researchers conducting genetic research shall:

- In their proposal, develop a plan for managing information that may be revealed through their genetic research;
- Submit their plan to the REB; and

	Policy No.	Replaces	Policy
	S2002-01	EC2002-01	Senate
	Policy Name		
Research Ethics Policy: Research With Human Subjects			
Approved by	Responsibility		Category
Senate	Senate		
Date Issued	Date Revised	Review Date	Related Policies, Reference
January 2002	February 2012	February 2017	

- Advise prospective participants of the plan for managing information revealed through the research.

Article 13.3

Where researchers plan to share findings with individuals, researchers shall provide participants with an opportunity to:

- Make informed choices about whether they wish to receive information about themselves; and
- Express preferences about whether information will be shared with biological relatives, or others with whom the participants have a family, community or group relationship.

Article 13.4

Where researchers plan to share results of genetic research with participants, the research proposal should make genetic counselling available at the time, where appropriate.

K.3 Genetic Research Involving Families

Article 13.5

Researchers who seek to recruit members of a family to participate in genetic research shall:

- ensure recruitment processes respect privacy and other personal interests of family members; and
- seek consent from individual family members.

K.4 Genetic Research Involving Communities and Groups


Article 13.6

Where researchers intend to recruit participants for genetic research based on their membership in specific communities or groups, it may be appropriate for researchers to discuss the research with community or group members, and/or their leaders, in addition to seeking consent from individual participants. In these cases, researchers shall provide details to the REB about their proposed methods for engaging in discussion.

K.5 Genetic Material Banks

Article 13.7

Researchers who propose research involving the collection and banking of genetic material shall indicate in their research proposal, and in the information they provide to prospective participants, how they plan to address the associated ethical issues, including confidentiality, privacy, storage, use of the data and results, possibility of commercialization of research findings and withdrawal by participants as well as future contact of participants, families, communities and groups.

	Policy No.	Replaces	Policy
	S2002-01	EC2002-01	Senate
	Policy Name		
	Research Ethics Policy: Research With Human Subjects		
Approved by	Responsibility		Category
Senate	Senate		
Date Issued	Date Revised	Review Date	Related Policies, Reference
January 2002	February 2012	February 2017	

Researchers who propose research involving the secondary use of previously collected and banked genetic material shall, likewise, indicate in their research proposal how they plan to address associated ethical issues.

SECTION L: GOVERNANCE OF RESEARCH ETHICS REVIEW

L.1 Establishment of Research Ethics Board (REB)


In accordance with Article 6.1, Capilano University shall establish a REB to review the ethical acceptability of all research involving humans conducted within the institution’s jurisdiction or under its auspices, that is, by their faculty, staff or students, regardless of where the research is conducted, in accordance with the Tri-Council Policy Statement.

Capilano University does agree to provide the REB with necessary and sufficient ongoing financial and administrative resources to fulfill their duties. The REB is independent in its decision making and is accountable to the President’s Office (Article 6.2).

Capilano University shall grant the REB the mandate to review the ethical acceptability of research on behalf of the institution, including approving, rejecting, proposing modifications to, or terminating any proposed or ongoing research involving humans. This mandate shall be more fully articulated in L.2 below and shall apply to research conducted under the auspices or within the jurisdiction of the institution (Article 6.3).

L.2 Mandate of the REB

Ensuring that ethical principles are applied to research involving human participants is the responsibility of the Research Ethics Board. The REB has two primary roles; to be educative and to review research proposals. In the educative role, the REB serves the Capilano University research community as a consultative body and thus, contributes to the education in research ethics. In its review role, the REB has the responsibility to approve, reject, propose modifications to, or terminate any proposed or ongoing research involving human participants that is conducted within, or by members of Capilano University including faculty, staff and students, using the considerations set forth in the Tri-Council Policy Statement (TCPS-2, 2010) as the minimum standard.

	Policy No.	Replaces	Policy
	S2002-01	EC2002-01	Senate
	Policy Name		
Research Ethics Policy: Research With Human Subjects			
Approved by	Responsibility		Category
Senate	Senate		
Date Issued	Date Revised	Review Date	Related Policies, Reference
January 2002	February 2012	February 2017	

L.3 Membership of the REB

The membership of the REB is designed to ensure competent independent research ethics review. Provisions respecting its size, composition, terms of appointment and quorum are set out below in accordance with Article 6.4.

The REB shall consist of at least 6 members, including both women and men, of whom:


- at least three are faculty members, each of whom is from a different Faculty within Capilano University, who have expertise in relevant research disciplines, fields and methodologies covered by the REB
- at least one member is knowledgeable in ethics
- at least one member is knowledgeable in the relevant law (but that member should not be the Capilano University’s legal counsel or risk manager).
- at least one member has no affiliation with Capilano University and is recruited from the community served by the institution.

It is advisable that each member be appointed to formally fulfill the requirements of only one of the above categories. To ensure the independence of the REB decision making, institutional senior administration shall not serve on the REB.

- The Chair is responsible for ensuring that the REB review process conforms to the requirements of the Tri-Council policy statement. The Chair is a voting member whose vote becomes the deciding vote in the event of a tie.
- The institution should consider the nomination of substitute REB members such that the REB may continue to function when regular members are unable to attend due to illness or other unforeseen eventualities. The appointment of substitute members should not alter the REB membership composition and these members should have the appropriate knowledge, expertise and training to contribute to the research ethics review process.
- The REB should have provisions for consulting ad hoc advisors in the event that it lacks the specific expertise or knowledge to review the ethical acceptability of a research proposal competently. Ad hoc members are consulted for a specific research ethics review and for the duration of that review. Ad hoc advisors should not be counted in the quorum for an REB, nor be allowed to vote on REB decisions.

L.4 Terms of Appointment

Articles 6.6, 6.8

	Policy No.	Replaces	Policy
	S2002-01	EC2002-01	Senate
	Policy Name		
Research Ethics Policy: Research With Human Subjects			
Approved by	Responsibility		Category
Senate	Senate		
Date Issued	Date Revised	Review Date	Related Policies, Reference
January 2002	February 2012	February 2017	

The three representatives from the different Faculties at Capilano University will be selected, one of whom will be elected by the REB, to serve as the Chair. In addition, the REB will select a Vice-Chair who will assume the duties of the Chair when the Chair is absent. The member knowledgeable in ethics, the member knowledgeable in the law and the community member will be appointed by the President.


- All members of the REB shall attend a workshop or orientation to reinforce the principles and practices of ethical review. All members of the REB are required to complete the on-line tutorial, TCPS 2: CORE that can be accessed at <http://www.pre.ethics.gc.ca/eng/education/tutorial-didacticiel/>
- Regular attendance by REB members at meetings is required. Frequent unexplained absences will be construed as a notice of resignation.
- Members of the REB will normally serve for two-year terms. An annual, staggered system of nomination and selection will be employed to ensure continuity in fulfilling the required tasks of the REB. Members can be re-nominated and selected for consecutive terms. Normally, no more than three consecutive terms will be served. Terms will begin and end using the academic year or as occasioned by unexpected vacancies.
- When it is anticipated that the REB will require new members, the Chair of the REB will inform the community at Capilano University of the need for new members and the expertise to be filled on the REB. After receiving the nominations, the Chair will review with the REB and then present a list of individuals who meet the relevant expertise requirements to the Vice President of Academic, who in turn, recommends a list to the President. The President or President's delegate then appoints the new member of the REB.

L.5 Meetings and Attendance

Article 6.10

The REB shall meet regularly to discharge its responsibilities and shall normally meet face to face to review proposed research that is not assigned to delegated review. A schedule of when the REB will sit to review research proposals will be communicated to the faculty, staff and students of Capilano University. The REB may request informal meetings with each other prior to the formal review process in order to expedite and facilitate the review process. Such informal meetings cannot, however, substitute for the formal review process.

The REB may hold general meetings, retreats, and educational workshops for members for education, discussion of issues, or revision of policies. The REB will also promote and communicate the policy of Research Ethics with Human Participants to, and provide educational opportunities, the faculty, staff and students at Capilano University.

	Policy No.	Replaces	Policy
	S2002-01	EC2002-01	Senate
	Policy Name		
Research Ethics Policy: Research With Human Subjects			
Approved by	Responsibility		Category
Senate	Senate		
Date Issued	Date Revised	Review Date	Related Policies, Reference
January 2002	February 2012	February 2017	

L.6 Conflicts of Interest

Article 7.3

If the REB is reviewing research in which a member of the REB has a personal interest in the research under review (e.g., as a researcher or as an entrepreneur), conflict of interest principles require that the member not be present when the REB is discussing or making its decision. It is expected that all REB members must disclose actual, perceived or potential conflicts of interest. The REB member may offer evidence to the REB provided the conflict is fully explained to the REB and the researcher has the right to hear the evidence and to offer a rebuttal.

Disclosure of the conflict of interest will comply with Capilano University's Conflict of Interest Policy.

L.7 Record Keeping


Article 6.17

Minutes of all REB meetings shall be prepared and maintained by the *Teaching and Learning Centre* on behalf of the REB. The minutes shall clearly document attendance at the meetings, the REB's decisions, any dissents and the reasons for them. REB decisions should be supported by clear references (e.g., date of decision, title of the project), documentary basis for decision (e.g., documents or progress reports received and reviewed), the plan for continuing ethics review and timelines, reasons for decisions, and any conditions or limitations attached to the proposal. Providing reasons for REB decisions is optional when ethics approval is granted.

Capilano University and its REB shall prepare and maintain adequate documentation of REB activities including the following:

- Copies of all research proposals reviewed, certificates of approval, scientific evaluations, if any, that accompany the proposals, approved sample consent documents, progress reports submitted by investigators, and reports of injuries to research participants
- Records of continuing review activities
- Copies of all correspondence between the REB and research investigators
- A list of REB members and contact information
- Written procedures for the REB

Records required by this policy shall be retained for at least 7 years, and records relating to research which is conducted shall be retained for at least 7 years after the completion of the research. All minutes shall be accessible for inspection and copying by authorized representatives of Capilano University, researchers, sponsors, funding agencies, Government, Departments, or Agencies at reasonable times and in a reasonable manner.

	Policy No.	Replaces	Policy
	S2002-01	EC2002-01	Senate
	Policy Name		
Research Ethics Policy: Research With Human Subjects			
Approved by	Responsibility		Category
Senate	Senate		
Date Issued	Date Revised	Review Date	Related Policies, Reference
January 2002	February 2012	February 2017	

L.8 Decision-Making

The REB shall meet on a regular basis to review proposed research that is not delegated to expedited review. The REB review shall be based upon fully detailed research proposals or, where applicable, progress reports. The REB shall function impartially, provide a fair hearing to those involved and provide reasoned and appropriately documented opinions and decisions. The REB shall accommodate reasonable requests from researchers to participate in discussions about their proposals, but researchers shall not be present when the REB is making its decisions. When an REB is considering a negative decision, it shall provide the researcher with all the reasons for doing so and give the researcher an opportunity to reply before making a final decision.

Final decisions in full review of projects that are based on a majority quorum (where the Committee at first meeting will decide its own quorum) will be adopted only if the members attending the meeting possess the range and background outlined in Section L.3 of this policy.

The REB shall notify research investigators and Capilano University in writing of its decision to:


- Approve the proposed research activity as submitted; or
- Require minor modifications to the proposed research activity. The resubmitted proposal would be reviewed by the Chair or Vice-Chair of the REB; or
- Require significant modifications or additional information or major revisions. The resubmitted proposal would be reviewed by the REB; or
- Disapprove the proposed research activity.

A subcommittee consisting of the Chair and Vice-Chair of the REB will conduct the expedited reviews, will follow the same format as the full REB in recording minutes and communicating results and will send a copy of the minutes and decisions/recommendations made to the REB.

L.9 Reconsideration

Article 6.18

Where researchers do not receive ethics approval, or receive approval conditional on revisions that they find compromise the feasibility or integrity of the proposed research, they are entitled to reconsideration by the REB. The REB is to be guided by principles of natural and procedural justice in their decision-making. Such principles include providing a reasonable opportunity to be heard, an explanation for the reasons for opinions or decisions, and the opportunity for rebuttal, fair and impartial judgment, and reasoned and written grounds for the decisions. The researcher may seek advice from the *Teaching and Learning Centre* for assistance to improve the researcher's request for ethical review.

	Policy No.	Replaces	Policy
	S2002-01	EC2002-01	Senate
	Policy Name		
Research Ethics Policy: Research With Human Subjects			
Approved by	Responsibility		Category
Senate	Senate		
Date Issued	Date Revised	Review Date	Related Policies, Reference
January 2002	February 2012	February 2017	

L.10 Appeals

Article 6.19

In cases where the researchers and the REB cannot reach agreement through reconsideration, Capilano University will permit review of the REB's decision. Capilano University shall enter into an agreement with an institution, whose Human Research Ethics Board, shall function as the Appeal Board for the purposes outlined in this policy. In return for providing the Appeal Board, Capilano University's REB may be made available to hear appeals of the applications rejected by the REB of the other institution.

Researchers wishing to appeal a decision of the REB to reject a research proposal or to rescind approval of on-going research previously approved by the REB, shall within 30 days, provide the President's Office with the following:

- The application as submitted to Capilano University's REB
- A statement of ground for appeal, and
- The ground for rejection of the application or rescindment of the approval issued by Capilano University's

Provided that the grounds of the appeal are consistent with this policy, and the memorandum of understanding establishing Capilano University's Appeal Board, the President's Office shall submit the materials to the Appeal Board within 10 working days of receipt of the materials described above.


Where the appeal concerns on-going research, the REB may direct that the research be suspended during the reconsideration dialogue and appeal process.

All appeal decisions of the Appeal Board shall be final and binding upon Capilano University and the researcher. Written documentation of the Appeal Board's decision will remain on record with Capilano University's REB.

L.11 Review Procedure for Ongoing Research

The REB shall maintain a continuing interest in the research after the project has undergone ethical approval and ongoing research is subject to continuing ethics review. An ongoing status report on the research must be submitted to the REB by the researcher annually, or as required by the REB. The rigour of the continuing review will be in accordance with a proportionate approach to ethics assessment. If a change in the research procedure is contemplated, the researchers will immediately submit an amended proposal to the REB for review.

In addition to the above requirement, the REB may work with the researcher to develop an appropriate plan for continuing review and the reporting structure for the termination of the project. A report, in the

	Policy No.	Replaces	Policy
	S2002-01	EC2002-01	Senate
	Policy Name		
Research Ethics Policy: Research With Human Subjects			
Approved by	Responsibility		Category
Senate	Senate		
Date Issued	Date Revised	Review Date	Related Policies, Reference
January 2002	February 2012	February 2017	

format specified by the REB must be submitted by the researcher to the REB within 60 days of request for review. Some examples of continuing review plans include:

- Formal review of the process of free and informed consent
- Establishment of a safety monitoring committee
- Periodic review by a third party of the documents generated by the study
- Review of reports of adverse events

L.12 Breach of Policy

Capilano University reserves the right to immediately halt any research involving human participants that has been started without the required approval from, or which does not comply with the institution's REB.

SENATE REPORT

AGENDA ITEM:	Faculty of Global and Community Studies Bylaws
PURPOSE:	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Approval <input type="checkbox"/> Information <input type="checkbox"/> Discussion
MEETING DATE:	September 14, 2021
PRESENTER:	Corey Muench; Chair, Senate Bylaw, Policy, and Procedure Committee

PURPOSE

Suggested revisions to the Faculty of Global and Community Studies (GCS) Bylaws were brought forward for review and approval at the September 14, 2021 meeting of the Senate Bylaw, Policy and Procedure Committee (SBPP).

BACKGROUND

Senate passed the Faculty of Global and Community Studies Bylaws in May of 2020. Subsequently, some changes to operational details and terminology have been suggested in order to facilitate the enactment of the bylaws and to better align with current job titles in the GCS Faculty.

OVERVIEW & CONSULTATIONS:

On May 27, 2021, the GCS Governance Enhancement Team (GET) recommended a few revisions to the GCS Faculty Bylaws. In addition, at a later meeting on May 27, the GCS Faculty Council endorsed these recommended revisions to enhance the participation of GCS administrative staff for operational efficiencies. The revised GCS bylaws were approved unanimously at the August 30, 2021 Faculty meeting. They were then brought to SBPP on September 14, 2021.

HIGHLIGHTS OF PROPOSED CHANGES BROUGHT TO SENATE BYLAW, POLICY, AND PROCEDURE COMMITTEE:

The attached agenda item includes a track changes/comment version and clean version of the revised bylaws. The summary of revisions are presented below.

1. References to the Dean’s Assistant have been revised with Administrative Lead in line with an updated position title within the University.
2. References to the ex officio voting have been removed.
3. The clause in section 2 e) has been updated to remove the one student per school requirement.
4. The clause 8.2.5. has been revised as per below:
Three (3) administrative staff employed within the Faculty, preference for lead staff in schools
5. The title “liaison librarian” was added in section 2c at the SBPP stage upon recommendation since librarians are not actually appointed as faculty members in specific Faculties.

DOCUMENTS FOR SENATE REVIEW

Two versions of the proposed revisions are provided for Senate: a version with “track changes” and with comments visible; and a clean, finalized version. The edits in the “track changes” version of the document were mostly proposed prior to the SBPP stage. The Senate Bylaws, Policy, and Procedure Committee accepted all of the changes and proposed only one change to the bylaws subsequent to the previous consultations with other groups. (See item 5 above.)

RECOMMENDATION

THAT the revisions to the *Faculty of Global and Community Studies Bylaws* be recommended to Senate for approval.

Faculty of Global and Community Studies Bylaws

Approved by the Faculty on August 30, 2021

Ratified/Approved by Senate on TBD,

PREAMBLE

The structure, composition, powers and duties of the Faculty are established by Sections 39-42 of the *University Act* (the Act) which requires university Faculties to establish rules for the governance, direction, and management of affairs and business with representation from the membership.

1. DEFINITIONS

- 1.1 Key terms in these bylaws follow definitions in the Act.
- 1.2 Other clarifications:
 - 1.3 “Faculty” (upper-case “F”) refers to the Faculty of Global and Community Studies.
 - 1.4 “faculty” (lower-case “f”) refers to instructional employees of the Faculty.
 - 1.5 “student” refers to a person currently enrolled in credit courses in the university and registered into one of the programs in the Faculty.
 - 1.6 “staff” refers to administrative support employees of the Faculty.
 - 1.7 “University” means Capilano University.

2. COMPOSITION OF THE FACULTY

The Faculty is composed of the following, for All-Faculty meetings:

- a) The Dean of the Faculty of Global and Community Studies;
- b) The President or designate;
- c) All faculty appointed in the Faculty of Global and Community Studies including instructors, lab supervisors, special appointees, and instructional associates; and liaison librarians;
- d) Such other members of the teaching or administrative staff of the Faculty or University as the Faculty shall appoint in conformity with rules determined by the Faculty and approved by the Senate; staff are non-voting members of the Faculty;
- e) Five (5) students as non-voting representatives; and
- f) The Registrar as a non-voting member.

3. POWERS AND DUTIES OF THE FACULTY

Section 40 of the Act sets the powers and duties, and limits to these powers and duties (see Appendix 1).

4. CHAIR AND VICE CHAIR

- 4.1 The Dean is the Chair of the Faculty.
- 4.2 A Vice-Chair is elected from the faculty for a two-year term. The Vice-Chair serves as the Chair in the absence of the Dean, or when the Dean steps outside of the role of the Chair in a regular meeting of the Faculty.

5. REGULAR MEETINGS OF THE FACULTY

- 5.1 The Faculty will hold a minimum of three (3) regular meetings per year, one (1) per academic semester. A minimum of fourteen (14) days' notice will be given prior to these meetings.
- 5.2 Agendas are prepared by the Chair and published and distributed to all members of the Faculty at least seven (7) days before the scheduled meeting.
- 5.3 Minutes of these regular Faculty meetings are taken, circulated, and archived by the Faculty Administrative Lead.
- 5.4 Quorum of regular Faculty meetings consists of twenty-five percent (25%) or twenty (20) members (in person or by proxy) of the Faculty of Global and Community Studies, whichever is the lower number.
- 5.5 Minutes of each meeting will be circulated at the subsequent meeting.

6. EXTRAORDINARY MEETINGS OF THE FACULTY

- 6.1 In matters of urgency, extraordinary meetings will be called by:
 - a) The Chair (Dean); or
 - b) The Vice-Chair in combination with the School Chairs/Coordinators or written petition of at least fifty percent (50%) of voting members.
- 6.2 Notice of extraordinary meetings will be given at least (7) days prior to the meeting.
- 6.3 Minutes of extraordinary meetings will be taken and circulated prior to the subsequent regular meeting of the Faculty.
- 6.4 Extraordinary meetings of the Faculty will normally be closed to the University community.

7. CONDUCT OF BUSINESS

- 7.1 Regular meetings of the Faculty will normally be open to members of the University community. The Chair will recognize at the beginning of meetings any non-members of the Faculty.
- 7.2 A meeting, or part thereof, may be held *in camera* subject to a majority vote by those present and eligible to vote.
- 7.3 *Robert's Rules of Order* will govern the conduct of all Faculty meetings.

- 7.4 Normal resolutions or motions require a simple majority of fifty percent (50%) plus one (1) to pass. Amendments to these Bylaws require a majority of two-thirds (2/3) of voting members present to pass.
- 7.5 To conduct its ordinary business in a timely and efficient way, the Faculty will establish a Faculty Council and relevant standing sub-committees.
- 7.6 The powers and duties of the Faculty Council and sub-committees are delegated to them by the Faculty but will not include matters on which the Senate requires a decision of the whole Faculty.

8. FACULTY COUNCIL

- 8.1 The Faculty of Global and Community Studies Council is the working academic governance body for the Faculty of the Global and Community Studies and is responsible for the Faculty's academic governance, planning, and management and for making recommendations to the Faculty, the Senate, and the University administration where appropriate.
- 8.2 *Composition of the Faculty Council:*
 - 8.2.1 The Dean of the Faculty of Global and Community Studies;
 - 8.2.2 The Vice-Chair of the Faculty
 - 8.2.3 The Chairs or Coordinators of the Schools;
 - 8.2.4 Program convenors;
 - 8.2.5 Three (3) administrative staff employed within the Faculty, preference for lead staff in schools, and
 - 8.2.6 Two (2) student representatives elected by students in the Faculty, for one (1) year.
- 8.3 *Chair and Vice-Chair:*
 - 8.3.1 The Chair of the Faculty Council is the Dean.
 - 8.3.2 The Vice-Chair of the Faculty Council is the Vice-Chair of the Faculty.
 - 8.3.3 The Vice-Chair will serve as chair in the absence of the Chair.
- 8.4 *Meetings of the Faculty Council and Conduct of Business:*
 - 8.4.1 The Faculty Council will meet a minimum of once per month between August 15th and June 15th.
 - 8.4.2 A schedule of meetings will be distributed at the beginning of the fall term.
 - 8.4.3 Agendas are prepared by the Chair with the help of Faculty Administrative Lead and distributed to the Faculty at least seven (7) days before the scheduled meeting.

- 8.4.4 Minutes are taken, produced, and archived by the Faculty Administrative Lead.
 - 8.4.5 Draft minutes of each meeting are circulated with the agenda for the subsequent meeting.
 - 8.4.6 Quorum for the Faculty Council meetings is set at fifty percent (50%) of voting members and must include the Chair or Vice-Chair in the absence of the Chair.
 - 8.4.7 Resolutions or motions require a simple majority of fifty percent (50%) plus one (1) to pass.
 - 8.4.8 Elections for elected positions will be conducted concurrently with elections for other elected positions in the Faculty, normally in the spring term in time for the next academic year's scheduling deadlines.
 - 8.4.9 Members of the Faculty Council are expected to act in the interests of the entire Faculty and to avoid conflicts of interest, in accordance with University Policy B.506.
- 8.5 *Powers and Duties of the Faculty Council:*
- 8.5.1 The powers and duties of the Faculty Council are delegated to it by the Faculty.
 - 8.5.2 In general, the Faculty Council will:
 - a) Develop and maintain a set of Faculty rules and procedures for the governance of the Faculty (in accordance with the Act and subject to the approval of the Faculty and subsequent ratification by the Senate);
 - b) Make recommendations to the Faculty regarding joint-curricular initiatives with other Faculties;
 - c) Make recommendations to the Senate, Board, and University administration on relevant matters;
 - d) Facilitate information sharing within the Faculty and both to and from other Faculties, service areas, and non-academic administrative areas of the University;
 - e) Form standing sub-committees to expedite conduct of its business and delegate limited authority to these committees. Sub-committees will conduct their business in accordance with their prescribed terms of reference. The terms of reference for the sub-committees will be approved by the Faculty upon the recommendation of the Faculty Council;
 - f) Form any *ad hoc* committees it deems necessary and expedient.

9. STANDING SUB-COMMITTEES OF THE FACULTY COUNCIL

9.1 Curriculum Committee

9.1.1 Meets monthly during the fall and spring terms. The meeting schedule is set by the Chair of the sub-committee and distributed by the Dean's office.

9.1.2 Duties and responsibilities are set in the sub-committee's terms of reference.

9.2 Strategic Planning Committee

9.2.1 Meets at least once during each fall and spring terms. The meeting schedule is set by the Chair of the sub-committee and distributed by the Dean's office.

9.2.2 Duties and responsibilities are set in the sub-committee's terms of reference.

9.3 Government Enhancement Team

9.3.1 Meets at least once during each fall and spring term. The meeting schedule is set by the Chair of the sub-committee and distributed by the Dean's office.

9.3.2 Duties and responsibilities are set in the sub-committee's terms of reference.

10. REVIEW

These Bylaws will be reviewed one (1) year after initial approval by the Senate and subsequently every five (5) years.

Version date: May 28, 2021

Review date: Spring 2026,

Appendix 1

Part 8 — Faculties

Faculties

39 (1) The faculties of each university may be constituted by the board, on the recommendation of the senate.

(2) A dean of a faculty is the chair of the faculty of which he or she is the dean.

Powers and duties of faculty

40 A faculty has the following powers and duties:

- a) to make rules governing its proceedings, including the determining of the quorum necessary for the transaction of business;
- b) to provide for student representation in the meetings and proceedings of the faculty;
- c) subject to this Act and to the approval of the senate, to make rules for the government, direction and management of the faculty and its affairs and business;
- d) to determine, subject to the approval of the senate, the courses of instruction in the faculty;
- e) subject to an order of the president to the contrary, to prohibit lecturing and teaching in the faculty by persons other than appointed members of the teaching staff of the faculty and persons authorized by the faculty, and to prevent lecturing or teaching so prohibited;
- f) subject to the approval of the senate, to appoint for the examinations in each faculty examiners, who, subject to an appeal to the senate, must conduct examinations and determine the results;
- g) to deal with and, subject to an appeal to the senate, to decide on all applications and memorials by students and others in connection with their respective faculties;
- h) generally, to deal with all matters assigned to it by the board or the senate.

Approval of rules

41 A general rule made by a faculty is not effective or enforceable until a copy has been sent to the senate and the senate has given its approval.

Advice to president

42 Any of the faculties may advise the president in any matter affecting the interests of the university, whether academic or disciplinary, but that advice does not limit the powers and authority of the president.

University Act: http://www.bclaws.ca/Recon/document/ID/freeside/00_96468_01#part8



Faculty of Global and Community Studies Bylaws

Approved by the Faculty on ~~August 30, 2021~~ April 2, 2020

Ratified/Approved by Senate on ~~TBD, May 12, 2020~~

PREAMBLE

The structure, composition, powers and duties of the Faculty are established by Sections 39-42 of the *University Act* (the Act) which requires university Faculties to establish rules for the governance, direction, and management of affairs and business with representation from the membership.

1. DEFINITIONS

- 1.1 Key terms in these bylaws follow definitions in the Act.
- 1.2 Other clarifications:
 - 1.3 "Faculty" (upper-case "F") refers to the Faculty of Global and Community Studies.
 - 1.4 "faculty" (lower-case "f") refers to instructional employees of the Faculty.
 - 1.5 "student" refers to a person currently enrolled in credit courses in the university and registered into one of the programs in the Faculty.
 - 1.6 "staff" refers to administrative support employees of the Faculty.
 - 1.7 "University" means Capilano University.

2. COMPOSITION OF THE FACULTY

The Faculty is composed of the following, for All Faculty meetings:

- a) The Dean of the Faculty of Global and Community Studies;
- b) The President or designate;
- c) All faculty appointed in the Faculty of Global and Community Studies including instructors, lab supervisors, special appointees, and instructional associates; and liaison librarians;
- d) Such other members of the teaching or administrative staff of the Faculty or University as the Faculty shall appoint in conformity with rules determined by the Faculty and approved by the Senate; staff are non-voting members of the Faculty;
- e) Five (5) students ~~(one per school)~~ as non-voting representatives; and
- f) The Registrar as a non-voting member of the Faculty.

Commented [CM1]: Change to "All-Faculty"?

Formatted: Highlight

Formatted: Highlight

Commented [CM2]: Tania Alekson: Status of librarian changed to "liaison librarian" and put at end of this item

Formatted: Strikethrough

Formatted: Strikethrough, Highlight

Formatted: Strikethrough

Commented [CM3]: Don't delete the word "member" here.

Formatted: Strikethrough, Highlight

Formatted: Strikethrough, Highlight

3. POWERS AND DUTIES OF THE FACULTY

Section 40 of the Act sets the powers and duties, and limits to these powers and duties (see Appendix 1).

4. CHAIR AND VICE CHAIR

- 4.1 The Dean is the Chair of the Faculty.
- 4.2 A Vice-Chair is elected from the faculty for a two-year term. The Vice-Chair serves as the Chair in the absence of the Dean, or when the Dean steps outside of the role of the Chair in a regular meeting of the Faculty.

5. REGULAR MEETINGS OF THE FACULTY

- 5.1 The Faculty will hold a minimum of three (3) regular meetings per year, one (1) per academic semester. A minimum of fourteen (14) days' notice will be given prior to these meetings.
- 5.2 Agendas are prepared by the Chair and published and distributed to all members of the Faculty at least seven (7) days before the scheduled meeting.
- 5.3 Minutes of these regular Faculty meetings are taken, circulated, and archived by the ~~Assistant to the Dean~~ Faculty Administrative Lead.
- 5.4 Quorum of regular Faculty meetings consists of twenty-five percent (25%) or twenty (20) members (in person or by proxy) of the Faculty of Global and Community Studies, whichever is the lower number.
- 5.5 Minutes of each meeting will be circulated at the subsequent meeting.

Formatted: Strikethrough, Highlight

Formatted: Highlight

6. EXTRAORDINARY MEETINGS OF THE FACULTY

- 6.1 In matters of urgency, extraordinary meetings will be called by:
 - a) The Chair (Dean); or
 - b) The Vice-Chair in combination with the School Chairs/Coordinators or written petition of at least fifty percent (50%) of voting members.
- 6.2 Notice of extraordinary meetings will be given at least (7) days prior to the meeting.
- 6.3 Minutes of extraordinary meetings will be taken and circulated prior to the subsequent regular meeting of the Faculty.
- 6.4 Extraordinary meetings of the Faculty will normally be closed to the University community.

7. CONDUCT OF BUSINESS

- 7.1 Regular meetings of the Faculty will normally be open to members of the University community. The Chair will recognize at the beginning of meetings any non-members of the Faculty.
- 7.2 A meeting, or part thereof, may be held *in camera* subject to a majority vote by those present and eligible to vote.
- 7.3 *Robert's Rules of Order* will govern the conduct of all Faculty meetings.
- 7.4 .

Commented [CM4]: Remove item 7.4 as it is blank

- 7.5 Normal resolutions or motions require a simple majority of fifty percent (50%) plus one (1) to pass. Amendments to these Bylaws require a majority of two-thirds (2/3) of voting members present to pass.
- 7.6 To conduct its ordinary business in a timely and efficient way, the Faculty will establish a Faculty Council and relevant standing sub-committees.
- 7.7 The powers and duties of the Faculty Council and sub-committees are delegated to them by the Faculty, but will not include matters on which the Senate requires a decision of the whole Faculty.

Commented [CM5]: delete comma

8. FACULTY COUNCIL

8.1 The Faculty of Global and Community Studies Council is the working academic governance body for the Faculty of the Global and Community Studies and is responsible for the Faculty’s academic governance, planning, and management and for making recommendations to the Faculty, the Senate, and the University administration where appropriate.

8.2 *Composition of the Faculty Council:*

- 8.2.1 The Dean of the Faculty of Global and Community Studies (~~ex officio,~~ voting);
- 8.2.2 The Vice-Chair of the Faculty (~~ex officio, voting~~);
- 8.2.3 The Chairs or Coordinators of the Schools (~~ex officio, voting~~);
- 8.2.4 Program convenors;
- 8.2.5 ~~Two (2) administrative staff employed within the Faculty. Three (3) administrative staff employed within the Faculty, preference for lead staff in schools.~~ (~~ex officio, voting~~), and
- 8.2.6 Two (2) student representatives elected ~~edive~~ by students in the Faculty, for one (1) year.

Commented [ES6]: Default for all is voting

Formatted: Strikethrough, Highlight

Formatted: Strikethrough

Formatted: Strikethrough, Highlight

Formatted: Strikethrough

Formatted: Strikethrough, Highlight

Formatted: Strikethrough

Formatted: Strikethrough, Highlight

Formatted: Highlight

Formatted: Strikethrough, Not Expanded by / Condensed by , Highlight

Formatted: Not Strikethrough, Highlight

Formatted: Highlight

Formatted: Strikethrough, Highlight

Formatted: Highlight

8.3 *Chair and Vice-Chair:*

- 8.3.1 The Chair of the Faculty Council is the Dean.
- 8.3.2 The Vice-Chair of the Faculty Council is the Vice-Chair of the Faculty.
- 8.3.3 The Vice-Chair will serve as chair in the absence of the Chair.

8.4 *Meetings of the Faculty Council and Conduct of Business:*

- 8.4.1 The Faculty Council will meet a minimum of once per month between August 15th and June 15th.
- 8.4.2 A schedule of meetings will be distributed at the beginning of the fall term.
- 8.4.3 Agendas are prepared by the Chair with the help of ~~Assistant to the Dean, Faculty Administrative Lead~~ and distributed to the Faculty at least seven (7) days before the scheduled meeting.

Formatted: Strikethrough, Highlight

Formatted: Highlight

- 8.4.4 Minutes are taken, produced, and archived by the ~~Assistant to the Dean~~
Faculty Administrative Lead.
- 8.4.5 Draft minutes of each meeting are circulated with the agenda for the subsequent meeting.
- 8.4.6 Quorum for the Faculty Council meetings is set at fifty percent (50%) of voting members and must include the Chair or Vice-Chair in the absence of the Chair.
- 8.4.7 Resolutions or motions require a simple majority of fifty percent (50%) plus one (1) to pass.
- 8.4.8 Elections for elected positions will be conducted concurrently with elections for other elected positions in the Faculty, normally in the spring term in time for the next academic year's scheduling deadlines.
- 8.4.9 Members of the Faculty Council are expected to act in the interests of the entire Faculty and to avoid conflicts of interest, in accordance with University Policy B.506.

8.5 *Powers and Duties of the Faculty Council:*

- 8.5.1 The powers and duties of the Faculty Council are delegated to it by the Faculty.
- 8.5.2 In general, the Faculty Council will:
- a) Develop and maintain a set of Faculty rules and procedures for the governance of the Faculty (in accordance with the Act and subject to the approval of the Faculty and subsequent ratification by the Senate);
 - b) Make recommendations to the Faculty regarding joint-curricular initiatives with other Faculties;
 - c) Make recommendations to the Senate, Board, and University administration on relevant matters;
 - d) Facilitate information sharing within the Faculty and both to and from other Faculties, service areas, and non-academic administrative areas of the University;
 - e) Form standing sub-committees to expedite conduct of its business and delegate limited authority to these committees. Sub-committees will conduct their business in accordance with their prescribed terms of reference. The terms of reference for the sub-committees will be approved by the Faculty upon the recommendation of the Faculty Council;
 - f) Form any *ad hoc* committees it deems necessary and expedient.

Formatted: Strikethrough, Highlight

Formatted: Highlight

9. STANDING SUB-COMMITTEES OF THE FACULTY COUNCIL

9.1 *Curriculum Committee*

- 9.1.1 Meets monthly during the fall and spring terms. The meeting schedule is set by the Chair of the sub-committee and distributed by the Dean's office.
- 9.1.2 Duties and responsibilities are set in the sub-committee's terms of reference.

9.2 *Strategic Planning Committee*

- 9.2.1 Meets at least once during each fall and spring terms. The meeting schedule is set by the Chair of the sub-committee and distributed by the Dean's office.
- 9.2.2 Duties and responsibilities are set in the sub-committee's terms of reference.

9.3 *Government Enhancement Team*

- 9.3.1 Meets at least once during each fall and spring term. The meeting schedule is set by the Chair of the sub-committee and distributed by the Dean's office.
- 9.3.2 Duties and responsibilities are set in the sub-committee's terms of reference.

10. REVIEW

These Bylaws will be reviewed one (1) year after initial approval by the Senate and subsequently every five (5) years.

Version date: ~~May 28, 2021~~ ~~April 20, 2020~~

Review date: ~~Spring 2026~~ ~~May 5, 2020~~



Appendix 1

Part 8 — Faculties

Faculties

39 (1) The faculties of each university may be constituted by the board, on the recommendation of the senate.

(2) A dean of a faculty is the chair of the faculty of which he or she is the dean.

Powers and duties of faculty

40 A faculty has the following powers and duties:

- a) to make rules governing its proceedings, including the determining of the quorum necessary for the transaction of business;
- b) to provide for student representation in the meetings and proceedings of the faculty;
- c) subject to this Act and to the approval of the senate, to make rules for the government, direction and management of the faculty and its affairs and business;
- d) to determine, subject to the approval of the senate, the courses of instruction in the faculty;
- e) subject to an order of the president to the contrary, to prohibit lecturing and teaching in the faculty by persons other than appointed members of the teaching staff of the faculty and persons authorized by the faculty, and to prevent lecturing or teaching so prohibited;
- f) subject to the approval of the senate, to appoint for the examinations in each faculty examiners, who, subject to an appeal to the senate, must conduct examinations and determine the results;
- g) to deal with and, subject to an appeal to the senate, to decide on all applications and memorials by students and others in connection with their respective faculties;
- h) generally, to deal with all matters assigned to it by the board or the senate.

Approval of rules

41 A general rule made by a faculty is not effective or enforceable until a copy has been sent to the senate and the senate has given its approval.

Advice to president

42 Any of the faculties may advise the president in any matter affecting the interests of the university, whether academic or disciplinary, but that advice does not limit the powers and authority of the president.

University Act: http://www.bclaws.ca/Recon/document/ID/freeside/00_96468_01#part8



**SENATE CURRICULUM COMMITTEE
RESOLUTION MEMO**

DATE: September 20, 2021
TO: Paul Dangerfield, Chair, Senate
FROM: Deb Jamison, Chair, Senate Curriculum Committee

The following motions were carried by the Senate Curriculum Committee at its meeting on September 17, 2021:

- 21/64** The new courses, BADM 340 – Business Internship I, BADM 345 – Business Work Experience I, BADM 440 – Business Internship II and BADM 445 – Business Work Experience II, as well as Cap Core designation under the heading *Experiential*, be recommended to Senate for approval.
- 21/65** The revisions to the Bachelor of Business Administration Degree and Business Administration Diploma program profiles be recommended to Senate for approval.
- 21/67** The prerequisite and co-requisite revisions to:
- BPAC 400 – Contemporary Cultural Practices
 - BPAC 401 – Canadian Cultural Policy and the Performing Arts
 - BPAC 402 – Advanced Production Planning I
 - BPAC 403 – Studies in Interdisciplinary Creation and Collaboration
 - BPAC 404 – Contemporary Performance Practices
 - BPAC 405 – Applied Production Planning
 - BPAC 406 – Strategic Career Planning
 - BPAC 407 – Studies in Interdisciplinary Performance and Production
- be recommended to Senate for approval.
- 21/68** Cap Core designation under the headings *Self and Society* and *Culture and Expression* to ENGL 322 – Literature and Society be recommended to Senate for approval.

Deb Jamison, Chair
Senate Curriculum Committee

Paul Dangerfield
Chair, Senate

Date: *Sep 20, 2021*

Date:

SENATE REPORT

AGENDA ITEM:	Teaching and Learning (STL) committee report
PURPOSE:	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Approval <input type="checkbox"/> Information <input type="checkbox"/> Discussion
MEETING DATE:	September 21, 2021
PRESENTER:	Diana Twiss - Chair, Teaching and Learning Committee

PURPOSE

To document the committees' support for the Centre for Teaching Excellence's proposal for a *Certificate in University Teaching and Learning* and make motion for Senate to support this proposal.

BACKGROUND

Centre for University Teaching and Learning certificate proposal

There is a large and growing body of research demonstrating the positive relationship between faculty educational development and student success outcomes. As a teaching-intensive university with high student-faculty interaction, Capilano has an opportunity to lead the path in BC for a certificate in university teaching at the faculty level.

At our September 21st meeting, Laura MacKay, director of the Centre for Teaching Excellence, presented a proposal for a *Certificate in University Teaching and Learning*. The Capilano University *Certificate in University Teaching and Learning* provides a professional development framework for faculty to develop, reflect, and deliver effective learning experiences that are pedagogically informed and inclusive to diverse learners.

The *Certificate in University Teaching and Learning* is specifically designed for faculty at Capilano University. Centering on a decolonized approach that creates space for indigenization, equity, diversity and inclusion, the program consists of **six workshop or modules**. Participants who successfully complete each workshop would receive recognition for completing that module (for example, a badge) and will receive the certificate upon completion of all courses. Three of the six modules that make up the certificate have already been developed and delivered to CapU faculty by the CTE team.

DISCUSSION

The STL committee reviewed the proposal. We confirm that the development of the Certificate is guided by the following core principles in alignment with both *Envisioning 2030* and the *2030 Academic Plan*:

- **Learning-centered:** focusing on the process of learning and co-creation of knowledge through a decolonizing approach.
- **Evidence-Informed:** building on scholarly teaching, effective learning strategies, and Indigenous ways of knowing and being.
- **Inclusive and Equity-focused:** recognizing the importance inclusiveness and anti-racist education and Capilano's commitment to TRC.
- **Supportive and Collaborative:** creating supportive environment for experimentation and innovation in teaching.

The committee agrees that the proposed certificate has clear **learning outcomes**. As some faculty may have already taken some of the workshops, it includes opportunity for **prior learning assessment**. To ensure high quality **accreditation with the Educational Developers Caucus** (EDC), a branch of the Society for Teaching and Learning in Higher Education will be pursued.

The committee also agrees that the proposed certificate offers several benefits to CapU faculty.

1. The certificate will be offered at no cost to **all regular and non-regular faculty** during their employment at Capilano. In comparison, the Provincial Instructor Diploma Program is \$3808 of which Capilano reimburses faculty for 75% (\$2856); however, faculty must still pay \$952.
2. There are financial incentives for those faculty to complete portions of the certificate. For example, the Internationally recognized Instructional Skills Workshop typically costs \$595 but has been offered at no cost to faculty at Capilano University for the past 4 years.
3. Faculty completing the Certificate will be recognized with a portable digital badge and certificate.
4. As a recruitment and employee retention tool, Capilano could recruit faculty with one of the only provincial faculty-level teaching and learning certificates.
5. The certificate can be used in marketing and communications in terms of conveying the quality of education at Capilano.

And finally, we agree that to achieve successful uptake and engagement from faculty, the Certificate would need to meet the following criteria:

1. Offered at no cost to Capilano faculty.
2. Able to be completed within one year.
3. Includes curriculum that meets prior learning assessment for the Provincial Instructor Diploma Program.

4. Includes curriculum that addresses the holistic domain of teaching and learning from course design to instructional skills, to assessment, inclusive teaching, and reflective and scholarly practice.
5. The Certificate would be eligible for national accreditation by the Educational Developer's Caucus branch of the Society of Teaching and Learning in Higher Education.

RECOMMENDATION

Motion

That Senate support the development of a *Certificate in University Teaching and Learning*, as proposed by the Centre for Teaching Excellence.

DRAFT