



**510th REPORT OF THE ACADEMIC POLICY COMMITTEE TO SENATE – PART A
on the APC meeting held on February 24th, 2022**

I. TO BE APPROVED BY SENATE

(A) NEW TEACHING PROGRAMS REQUIRING SENATE APPROVAL - none

(B) ACADEMIC PERFORMANCE ISSUES / POLICIES / GOVERNANCE/AWARDS

Office of the Provost and Vice-Principal (Academic)

Revisions to the Guidelines for Developing a Service Portfolio – *appendix a*

At a meeting on February 24th, 2022, APC reviewed and approved proposed revisions to the Guidelines for Developing a Service Portfolio that would offer broader recognition to informal service and administrative work that is disproportionately taken up by faculty who are members of underrepresented and equity seeking groups. This work can constitute a significant contribution to strengthening the McGill Community and currently risks being unnoticed and unaccounted for in assessing academic performance. The revisions aim to ensure that such work is recognized and valued at McGill.

Be it resolved that Senate approve the proposed revisions to the Guidelines for Developing a Service Portfolio.

Office of the Vice-Principal (Research and Innovation)

Revisions to the Policy on the Ethical Conduct of Research Involving Human Participants - *appendix b*

At a meeting on February 24th, 2022, APC reviewed and approved proposed government mandated revisions to the Policy of the Ethical Conduct of Research Involving Human Participants. Two of the University's Research Ethics Boards (REBs) are designated by the *Ministère de la Santé et des Services Sociaux (MSSS)*: the Research Ethics Board-3 (REB-3) and the Faculty of Medicine and Health Sciences Research Ethics Board (FMHS REB). The MSSS recently requested that the Policy on the Ethical Conduct of Research Involving Human Participants be updated to indicate that these two REB's members are appointed by and report to the University's highest governing body, the Board of Governors. These REBs review research that falls under the auspices of Article 21 of the Quebec Civil Code which requires that research which could interfere with the integrity of a person who is a minor and or an adult unable to consent for themselves be reviewed by an REB that has been designated by the MSSS. In addition, several other changes aiming to ensure accuracy and to reflect current practices and protocols have been included.

Be it resolved that Senate approve and recommend to the Board of Governors for approval the proposed revisions to the Policy of the Ethical Conduct of Research Involving Human Participants.

(C) CREATION OF NEW UNITS / NAME CHANGES / REPORTING CHANGES - none

(D) CHANGES IN DEGREE DESIGNATION – none

(E) INTER-UNIVERSITY PARTNERSHIPS – none

(F) OTHER – *none*

II. **TO BE ENDORSED BY SENATE / PRESENTED TO SENATE FOR DISCUSSION** – *none*

III. **APPROVED BY APC IN THE NAME OF SENATE**

(A) DEFINITIONS – *none*

(B) STUDENT EXCHANGE PARTNERSHIPS / CONTRACTS / INTERUNIVERSITY PARTNERSHIPS - *none*

(C) OTHER - *none*

IV. **FOR THE INFORMATION OF SENATE**

I. **ACADEMIC UNIT REVIEWS** - *none*

II. **APPROVAL OF COURSES AND TEACHING PROGRAMS**

1. **Programs**

a) APC Approvals (new options/concentrations and major revisions to existing programs)

i. New Programs

ii. Major Revisions of Existing Programs

Approved by SCTP on January 6th, 2022 and reported to APC on February 24th, 2022

Faculty of Science

B.Sc.; Honours in Chemistry (71-74 cr.)

B.Sc.; Major in Chemistry (59-65 cr.)

b) APC Subcommittee on Courses and Teaching Programs (SCTP) Approvals
(Summary Reports: <http://www.mcgill.ca/sctp/documents/>)

i. Moderate and Minor Program Revisions

Approved by SCTP on January 6th, 2022, and reported to APC on February 24th, 2022

Graduate and Postdoctoral Studies

Faculty of Medicine and Health Sciences

M.Sc. (A.) in Nurse Practitioner; Non-Thesis – Primary Care (45 cr.)

Graduate Certificate in Primary Care Nurse Practitioner (27 cr.)

Graduate Diploma in Primary Care Nurse Practitioner (30 cr.)

Desautels Faculty of Management

B.Com.; Major in General Management; Concentration in Business Analytics (15 cr.)

B.Com.; Major in Business Analytics (69 cr.)

B.Com.; Major in Retail Management (69 cr.)

Schulich School of Music

B.Mus.; Faculty Program in Music; Jazz (123 cr.) [from December 2, 2021]

Faculty of Science

B.Sc.; Major in Atmospheric Science (60-62 cr.)

B.Sc.; Liberal Program - Core Science Component Atmospheric and Oceanic Sciences (45-48 cr.)
B.Sc.; Major in Atmospheric Science and Physics (69 cr.)
Diploma in Meteorology (30 cr.)

ii. Program Retirements

Approved by SCTP on January 6th, 2022, and reported to APC on February 24th, 2022

Graduate and Postdoctoral Studies

Faculty of Medicine and Health Sciences

Graduate Certificate in Theory in Primary Care (15 cr.)

Faculty of Science

B.Sc.; Honours in Chemistry; Atmosphere and Environment (75 cr.)

B.Sc.; Honours in Chemistry; Materials (74 cr.)

B.Sc.; Honours in Chemistry; Measurement (74 cr.)

B.Sc.; Major in Chemistry; Atmosphere and Environment (63 cr.)

B.Sc.; Major in Chemistry; Materials (62 cr.)

B.Sc.; Major in Chemistry; Measurement (62 cr.)

2. Courses

a) New Courses

Reported as having been approved by SCTP on January 6th, 2022: 15

Desautels Faculty of Management: 3

Faculty of Medicine and Health Sciences: 11

Faculty of Science: 1

b) Course Revisions

Reported as having been approved by SCTP on January 6th, 2022: 16

Faculty of Engineering: 7

Desautels Faculty of Management: 5

Faculty of Medicine and Health Sciences: 1

Faculty of Science: 3

c) Course Retirements - none



McGill

Memorandum Note de service

Date: 24 February 2022

To/Destinataire(s): Prof. Manfredi, Provost and Vice-Principal Academic, Chair of APC

From/De la part de: Prof. Angela Campbell, Associate Provost (Equity & Academic Policies)

c.c. Paola Colapelle, Academic Program Administrator

Subject/Object: Proposed Revisions to the Guidelines for Developing a Service Portfolio, Appendix C to the Regulations Relating to the Employment of Tenure Track and Tenured Academic Staff (“Guidelines”)

For: information discussion **decision**

Purpose: To propose revisions to the Guidelines that would offer broader recognition to informal service/administrative work, disproportionately taken up by faculty who are members of underrepresented groups.

Background: These changes emerge from discussions across North American campuses that have illuminated the significant, often less “visible”, work that faculty – especially those who are members of underrepresented groups – do outside of formally appointed administrative roles. This work can constitute a significant contribution to strengthening our community but risks going unnoticed and unaccounted for in assessing academic performance. Proposed revisions aim to ensure that such work is recognized and valued at McGill.

Prior consultations/approvals The issue at the centre of this initiative has arisen in consultation with faculty members and associations, especially those who are members of underrepresented/equity-seeking groups, with requests made for formal policy efforts to extend recognition and value to informal service and typically “less visible” service to the University and wider communities. Revisions have been reviewed and approved by MAUT Council.

Next steps: Presentation to Senate for review and approval.

Attachments **Appendix A: Proposed Revisions to: APPENDIX C of the Regulations Relating to the Employment of Tenure Track and Tenured Academic Staff: “Guidelines for Developing a Service Portfolio**

APPENDIX C

Guidelines for Developing a Service Portfolio

The present document is intended to help members of the academic staff in the preparation of their portfolios related to their service activities, formally referred to as “other contributions to the University and scholarly communities.” At McGill, service is a core academic duty, alongside the duties of teaching and research. Hence, a service portfolio, reflecting contributions to committees both internal and external to the University, is an essential component of applications for reappointment, tenure and promotion.

These guidelines are advisory; following them is not compulsory. Indeed, services portfolios will vary from one colleague to the next, within and across disciplines. The orientation and emphasis of a service portfolio will also vary depending on career stage. For example, a pre-tenure academic colleague will not be expected to hold the same level of service leadership or responsibility as a colleague who is applying for promotion to the rank of full professor or full librarian.

Academic staff members are typically called upon to serve the University community not only by their respective Chairs, Directors and Deans, but also from other areas of the Faculty and University. Moreover, other forms of service contributions that reflect leadership and motivation to make a difference within academic communities will arise where staff members initiate activities themselves or in collaboration with others. Such contributions merit recognition and value.

Some academic activities will have a hybrid quality and may be properly qualified as service and/or as teaching or research. Candidates can determine where to include information about such activities, providing justification where the same activity is discussed in more than one part of a reappointment, tenure, or promotion dossier.

McGill University recognizes that not all service will occur in formal, structured activities. We know that many faculty members are called upon to advise, mentor, and support other colleagues and students. We also know that colleagues who are members of underrepresented groups are disproportionately called upon to take up these responsibilities. This work, which is often less visible than that which occurs in committee contexts, makes an important and valued contribution to the University community. As such, candidates are not only permitted, but encouraged to include this work within their service portfolio, which will be accounted for in committee assessments of their performance in this area of academic responsibility.

A. STATEMENT OF SERVICE CONTRIBUTIONS (approximately 4 pages)

A statement of service should provide a narrative about the candidate’s approach and commitment to such work, notably by;

- demonstrating how the candidate’s contributions exhibit:
 - a sense of **engagement, citizenship**
 - initiative and capacity for leadership,
 - the community’s confidence in the candidate’s capacities, commitment, integrity and judgment; and/or

- value and reach of service contributions, notably by explaining their influence and impact on the University and wider communities;
- describing whether and how a candidate's service activities have influenced their teaching and research, and vice versa.

It is often helpful to committees charged with evaluating service portfolios if the latter is structured to include separate sections addressing contributions to: (i) the department and Faculty, (ii) the University, and (iii) the wider scholarly community.

Within each of these sections, candidates should for each service activity:

- explain the nature of the mandate/role/responsibility
- identify the term or duration of the mandate/role/responsibility
- briefly describe the work undertaken and its contribution or impact, including efforts that demonstrate leadership and initiative

Contributions to the Department and Faculty

Here, service activities may include:

- Administrative appointments (e.g., Director of a Centre or Institute; Vice, Associate or Assistant Dean, Chair)
- Membership or leadership in standing or *ad hoc* committees of the department or faculty
- Initiatives to establish new working groups or committees within the department or faculty
- Creation or convening department or faculty workshops, research groups, or lecture or speakers' series
- Student service or student support roles (e.g., Graduate Program Director, Student Advising, Disciplinary Officer, Faculty Advisor to a journal or research publication housed within the Department or Faculty)
- Service as a mentor both within ~~formal unit- or Faculty-led~~ mentorship programs or informally, as an advisor or support for colleagues or students within the Department and/or Faculty
- Organizing or convening seminars, conferences or colloquia within the Department or Faculty

The foregoing are examples, and do not comprise an exhaustive list.

Contributions to the University

Here, service activities may include:

- University governance roles (e.g., membership in Senate or the Board of Governors)
- Membership or leadership in standing or *ad hoc* committees of the University (examples are abundant, and may include committees related to: academic programs, research, equity, student life and learning, **academic or staff recruitment**, faculty development or promotion, campus resources/space/planning, **leadership advisory appointments**, alumni relations)
- **Dean's representative or Provostial delegate in academic recruitment committees**

- Service on Senate-nominated and appointed committees (e.g., Committee on Student Discipline, University Tenure Appeals Committee, Committee on Staff Grievances and Disciplinary Procedures)
- **Community engagement and outreach that supports McGill's presence in the broader community**
- Service as an Assessor appointed under the *Policy on Harassment & Discrimination (before 2021)*
- Service on cyclical unit review committees
- Initiatives to establish or lead centres, institutes, working groups, **networks**, or committees within the University
- Service as a mentor **both** within a **formal** University-led mentorship program **or informally, as an advisor or support for colleagues or students across the University**
- Service as an examiner on theses or juries for McGill students (a candidate may decide that this is more properly placed in their Teaching Portfolio)
- Service as a pro-dean on doctoral defences
- Organizing or convening research panels, conferences or colloquia within the University
- Leadership and/or work within the faculty association (MAUT)
- **Leadership and/or work within any of the University's associations struck to advance EDI on campus (e.g., a Subcommittee of the JBSCE/EDIC, McGill Indigenous Faculty and Staff Caucus, Dr. Kenneth Melville McGill Black Faculty and Staff Caucus)**

The foregoing are examples, and do not comprise an exhaustive list.

Contributions to the Wider Scholarly Community

Here, service activities may include:

- Membership or leadership in inter-university academic committees
- Membership or leadership in disciplinary or professional committees **and networks**
- Membership or leadership in conference organizing committees
- Membership or leadership in committees within the private, public or nongovernmental sector, where the candidate is called upon to bring their academic expertise and insights
- Community engagement, particularly opportunities arising from the candidate's expertise and experience, for example, participation in community-based events (whether within the academy or outside) or engagement with the media, all furthering knowledge dissemination
- Service as a reviewer on tenure and promotion dossiers from institutions other than McGill
- Unit reviewer for programs, departments or institutes outside of McGill
- Membership in journal editorial committees
- Service as an examiner on theses or juries for students outside of McGill (although a candidate may feel this is more properly placed in their Teaching Portfolio)
- Membership in juries convened to assess research funding applications
- Peer review for granting councils, journals, publishers, or conference proceedings
- **initiatives that are not formally assigned but that a candidate has decided to develop or pursue on their own initiative and in consultation with their Chair and Dean**

The foregoing are examples, and do not comprise an exhaustive list.

Last Revised: February 2022



McGill

Memorandum Note de service

Office of the Vice-Principal (Research and Innovation)

Date: February 15, 2022

To/Destinataire(s): Christopher Manfredi, Provost and Vice-Principal (Academic), Chair of APC

From/De la part de: Martha Crago, Vice-Principal (Research and Innovation)

c.c. Paola Colapelle, Academic Program Administrator

Subject/Object: Provincially Mandated Revisions to the *Policy on the Ethical Conduct of Research Involving Human Participants*

For: Decision

Purpose:

Two of the University's Research Ethics Boards (REBs) are designated by the *Ministère de la Santé et des Services sociaux* (MSSS) to review research that falls under the auspices of Article 21 of the Quebec Civil Code: Research Ethics Board-3 (REB-3) and the Faculty of Medicine and Health Sciences Research Ethics Board (the FMHS REB). Article 21 requires that research which could interfere with the integrity of a person who is a minor and or an adult unable to consent for themselves be reviewed by an REB that has been designated by the MSSS.

The MSSS requires redesignation every 3 years. The MSSS renewed the designation of these two REBs from October 1, 2021 – September 30, 2024, on the condition that the *Policy on the Ethical Conduct of Research Involving Human Participants* be revised to indicate that the REBs report to the highest governing body, the Board of Governors and that the Board of Governors is responsible for appointing members to the REBs. The MSSS requires that the revised Policy be adopted by the Board and sent to the MSSS no later than March 31, 2022.

Considering this requirement, revisions must be made to the *Policy on the Ethical Conduct of Research Involving Human Participants*, which will be conducted in two phases. First, the revisions required to meet the MSSS compliance requirements will be completed at this time. Second, a deeper review and refresh of the Policy will be initiated in early 2022 and go through the consultation and approval process for research related policies. The Policy was last reviewed in December 2012. In fall of 2019, a review was planned to start in early 2020. However, due to the pandemic with many other priorities, the review was postponed. There is currently no review clause in the Policy.

Background:

In addition to the MSSS required revisions, several other changes need to be implemented at this time to ensure accuracy and to reflect current practices and protocols:

- Section 1.4: Removal of statement related to student thesis guidelines, which is no longer valid
- Section 2.1: Revisions to the membership titles and appointment process of Advisory Council on Human Research Ethics (ACHRE) members

- Section 2.2: Required revisions by the MSSS to make clear that the REB reports directly to the Board of Governors and that they appoint REB members
- Section 3.3: Update on information on hospital/multi-site reviews that is outdated
- Section 4.6: Removal of outdated information on what does not need prior approval of the REB for certain modifications
- Section 5.0: Removal of reference to the province's Plan d'action ministériel, which is no longer accurate.

*Prior consultations/
approvals*

- Associate Director, Research Ethics and Ethics Officer, Faculty of Medicine and Health Sciences (Fall 2021)
- Chair of ACHRE, the University body responsible for advising and making recommendations to the VP (RI) on policies and procedures related to research involving human participants (December 2021)
- Secretary General (November/December 2021)
- REB Councillor at the MSSS (November/December 2021)
- Legal Services (January 2022)
- Office of the VP (RI) (January 2022)
- P7 (January 20, 2022)
- Research Advisory Council (RAC) (February 1, 2022)

Next steps:

Submission to:

- Academic Policy Committee: February 24, 2022
- Senate: March 23, 2022
- Executive Committee of the Board of Governors: March 24, 2022

Attachments

- *Policy on the Ethical Conduct of Research Involving Human Participants*



POLICY NAME	POLICY ON THE ETHICAL CONDUCT OF RESEARCH INVOLVING HUMAN PARTICIPANTS
Approving Body	To be filled by Secretary-General
Initial Approval Date	To be filled by Secretary-General
Date of last review	To be filled by Secretary-General
Date of next review	To be filled by Secretary-General
Executive Sponsor	Vice-Principal (Research and Innovation)
Related Documents	Regulation on the Conduct of Research

PREAMBLE

A fundamental commitment of the University is to the advancement of learning through scholarly activities, including research involving human participants. The University recognizes that such activities flourish only in a climate of academic freedom, and therefore is committed to safeguarding, among others, the freedoms of inquiry and dissemination of research results. When these activities involve human participants these freedoms must be integrated with the responsibility to conduct the research in a manner that respects the dignity, rights and welfare, and above all protects from possible harm, the persons who are the research participants.

The purpose of this policy is to promote and facilitate the conduct of research involving human participants in a manner consistent with the highest scholarly and ethical standards. To this end, McGill University is committed to adhering to the principles and articles stipulated in the most recent version of the [Tri-Council Policy Statement Ethical Conduct For Research Involving Humans](#) (TCPS). The three core principles are respect for persons, concern for welfare, and justice. Researchers are responsible for knowing about and adhering to the standards articulated therein.

This policy describes the administrative structures and procedures for the ethical review of research involving human participants at McGill University. All such research must be in compliance with the TCPS; this policy; the policies, procedures and guidelines established by the McGill Advisory Council on Human Research Ethics and the individual Research Ethics Boards as well as all relevant federal and provincial regulations and laws, such as the Quebec Civil Code and the Canada Food and Drug Act.

All research projects involving research participants conducted at or under the auspices of McGill University require ethics review and approval by a McGill Research Ethics Board (REB) or an REB of a McGill affiliated ~~health and social services institution~~ or an REB recognized by a formal agreement with the University, before the research may begin.

Deleted: hospital

1.0 RESPONSIBILITIES

Authority for ethics review according to this policy is established by the Board of Governors of the University. The ethical conduct of research involving human participants is a responsibility that is shared by the various constituents of the University. Notwithstanding this shared responsibility,

there are specific responsibilities that can be summarized as follows.

1.1 Responsibilities of the Administration

The Office of the Vice-Principal (Research and Jnnovation) bears the responsibility for the implementation of the University's policies on research involving human participants. It must provide for the appropriate administrative oversight and the necessary resources to ensure that the University's adopted practices and procedures are being adhered to and are in compliance with all applicable ethical requirements. The Office of the Vice-Principal (Research and Jnnovation) is responsible for entering into any agreements with other institutions, such as the McGill affiliated health and social services institutions, to conduct the ethics review and approval of the research of McGill members.

Deleted: International Relations

Deleted: International Relations

Deleted: hospitals

Academic administrators such as Deans, Directors and Department Chairs, have a responsibility for the conduct of research carried out within their jurisdictions. They have a responsibility to be aware of ongoing research and a duty to create a climate for ethical practice in research by promoting widespread general awareness and knowledge of this policy and the need for ethics review.

1.2 Responsibilities of Researchers

Researchers have the primary responsibility to ensure that their research is carried out in an ethical manner. They are responsible for the protection of the rights and welfare of the research participants.

Researchers must be familiar with and comply with this policy and other ethical guidelines relevant to their research discipline. It is the responsibility of the researcher to obtain ethical approval as described in this policy for any project involving human participants before starting the research. If there is any uncertainty about whether the research needs ethical review and approval, the researcher should consult the appropriate REB for advice.

All members of a research team who conduct research under the supervision of others also bear personal responsibility for the ethical conduct of research with human participants. The Principal Investigator has the responsibility to ensure that the members of the research team comply with the provisions of this policy. Principal investigators should ensure that the members of the research team are aware of the contents of this policy and of other applicable ethical guidelines that are relevant to their responsibilities. Researchers must ensure that all individuals under their supervision have the training and competence needed to carry out their responsibilities in an ethical manner.

1.3 Responsibilities of Faculty Members as Supervisors of Student Researchers

All student research must be supervised by a faculty member who accepts responsibility for overseeing the ethical conduct of the student's research project. The supervising faculty member has certain responsibilities even though the student may be the primary researcher. Supervisors must ensure that their students have the training and competence needed to carry out their responsibilities in an ethical manner. They must ensure that the students are aware of and familiar with the contents of this policy and of other applicable ethical guidelines that are relevant to their responsibilities. Once a student's research project is approved, the supervisor must take further reasonable measures to ensure that the research is conducted in accordance with the provisions of this policy and other applicable ethical requirements. In the case of all undergraduate research, the supervisor has full responsibility to ensure that a student's project receives the appropriate ethics approval. In the case of course research projects, as described in Section 3.4, the supervisor/instructor has full responsibility to ensure that a student's project receives the appropriate ethics approval. In the case of graduate or postdoctoral research, except for course research projects as described in Section 3.4, it is the joint responsibility of the faculty supervisor and the student to ensure that the project receives the appropriate ethics approval. Supervisors are required to co-sign the student's submission to the REB to affirm their supervisory

responsibilities.

1.4 Responsibilities of Student Researchers

Student research projects involving human participants must receive the appropriate ethics review and approval before the research may begin. Although a student's research must be supervised by a faculty member, this does not in any way relieve the obligation of the student to be familiar with and comply with the contents of this policy that are relevant to the student's responsibilities. As stated in Section 1.3, in the case of graduate or postdoctoral research, except for course research projects as described in Section 3.4, it is the joint responsibility of the faculty supervisor and the student to ensure that the project receives the appropriate ethics approval.

Deleted:
Deleted:
Deleted:

2.0 STRUCTURE

The overall responsibility for overseeing the ethical conduct of research involving human participants is entrusted to the Office of the Vice-Principal (Research and Innovation). The following bodies have been established for developing and implementing University policies and procedures related to human participant research.

Deleted: As
Deleted: per Thesis Office guidelines, students will be required to include the ethics approval certificate when depositing their thesis.

Deleted: International Relations

2.1 Advisory Council on Human Research Ethics

The Advisory Council on Human Research Ethics (ACHRE) is the University body responsible for coordinating University-wide understanding of, and compliance with, the applicable requirements for the ethical conduct of research involving human participants. The ACHRE reports directly to the Board of Governors and to the Office of the Vice-Principal (Research and Innovation) and must submit an annual report of its activities.

Deleted: International Relations

Membership

The ACHRE shall, at a minimum, consist of:

- the Chair, appointed by the Board of Governors, in consultation with the Vice-Principal (Research and Innovation) and with the other members of the ACHRE, who shall be a faculty member who is knowledgeable in research ethics
- the Associate Vice-Principal (Research and Innovation)
- the Chairs of the University REBs
- the Associate Director, Research Ethics (OVPRI), who will serve as Secretary
- the Ethics Officer, Faculty of Medicine and Health Sciences
- one person representing community interests and concerns, who has no formal affiliation with the institution, appointed by the Board of Governors, in consultation with the Vice-Principal (Research and Innovation) and with the other members of the ACHRE
- one graduate student or postdoctoral fellow, to be named by the PGSS

Deleted: ¶

Deleted: International Relations

Deleted: in consultation

Deleted: International Relations

Deleted: Research Ethics Officer

Deleted: R

Deleted: 10

Deleted: Senior Ethics Administrator

Deleted: Faculty of Medicine

Deleted: International Relations

Deleted: in consultation

Other members may be appointed on an ad-hoc basis as deemed necessary to carry out the mandate of the committee.

Responsibilities

The ACHRE shall be responsible for:

Advising and making recommendations to the Vice-Principal (Research and Innovation) on policies and procedures to be established or modified, in order to ensure that all research involving human participants conducted at or under the auspices of McGill University is carried out in a manner consistent with the highest ethical standards. The ACHRE will actively monitor the consistency of these policies and procedures with other McGill policies, the Tri- Council Policy Statement *Ethical Conduct For Research Involving Humans*, federal and provincial regulations, and all other applicable guidelines.

Deleted: International Relations

Reviewing and advising the Vice-Principal (Research and Innovation) on the number, jurisdiction

Deleted: International Relations

and responsibilities of the REBs at McGill University.

Developing and reviewing policies, guidelines and procedures, in conjunction with the REBs, to promote consistency of procedures and policy interpretation.

Responding to any issues of concern raised by the REBs and providing ethical and legal expertise to the REBs as needed.

Collaborating with the Office of the Vice-Principal (Research and Innovation) and the REBs to develop and implement educational resources and programs on the ethics of research involving human participants, for faculty, staff and students.

Maintaining liaison with other organizations involved in the protection of human research participants.

Creating subcommittees as required to carry out the business of the ACHRE.

Receiving the annual reports of the REBs and submitting them to the Board of Governors and the Office of the Vice-Principal (Research and Innovation).

Deleted:

Deleted:

Deleted:

Deleted:

Deleted: International Relations

Deleted: ¶

Deleted: forwarding

Deleted: International Relations

Meetings

Meetings are held annually and at the call of the Chair as needed.

Quorum will be 50% of the membership. The Chair has the final authority to decide if the quorum membership present is adequate for the proper conduct of the meeting.

Normally, decisions are arrived at by consensus. Only after reasonable efforts to reach a consensus have failed, decisions will be made on the basis of a simple majority vote of those members present.

Minutes will be taken of every meeting in sufficient detail to document attendance, decisions and dissents (when applicable including a record of voting), and a summary of the discussion of important issues.

2.2 Research Ethics Boards

The mandate of an REB is to determine the ethical acceptability of research involving human participants, with the primary objective of protecting the rights and welfare of the participants. Each REB reports directly to the Board of Governors, and must submit an annual report of its activities.

The jurisdiction and number of REBs are established considering the range of research conducted at the University and consistent with appropriate workloads.

Researchers usually submit their projects to their designated REB (see Appendix I). Researchers may consult with the REB Chair to determine if another REB may be more appropriate for the review of their research project. The REB Chair has the authority to refer a project to another more appropriate REB, in consultation with the Chair of the other REB.

Deleted: and the Office of the Vice-Principal (Research and International Relations) through ACHRE

Deleted:

Membership

REBs will be maximally effective to the extent that their members are selected on the basis of their interest in, commitment to, and suitability for the role.

An REB, shall, at a minimum, consist of five members, including both men and women, and have:
- at least one member who is knowledgeable about the relevant ethical issues
- at least two faculty members who have broad expertise in the methods or in the areas of research that are covered by the REB; no REB may consist entirely of members of one discipline
- for biomedical research, and for all research reviewed by an REB designated by the Ministry of

Health and Social Services, at least one member who is knowledgeable in the relevant law but is not the legal counsel of the University; this is advisable but not mandatory for other areas of research - at least one member who represents community interests and concerns, and has no formal affiliation with the Institution

The Board of Governors is responsible for the appointment, reappointment and removal of REB members. The term of appointment for members will normally be 3 years, renewable, with staggered appointments. The Chair will be appointed by the Board of Governors, in consultation with the Vice-Principal (Research and Innovation) and in consultation with the Deans of the relevant Faculties.

Deleted: ¶
Deleted: by the
Deleted: International Relations

The other members will be appointed by the Board of Governors in consultation with the REB Chair. The other members of an REB may be nominated by the relevant Faculties/Schools/Departments according to their regular nominating procedures, in consultation with the Chair of the REB and presented to the Board of Governors for appointment. The number of members to be nominated from each unit within the REB's jurisdiction is to be determined by the Chair of the REB and should be approximately in proportion to the number of submissions from that unit. For REBs that cover a large number of units, REB membership should be rotated to ensure that all units submitting projects have an opportunity to be represented. The REB Chair may deem that other regular members may be necessary to carry out the mandate of the REB. Such members will be presented to the Board of Governors for appointment.

Deleted: are to be appointed
Deleted: ¶
Deleted: ¶

Deleted: Other regular members may be appointed as deemed necessary by the Board of Governors in consultation with the REB Chair to carry out the mandate of the REB....

Alternate members may be appointed for each of the regular members so as not to prohibit the functioning of the REB in case of illness or other unforeseen circumstances.

When membership of an REB extends beyond 5 members, the community representation should increase proportionately.

The REB Chair may appoint ad hoc members or seek outside advice when reviewing a project that requires specific expertise regarding methodology, community or research participant representation, or other matters.

No member of an REB may participate in the review of any project in which the member has a conflicting interest, such as their own or their student's project. Members must disclose to the REB possible conflicts of interest arising out of personal relationships, financial interests, multiple roles, or other factors. When the REB determines that a conflict exists, the member may be requested to provide information to the REB but may not be present during the consideration of the project.

Responsibilities

Each REB:

Is responsible for reviewing research projects involving human participants in a manner consistent with this policy.

Deleted:
Deleted:

Has the authority to approve, require modification of, or disapprove research projects according to the requirements of this policy.

Is responsible for conducting the continuing review of ongoing research projects.

Has the authority to suspend or terminate approval of any ongoing research that is not being conducted in accordance with the REB's requirements or other ethical requirements.

Deleted: proposed or

Has the authority to suspend or terminate approval of any ongoing research that has been associated with unexpected serious harm to participants or that it deems to pose an unacceptable risk of harm to participants. In this regard, the REB Chair is authorized to act on behalf of REB members in exigent circumstances. Actions taken by the REB Chair in relation to exceptional circumstances should be brought to the full REB for ratification as soon as is practicable and in all cases, no later than 30 days after the action was taken.

Is responsible for promptly reporting the suspension or termination of approval of a research project to the Principal Investigator, the Vice-Principal (Research and Jnnovation) and other institutional officials as deemed appropriate by the REB, providing a statement of the reasons for the action taken.

Deleted: International Relations

Is responsible for establishing and overseeing mechanisms for delegated review of course research projects (as described in Section 3.4) in units within its jurisdiction.

Is responsible for serving as the initial appeals committee for any appeal taken by an individual against a decision of a delegated review of course research projects.

Acts as a resource to the University community on matters pertaining to the ethical conduct of research involving human participants and can provide consultation to researchers at all stages of the application and review processes.

Is responsible for developing guidelines and procedures for implementing the requirements of this policy consistent with the needs of the relevant research disciplines served by the REB. These may be more, but not less, stringent than those described in the present policy. Such guidelines and procedures shall be formalized in writing and approved by the ACHRE.

Is responsible for informing the ACHRE of issues arising that may affect the review process of the REBs, or any other issues of concern that may affect University policy relating to research involving human participants.

Meetings

The REB shall meet at least annually, and as needed to review research proposals that are not assigned for delegated review.

As a minimum, a quorum of an REB must have five members, of which two members have broad expertise in the methods or areas of research under review, one member who is knowledgeable about the relevant ethical issues, one member with no formal affiliation with the institution and, for biomedical research and all research under the auspices of Article 21 of the Quebec Civil Code, one member who is knowledgeable in the relevant law. However, the Chair has the final authority to decide if the quorum present is adequate to properly conduct reviews.

Researchers must be informed of submission deadline requirements.

An REB should accommodate reasonable requests from researchers to participate in discussions of their proposals, but the researchers shall not be present when the REB makes its decisions.

Normally decisions will be arrived at by consensus. Only after reasonable efforts to reach a consensus have failed, decisions will be made on the basis of a simple majority vote.

Only regular members (or their alternates when replacing the regular member) have a vote.

Regular attendance by REB members at meetings is required.

Minutes must be taken of every meeting in sufficient detail to document attendance, decisions and dissents and the reasons for them (when applicable including a record of voting), and a summary of the discussion of important issues.

REB records must be kept for a minimum of three years beyond the termination of a project.

2.3 Confidentiality

The desirability of openness with respect to the business of the various committee meetings must be limited by considerations of privacy of human participants or of third parties, the confidentiality

of proprietary data, the need to encourage free discussion at these meetings, and the desire to promote cooperation in carrying out the purposes of these committees.

Attendance at Meetings - Normally, regular REB and other committee meetings are closed to the University community and the general public. Exceptions may be made by each committee when warranted.

Minutes of Meetings – Normally, minutes of these meetings are only accessible to the committee members. However, in order to assist internal and external audits or research monitoring, and to facilitate reconsideration or appeals, the minutes will be made accessible to authorized representatives of the institution, researchers and funding agencies.

Annual Reports – The Chair of each REB must submit an annual report to the Chair of the ACHRE, summarizing the nature and volume of the REB’s activities. These reports are made publicly available. Confidential matters should not be included in such reports, but should be conveyed separately.

Research Proposal – Each committee shall consider a research proposal and all accompanying information to be confidential documents.

3.0 RESEARCH REQUIRING ETHICS REVIEW

All research involving human participants conducted at or under the auspices of McGill University, must be reviewed and approved by the appropriate McGill approved REB. The requirement for REB review applies to those activities that meet the TCPS definition of ‘research’ and ‘human participants’. Researchers must consult the TCPS for discussion of what activities need ethics review and what exceptions may exist. Researchers are responsible for consulting with the REB for verification as to whether their research needs ethics review or not.

3.1 Scope of Review

The requirement for ethics review and approval by a McGill approved REB applies to

- all research projects involving human participants conducted by or under the supervision of any member of McGill University, whether the research is funded or non-funded, or conducted on University premises or elsewhere. For the purpose of this document, a member of the University is defined as including academic and non-academic staff, sessional instructors, students, visiting or adjunct scholars, postdoctoral fellows, paid and unpaid research associates and assistants, and any person in a like position, when acting in connection with their institutional role. This applies to new faculty even though their current research may have received ethics approval at a previous institution.
- all student research projects involving human participants conducted as part of thesis or course requirements
- pilot studies and feasibility studies involving human participants
- all research involving human participants (including recruitment and/or data collection) conducted by organizations or individuals who are not members of McGill University while on University premises or using University facilities, equipment, or resources (including human resources)
- research that involves the use of the University’s non-public information to identify or contact human research participants.

Deleted:

Deleted: or participant recruitment

3.2 Research Projects in Which the Researcher is a Consultant

Research projects involving human participants conducted by McGill members as part of consulting activities as defined by

University regulations will need review and approval by the appropriate REB when

- a) McGill facilities, equipment, supplies, or support staff are used or

- b) the research data collected will be disseminated in association with the University or
- c) the researcher purports to represent the University in any way

3.3 Multi-jurisdictional Research

Much research is conducted by McGill members in locations outside of the institution whether in the field or within other institutions. Institutional accountability requires that each institution is responsible for research carried out under its auspices no matter where the research is conducted. There are also projects that may involve McGill members and researchers from other institutions. McGill REB approval is always needed in all circumstances before the research begins except in cases where McGill has formally delegated ethics review and approval to an external REB.

Fieldwork Research - Research involving human participants conducted in the field, whether in Canada or in foreign countries, must be reviewed and approved by the appropriate McGill REB before the research may begin. The investigator is responsible for being aware of any established mechanisms or guidelines to be followed or ethical approvals to be obtained when conducting research in other locations and/or dealing with particular groups or communities. The investigator is responsible for ensuring that all the required approvals have been obtained before starting the research, or for demonstrating to the REB why this is not feasible.

Research at Other Institutions - Research involving human participants conducted by McGill members in other institutions must be reviewed and approved by the appropriate McGill REB before the research may begin. Researchers are also responsible for obtaining the necessary ethics approval from any ethics boards or authorities that oversee research at the other institutions. The investigator is responsible for ensuring that all the required approvals have been obtained before starting the research.

Research with non-McGill collaborators - When McGill members are part of a collaborative research project involving human participants where the McGill member is the Principal Investigator, McGill REB approval is needed for all the human participant research to be conducted, even if the data will only be collected by the non-McGill member. The McGill member must also ensure that the collaborators have obtained their own institutional ethics approvals before collecting or accessing data. In the case where the Principal Investigator is from another institution and has already obtained their institutional REB approval, the McGill member must normally also obtain McGill REB approval before collecting or accessing data.

Inter-institutional Agreements - McGill has agreements with several institutions authorizing the ethical review of research conducted by McGill members to be done by an external REB. See Appendix I for a complete listing.

a) Research at affiliated health and social services institutions - Where the University has agreements in place with affiliated institutions, the University mandates the institution's REB to conduct the ethics review of McGill members on behalf of the University, and no further review is needed by a McGill REB. Researchers must adhere to the requirements of the affiliated institution's REB. When the human participant research will take place at both the affiliated institution and on the McGill campus, the researcher must also obtain a feasibility review and final authorization by the University for the portion of the research undertaken on the McGill campus.

b) Research Involving collaborators from Quebec Universities - The University is party to the Entente pour la reconnaissance des certificats d'éthique des projets de recherche à risque minimal (the 'Entente'). Under certain conditions, this Entente allows for the ethics review to be conducted by only one REB where there are researchers from several Quebec universities involved. See Appendix I for details.

3.4 Student Research

All student research involving human participants, including but not limited to theses, independent research projects, and postdoctoral research, must receive ethics review and approval as described

Deleted:

Deleted: Team

Deleted:

Deleted: h involving

Deleted: Research Ethics Boards of Affiliated Teaching Hospitals

Deleted: The REBs of the affiliated teaching hospitals directly to the Board of Directors of each of the hospitals and have their own policies and procedures. Researchers conducting human participant research at a hospital usually apply to the hospital REB for ethics review and approval. Multi-site projects conducted within the Faculty of Medicine and an affiliated hospital(s) or in more than one of the affiliated hospitals are normally reviewed by the Faculty of Medicine REB and not by each hospital REB. The hospital REBs are recognized as acting on behalf of the University for conducting ethics reviews for McGill members conducting hospital-based research at any of the affiliated teaching hospitals.

Deleted: and with the terms and conditions of the agreement in effect between the affiliated institutions and the University.

Deleted: The Faculty of Medicine coordinates the Research Ethics Committee of the Faculty (RECF). The RECF is a work group composed of the Chair of the Faculty of Medicine REB and the REB Chairs of the affiliated hospitals, with the Associate Dean (Research) of Medicine acting as the RECF Chair. The purpose of the RECF is to provide a forum to address common issues across these REBs, and to discuss and share information and experiences regarding emerging ethical issues. The RECF will make recommendations for guidelines and procedures for the Faculty of Medicine and the affiliated hospital REBs to follow, and attempt to achieve, as far as possible, uniformity in function among these REBs. The Chair, or the appointed delegate of the Chair, of the RECF will report to the ACHRE any issues of concern which pertain to University policy on research involving human participants.

Deleted: Team

in Section 4.1 before the research may begin. Some student research projects are conducted in courses that require students to collect data from human participants, and these projects must also receive ethics review and approval. The intent of course research projects, however, is for the student to become more knowledgeable about the research process, rather than to contribute to generalizable knowledge, and the results of the data are not intended for publication or presentation outside the classroom. The REB may establish guidelines for delegating the review of course research projects as described in Section 4.1. It is the responsibility of the course instructor to contact the REB if there is any uncertainty as to whether a course project needs ethics review or not. The applicable criterion for determining if ethics review is required is if an activity would be subject to ethics review in any other context, it is subject to review if it occurs in a teaching or training context. In the event that student research falls under the auspices of a research project that has already received ethics review and approval from a McGill approved REB, no further approval is necessary.

4.0 REVIEW OF RESEARCH

The review process is conducted in accordance with the standards and procedures of the TCPS as well as applicable federal and provincial requirements. The type of review depends upon the anticipated level of risk posed to research participants. Risks can include physical, psychological, or economic harms and can include injury to reputation or privacy. According to the TCPS, a project may be considered to involve minimal risk if the possible harms anticipated by participation in the research are not greater, considering probability and magnitude, than those ordinarily encountered by participants in those aspects of their everyday life that relate to the research.

4.1 Levels of Review

Full REB Review - Ethics review by a full REB is conducted at a convened meeting of the REB at which a quorum is present. Research that is considered to be greater than minimal risk must be reviewed by the full REB as does any research conducted under the auspices of Article 21 of the Quebec Civil Code. However, REB Chairs may designate any proposal for full review.

Delegated Review - While full REB review is the default process, the REB may delegate ethics review of minimal risk research to an individual or individuals from among the REB membership. The REB may delegate the review of course research projects, as described in Section 3.4, to individual REB members or to an REB designated departmental representative or committee. Course research projects may not involve greater than minimal risk. Jurisdiction of review is determined according to the department or faculty that offers the course, not by the department or faculty in which the student is registered. All delegated reviews must be reported to the full REB on a regular basis.

4.2 Scholarly Review as Part of Ethics Review

As stated in the TCPS, as part of research ethics review, the REB shall review the ethical implications of the methods and design of the research. When evaluating if the potential gains of the research warrant the costs and risks to be incurred by the participants and where risk of potential harm to participants exists, the REB must satisfy itself that the design of a research project is capable of addressing the questions being asked in the research. REBs may therefore require that research be peer reviewed, particularly when the research involves greater than minimal risk to participants. The extent of the scholarly review that is required for biomedical research that does not involve more than minimal risk will vary according to the research being carried out. Research in the humanities and the social sciences that poses, at most, minimal risk shall not normally be required by the REB to be peer reviewed. REBs must respect the relevant guidelines that require REBs to evaluate the scientific aspects of the research as part of ethics review for specific types of research (e.g. clinical trials).

In cases where the research has already passed acceptable peer review, such as through a funding agency or through a peer review process established within the University, the REB will normally accept documentation of those reviews as evidence that appropriate scholarly standards have been met. However, in cases where the REB has a good and defined reason for doing so,

the REB reserves the right to request further *ad hoc* independent peer review. REB members may also conduct the review of scholarly validity during the course of ethical review, which would require that the REB has members with the necessary expertise to carry out a proper peer review of the research in question. REBs shall base their judgment about scholarly value on a global assessment of the degree to which the research might further the understanding of a problem, issues or phenomenon; it shall not be based on methodological biases or a preference for particular procedures.

4.3 Decision Making and Outcome of the Review Process

An REB should accommodate reasonable requests from researchers to participate in discussions of their proposals, but the researchers shall not be present when the REB makes its decisions. Normally, decisions are arrived at by consensus. Only after reasonable efforts to reach a consensus have failed, decisions will be made on the basis of a simple majority vote of those members present. The REB shall provide the researcher with a written summary of its grounds for a decision.

A decision on a submission can be categorized as follows:

- a) Approved.
- b) The REB endorses the submission with conditions that must be met before final approval is granted.
- c) The REB cannot make a decision based on the information provided and the decision is deferred pending receipt of additional information or major revisions. The REB will then re-review.
- d) Not approved.

A decision of an REB to allow or disallow research on ethical grounds is final unless reversed by the REB upon reconsideration, pursuant to the standards in this policy. The institution may however, refuse to allow certain types of research within its jurisdiction, even though it has been found to be ethically acceptable.

4.4 Appeals of Decisions

a) Reconsideration - Researchers have the right to request, and the REB has an obligation to provide, reconsideration of an REB decision. The researcher must provide a written rebuttal in response to the concerns identified by the initial REB review. The researcher has the right to appear and be heard in a meeting with the REB to discuss the rebuttal. The REB decision following reconsideration is final.

A researcher who continues to dispute an REB decision after reconsideration by the REB may appeal that decision through the formal appeals process.

b) Appeals – Appeals can be made for procedural or substantive reasons. There will be two Research Ethics Appeal Committees, one serving the REB of the [Faculty of Medicine and Health Sciences](#) and one serving the remaining REBs. The Advisory Council on Human Research Ethics is responsible for establishing the appeals process for the Research Ethics [Appeals](#) Committees in accordance with the requirements of the TCPS.

Deleted: Faculty of Medicine

The Research Ethics Appeal Committee will serve as the final appeal committee whose decisions shall be final and binding in all respects for any appeal made by a researcher against a decision of an REB.

There shall be no recourses, grievances or review process of matters decided upon by the Research Ethics Appeal Committee pursuant to other regulations or policies of the University.

Researchers should recognize that decisions regarding appeals will be made in light of the primary objective of protecting the rights and welfare of the participants.

4.5 Continuing Review

Ongoing research shall be subject to continuing ethics review based on the associated risks to the participants. Normally, REBs will require at least annual reports on the status of all ongoing research projects. The greater the risk to the participant, the greater the scrutiny of the continuing review process. The design of this process will depend upon the particular circumstances of the project and might include but is not limited to

- a) requiring the researcher to submit status reports at various intervals as determined by the REB
- b) requiring the researcher to propose an appropriate monitoring mechanism
- c) requiring reports from an independent data and safety monitoring board

The REB may require further monitoring activities or schedule audits of ongoing research projects, although it is not expected that the REB will be responsible for conducting these activities.

The REB should be promptly notified by the researcher when the project is terminated.

4.6 Modification of an Approved Project

Researchers proposing any significant changes to the research project must obtain the approval of the REB before proceeding with these changes, except when necessary to eliminate an immediate hazard to a participant. The REB must then be immediately notified and the modification submitted for consideration immediately thereafter. Modifications may include, but are not limited to, changes in research design, participant population, consent procedures, change of principal investigator, new funding, or new co-investigators. Modifications involving minimal risk may be conducted by delegated review.

4.7 Unanticipated Issues

Researchers are obligated to immediately notify the REB of any unanticipated issues that may affect the risk level to participants or that may have other ethical implications. There may also be additional reporting requirements that researchers must adhere to for specific types of research (e.g. clinical trials). Researchers must consult the REB guidelines for specific reporting responsibilities. It is also the responsibility of a researcher to share any new knowledge with the REB that may affect a participant's welfare or have other ethical implications.

4.8 Conflicts of Interest

The researcher has a duty to inform the REB of any actual, potential or perceived conflicts of interest. A conflict of interest arises where the researcher has a material interest of any nature - personal, financial, career or otherwise - that may conflict with the researcher's duty of honesty and integrity. Conflicts may arise when the researcher serves dual roles (e.g. treating physician, teacher or employer, as well as researcher) and as such may unduly influence the participant to participate in the research. The REB has the responsibility to identify and seek clarification of situations where conflicts of interest may exist. REBs should be provided with the relevant details regarding the research projects, budgets, commercial interests, consultative relationships and any other information needed to allow them to properly identify and address possible conflicts of interest. When a significant real or perceived conflict of interest is brought to the attention of the REB, the researcher may be required to disclose the conflict to potential participants, to abandon one of the interests in conflict, or to take some other action to address the conflict, as specified by the REB.

REB members must disclose to the REB possible conflicts of interest arising out of personal relationships, financial interests, multiple roles, or other factors. Members of an REB may not be present during the consideration of their own project or any other project in which the member has a conflicting interest.

This section does not attempt to address all matters relating to conflicts of interest therefore, as appropriate, reference should also be made to existing University guidelines and regulations on conflicts of interest.

Deleted:

Deleted: or a

Deleted: Other minor modifications should be reported on a regular basis such as a change of project title, additional funding sources, change of co-investigator(s) or other collaborators.

5.0 RECORD-KEEPING FOR RESEARCHERS

The McGill [Regulation on the Conduct of Research](#) states that research data be maintained for a period of 7 years from the date of [first](#) publication in the absence of any specific sponsor requirements. Researchers are responsible for ensuring that all data is maintained in accordance with the confidentiality and security promised to the study participants.

Researchers are responsible for being aware of any specific data retention requirements applicable to their particular research (e.g. funding agencies, Health Canada).

6.0 COMPLAINTS, CONCERNS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

Research participants, researchers, staff members, REB members and any other individuals who have concerns, complaints or recommendations related to research involving human participants are encouraged to contact any of the offices listed in Appendix II. They will be directed to the appropriate office/individual. All inquiries will be taken seriously and dealt with in a timely manner. Complaints regarding research conducted under the auspices of affiliated [health and social services institutions](#) follow the complaint procedures established by those institutions.

Participants who have specific complaints or concerns about any aspect of their participation in a research study should contact the [Associate Director, Research Ethics](#) in the Office of the Vice-Principal (Research and [Innovation](#)). The Chair of the Advisory Council on Human Research Ethics will be notified immediately for investigation of the complaint. Once all the information is received, the Chair of the Advisory Council on Human Research Ethics will determine if any further action is necessary. The participant and the Principal Investigator will be notified of any decision and the justification for any actions taken. If research misconduct is suspected, as defined under the University's Regulations Concerning Investigation of Research Misconduct, the Chair of the Advisory Council on Human Research Ethics shall immediately initiate the reporting process described in said Regulations. The REB involved must be notified of any investigation in progress to allow the REB to take any safety measures that may be necessary to protect the welfare of the research participants. All complaints and actions taken, with confidentiality maintained, shall be reported in the ACHRE annual report. All founded complaints or cases of research misconduct, including the researcher's nominative information, must be reported to the relevant authorities as required by the applicable regulations, policies, code or collective agreement to which the researcher is subject. This includes the Dean/Chair of the Faculty, School or Department, the Vice-Principal (Research and [Innovation](#)), the REB that approved the research, and where relevant, the Board of Governors and the Ministry of Health and Social Services, and to other persons who have a legitimate need to know. All REB records, including investigator proposals and nominative information, shall be made available to authorized individuals for the purposes of auditing, monitoring and investigation of complaints or research misconduct.

Complaints regarding an REB should be made to the Chair of the Advisory Council on Human Research Ethics. The Chair is responsible for investigating the allegation and must report such allegations to the Vice-Principal (Research and [Innovation](#)) for appropriate action. All complaints, with confidentiality maintained, must be reported in the ACHRE Annual Report.

Any REB member or other individual involved in the review of research involving human participants who believes they are or have been the target of undue pressure by a researcher or any other individual should report the incident to the Chair of the Advisory Council on Human Research Ethics. The Chair is responsible for investigating the allegation and must report such allegations to the Vice-Principal (Research and [Innovation](#)) for appropriate action.

7.0 NONCOMPLIANCE

Instances of noncompliance with policies or procedures for research involving human participants should be brought to the attention of the Chair of the appropriate REB for review and resolution. When deemed appropriate, serious instances of noncompliance will be forwarded to the appropriate institutional officials for disposition.

Deleted:). In particular, in compliance with measure 9 of the [Plan d'action ministériel](#), a Principal Investigator conducting projects involving human participants within institutions that fall under the responsibility of the Ministry of Health and Social Services, such as hospitals or CSSSSs, as well as in institutions where there is a Ministry of Health and Social Services designated REB, is required to maintain a list of participants for at least a period of one year after the project ends. The list must include the name of the person, contact information for the participant; the REB project number, and the start and end date of the project. This requirement doesn't extend to projects where participants will be completely anonymous, or where only a records review will be conducted (e.g. examining school records, medical chart reviews).

Deleted: hospitals

Deleted: s

Deleted: Research Ethics Officer

Deleted: International Relations

Deleted: International Relations

Deleted: International Relations

Deleted: International Relations

Noncompliance can include, but is not limited to, failure to obtain prior REB approval before starting a research project, inadequate supervision of the research, failure to report unanticipated issues or protocol changes to the REB, failure to provide ongoing progress reports, or significant deviation from the approved protocol.

Actions taken by an REB or the University administration, as appropriate, may include, but are not limited to, education measures, compliance audits, terminating or suspending REB approval of active studies, restrictions on the ability to serve as an investigator on research projects involving human participants, freezing of research funds, or academic penalties in accord with the [Code of Student Conduct and Disciplinary Procedures](#) and the [Regulations Relating to the Employment of Academic Staff](#). Graduate students who do not have REB approval for projects involving human participants risk non-acceptance of their thesis work.

Any action taken by the REB or the University administration will be reported promptly, in writing, to the investigator.

APPENDIX I

MCGILL APPROVED RESEARCH ETHICS BOARDS

1) **McGill Research Ethics Boards** - The University currently has 5 Research Ethics Boards formally approved to conduct the ethics review of research involving human participants in accordance with this policy. A researcher's designated REB is usually determined according to the unit of the researcher's primary academic appointment, although researchers may consult with the REB Chair to determine if another REB may be more appropriate for the review of their research project. Faculties and departments are assigned to specific boards as follows:

Faculty of Medicine and Health Sciences Research Ethics Board (also referred to as the Institutional Review Board or the IRB) – for members in the Faculties of Medicine and Health Sciences and Dentistry and any research involving biomedically invasive measures, procedures, interventions or genetic research.

Deleted: Faculty of Agricultural and Environmental Sciences Research Ethics Board – for members in the Faculty of Agricultural and Environmental Sciences for research involving competent adults

Deleted: Faculty of Medicine

University Research Ethics Board 1 – for members in the Faculty of Law, Faculty of Arts except Linguistics and Social Work, Faculty of Engineering, Desautels Faculty of Management, School of Continuing Studies, Faculty of Religious Studies, Faculty of Science except Psychology, and any other unit not specifically assigned to another REB, for research involving competent adults

Deleted: I

University Research Ethics Board 2 – for members in Linguistics, Psychology, Schulich School of Music, School of Social Work and the Faculty of Education, for research involving competent adults

Deleted: II

University Research Ethics Board 3 - for members in all units except the Faculties of Medicine and Health Sciences and Dentistry for research involving minors or adults not competent to consent

Deleted: III

University Research Ethics Board 4 – for members in the Faculty of Agricultural & Environmental Sciences for research involving competent adults

2) **Affiliated Health and Social Services Institutions – The University recognizes the REBs of the following institutions** as acting on behalf of the University for conducting ethics reviews for McGill members in accordance with the terms of the agreement in place with each of them:

- the CIUSSS CODIM
- the CIUSSS ODIM
- the McGill University Health Centre

Deleted: Hospital Research Ethics Boards –The University recognizes the Research Ethics Boards of the affiliated hospitals

Deleted: conducting research in the following affiliated hospitals:...

Deleted: the McGill University Health Center

Deleted: the Douglas Hospital

Deleted: the SMBD Jewish General Hospital

Deleted: St. Mary's Hospital Center

3) Other

a) The University recognizes the Research Ethics Board of the Centre de recherche interdisciplinaire en réadaptation du Montréal métropolitain (CRIR) as acting on behalf of the University for conducting ethics reviews for McGill members conducting research within an establishment of CRIR.

b) The University is party to the Entente pour la reconnaissance des certificats d'éthique des projets de recherche à risque minimal (the 'Entente'). When a research project involves only minimal risk and involves a member(s) from McGill and an investigator(s) from a Quebec university who is also party to the Entente, the ethics review will be undertaken by the REB (REB PI) for the university under whose auspices the Principal Investigator carries out the research. The ethics approval from the REB PI will be recognized by the REB of the co-investigator without further ethics approval needed. The co-investigator's REB retains the option to conduct a full ethics review if it determines that the research involves greater than minimal risk. This does not apply to any research conducted under Article 21 of the Quebec Civil Code. Procedural details should be obtained from the REB.

APPENDIX II

Contact Information for Complaints, Concerns and Recommendations Related to Research Involving Human Participants

Associate Director, Research Ethics, Office of the Vice-Principal (Research & Innovation)
– (514) 398-6831

Deleted: Research Ethics Officer

Deleted: International Relations

Chair, University Advisory Council on Human Research Ethics – (514) 398-6831

Vice-Principal (Research and Innovation) – (514) 398-3991

Deleted: International Relations

www.mcgill.ca/research/researchers/compliance/human/ - lists all REB Chairs and contact information