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WHAT IS MULTI-JURISDICTIONAL RESEARCH?

Research involving humans that may require the involvement of multiple institutions and/or multiple REBs includes, but is not limited to, the following types of research projects:

1) conducted by a team of researchers affiliated with different institutions

2) several projects independently conducted by researchers affiliated with different institutions, with data combined at some point to form one overall research project

3) conducted by a researcher affiliated with one institution, but that involves collecting data or recruiting participants at different institutions

4) conducted by a researcher who has multiple institutional affiliations

5) conducted by a researcher at one institution that requires the limited collaboration of individuals affiliated with different institutions or organizations

6) conducted by researcher(s) working under the auspices of a Canadian research institution but conducted in another province, territory or country.
TCPS Article 8.1

Adoption of Alternative Review Models: An Institutional Responsibility

**SCOPE: Min-risk studies only**

An institution that has established an REB may approve alternative review models for research involving multiple REBs and/or institutions, in accordance with this Policy.

Next: What are our options for alternative review models?

**REASONING**

Facilitates the ethics review process and ethical conduct of such research

Provides flexibility and efficiency

Avoids unnecessary duplication of review

Ensures that all participants are afforded the same respect and protection

Balanced with proportionate review

Who has documented reciprocal agreements with other REBs?
ALTERNATIVE REVIEW MODELS

An institution may authorize its REB to accept reviews undertaken by an external REB. This authorization should be based on an official agreement that includes, but is not limited to, the following minimum components:

• All institutions or equivalent organization(s) involved agree to
  (1) adhere to the TCPS
  (2) formalize the cross-institutional agreement, and
  (3) document the existence of this agreement in their institutional policies;
• The highest institutional level, the body that originally defined the jurisdiction of the REB and its relationship to other relevant bodies or authorities within the institution, makes the decision to allow an REB to recognize research ethics review decisions made by another REB (in accordance with Article 6.2); and
• Approvals based on cross-institutional agreement should be documented and reported to the full REB, through the REB Chair, in each institution. The point in reporting is informational. It should not necessarily trigger a duplicate research ethics review.
OUR OPTIONS

• Independent ethics review by several REBs
  What most of us do now.

• Ethics review delegated to an external, specialized or multi-institutional REB
  Considerations: specialized content/methods, geographic/region-specific, volume of reviews, shared expertise, provincial legislation requiring this type of review, etc.

• Reciprocal REB review
  Official agreement to accept (with agreed level of oversight), the reviews of each other’s REBs, or reviews dealt with on a case-by-case basis (what some of us do now, undocumented).

Choosing the appropriate research ethics review model
The researcher and the REB should pay attention to the research context, and the characteristics of the populations targeted by the research.

The final decision regarding the selection of the appropriate model is the responsibility of the principal, or “home” REB (Article 8.2).
Consulting firm was hired to conduct a study that surveyed post-secondary students in the region.

PI contacted all 19 REBs
- 5 wanted local review using their application forms
- 2 exempted the study from needing review
- 12 accepted decision from Dalhousie (chosen “home” REB)

It was hard for him to know what to do, what the rules were (i.e. interpreting TCPS as a non-academic), and who to call for help.

Many reviews were happening at once, and several suggested moderate modifications.

It took nearly 4 months to receive final clearance.

Study suffered from “survey fatigue” due to late start (as low as 6% response rate).

Frustrating and confusing for PI (and some REBs).
• Streamlined review process for UPEI researchers who wish to use patients, staff, resources or data under the auspices of Health PEI and the Dept. of Health & Wellness

• Single application

• Initial minimal review by UPEI REB

• Protocol review and approval by Health PEI REB

• MOU between UPEI and Health PEI
Would employing alternative review models *for min-risk studies* free up valuable time and resources?

OR

Are there good reasons to keep conducting individual reviews of min-risk studies at each location?

*It depends.....*
PROBLEM
Researchers may not know how many REBs there are in Atlantic Canada that they might need to apply to, should he/she wish to conduct research at all institutions in all four provinces.

PROPOSED SOLUTION
Create an Atlantic Canada REB Directory

Education
Health
Indigenous

BENEFITS
Innovate or perish
Better user experience
Collaboration instills trust
Environmental Scan: Education Who’s Who?

**NS**
- Acadia
- Cape Breton U
- Dalhousie U
- Mount Saint Vincent U
- Agricultural College (DAL)
- College of Art & Design
- Community Colleges
- Saint Mary’s U
- St. Francis Xavier U
- U Sainte-Anne
- U Kings College

**NB**
- Mount Allison U
- Community Colleges
- St. Thomas U
- U de Moncton
- U New Brunswick - Fredericton
- U New Brunswick – Saint John

**PEI**
- Holland College
- U Prince Edward Island

**NL**
- College of the North Atlantic
- Memorial U

Any others?
# Environmental Scan: Health Who’s Who?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>NS</th>
<th>NB</th>
<th>PEI</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>IWK Hospital</td>
<td>Horizon</td>
<td>Health PEI REB</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NS Health Authority</td>
<td>Vitalité</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**NL**

Provincial Health Research Ethics Board (HREB)
Interdisciplinary Committee on Ethics in Human Research (ICEHR) at MUN

Any others?
Environmental Scan: Indigenous Who’s Who?

NL
Nunatsiavut Research Advisory Committee
NunatuKavut Research Advisory Committee
Innu – Natuashish community or Innu leadership approval
Innu – Sheshatshiu community or Innu leadership approval
Conne River Health and Social Services, Miawpukek First Nation
Qalipu Mi’kmaq First Nation

NS
Mi’kmaw Ethics Watch

PEI
Mi’kmaq Confederacy Ethics Review Committee
Native Council of PEI

NB
Maliseet Research Review Board
Urban Aboriginal Knowledge Network UNB

Any others?
Atlantic Canada REB Directory

Doesn’t need to be a huge project.

A shared excel spreadsheet on Google Docs has already been started (we can then post it as a link on our websites). Template on next slide.

Contain name of the REB, purview of the REB, link to contact person’s info, and a link to instructions on how to apply and/or link to application form.

Will require a commitment from each contact person to respond to one e-mail a year to verify/confirm the information about their organization’s REB.

Bonus feature to consider: For $20/year from each REB, we can purchase software to regularly check that all links are correct.
## DISCUSSION

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>REB Name</th>
<th>Purview (What Research Requires This REBs Review)</th>
<th>Contact (link)</th>
<th>How to Apply (link)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| St. Thomas University | Review is available normally only to members of the STU community, external researchers working in formal collaboration with STU members, or for research conducted at STU by others (UNINV researchers see Appendix A). For the purposes of this policy, the term "STU Research" is used to refer to all three categories of research.  

All research projects involving human participants undertaken by members of the university community fall within the jurisdiction of the STU Research Ethics Board. This includes all research conducted by STU faculty, staff and students, including students carrying out research as part of class assignments, irrespective of the source of financial support (if any) and irrespective of the location of the project, provided the investigator represents the work as STU Research.  

In some instances, ethical review of student work may be conducted at the departmental level (see Section 2.7). Researchers from outside the community who access resources or participants at STU are also required to undergo review. Review by the Research Ethics Board is also necessary for research involving human biological materials as well as human embryos, fetuses, fetal tissue, reproductive materials and stem cells.  

The term "Research" is defined in the TCPS as "an undertaking intended to extend knowledge through a disciplined inquiry and/or systematic investigation" where a "disciplined inquiry" refers to "an inquiry that is conducted with the expectation that the method, results, and conclusions will be able to withstand the scrutiny of the relevant research community" (Article 2.1). This does not normally include quality assurance studies, quality improvement studies, program evaluation activities, performance reviews, creative practice activities, or testing within the normal educational requirements (Article 2.5). Other research that is exempt from REB review is outlined below in Section 2.2 of this Policy.  

Researchers who are unsure if their project falls within the scope of REB review should contact the REB Chair for guidance rebchair@stu.ca | http://w3.stu.ca/stu/research/ethics | http://tinyurl.com/Apply-To-STU-REB |
In agreement with the Atlantic Region Elders who gathered in Millbrook First Nation in 2010, the Elder’s Advisory Council decided their role would include providing advice on matters related to protocols, ethics and best practices for the sharing of Traditional Knowledge, Customs, Traditions and Spirituality, as well as best practices alongside Elders. This would include working alongside Elders in all areas of community life and development including research.
NEXT STEPS

EXPLORE MJR AGREEMENTS & UNIVERSAL APPLICATION FORM
BENEFITS
Improving inter-institutional co-operation
Lightening our workload
Facilitating access to larger participant pools
Happier researchers/reduced review times

DRAWBACKS
May be difficult to implement & reach consensus
New technology/software

CURRENT EXAMPLES
University of Toronto (Hospitals)
Hamilton Integrated Research Ethics Board (McMaster & Health REBs)
Saskatchewan
United States (recent changes to Common Rule)
THANK YOU!